

Ipswich Local Plan

Proposed Submission Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) Development Plan Document

Pre-submission Consultation Statement, November 2014

Contents

- 1 Introduction**
- 2 Outline of the plan preparation process in Ipswich**
- 3 Issues and Options Stages ('Regulation 25' stage under both the 2004 and amended 2008 Regulations)**
- 4 Preferred Options Stage (Regulation 26 under the 2004 Regulations)**
- 5 Pre-Submission Stage (Regulation 18 under the 2012 Regulations)**
- 6 Conclusion**
- 7 Appendices**

Proposed Submission Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) development plan document

Pre-submission Consultation Statement, November 2014

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Ipswich Borough Council approved the proposed submission Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) development plan document (DPD) for Ipswich on 19th November 2014. This is a key development plan document forming part of the Ipswich Local Plan.
- 1.2 Before the Council submits the Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD to the Secretary of State, it has to comply with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. One of the requirements of Regulation 19 is that the Council must publish a statement setting out:
- (i) Which organisations and individuals have been invited to have involvement in the preparation of the plan;
 - (ii) How they were invited to make their representations;
 - (iii) A summary of the main issues raised; and
 - (iv) How those issues have been taken into account.
- 1.3 This Pre-submission Consultation Statement addresses the requirement of Regulation 19 in relation to the proposed submission Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD.
- 1.4 The local plan system is built on a principle of 'front loading' in plan preparation, to involve stakeholders from the earliest stages. The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) states:
- Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made.*
- 1.5 The soundness of the Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD will be judged against whether it has been prepared in accordance with the Regulations and the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement, in relation to involving people.
- 1.6 The Council is committed to ensuring that the views of the community are taken into account as far as possible in the Local Plan. The Statement of Community Involvement for Ipswich was adopted in September 2007 and a subsequent review was adopted in March 2014 and sets out the approaches the Council will use to engage people in plan preparation.

2 Outline of the plan preparation process in Ipswich

- 2.1 The Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD plan preparation process in Ipswich began in 2005, and has seen several changes along the way. In 2005, the Council started preparing four development plan documents in parallel:

- Core Strategy and Policies;
- The Requirements for Residential Developments;
- IP-One Area Action Plan; and
- Site Allocations and Policies.

2.2 This remained the case through the Issues and Options stage.

2.3 However, subsequently at the Preferred Options Stage, the Requirements for Residential Development document was combined with the Core Strategy. Thus the number of development plan documents was reduced to three. Public consultation was undertaken on the three development plan documents between January and March 2008. The Core Strategy document was then taken through to adoption in December 2011.

2.4 This Pre-submission Consultation Statement relates only to the proposed Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD. Up until the preferred options stage in 2008, the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and the IP-One Area Action Plan DPD had been separate documents.

2.5 The Council's Local Development Scheme (July 2012) introduced a combined Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD. The Council's Local Plan newsletter 6 in February 2013 further noted that the two documents had been combined and that the Council was reviewing proposed site allocations from the earlier preferred options documents, published in November 2007, which had been updated by the strategic housing land availability assessment (March 2010). In addition in the newsletter the Council issued a call for sites in addition to those already identified that should be considered by the Council for allocation as development sites.

2.6 A revised Local Development Scheme was published in July 2013 and a draft pre-submission Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD was approved at the Council's Executive Committee in October 2013 for public consultation (Regulation 18 of the 2012 Regulations). An eight-week public consultation was undertaken between 13th January and 10th March 2014.

2.7 A Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for Ipswich review, which consolidated and improved the September 2007 version, was adopted in March 2014. The SCI sets out how the community will be involved in plan making. The Council must comply with the SCI in enabling involvement in all local development documents. A further Local Development Scheme was published in September 2014.

2.8 The timeline below sets out the broad timetable that Site Allocations and Policies and IP-One Area Action Plan document preparation has followed, and key changes to the process or context that relate to it.

Year	Preparation stages	Related changes or publications
2005	Initial mail out to ask for issues that the plan may need to address ('Regulation 25' under the 2004 Regulations)	January 2005 First Local Development Scheme published

2006	Issues and Options consultation – June to July ('Regulation 25' under the 2004 Regulations)	Revised Local Development Scheme published March 2006
2007	<p>Further issues and options consultation – February to March (Regulation 25 under the 2004 Regulations)</p> <p>Executive meeting 19/11/07 approved Preferred Options document for consultation.</p> <p>Requirements for Residential Development incorporated into Core Strategy through the revised Local Development Scheme May 2007.</p>	<p>Revised Local Development Scheme published May 2007</p> <p>Statement of Community Involvement adopted September 2007</p>
2008	January to March consultation on Preferred Options (Regulation 26 under the 2004 Regulations)	<p>Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 published in June 2008</p> <p>Revised Planning Policy Statement 12 published in June 2008 – Local Spatial Planning</p>
2012	Executive decision to combine Site Allocations and Policies plan and IP-One Area Action Plan at Executive meeting 3/7/12. September 9 th to approve proposed submission Core Strategy and Policies development plan document for consultation (i.e. for Regulation 27 stage under the amended 2008 Regulations).	<p>National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012</p> <p>Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 published in April 2012</p> <p>Revised Local Development Scheme published in July 2012</p>
2013	<p>Call for Sites in Local Plan newsletter 6 February 2013 for four weeks until 14/3/13.</p> <p>Executive meeting 15/10/13 approved Draft Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) for consultation (i.e. for Regulation 18 stage under the 2012 Regulations).</p>	Revised Local Development Scheme published in July 2013
2014	Regulation 18 consultation carried out 13 th January to 10 th March 2014.	<p>Statement of Community Involvement review adopted March 2014</p> <p>Revised Local Development Scheme published in September 2014</p>

2.9 The following sections will explain, stage by stage, who was invited to be involved, and how. They will outline the main issues raised by respondents and how they have been taken into account since the preferred options stage in 2007/08.

3 Issues and Options Stages ('Regulation 25' stage under both the 2004 and amended 2008 Regulations)

Who was consulted, how, and when?

3.1 The issues and options stage in Ipswich consisted of three distinct public consultation stages, each with a different emphasis - in January 2005, June to July 2006 and February to March 2007. It also included ongoing meetings with stakeholders throughout the period.

3.2 In **January 2005**, initial views on issues to be addressed were invited by:

- Publishing leaflets about the development plan documents;
- Writing to specific and general consultation bodies enclosing a leaflet;
- Writing to all people on the Council's Local Plan mailing list who responded to the revised deposit draft of the Local Plan in 2001 to alert them;
- Placing an article in the Council's newspaper 'The Angle' delivered to households in Ipswich, informing the wider community; and
- Placing information on the Council's website, at its main offices, and in libraries.

3.3 There followed in **June to July 2006** a second period of consultation with the public about identified issues, and options for addressing them. Views were invited by:

- Publishing consultation documents and comment forms for the development plan documents;
- Writing to specific and general consultation bodies;
- Writing to all people on the Council's Local Plan mailing list who responded to the revised deposit draft of the Local Plan in 2001 and the first local development framework consultation in January 2005;
- Placing an advertisement in the Ipswich Evening Star and the East Anglian Daily Times;
- Placing all relevant documentation on the Council's website, at its main offices, and in libraries;
- Holding five drop in events at the Corn Exchange at various dates and times including Saturday and evening slots;
- Attending existing events including four scheduled area forum meetings (South East, South West, North East and North West Area Forums);
- Attending meetings with stakeholders; and
- Placing a planning feature in the Council's Newspaper, the Angle, delivered to households in Ipswich.

3.4 The third period of consultation took place in **February and March 2007** and focused on development control policies (and also additional site suggestions, but this is not relevant to the Core Strategy and Policies). Views were invited by:

- Publishing a further consultation document;
- Writing to specific and general consultation bodies;

- Writing to all people on the Council's combined Local Plan and LDF mailing list;
- Placing an advertisement in the Ipswich Evening Star and the East Anglian Daily times;
- Placing all relevant documentation on the Council's web site, at its main offices, and in libraries;
- Informing the Area Forums of the consultation; and
- Attending meetings with stakeholders.

4 Preferred Options Stage (Regulation 26 under the 2004 Regulations)

Who was consulted, how, and when?

- 4.1 The Preferred Options Site Allocations and Policies and IP-One Area Action Plan development plan documents were approved by the Executive on 19th November 2007. An opportunity was provided for people to ask questions about the documents and to make short presentations on the document contents at that Executive meeting. Consultees on the local development framework address list were invited to do so by letter. The consultation started on 14th January. The formal closing date was 25th February but the Council, in response to pressure from the public, agreed to consider all representations received up to 20th March.
- 4.2 This was the first stage of consultation on the development plan documents for which the Council had in place its adopted Statement of Community Involvement. At the time of the preferred options consultation, the 2004 Regulations were still those in force.
- 4.3 Views on the development plan documents were invited by:
- Publishing the consultation documents and comment forms for the development plan documents;
 - Writing to specific and general consultation bodies;
 - Writing to all people on the Council's combined Local Plan and local development framework mailing list (the latter now also including respondents to the SCI consultations);
 - Placing a statutory notice in the Ipswich Evening Star and the East Anglian Daily times;
 - Placing all relevant documentation on the Council's website, at its main offices, and in libraries;
 - Holding five drop in events at the Corn Exchange at various dates and times including Saturday and evening slots, and a further drop in event at Northgate Arts Centre;
 - Attending existing events including five area forum meetings, an Ipswich Society meeting, the Environment Panel and River Action Group;
 - Holding two public meetings, one about the Ipswich Northern Fringe and one about transport infrastructure;
 - Attending meetings with stakeholders;
 - Organising a workshop for secondary school geography students from the town;
 - Placing site notices on the strategic employment site suggested in the Core Strategy and notifying neighbours through a letter;
 - Placing a planning feature in the Council's Newspaper, the Angle, delivered to households in Ipswich; and

- Providing copies of the Angle to the clerks of neighbouring Parish Councils, where they were in agreement, for distribution in their villages.

4.4 The Preferred Options Site Allocations and Policies DPD set out area based policies and proposed site allocations. The site and area based policies were divided into policy areas, which are listed below:

Policy Area 39: The protection of identified sites for the uses proposed
 Policy Area 40: The identification, protection and development of Green Corridor
 Policy Area 41: The identification and protection of employment areas

4.5 The Preferred Options IP-One Area Action Plan DPD was divided into two key sections: Part B – The Policies, consisting theme based policies and site allocations across six chapters and Part C – Opportunity Areas, which set out opportunities and development principles across 12 area studies. These sections and policy areas are shown below:

Part B – The Policies

Work

Policy Area 42: The town centre boundary
 Policy Area 43: Site allocations for employment (B1 use)
 Policy Area 44: Hotels
 Policy Area 45: Leisure developments
 Policy Area 46: Protecting existing employment areas

Live

Policy Area 47: Residential and residential-led mixed use allocations
 Policy Area 48: Cultural facilities
 Policy Area 49: Community facilities
 Policy Area 50: Design and amenity in town centre living
 Policy Area 51: Sequential approach to the location of development

Travel

Policy Area 52: Key cycle and pedestrian routes
 Policy Area 53: Wet Dock crossing
 Policy Area 54: Star Lane and College Street gyratory
 Policy Area 55: Public transport improvements
 Policy Area 56: Parking strategy

Shop

Policy Area 57: The central shopping area boundary
 Policy Area 58: Primary, secondary and speciality shopping areas
 Policy Area 59: Waterfront shopping
 Policy Area 60: Site allocations for new retail development

Townscape

Policy Area 61: Environmental improvements
 Policy Area 62: Green space and play
 Policy Area 63: Urban design guidelines

Infrastructure

Policy Area 64: Site for Ipswich flood barrier
 Policy Area 65: Site for town centre electricity sub station

Part C: Opportunity Areas

- A: Island Site
- B: Merchant Quarter
- C: Holywells
- D: Education Quarter
- E: Over Stoke Waterside
- F: Riverside West
- G: River Corridor
- H: Ipswich Village West
- I: Portman Road
- J: Westgate
- K: Mint Quarter
- L: Crown Street

- 4.6 The preferred options documents including the Core Strategy pursued an approach of urban concentration, rather than peripheral greenfield development, and maximising development on previously developed land. The consultation on the Core Strategy took place simultaneously with that on the IP-One Area Action Plan, and the Site Allocations and Policies document. A benefit of this approach was that consultees could see what the strategic approach would mean for sites. The disadvantage was the volume of material that consultees had to read.
- 4.7 The preferred options stage was the stage at which the Council first had in place a database into which respondents could directly enter their comments, and see what other people had written. However, the great majority still chose to submit their comments by paper (using either the comment form or by writing a letter) or by email. The planning policy team entered the paper or email-based comments manually so that all comments made are available to view as a summary and in full on the Council's website at www.ipswich.gov.uk. Respondents were informed of this by letter in July 2009.

Summary of the main issues raised during Regulation 26 Preferred Options stage

- 4.8 At the preferred options stage, the Council received 1,666 formal representations (59%) by the formal deadline and 1,158 (41%) further comments by the March deadline. This number of representations was for all three development plan documents, including the Core Strategy. Clearly the opportunity to comment after the February deadline enabled many additional people to become involved who might not otherwise have been able to do so. This has influenced the Council in consulting for a period of eight weeks in general where there are multiple development plan documents, as was demonstrated at the Regulation 18 stage in early 2014.
- 4.9 Of the 2,824 comments received, 2,390 (85%) were objections and 434 (15%) were in support.

Site Allocations and Policies development plan document

- 4.10 The Site Allocations and Policies DPD attracted the most comments, numbering 1,562 or 54% of the total, which demonstrates that the site-specific proposals generally create the greatest response. 1,402 or 90% of those were objections.
- 4.11 The site attracting the most objection was UC073 Land between Cobbold St and Woodbridge Rd (The Caribbean Club) with 432 objections, most of which took the form of a standard objection.

- 4.12 Other sites attracting notably high levels of objection were UC185 St Clement's Hospital with 155 objections, UC065 London Road Allotments with 96 objections, and UC008 the All Weather Area at Halifax Road with 76 objections. The objections cover matters such as the scale of development and its impact on wildlife, trees and infrastructure (St Clements); the loss of a statutory allotment that also has great wildlife value (London Road); and the loss of a play area and a bowling green (Halifax Road). However, whilst numbers may reflect the strength of local feeling about sites, the planning issues raised may be just as significant in 1 objection as 100.
- 4.13 A handful of sites in the Site Allocations DPD attracted only supporting comments, but this was only the case where the proposal was 'no allocation'. Examples include UC066 London Road Allotments (section adjacent to the railway), UC079 Playing Fields Victory Road, UC084 land south of the Sewage Works, and UC266 Land at Pond Hall Farm south of the A14.
- 4.14 Nine 'new' sites were put forward for consideration. Of these, six constitute parts of the areas previously identified as A to F in the Northern Fringe at the Issues and Options Stage:
- Incorporate Websters sale yard into UC040 Land between Vernon St & Stoke Quay
 - Allocate land to the rear of 6 Tuddenham Rd for two new dwellings
 - Consider the heavy vehicle testing station at Holbrook Road / Landseer Road for housing
 - Land opposite 289-299 Henley Road (part of Northern Fringe area B)
 - Land at Valley Road for residential (part of Northern Fringe area C)
 - Land at Tuddenham Road for recreation and/or residential (part of Northern Fringe area E)
 - Land at Church Farm, Thurleston lane (part of Northern Fringe area A)
 - Land between Humber Doucy Lane and the Borough boundary (part of Northern Fringe area F)
 - Land between Tuddenham Road and the Borough boundary (part of the Northern Fringe area F)

A review of sites for housing development was considered through the strategic housing land availability assessment (SHLAA), which was subject to public consultation at the same time as the proposed submission Core Strategy and Policies development plan document between 2nd October and 27th November 2009. The SHLAA was published in March 2010.

IP-One Area Action Plan development plan document

- 4.15 IP-One attracted 548 comments, 410 objections (75%) and 138 supporting comments (25%).
- 4.16 The Opportunity Areas that generated the highest number of objections were Opportunity Areas B the Merchant Quarter and G the River Corridor.
- 4.17 No single Policy Area stands out as attracting notably more objections than others, but the 'Travel' section (Policy Areas 52 to 56) gained most overall and, within it, Policy Area 53 Wet Dock Crossing had most objections.

- 4.18 Of the site allocations proposed within IP-One, three attracted slightly more objection than the others: UC038 the Island Site (10 objections), UC051 the Mint Quarter (11), and UC057 Land between the Old Cattle Market and Star Lane (13). However, the numbers are far lower than objections to sites in the Site Allocations DPD. Objectors raise issues such as the deliverability of the sites, the density of development, flood risk, and rights of way.
- 4.19 The young people who attended the Schools Workshop undertook an exercise to identify how they would like to see Ipswich change. The factors they prioritised were as follows:

Things they would like to see more of in Ipswich:

- Shopping – more choice, better quality;
- More sports facilities – more choice, ice rink, swimming pools, gyms for under 16s;
- Transport – more cycle paths, cheaper public transport, more footpaths;
- Entertainment for young people – nightclubs, youth clubs, teen cafes, sports centre; and
- Trees, open space, parks.

Things they would like to see less of in Ipswich:

- Litter, chewing gum on the pavement, plastic bags, cigarette litter;
- Crime, unsafe places, vandalism; and
- Congestion and cars.

How the issues have been taken into account (including the Core Strategy and Policies DPD, which was taken through to adoption in 2011)

- 4.20 A summary of all the comments received was made and reported to the Council's Executive on 9th September 2008. Appendix 1 and 2 provides a detailed response to summaries of the comments made at the preferred options stage on the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and the IP-One Area Action Plan DPD and the Council's response.
- 4.21 The Proposed Submission Core Strategy and Policies DPD was prepared taking into account the comments that people had made at preferred options stage, new guidance, new evidence such as the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and new policy such the East of England Plan that was finally adopted in May 2008 after the preferred options stage.
- 4.22 In terms of the 'big' issues for Ipswich, the Proposed Submission Core Strategy also allocated some land for development at the Northern Fringe of Ipswich between 2016 and 2021 with further land in that area highlighted as the broad area for further housing growth in the period 2021 to 2025.
- 4.23 The Core Strategy and Policies document was progressed through an Examination in Public to adoption in December 2011.
- 4.24 The preferred options comments have informed the draft pre-submission Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD (October 2013), which had been combined as a result of the Council's Local Development Scheme published in July 2012.

5 Pre-Submission Stage (Regulation 18 under the 2012 Regulations)

Who was consulted, how, and when?

- 5.1 The Council's Local Plan newsletter 6 in February 2013 issued a call for sites in addition to those already identified that should be considered by the Council for allocation as development sites. The newsletter was sent to all people on the Council's Local Plan mailing list and published on the Council's website. The call for sites was over a period of four weeks and the Council invited as much information as possible to be provided in relation to potential sites including a location plan identifying the site. The call for sites period ran until 14th March 2013.
- 5.2 Two new sites were put forward following this request. One was an artificial hockey pitch at Ipswich Sports Club, with a proposed use for residential, subject to satisfying Core Strategy policy DM28. The second site was at 333 Felixstowe Road east of Malvern Close with a proposed use for residential as an alternative to the existing use on the site.
- 5.3 The draft pre-submission stage followed and an eight week public consultation on the Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD was undertaken between 13th January and 10th March 2014. Comments were invited by:
- Publishing consultation documents and comment forms for the Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD;
 - Writing to all specific and general consultation bodies;
 - Writing to all people on the Council's Local Plan mailing list;
 - Writing to those bodies prescribed by the duty to co-operate;
 - Placing a public notice in the East Anglian Daily Times and Ipswich Star;
 - Placing all relevant documentation on the Council's website, at its main offices, the Council's Customer Services Centre and in libraries;
 - Holding ten drop in events at five venues including the Town Hall alongside consultation on the Ipswich Garden Suburb supplementary planning document at various dates and times including evenings and weekends;
 - Attending five Area Committee meetings and giving a presentation;
 - Attending meetings with stakeholders; and
 - Placing a planning feature in the Council's Newspaper, the Angle, delivered to households in Ipswich.
- 5.4 The Site Allocations document allocated land for the development of 2,409 dwellings that did not currently have planning permission. This is in addition to the 3,500 dwellings allocated through the focused review of the Core Strategy at the Northern Fringe.
- 5.5 There are six opportunity areas identified in the document, down from 12 identified in the preferred options IP-One Area Action Plan (2007) reflecting the opportunities that exist during the plan period.
- 5.6 A new school site was identified on land in University Campus Suffolk's ownership at Back Hamlet along with a school extension to Rose Hill Primary School on Derby Road. A site was also identified at Duke Street for education purposes. This is in addition to three new primary schools and a secondary school identified at the Ipswich Garden Suburb (Northern Fringe) through the Ipswich Garden Suburb supplementary planning document.

- 5.7 In the town centre the former Civic Centre site and police station site known as 'Westgate' was identified as an extension to the central shopping area. There was also a corresponding contraction of the eastern edge of the central shopping area.
- 5.8 Gypsy and Traveller provision for five pitches was identified in policy DM41 and a site was identified at River Hill, to meet this requirement.
- 5.9 A summary of representations is shown in Appendix 3. The main issues raised related to particular sites, with the following aspects of the plan attracting the most comment (the response is also provided):
- Objection to the residential allocation of the Ormiston Children's Centre at site reference IP257 Land at Felixstowe Road east of Malvern Close (allocation deleted);
 - Objection to the allocation of part of the land at River Hill site reference IP261 for permanent pitches for Gypsies and Travellers (allocation deleted and way forward identified as joint work with the other Suffolk local authorities to make strategic provision across the county);
 - Objection to the allocation of land at Lavenham Road site reference IP061 for residential use and public open space (site retained as an allocation);
 - Objection to allocations at Ravenswood sites on reference IP150a, b and c for housing and a sports park (site IP150a is subject to planning applications, site IP150b retained as a sports park allocation in line with the 1997 Local Plan allocation, site IP150c now proposed for employment B1 use in line with the 1997 Ipswich Local Plan allocation).
- 5.10 English Heritage and Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service provided extensive comments on heritage aspects of sites, which have largely been incorporated into the revised plan.
- 5.11 Suffolk County Council (Education) identified the need to consider how many school pupils new developments would generate and to address that need, as many Ipswich primary schools are at capacity.
- 5.12 In addition a greenfield site has been proposed for residential development off Humber Doucy Lane, which is not currently supported.

6 Conclusion

- 6.1 The Council has a significant objectively assessed housing need to accommodate where possible in Ipswich, which has necessitated some difficult decisions about how that need should be distributed and planned for. In addition it is necessary to ensure the Council has an appropriate job target to ensure economic growth in the Borough. In preparing the Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD, the Council has greatly valued the input received from all respondents.
- 6.2 The Council is committed to public involvement in the preparation of its Local Plan and has made efforts to ensure that people have been both informed of the key opportunities for involvement, and able to participate, for example by using a mixture of approaches and techniques. This Statement of Pre-Submission Consultation has set out the key approaches used, who has been invited to take part, what response they have made and how the comments have been taken into account
- 6.3 The Council considers that the approach taken has complied with Regulatory requirements and with the adopted SCI and its subsequent review

**Appendix 1 – Site Allocations and Policies DPD – Analysis of Preferred Options
Comments (2008) and Council Responses (2013)**

SITE ALLOCATIONS & POLICIES - ANALYSIS OF PREFERRED OPTIONS COMMENTS (2008) AND COUNCIL RESPONSES (2013)

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Whole document	Comment on whole document	10	2	Sport England – East Region, Environment Agency, GO East, Peacock & Smith Ltd., RSPB, K Wilson, Crest Nicholson	Stephen Marginson, EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No proper mix of housing is provided for, flats outnumbering houses (approx 80:20). Need more affordable housing. Greenfield development is needed to provide a wider and more suitable mix of house types as well as affordable family housing. A Strategic Housing Land Availability Study required addressing vital housing issues. Strategic Housing Market Assessment should also be published. Consultation document does not identify any sites specifically for meeting potential sports facility need that will arise during the period of the DPD (SE). Sites lying within the medium to high risk Flood Zones 2 and 3 need to undergo Sequential Test as stated in paragraph 16 of PPS 25. (EA) Obligation of the Council under the Water Framework Directive- ensure proposed development is phased to ease off pressure on water resources. (EA) Lack of detail in the Core Strategy in relation to scale of growth at broad locations and conformity with the Core Strategy. Site Specific Allocations DPD would need to identify the sites where the Policy Area 13 of the Core Strategy applies. (GO East) Lack of the any clear timescales for the DPDs. (GO East) Limited references to the Sustainability Appraisal in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD. (GO East) Lack of contingency planning to ensure delivery, should brownfield sites not come forward as predicted. In The Core Strategy Policy Area 2, the existing Morrisons store at Sproughton Road should be included within the proposed district centre's boundary. Each site should be evaluated on the basis of its merits and value to the community. Concerns about proposed development sites or adjacent to sites that are important for nature conservation. (RSPB). 	<p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2008 identifies key housing issues and Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS8 requires a mix of dwelling types to be provided.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS12 requires the Council to work with partners to provide affordable housing to meet identified needs in Ipswich.</p> <p>Policy CS10 identifies the Ipswich Northern Fringe as the main source of supply of housing land in Ipswich up to and beyond 2021.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was published 2010.</p> <p>The SHMA was published 2008.</p> <p>Policy DM28 looks to protect , inter alia, sport and recreation facilities. Policy DM29 requires that development will be required to contribute to public open spaces and sport and recreation facilities. Further provision will be assessed against the findings of the Ipswich Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Study 2009.</p> <p>This is noted in the postamble to Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM4.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out the timescale for development plan documents (DPDs).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Adopted Core Strategy Policies CS7 and CS10 provides for contingency in delivering housing should brownfield sites not come forward as predicted.</p> <p>It is not proposed to include Morrisons within the District Centre at this stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM31 seeks to conserve local natural and geological interest. Para 9.158 advises that direct and indirect impacts of proposals will be taken into account. Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS4 states that the Council is committed to protecting and enhancing the Borough's built, historical , natural and geological assets and that the Council will seek to conserve and enhance local biodiversity.</p>
Chapter 1 Introduction		0	0			No comments made.	

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Chapter 2 The New Planning System	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	2	0	Home Builders Federation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council needs to ensure that a range of both Brownfield and Greenfield sites are available for development. Range of different types and forms of housing are provided in various locations to meet the needs of its population. A Strategic Housing Market Assessment required as an essential tool and evidence base. Planning gain requirement to be fully considered in relation to site viability. Flexible approach to be adopted for delivery of affordable housing. Shorter DPDs to be prepared as promoted under the new planning system. 	<p>The SHLAA 2010 demonstrates the deliverability of housing. Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS9 requires that at least 60% of development will be on previously developed land.</p> <p>The SHMA 2008 identifies key housing issues and Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS8 requires a mix of dwelling types to be provided. A SHMA was undertaken in 2008 and forms part of the evidence base.</p> <p>The Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS17 sets the Council's standard charge approach to delivering infrastructure. Para 8.199 of the Adopted Core Strategy sets how the Council will assess schemes based on viability issues. The SHLAA 2010 takes account of site viability.</p> <p>The Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS12 offers a flexible approach dependent on site size, numbers of housing proposed and an independent assessment of viability.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Chapter 3 The Core Strategy and Policies Document	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	1	1	CABE	EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design is now well established in planning policy at national and regional levels, and LDFs offer an opportunity to secure high-quality development, of the right type, in the right place, at the right time. Robust design policies should be included within all LDF documents and the Community Strategy, embedding design as a priority from strategic frameworks to site-specific scales. To take aspiration to implementation, local planning authorities' officers and members should champion good design. Treat design as a crosscutting issue – consider how other policy areas relate to urban design, open space management, architectural quality, roads and highways, social infrastructure and the public realm. Design should reflect understanding of local context, character and aspirations. Include adequate wording or 'hooks' within the policies that enable you to develop and use other design tools and mechanisms, such as design guides, site briefs, and design codes. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy policy DM5 specifically requires all new development to be well designed and sustainable.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Design is considered by the Council to be important adding value both visually and functionally. Policy DM5 of the Adopted Core Strategy requires all new development to be well designed and sustainable.</p> <p>Criterion 'e' of policy DM5 of the Adopted Core Strategy requires development to protect and enhance the special character of Ipswich and to reinforce the attractive physical characteristics of local neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Detailed design issues are considered in adopted Core Strategy Policies DM5 to DM7.</p>
Chapter 4 The Ipswich Community	Comments on and/or omissions from whole	0	0			No comments made	
Chapter 5 Ipswich Local Development Framework	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	1	1	EERA	EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References to the East of England plan require updating to reflect current position with regard to progress. 	The East of England Plan was abolished in January 2013.
Chapter 6 Site or Area Based Policies	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	2	0	EERA, Crest Nicholson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear policies for meeting the accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers. (EERA) Alternative location should be suggested for the two pitches on the site that is to be redeveloped. (EERA) 	<p>The Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS11 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation covers this point.</p> <p>Site UC027 is no longer proposed for an allocation.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of the any clear timescale for the DPD. 	The Site Allocations Document will be in general conformity with the Core Strategy which sets the Strategy for the development of Ipswich up to 2027.
Chapter 6 Site or Area Based Policies	Policy Area 39 Protection of Identified Sites for the Uses Proposed	5	0	Merchant Projects Ltd., C E Jones, Environment Agency, PRUPIM, Mersea Homes	James Baker- Greenways Project, Natural England, Environment Agency, RSPB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-allocation of Henley Road Sports Club- the additional facilities that the Club needs cannot be accommodated within the existing boundary so the site should be allocated for residential development. Any site where the developer fails to carry out any investigation or assessment required under PPS or contravenes environmental legislation, EA will object to it even if the site is not allocated. (EA) Council has no self-determined right to reserve sites for its own plans, if objections have been raised and upheld against such use. More flexible approach should be taken to protection of sites for the used purposes; otherwise it would preclude development over the Plan Period. (PRUPIM) This Policy serves no useful function and is unclear in its implementation. 	<p>A pitch is allocated in the draft plan but only subject to Core Strategy policy DM28 being addressed satisfactorily.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Site Allocations document identifies allocations of land for specific types of development to help to meet its targets and vision. Any planning application submitted will be subject to public consultation and material objections considered.</p> <p>All material considerations are taken into account in assessing sites.</p> <p>It is essential that there is a clear spatial strategy which can be effectively implemented.</p>
Chapter 6 Site or Area Based Policies	Policy Area 40 The Identification, Protection and Development of Green Corridor	2	5	Ipswich School, Mersea Homes	James Baker- Greenways Project, Natural England, Environment Agency, RSPB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the Policy in principle but suggest that Site Allocation Plan A and Plan B should not be part of either the green corridor or green rim as this would compromise the delivery of the Ipswich School's expanded sports facilities. The policy should encourage adequate ecological surveying of sites at an early stage to ascertain whether areas to be retained as green space should be protected as existing habitat and not subject to damage and later re-landscaping into inappropriate habitat types. No clear mechanism proposed for the basis of identification of the green corridors and their expansion. In order for the policy to function properly it must have a sound basis for implementation and be based on credible, robust and up-to-date evidence, as required by PPS12. Proposed green corridor should be highlighted on map for clarity. (RSPB) 	<p>Green Corridors are identified in the Key Diagram and are indicative.</p> <p>Noted. Policy DM31 of the Adopted Core Strategy recognises the importance of locally designated sites. The Wildlife and Countryside Act and the Habitats Regulations protect wild species.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS16 seeks to protect, enhance and extend the network of green corridors through requiring proposed development to provide additional space, working with partners, improving access to existing and supporting the Greenways Project.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Adopted Core Strategy Key Diagram shows the location of the green corridors and green rim approach which is also specifically referred to in policy CS16 of the Adopted Core Strategy.</p>
Chapter 6 Site or Area Based Policies	Policy Area 41 The Identification and Protection of Employment Areas	1	2	Mersea Homes	Strutt & Parker, Ashfield Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IP-One Policy Area 46 (Protecting Existing Employment Areas) fails to provide an effective policy basis for decisions. Proposed approach has not been fully informed by an up-to-date evidence base. PA 41 should provide a policy basis for protecting existing employment uses, rather than simply focussing in employment areas. Policy relationship should also be made with other policy areas in the Core Strategy, Site Allocations DPD and IP-One AAP. Policy should recognise breadth of issues, which land use policy affects, based on analysis and robust evidence base. 	<p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS13 addresses planning for jobs growth and DM25 addresses protection of employment land.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM25 addresses protection of employment land.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Chapter 7 Proposed Sites	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	32	3	Highways Agency, Home Builders Federation, Suffolk County Council, Cherted Town Planning Consultants, EERA, Anglian Water Services Ltd., Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Ashfield Land, Sina Developments, Trustees of the PE Cooke Settlement, Ipswich School	Natural England, Anglian Water Services Ltd., Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment to be undertaken for the sites before including them in the DPD in accordance with the provisions of Department for Transport Circular 02/2007 Planning and the Strategic Road Network and the Guidance on Transport Assessment (March 2007). (HA) The location of proposed sites is a matter for local consideration. In consideration of their acceptability and deliverability, the Borough Council will need to consider the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy. (EERA) Generally support the wide range of sites for development. Traffic issues including extra cars, new bus services, improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists have not been detailed. A general standard should be adopted for road infrastructure improvements, traffic flow improvements, new public transport facilities and separation of pedestrians and cyclists from major traffic routes. No reference made to Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) or SHMA in order to inform evidence base in accordance with PPS3. Sites should be allocated in terms of which would provide the best opportunities for achieving the principles of sustainable development as set out in PPS1 and East of England Plan Policy SS1. Concerns about the number of playing field and urban open spaces identified as preferred options for development. Land opposite 289-299 Henley Road to be considered for development. This has been out of agriculture but has become redundant as sports field. Backland at 6 Tuddenham Road to be included as residential development for two new houses. Unclear whether the East of England Housing target is met or not. The Council intends to meet its basic obligation for housing delivery (ie 15,400 out of 20,000 for Ipswich Policy Area). Consultation document does not make it clear that the need to support a further 4,600 homes in the IPA has been taken onto account or not. Figures for housing allocation and delivery in this document and Core Strategy document (paragraph 8.144) are not consistent with those in the Ipswich Site Allocations and Policies document (para 7.4). Water Cycle Study to be included in the list of reference documents. Phasing of development may be required to enable infrastructure upgrades to be undertaken. Too much development taking place in Ipswich, especially flatted housing development. 	<p>Appropriate sites will be subject to a Transport Assessment as part of the application process. The Adopted Core Strategy policy DM17 requires that each development is assessed against, inter alia, transport issues.</p> <p>The final location of sites will be subject to public consultation. The acceptability and deliverability of sites will be considered against policies and strategies in force at that time.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM17 and CS20 considers transport issues.</p> <p>The SHLAA and the SHMA are referred to in the Adopted Core Strategy and form part of the evidence base of policies contained within. Sites are assessed against the policies in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Sustainable development is a fundamental aim of the planning system and a key component in the emerging NPPF. Sites will be considered against their sustainability.</p> <p>The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act section 38(6) requires that the determination of any planning application must be made in accordance with the development plan. The Adopted Core Strategy contains policies to protect playing fields and urban open spaces where appropriate.</p> <p>This is noted as a broad allocation for housing under policy Adopted Core Strategy policy CS10.</p> <p>This proposal would be considered against policies in the Adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Policy CS7 of the Adopted Core Strategy sets the amount of new housing required and gives an estimated housing delivery up to 2027. Regional Figures are subject to review over time in a fluid situation. It would not be appropriate to state whether the target is met.</p> <p>The figures stated are correct at the time of publication of the documents which are subject to review on different timetables. The final documents will be consistent.</p> <p>A Haven Gateway Water Cycle Study Stage 1 Report was published in 2008 and a Stage 2 report was published in 2010. Both are included in the evidence base.</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing and the National Planning Policy Framework that supersedes it calls for a mix of tenure, type and size. The SHMA provides evidence to support policy preparation. Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS8 refers to the balance between flats and houses. The mix of housing is checked through the Annual Monitoring Report to ensure that a variety of type is maintained across the Borough.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term residents of Ipswich are disappointed and frightened to see every open space devoured, especially UC 185 St. Clements Hospital site. The Core Strategy Preferred Options states that site allocations have been made having regard to the estimated net change in employment over thirteen sectors between 2001 and 2021, taken from the Haven Gateway Employment Land Study in 2005. However, it is unclear what the contribution of each site will be in terms of the estimated job growth by sector. Core Strategy fails to allocate site (UC 257) for employment use. Ashfield Land has acquired freehold ownership of 22.5 ha of land adjacent to junction 53 of the A14. It has undertaken studies and amassed evidence to demonstrate that it can deliver a high quality, strategic employment-led mixed-use development on site bringing major benefits to the Ipswich Policy Area. These focus on generating up to 2,000 new jobs, significantly improving accessibility by public transport into Ipswich from A14 and providing 9 ha of managed public open space. The site at Church Farm [north Ipswich] is recommended for allocation as a site for residential development, but is not included in the list of proposed sites in the document. Residents of Landseer Road have asked in the past whether there is a possibility that the heavy vehicle Testing Station in Holbrook Road, off Landseer Road might be relocated, thereby removing some heavy traffic from this area. The Ipswich School requests that the land north of Valley Road (Site Location Plan A) is allocated for housing. The site forms part of the recognised expansion area at the Northern Fringe, but is in itself a stand alone proposal, which delivers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New sports facilities for Ipswich School and the wider community (at land west of Tuddenham Road) Enhanced opportunities for pupils at Ipswich School The natural expansion of a successful local school. Concerns on deliverability, availability, density and suitability of specific allocations in the Proposed Site Allocations Document. Objection to lack of allocation of land at Red House Farm. Object to conclusion (para 7.3) that 2870 dwellings can be delivered – the figure does not reflect risks to delivery Need a better mix of dwellings – 80% of approvals are flats which represents an oversupply 	<p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS16 seeks to protect green spaces for the benefit of residents. Any proposed development of areas such as St Clements hospital will be subject to public consultation.</p> <p>The Site Allocations Document cannot be prescriptive in this regard. Each site is considered on its merits.</p> <p>The site has been allocated for employment use.</p> <p>The site is not consider deliverable in the plan period.</p> <p>The site has a long lease and therefore is not available for re-development during the plan period.</p> <p>The site is identified in the Adopted Core Strategy as An Area for the Delivery of Housing and Associated Facilities prior to 2021.</p> <p>This site is proposed for allocation in a focused review of the Core Strategy being undertaken in 2013. See above See above</p> <p>The SHLAA addresses these points.</p> <p>The site is identified in the Adopted Core Strategy as a Broad Area for Housing and Associated Facilities after 2021.</p> <p>The SHLAA has now superseded this table.</p> <p>The SHMA provides evidence to support policy preparation. Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS8 refers to the balance between flats and houses. The mix of housing is checked</p>
Chapter 8	Comments on and/or omissions of the Development from whole	0	0			No comments made.	
Chapter 9	Comments on and/or omissions of the Implementation, Targets, from whole	3	0	EERA, GO East, Crest Nicholson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear policies dealing with implementation and monitoring. 	The Adopted Core Strategy sets objectives and targets. The Local Plan Annual Authority Monitoring Report reviews the progress of these arrangements.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Monitoring and Review	chapter					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All policies relating to the above need to be included in the Core Strategy. (EERA) Lack of contingency planning to ensure housing delivery should brownfield sites not come forward as predicted. (GO East) 	The SHLAA demonstrates the deliverability of the sites and that sufficient housing is available beyond 2021.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	1 UC005 Former Tooks Bakery	8	3	Highways Agency, ABF Plc, Henry Cooper, Lucia Aguilargomez, Suffolk County Council, Crest Nicholson, Mersea Homes, David Wilson Homes	Merchant Projects Ltd., Steven Wells, Crest Nicholson, Mersea Homes, David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. It would be unacceptable to provide a further all-movements junction on Bury Road, since this would be highly likely to contribute to further delays in the flow of traffic on Bury Road, particularly the inbound stream during the morning peak. This would also affect the bus lane. Any access for these sites should be sought from Old Norwich Rd Proposed density low. Site has a better potential to be developed as high quality employment land. 	<p>The Ipswich Travel Ipswich scheme aims to reduce dependency on the private car by 15% within the lifetime of the plan. Under Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM15, proposals for major development will require a transport assessment to be undertaken including an assessment of the impact of the local highway network.</p> <p>The access will be agreed with the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Medium density is considered to be more appropriate in this location and the average medium density has been reduced.</p> <p>Employment was considered but the site is more appropriate for housing.</p>
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	2 UC008 All Weather Area Halifax road	76	0	Maidenhall Residents Association, Sport England - East Region, Cllr Smart, Cllr Powell, IBC Labour Group, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Wherstead Road Residents' Association, Suffolk County Council and 67 individuals.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site should be retained as existing use – it is well used as a play area and bowls club and community building. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. An alternative site for replacement of existing activities has not been identified in the DPD. (SE) The PPG17 study is not yet published so there is no evidence of a surplus of children's play or bowls clubs. (SE) Overlooking and loss of privacy for adjoining houses. Site would not be deliverable because it is an open space. Loss of trees. Children would be forced to play in the streets. Loss of views enjoyed by existing dwellings. Could only support if a new bowls club were provided. Need to keep leisure facilities for a growing population. Extra development would put intolerable demands on infrastructure. The Council has just spent money improving the play equipment so it would be wasteful to destroy it. Should resist development but move teen shelter to Stoke High School and make the bowls pavilion Maidenhall Community Centre. 	Site should be considered with UC033 but development is not dependent upon it. Site is no longer proposed for allocation.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	3 UC009 Victoria Nurseries, Westerfield Road	4	2	The Ipswich Society, McKie, L Lay, Cllr Lockington	Crest Nicholson, Mersea Homes, David Wilson Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site to be retained as existing use. Valuable local amenity. Enables people to buy provisions locally so more sustainable. Place for the community to meet. It's a unique place and an excellent nursery, one of few within Ipswich. 	Site has a temporary consent for a horticultural nursery. However in the longer term it is considered that housing is an appropriate use.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	4 UC010 Co-op Depot, Felixstowe Road	9	0	Greenways Project, East of England Co-op Society Ltd., Suffolk County Council, Highways Agency, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, E Phillips, H Cooper		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment to be undertaken for the site before the proposed development commences (HA, SCC) Site to be retained as existing use. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. Proposed density too high. Loss of jobs. Proximity to railways. Support but the area should be extended to cover all the Co-op's land holding and should allow for additional retail floor space Value of existing uses and multiple ownerships and tenancies will affect delivery 	<p>Noted. Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM15 addresses this issue.</p> <p>Parts of the site are vacant and no longer viable for their existing uses. It is anticipated that housing can be developed on part of the site as and when the opportunity arises.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policies DM15 and DM16 address travel demand management and sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>Medium density is considered to be more appropriate in this location and the average medium density has been reduced.</p> <p>It is likely that the jobs would be transferred elsewhere in the Borough. Noise can be mitigated against.</p> <p>The SHLAA has extended the boundary to cover the Co-Op's land and additional retail floorspace would need to be considered in relation to the nearby district centre.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	5 UC013 Hill House Road	2	1	Greenways Project, Crest Nicholson	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density too high. Need high quality boundary to park 	Density has been reduced in the SHLAA to medium density but is too small to allocate.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	6 UC016 Funeral Directors, Suffolk Road	17	1	IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Mersea Homes, A Leathley, Cllr Lockington, Cllr Ellesmere, & 10 Individuals	East of England Co-op Society Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density too high and may disturb wildlife. Should be lower density low-rise development with open space and plenty of parking Alternative uses suggested: community facilities, parking, play area, wildlife, school and medical centre Site has risk to Radon. Site has risk to flooding. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion – already difficult for emergency access. Development would lead to overlooking and loss of privacy. Insufficient parking in the area. Primary school is full. Support, but access should be from Tuddenham Avenue and development should be car free. Site contains a phone mast. Site contains protected trees. Unnecessary strain to existing infrastructure and services. 	An outline planning application has been approved at a low density (11/00079/OUT).
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	7 UC017 Land west of Handford Cut	2	1	IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. Site at risk of flooding. 	Site is no longer being allocated for residential as not available for development but part of site previously had a planning permission for 12 dwellings.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	8 UC018 Deben Road	6	1	Crest Nicholson, S Wragg, L Lay, A K Chamberlain, S R Peck, P E Kersey	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. Rise in anti-social behaviour. Site to be retained as existing use. Proposed density too high. Loss of jobs. 	Site is no longer being allocated for residential as not available for development.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unnecessary strain to existing infrastructure and services. 	
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	9 UC019 153-159 Valley Road	1	2	The Ipswich Society	Greenways Project, Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is deliverable (low density housing) but would need to incorporate pedestrian and cycle access to playing field. 	Site has been developed.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	10 UC020 Water Tower & Tennis Courts, Park Road	10	1	Sport England-East Region, Crset Nicholson, Clr Lockington, A Catto, S Abbott, A Chester, A Cooper, P Gray, R A Gosling, C Foster, R A Bush	Mersea Homes, David Wilson Homes Crest Nicholson (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to loss of tennis courts – an alternative site for replacement of existing activities is not identified in the DPD. Proposed density too high and may disturb wildlife. Site to be retained as existing use. Proposed development may interfere with water tower and reservoir at the site. Proposed development is threat to social, economical and environmental activities. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. Unnecessary strain to existing infrastructure and services. Water storage should be kept as threat of drought increases. Harm to character of Park Road Conservation Area. Where will masts on water tower go? Traffic problems already on Park Rd and Elsmere Rd. Site contains stag beetles. Pressure on school places. 	The site has planning permission for 5 houses on the part of the site including the tennis courts. The remainder of the site is not coming forward for any development with the exception of one dwelling.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	11 UC021 Randwell Close	13	0	IBC Labour group, Crest Nicholson, Mersea Homes, Greenways Project, David Wilson Homes, D Mullett, J W Gorham, B A Cudmore, Clr Martin, Y P Graves, R A Barnes, E Phillips, N White		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to loss of large gardens that support wildlife. Proposed density too high and may disturb wildlife. Site awkward to be developed for housing with no proper access. Retain open space or no allocation. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. Randwell Close is too narrow for access, and has a sharp bend in it and poor visibility at its junction. Support housing but with lower density and low rise to preserve privacy. There has been a recent consent for housing. 	Site has been developed.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	12 UC022 The Albany	4	1	Greenways Project, Crest Nicholson, Henry Cooper, David Wilson Homes	Mersea Homes, David Wilson Homes Crest Nicholson (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density too high. Ecological appraisal essential. Should be a nature reserve. This scale of development would over stretch infrastructure. 	Site has been developed.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	13 UC023 94 Foxhall Road	0	1		Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting comments. 	Site has been developed.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	14 UC024 Fire Station, Colchester Road	9	0	Mersea Homes, Suffolk Amphibian and Reptile Group (SARG), IBC Labour Group, Crest		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site should be retained as existing use. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. 	The Fire Station has now moved, the site has planning permission (12/00429/FUL) for 59 dwellings and development is under construction.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
				Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Mr & Mrs Cornwall, I M Maeers, L Aquilar-Gomez		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is near allotments that have records of smooth newts and common frogs, and possible slow worms hence full survey needed before any development. If development takes place it should be low rise, up market family homes. Sidegate Lane too busy for access. 	
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	15 UC025 Mallard Way Garages	8	0	Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Mersea Homes, A Bultitude, R Kirby, D H Boater, Mrs Abbott, J R Scrivener, R F Powell	Mersea Homes, David Wilson Homes Crest Nicholson (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 33 garages are nearly all in use – would have to park on street without them creating congestion and with less security for car. Site should be retained as existing use. Garages also used for vital storage. No privacy for adjoining houses. Site awkward to be developed for housing with no proper access. 	This site is no longer being proposed for development as it has poor access.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	16 UC026 Former Garages, Recreation Way	1	1	Crest Nicholson	Mersea Homes, David Wilson Homes Crest Nicholson (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density too high. 	Site has been developed.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	17 UC027 163 & 165 Henniker Road	3	1	EERA, Crest Nicholson, Suffolk County Council	Mersea Homes, David Wilson Homes Crest Nicholson (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternate sites for replacement of existing two pitches for Gypsies and Travellers must be identified. Proposed density too high. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	18 UC028 Widgeon Close Garages	0	1	Crest Nicholson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting comments. 	The site is no longer being proposed for development as it has poor access.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	19 UC030 Land opposite 674-734 Bramford Road	13	4	Bramford Parish Council, Suffolk County Council, Highways Agency, SARG, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, J Fairburn, I Fairburn, H Cooper, A Andersen, S Deas, R Nunn	Greenways Project, Mersea Homes, David Wilson Homes Crest Nicholson (joint), I McKie, E Apea-Agyei	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment to be undertaken for the site. (HA) Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, parking problems and congestion. Bramford lane is too congested already and cannot take more traffic. Proposed density too high. Site survey to be conducted properly before any development commences (for reptiles/amphibians). Site better suited for employment use. Site used for dog walking. Development would cause noise and disruption. Would devalue existing houses. Several supporting comments for green rim element of site. 	<p>A transport assessment would need to be undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures secured by a planning obligation in accordance with Policy DM15 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DPD. Policy DM18 addresses car parking and we expect parking to be fully integrated into the design of the scheme and to comply with local parking standards.</p> <p>The site is being allocated for medium density housing at a lower density than previously suggested retaining some open space as suggested.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	20 UC031 Land at Humber Doucy Lane	0	4		Greenways Project, Little Bealings Parish Council, Crest Nicholson, E Phillips	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support non-allocation of site and retaining existing use. 	Site is not being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	21 UC033 King George V Field, Old Norwich Road	9	2	Greenways Project, Sport England-East Region, Highways Agency, IBC Labour group, Crest Nicholson, Suffolk County Council, David Wilson Homes, H Cooper, K Brinkley	Merchant Projects Ltd., David Wilson Homes, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment to be undertaken for the site. (HA) Loss of valuable open space in prominent location. An alternative site for replacement of existing activities has not been identified in the DPD. (SE) Proposed density too high. Site better suited for employment use. Support but development split is too prescriptive – need more flexibility. Loss of well used playing fields. 	<p>A transport assessment would need to be undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures secured by a planning obligation in accordance with Policy DM15 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DPD.</p> <p>A significant amount of open space is being retained on the site. The alternative site is in a neighbouring district authority area.</p> <p>The site is being allocated for medium density housing at a lower density than previously suggested retaining the open space as suggested.</p> <p>These would be relocated.</p>
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	22 UC034 Land at Bramford Road (Stock's site)	6	4	Bramford Parish Council, GeoSuffolk, Crest Nicholson, SARG, SCC, A Anderson	Greenways Project, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Mr & Mrs I Mckie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. Site has risk to flooding. Site survey to be conducted properly before any development commences. Proposed density too low. Site awkward to be developed for housing with no proper access. Planning consent should be conditional on letting geologists and archaeologists have access to site to sample important deposits. 	<p>A transport assessment would be undertaken at the time of a planning application.</p> <p>A flood risk assessment would need to be undertaken at the time of a planning application.</p> <p>Medium density is considered to be appropriate in this location and the average medium density has been reduced. However the area suggested for housing has been increased.</p> <p>Access is available off Jovian Way.</p>
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	23 UC035 578 Wherstead Road	8	0	Greenways Project, Robert Brett & Sons Ltd., Environment Agency, Wherstead Road Residents Association, Skinner Salter Partnership, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Mersea Homes, R D Ward		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site has close proximity to wharf, so housing not acceptable. Site is closely adjacent to site of special scientific interest. Site has risk to flooding. Proposed development to be phased to ease off pressure on water resources. Proposed density high. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, parking problems and congestion. Unnecessary strain to existing infrastructure and services. Site to be retained as open space. Proposed density too low. 	Flood risk constraints prevent housing development and the site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	24 UC061 Raeburn Road South / Sandy Hill Lane	14	1	Greenways Project, Natural England, Environment Agency, Gainsborough Retail Park Ltd., SCC, Suffolk Rights of Way	IBC Labour group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment to be undertaken for the site before development commences. (HA) Ecological survey necessary before any development commences. (EA) Site covers land designated as County Wildlife Site. 	<p>See below.</p> <p>Noted and this would have to be taken into account in any new development.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
				Ltd., Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Highways Agency, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes Ltd., Ashfield Land, Associated British Ports, Crest Nicholson, H Cooper, Mr & Mrs I Mckie		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, parking problems and congestion. Unnecessary strain to existing infrastructure and services. Site adjacent to sewage farm. Proposed development to be phased to ease off pressure on water resources. Public Right of way passing through the site. Site has risk to flooding. Site unsuitable for employment use. Proposed development may impact port operational facilities. Support allocation but should include retail use. 	A transport assessment would need to be undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures secured by a planning obligation in accordance with Policy DM15 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DPD. Policy DM18 addresses car parking and we expect parking to be fully integrated into the design of the scheme and to comply with local parking standards.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	25 UC062 Elton Park Industrial Estate	10	3	Environment Agency, JG Ipswich LLP, Scott-Brown partnership, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), Highways Agency, Crest Nicholson, SCC, Andrew Martin Associates, H Cooper, Mrs & Mrs I McKie	Greenways Project, Inland Waterways Association Ipswich branch, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment to be undertaken for the site. Site better suited for employment/industrial use. Unnecessary strain to existing infrastructure and services. Site has risk to flooding. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, parking problems and congestion. Proposed development to be phased to ease off pressure on water resources. (EA) Proposed density high. Site wholly to be allocated for employment use. Support bridge but it should be capable of taking buses. Buffer zone should be retained along the river. (EA) Support in principle except for requirement to rehouse existing company. 	<p>See below.</p> <p>There was previously a resolution to grant planning permission for 130 dwellings subject to a section 106 agreement being agreed.</p> <p>A flood risk assessment would need to be undertaken at the time of a planning application.</p> <p>A transport assessment would need to be undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures secured by a planning obligation in accordance with Policy DM15 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DPD. Policy DM18 addresses car parking and we expect parking to be fully integrated into the design of the scheme and to comply with local parking standards.</p>
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	26 UC064 School site, Lavenham Road	2	1	Highways Agency, SCC	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential impact of development on highways to be assessed before the development commences. (HA) 	A transport assessment would need to be undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures secured by a planning obligation in accordance with Policy DM15 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DPD.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	27 UC065 London Road Allotments	96	2	Greenways Project, SCC, Chris Mole (MP), Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Pupils-Ranelagh Primary School, David Ellesmere-IBC SARG, Morland Road Allotment holders, London Road	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), David Lawson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is statutory allotment containing rare trees and wildlife. Site to be retained as existing use. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, parking problems and congestion. Development on Greenfield space not preferred. Proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the already densely populated surroundings. Potential loss of local wildlife habitat as site contains reptiles. Proposed density high. 	Site is no longer being allocated.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
				London Road Allotment holders, Northgate & Colchester Road Allotment Holders, Maidenhall Allotment Holders, Castle Hill Allotment Field Committee, Ipswich Allotment Holders Association, Belstead Allotments, IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, and 74 Individuals		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has to have regard to biodiversity under the NERC Act 2007. Site has poor drainage. Proposed development may lead to flooding problems for adjacent houses. Ecological survey necessary before any development commences. There has been an increase in take up of plots and are working to continue that, as plot once lost is gone forever. 	
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	28 UC066 London Road Allotments	0	10		Greenways Project, SARG, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, London Road Allotment Holders, Crest Nicholson, D Lawson, B Rudkin, S Rudkin, Pupils at Ranelagh Primary School, I McKie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments in support of non-allocation. 	Noted.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	29 UC068 Former 405 Club, Bader Close	11	1	Highways Agency Greenways Project, Sport England-East Region, SCC, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, SARG, IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, H Cooper, Mr & Mrs I McKie	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment required before any development commences. Alternate sites for replacement of existing activities not identified. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. Site to be retained as playing field and open space area. Site has wildlife interest, so buffer strip to be included to retain that. Site to be provided for housing and community uses. Support allocation but should with open space to railway corridor. Poor access to the site. 	A transport assessment would need to be undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures secured by a planning obligation in accordance with Policy DM15 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DPD.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	30 UC069 JJ Wilson, White Elm Street	2	2	SCC, Crest Nicholson	Strutt & Parker, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. (SCC) Proposed development along with other potential housing areas will have significant implications on provision of school places. (SCC) Site wholly to be allocated for employment use as it is in a prime location within the employment area. 	<p>A transport assessment would need to be undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures secured by a planning obligation in accordance with Policy DM15 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DPD.</p> <p>Planning contributions to education are secured through section 106 agreements to enable school provision to be addressed.</p> <p>The site has been put forward for possible housing and is an area that has a growing residential population and is close to the proposed district centre on Duke Street.</p>
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	31 UC070 Former British Energy Site, Cliff Quay	9	2	Greenways Countryside Project, Highways Agency,	British Energy, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain pedestrian and cycle links across the site. 	

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
				Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency, H Cooper, Associated British Ports, Ashfield Land, Crest Nicholson and David Wilson Homes	Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment required before any development commences. (HA, SCC) Proposed density high. Retain and extend employment use on the site. Site contains land contamination issues. (EA) Proposed development to be phased to ease off pressure on water resources. (EA) Proposed development may impact port operational facilities. Proposed development along with other potential housing areas will have significant implications on provision of school places. (SCC) Site unsuitable for housing due to proximity to sewage works and contamination issues. 	<p>A transport assessment would need to be undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures secured by a planning obligation in accordance with Policy DM15 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DPD.</p> <p>The site is no longer being allocated for housing. Employment use is accepted by the Council. Noted.</p> <p>Planning contributions to education are secured through section 106 agreements to enable school provision to be addressed. Noted.</p>
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	32 UC073 Land between Cobbold Street and Woodbridge Road	431	1	Ipswich Caribbean Association, SCC, Ipswich Hindu Samaj, Nu Roots, Cut It! Style It!, IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson, Mind Charity Shop, Julienes Internet Café, Ipswich Community Radio, CSV Media Clubhouse, Suffolk School of Samba, Bangladeshi Support Centre, 1st Source Ltd, St John Ambulance, ICA Dominos Club, Ipswich & Suffolk Council for Racial Equality, BOBCO, Thurleston High School, Zephyr Security, Cutting Entertainment and 410 individuals.	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to loss of important community space. (SCC) Alternate sites for replacement of existing activities not identified. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and poor air quality. (SCC) Retain existing use on the site. Site lies in the Conservation Area. Proposed density too high. Site more suitable for commercial and community uses. Proposed development along with other potential housing areas will have significant implications on provision of school places. (SCC) If development goes ahead it should be considered for supported housing. (SCC) 	The site is no longer being proposed for residential development and a car park has been developed on the site of the former community use.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	33 UC076 Cocksedge Engineering, Sandy Hill Lane	2	1	Suffolk County Council, Crest Nicholson	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development along with other potential housing areas will have significant implications on provision of school places. (SCC) Site is part of an employment area with proximity to sewage works. SCC holds long-term lease and is concerned about alternative uses. (SCC) Proposed development would lead to a loss of valuable employment site. Retain as existing use. 	The site is no longer being proposed for residential development.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	34 UC077 Thomas Wolsey Special School, Old Norwich Road	8	2	Highways Agency, Sport England-East, Suffolk County Council, Crest Nicholson, H Cooper and Mr & Mrs PA Riches	Greenways Project, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment required before any development commences. (HA) Alternate sites for replacement of existing activities not identified. (SE) Retain existing use on the site. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. Proposed development would lead to loss of protected trees, wildlife and privacy of adjoining houses. Access to the site should be provided from the Old Norwich Road to provide more clearance from the signal junction. (SCC) Proposed density is high. 	See below. Site has a detailed planning permission for 48 dwellings (11/00980/REM) approved 5th Mar 2012 and development is under construction.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation	35 UC079 Playing Fields, Victory	0	5		Sport England-East, SCC, IBC Labour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support non-allocation of the site with flexibility for expansion of local educational uses. 	Noted.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	36 UC080 Land at Yarmouth Road	10	2	Greenways Project, Environment Agency, Planning Potential, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes Ltd., Crest Nicholson, IBC Labour Group, Suffolk County Council, David Wilson Homes, Mersea Homes, I McKie	Inland Water Association Ipswich branch, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the site as open space/ wildlife/ recreational use. Site has risk to flooding. (EA) Proposed development to be phased to ease off pressure on water resources. (EA) Site not ideal for housing development, more suitable for leisure or retail use. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and congestion. (SCC) Proposed development along with other potential housing areas will have significant implications on provision of school places. (SCC) Support allocation but housing element should have high environmental standard and riverside environment centre should help to enable people to access the river for recreation. 	A public house/restaurant has been constructed on this site. No longer applicable.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	37 UC081 St Margaret's Green / Woodbridge Road	0	1		Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the allocation 	The site was proposed at the preferred options stage for no allocation due to a mixed use scheme having been granted planning consent (06/00495/FUL). This planning consent has been renewed twice since then (09/00389/FUL & 12/00101/FUL). Suggest allocating the site for residential should the planning consent not be renewed in the future.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	38 UC083 Land north of Whitton Sports Centre	2	3	Sport England-East, SCC	Greenways Project, SARG, Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the site as open space or extend it as additional space for sports centres. (SE) 	Noted.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	39 UC084 Land south of Sewage Works	1	5	SARG	Greenways Project, Natural England, SCC, Crest Nicholson, Suffolk Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support non-allocation but should add site to existing country parks and managed for wildlife. 	Noted.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	40 UC087 83/85 Dales Road	8	1	Ashfield Land, Mr Ling, LM Marshall, VE Derrett, VG Wharr, RD Beales, GA Read, DB Brett	Crest Nicholson, R Payne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site ideal for housing development preferably bungalows. Proposed development would lead to parking problems and congestion. Support allocation but should be light industry. 	See below. The site is too small to generate congestion and parking would be considered at the time of a planning application in line with the Suffolk Advisory Parking Standards. Site is proposed to be allocated for employment uses, which can include light industry.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	41 UC092 345 Woodbridge Road	2	1	Crest Nicholson, A Leathley	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density too high. Need to address existing parking problems. 	Site has a planning permission for a replacement garage (10/01036/FUL), approved 10th Feb 2011, which is preferred to the previous permission for 14 dwellings (08/00362/FUL), approved 3rd Jul 2008, which itself was lower than the 21 dwellings proposed at the preferred options stage.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	42 UC095 79 Cauldwell Hall Road	0	1		Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting comments 	Site has planning permission for 16 dwellings, which are likely to be developed. The original planning permission (06/00921/OUT) was followed up by a detailed planning permission (09/00811/REM), approved 8th Mar 2010. However a renewal of 06/00921/OUT was approved (12/00114/VC) 12th Mar 2012 and therefore it may be worth considering allocating the site for housing.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	43 UC106 Morpeth House, 97-99 Lacey Street	22	1	The Ipswich Society, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Crest Nicholson, Cllr D Ellesmere, IBC Labour Group, & 17 Individuals	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear whether existing building is to be demolished or rest of the site is to be developed. Site assessment and ecological survey to be carried out before the development commences. Site suffering from poor drainage and water seepage problems. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, parking problems and congestion. Proposed development would lead to loss of refuge for birds and wildlife. (SWT) Council has to have regard to biodiversity under the NERC Act 2007. (SWT) Proposed development would lead to loss of an important historical and architectural building. Property sited on a landfill consultation zone. Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Retain as existing use. Existence of mature trees and TPOs on the site. Unnecessary strain on local health and community services. Site has risk of flooding. Site should be used as a car park retaining existing buildings and trees. Proposed density too high. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	44 UC110 Telephone Exchange, Portman Road	6	0	English Heritage, Mersea Homes, IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson, SCC, David Wilson Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site adjoins conservation area and listed buildings. (EH) Proposed density too low. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, parking problems and congestion. Site within landfill consultation zone. Retain as existing use. Site costly to redevelop due to existing telecomm infrastructure constraints. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	45 UC113 Part former Volvo site, Raeburn Road	2	1	Gainsborough Retail Park Ltd.	IBC Labour Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wish to see more retail or a mix of retail and residential on the site. 	Residential unsuitable on the site due to close proximity to the sewage works. Retail in this location would be contrary to the adopted Core Strategy (December 2011).
Appendix 3 Site Allocation	46 UC114 6-24 Defoe Road	10	0	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No proper access to the site. Retain as existing use. 	Site is no longer being allocated.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Details				Wilson Homes (joint), Clr Steven Wells, IBC Labour Group, TJ Silvester, AM & DM Burton, JE Ruffles, JR Clark, GV Edmunds		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density too high. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and parking problems due to proximity to major junction. Multiple ownership of land and many owners not willing to sell. Further shortages of social housing if any of the properties are knocked down to create access. 	
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	47 UC115 Rear of Stratford Road and Cedarcroft Road	5	1	Crest Nicholson, E Saker, PR Girling, GRYoung, Mr Mitchell	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and parking problems. Poor access to the site. Multiple ownership of the site. Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Retain as existing use. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	48 UC120 Henniker Road (rear of 668-730 Bramford Road)	15	1	Bramford Parish Council, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), IBC Labour Group & 10 Individuals	T Furzer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and parking problems. Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Poor access to the site. Loss of private amenity space for existing residents. Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Retain as existing use. Multiple ownership of the site. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	49 UC125 32 Larchcroft Road	6	1	Greenways Project, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), A Harvey, Mr & Mrs Andrews	M Jackaman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site assessment and ecology survey to be carried out before the development commences. Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and parking problems. Retain as existing use. Poor access and constrained layout not ideal for housing development. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	50 UC128 301- 305 Norwich Road	8	0	East of England Co-op Society, Planning Potential, Glyn Hopkin Ltd., Mersea Homes, IBC Labour Group, David Wilson Homes, Crest Nicholson, F Yates		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density low. Site better suited for mixed use with residential and commercial uses. Proposed development would lead to loss of jobs. Retain as existing use. Alternate sites for replacement of existing activities not identified. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and parking problems. Property sited on a landfill consultation zone. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	51 UC129 Depot, Beaconsfield Road	5	2	IBC Labour Group, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), SCC, R & M Ward	Greenways Project, Inland Waterways Association Ipswich branch, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site has risk to flooding. Property sited on a landfill consultation zone. Retain as existing use. Support allocation subject to appropriate flood defence works. 	<p>Residential and commercial development is dependent on the implementation of the flood defence barrier. Noted. The truck depot is a non-conforming and noisy use within a residential area and access to and from the site is fairly constrained. Residential development would therefore have positive environmental and amenity benefits for local residents.</p> <p>Residential and commercial development is dependent on the implementation of the flood defence barrier.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support housing but should make use of pedestrian walkway and cycle path along the river. 	
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	52 UC130 Rear of Riverside Road / Bramford Road	7	1	Bramford Parish Council, IBC Labour Group, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), MVL	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands and parking problems. Site assessment and ecology survey to be carried out before the development commences. (SWT) Council has to have regard to biodiversity under the NERC Act 2007. (SWT) Retain the site as open space. Proposed density high. Site has risk to flooding. Property sited on a landfill consultation zone. Support allocation subject to access being acceptable. 	Site is no longer being allocated as not deliverable.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	53 UC132 Rear of 601-655 Bramford Road	27	2	Bramford Parish Council, Highways Agency, SCC, IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes & 21 individuals	Mr & Mrs Ayles, WR Moffatt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Transport assessment required before any development commences. Retain the site as existing. Proposed density high. Loss of trees and plants. Site suffering from poor drainage and excess water causing flooding. Multiple ownership of land and many owners not willing to sell. Houses would be devalued. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development, although residential development may be deliverable on part of the site subject to overcoming drainage constraints.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	54 UC148 Builders Yard, Vermont Crescent	4	0	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), AB Parry, D Chittock		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. No proper access to the site. Proposed density high. Site within landfill consultation zone. Retain existing use. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	55 UC156 Rear of Jupiter Road & Reading Road	9	1	Greenways Project, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), A Harvey, Mr & Mrs Andrews, E Phillips, G Dickson, L Trusler, Mr & Mrs Stevens, K Maly	Roxburgh Roofing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain existing open space. Loss of employment area. Proposed density too high. No proper access to the site. Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Site within landfill consultation zone. 	Preferred options suggested 23 dwellings. A planning permission was granted for 14 dwellings (07/00997/FUL), approved 25th Jan 2008, and an amended scheme for 13 dwellings (09/00039/FUL) was approved 12th Mar 2009. A renewal of 09/00039/FUL (12/00192/FUL) was pending consideration in Mar 2012.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation	56 UC157 14 Crofton Road	12	0	SCC, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson &		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple ownership of land. Loss of vital green area. 	Site is no longer being allocated.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Details				David Wilson Homes (joint), E Phillips, R Nunn, MW & FM Stow, PW Smith, AR Mann, A Leathley, J Corbett, K Goldin		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density too high. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Site within landfill consultation zone. Site is partially Greenfield. Site is tended kitchen garden and not intended to be sold off. Wish to see family housing rather than flats. 	
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	57 UC167 Club, Newton Road	17	0	Sport England-East, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), Newton Road Conservative Club, IBC Labour Group, K Watling, H Atkins, W Hignett, D Atkins, D Vincent, MA Atkins, AM Uren, TS & LN Simper & Cowley, EL Smith, Wherry Housing Association	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternate sites for replacement of existing activities not identified. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Loss of public recreational facility. Unnecessary strain to existing infrastructure and services. Retain existing use. Owners not willing to sell their property. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	58 UC170 2 & 4 Derby Road	3	0	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain existing use. Loss of employment area. Alternate sites for replacement of existing activities not identified. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	59 UC171 The Railway PH and 245 Foxhall Road	0	2		Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint),	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting comments. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	60 UC172 Rear of Cauldwell Hall Road and Kemball Street	17	2	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), IBC Labour Group, Cllr D Ellesmere, Cllr S Martin & 11 individuals	Ian Dickson Ltd., R Davies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Multiple ownership of land and owners not willing to sell their properties. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Retain existing use. No proper access to the site. Proposed density too high. Risk of flooding. Loss of employment land, which is in good use. Possible loss of wildlife. 	Site is no longer being allocated. Part of site has been developed for residential and a further small part of the site may come forward as windfall residential development.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	61 UC180 547 Foxhall Road and land to rear	12	0	Ipswich Model Engineering Society, SCC, IBC Labour Group, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), Crest Group Ipswich		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternate sites for replacement of existing activities not identified. Site boundary needs to be reviewed, as it appears to encroach into site of Copleston High School. (SCC) Loss of community facilities and school playing fields. Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. 	Site is no longer being allocated.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
				Scout Group-Ipswich, Cllr S Martin, DM Jones, JG Pearse, AJ Goldsmith, C Millis		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain existing use. Poor access to site. Site owned by Ipswich Model Engineering Society with a trust deed of 60 years standing. Multiple use of site. Price and saleability of existing properties would plummet. Tram stop should be provided to reduce road use. (IS) 	
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	62 UC185 St Clements Hospital Grounds	155	4	Highways Agency, Sport England – East Region, SCC Environment Agency, Birketts LLP, Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council, Ipswich Hospital Bowls Club, Suffolk Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust, Ipswich Hospital NHS Trust, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), Unite the Unions, IBC Labour Group, Cllr D Ellesmere, Cllr S Martin, SCC & 140 individuals.	Greenways Countryside Project, The Ipswich Society, The Kesgrave Covenant Ltd., PM Hemingway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment required before development commences. (HA & SCC) Alternate sites for replacement of existing activities not identified. (SE) Serious impact on wildlife corridor. (EA) Proposed development along with other potential housing areas will have significant implications on provision of school places. SCC has therefore suggested a site of 4 acres reserved in the site UC010 as part of s106 for development of schools. (SCC) Site partly to be developed for housing and remaining for open space/ community/ leisure use. Loss of associated jobs, open space, wildlife and trees as Green Lung. Unnecessary strain to existing infrastructure and services. Proposed density too high. Proposed development to be phased to ease off pressure on water resources. (EA) Loss of sports and social ground. Retain existing use. Loss of rainwater to reserves due to hard surfaces. Land should be used for leisure/ public open space rather than housing, in case the hospital closes down. Storm water drainage a critical problem. Highways need further enhancement as part of redevelopment process until then deliverability is seriously questioned. Development should be in combination with UC262 with housing and public open space uses. Ecological assessment required to ensure protection of wildlife (bats and reptiles). (EA) 	Preferred options suggested 512 dwellings at a medium-density on 80% of the site. The SHLAA suggests low-density development on 80% of the site, which gives an indicative capacity of 350 homes, however further site analysis suggests an indicative capacity of 227 homes.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	63 UC192 Rear of Allenby Road and Hadleigh Road	4	1	IBC Labour Group, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), SCC, R & M Ward, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Cllr D Ellesmere	S Ahmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple ownership of land. Poor access to site. Retain existing use. Site within landfill consultation zone. 	Site is no longer being allocated.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	64 UC209 Front of Pumping Station, Belstead Road	12	0	Greenways Project, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint), Stoke Park Residents Association, NWA Planning, A Long, R Kirby, K Purnell, C Carter, A Lee, JD Carnell, M Garnham		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor access to site. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Retain existing use. Loss to vital public utility service. Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses Proposed density too high. Site topography and existing boreholes a constraint in development. Part allocation for semi-natural open space. 	Preferred options suggested 33 dwellings at a medium-density. The SHLAA suggests 27 dwellings at a medium-density.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	65 UC213 Rear of 17-27 Ramsey Close (Wigmore Close)	34	1	Stoke Park Residents Association, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint) & 30 individuals	L Norris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Loss of privacy and light for adjoining houses. Adverse effects on the amenities of the area. Proposed density too high. Multiple ownership of land and owners not willing to sell. Retain existing use. No road frontage. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	66 UC229 100 Clapgate Lane	25	2	Greenways Project, IBC Labour Group, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes (joint), P & C Levick supported by petition & 21 other individuals	A Leathley, K Rust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density too high. Narrow frontage of site. Loss of habitat for wildlife such as frogs, toads, newts, stag beetles etc. Access is dangerous - next to an old people's home and entrance to the park. Overlooking of surrounding properties. The land floods from Clapgate Lane. Refuse to give up garden. Out of character with surrounding area. Clapgate Lane is quite narrow and is often heavily parked. Loss of environmental quality for the existing houses. Adverse impact on the conservation area and wildlife in the adjacent park. The land is already in active use. Loss of trees. Development would compromise the security of the existing dwellings. Should use empty buildings before taking garden land. Support allocation but should be lower density – 6 dwellings and 10 dwellings both suggested. Would affect property values. Development would cause anxiety to elderly residents. Site unlikely to come forward because of multiple ownerships. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	67 UC230 Corner of Hawke Road and Holbrook	2	0	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site within landfill consultation zone. Retain existing use. No evidence of existing user's relocation. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3	68 UC231 251	4	2	Tree House Family	Ormiston Children &	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain existing use. 	Site is no longer being allocated.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Site Allocation Details	Clapgate lane			Forum, Sure Start Tree House Children's Centre, IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson	Families Trust, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (joint)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of play area for children/ community use. Site within landfill consultation zone. Support the allocation but do not want access from 251 Clapgate Lane. Owner not willing to sell off property and the capital grant to purchase the building has a clawback clause in it. 	
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	69 UC234 15-39a Bucklesham Road	34	0	Greenways Countryside Project, Environment Agency, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes (L&P) Ltd (on behalf of Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes, IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson, Suffolk County Council, David Wilson Homes & 22 individuals		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unnecessary strain on existing infrastructure and community facilities. Land unsuitable for building as underground stream of water runs through the entire site. Negative impacts on the environment. Loss of habitat with potential wildlife. Retain existing use. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Proposed development to be phased to ease off pressure on water resources. (EA) Possible contamination in the ground water due to sudge. (EA) Possible risk of flooding and subsidence due to poor drainage. Multiple ownership of land and owners not willing to sell. Proposed density is out of character making it not an acceptable proposal. Site adjacent to western boundary of Bixley Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest & thus would need careful assessment before any development commences. Indicative capacity of 5 homes for central part of site more realistic and achievable. Relevant investigation to be carried out especially on stability of land. Site within landfill consultation zone. 	Part of the site has planning permission for 3 dwellings (08/00266/FUL) approved 12th Jun 08 and is under construction. The remainder of the site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	68 UC236 Former Driving Test Centre, Woodbridge Road	3	2	Henry Cooper, IBC Labour Group	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes Ltd., Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density high. Retain existing use. Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Unnecessary strain on existing infrastructure and community facilities. Land should be allocated for employment use. Support housing but should reduce density and provide ample open space. 	Site size has been increased to include some of the adjacent site, reference UC237. Planning permission granted for 42 affordable dwellings (09/00787/FUL), approved 17th Mar 10 and under construction, and for 5 flats (09/00788/FUL), approved 21st Jan 10. The Driving Test Centre has relocated to elsewhere in the Borough.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	69 UC237 BT Depot, Woodbridge Road	5	0	Henry Cooper, IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density too high. Site fully operational. Redevelopment of land to be expensive due to cost of relocation of telecommunication infrastructure. 	There is a resolution to grant planning permission for up to 39 dwellings (12/00654/OUT).

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	70 UC246 South of Bramford Road	3	4	Bramford Parish Council, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, IBC Labour Group	River Action Group, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes Ltd., Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Proposed density high. Council has to have regard to biodiversity under the NERC Act 2007 and carry out reptile survey. (SWT) Site within landfill consultation zone. Possible risk of flooding. Support proposal but provide open space and a separate cycleway. 	Site is under construction for residential development and is nearing completion.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	71 UC250 112-116 Bramford Road	4	0	Bramford Parish Council, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes Ltd., Crest Nicholson, SCC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would lead to additional traffic demands, congestion and parking problems. Possible risk of flooding. Listed building near site. Proposed density too high. Prefer mixed-use development with commercial on ground floor. 	Proposed density of 15 dwellings in the preferred options is lower than was granted outline planning permission (08/00519/OUT) for 24 dwellings as part of a mixed-use scheme, approved 30th Sep 08. An extension on time limit for this permission (11/00247/VC) was approved on 19th Sep 11. Planning permission for 2 commercial units and 24 residential units.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	72 UC252 Running Buck PH, St Margaret's Plain	13	1	English Heritage, Bethesda Community Charitable Trust (Charles Clarke), Bethesda Baptist Church, Bethesda Community Charitable Trust (S Sherman), IBC Labour Group, Crest Nicholson, S Sharpe, A Catto, D Brock, J Rackham, DR Bailey, R Jarritt	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site adjoins conservation area and listed buildings. Retain existing use. Proposed density too high. Possible risk of flooding. Site contains Grade II listed building. Site has been redeveloped to a high standard to provide charity activities and essential services to the community. Reference to site as Running Buck Public House is incorrect and misleading as it has been running as The Key for the last 10 years. Owners not willing to release site for residential use. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	73 UC257 Land north of Whitton Lane	1	3	Ashfield Land	Greenways Countryside Project, Edward Phillips, SCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site more suitable for employment and transport use. 	Noted and site is proposed to be allocated for employment uses.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	74 UC258 Cranes Site	4	2	Rowland Shaw, EEDA, Andrew Martin Associates, SARG	Greenways Countryside Project, R J Kemp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The identification of Cranes is a positive step in planning for employment growth but the Council should consider how it relates to other regional priority sites e.g. Adastral Park (EEDA) Transport assessment required before development commences. Site survey to be conducted properly before any development commences. Evidence base doesn't support allocation as strategic employment site, reallocate it as jobs led opportunity site. 	Site has planning permission (11/00763/OUTFL) for employment uses. Site is identified as a strategic employment site in the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DPD (December 2011).
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	75 UC260 Former Norsk Hydro Site, Sandy Hill Lane	4	1	Greenways Countryside Project, Ashfield Land, Gainsborough Retail Park Ltd, SCC	IBC Labour Group,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land has not much demand for employment use. Site has existing retail permission that has been implemented. 	Site has a planning permission for retail development. Application for Certificate of lawful development - that Reserved Matters consent I/96/0080/REM dated 15.11.96 (for 4 retail units and ancillary works) has been implemented and can therefore be completed, approved 8th Feb 12.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	76 UC261 Wooded area and large verge, Birkfield Drive	0	3		Greenways Countryside Project, I McKie, SCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting comments. 	Noted.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	77 UC262 St Clements Golf Course	2	10	The Ipswich Society, The Kesgrave Covenant Ltd.	Greenways Countryside Project, Sport England –East Region, Cllr Sandy Martin, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Unite the Unions, IBC Labour Group, SCC, I McKie, D Morgan, E Phillips	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site more suitable for housing and public open space. The existing use would be redundant once the St Clements Hospital site is vacated. A combined development along with St Clements Hospital ground is preferred. 	Site is protected as open space.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	78 UC263 Ransomes Europark (east)	3	1	Greenways Countryside Project, Rowland Shaw, SARG	Strutt & Parker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site partly to be allocated for semi-natural green space or wildlife area. Reptile survey to be carried out on the site. Site more suitable for mixed-use development. 	Site is identified as an existing employment area.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	79 UC264 Between railway junction and Hadleigh Road	7	1	Greenways Countryside Project, The Ipswich Society, SCC, I McKie, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, SARG, SCC	Inland Waterways Association Ipswich Branch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site partly to be allocated for semi-natural green space along the river as public recreational area. Public access to be restricted only to the North bank of the river. Reptile survey to be carried out on the site. (SARG) Need of rail chord to be considered prior to allocation for development. (SCC) Provision for pedestrian and cycle route to be planned. 	Site is identified as an existing employment area.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	80 UC265 Land south of the A14	0	4		Greenways Countryside Project, Natural England, SCC, SARG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting comments. Habitat suitable for amphibians and reptiles and needs to be retained. This site should be completely taken out of planning process for any kind of development. 	Noted. Noted. Noted.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	81 UC266 Land at Pond Hall Farm, south of the A14	0	6		Greenways Countryside Project, Natural England, SCC, I McKie, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, SARG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site partly to be allocated for semi-natural green space to protect bio-diversity. Habitat suitable for amphibians and reptiles and needs to be retained. 	Site is no longer being allocated.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	82 UC267 Land south of Ravenswood	0	5		Natural England, SCC, I McKie, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, SARG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting Comments 	Noted, however site is now proposed to be allocated for open space, outdoor sports use and residential. Restaurant uses have planning permission on this site and are under construction. There is also a planning permission for a care home (13/00320/FUL).
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	83 UC268 Lister's, Landseer Road	1	0	Ashfield Land		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is already in use as employment. Size of site suggests that redevelopment is unlikely to make any contributions to job target. 	Noted. Existing use retained.
Appendix 3 Site Allocation Details	84 UC269 Airport Farm Kennels, north of A14	6	0	Henry Cooper, SCC, Turley Associates, D Hobbs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport assessment to be undertaken to evaluate potential impacts on highways Robust travel plan required. 	An allocation is proposed for employment use subject to access improvements. Travel plans are required by the Core Strategy policy DM15.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site designated as countryside and partly falling within Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Proposed development will preclude any future construction of East Bank Link Route, which is vital for success of the town. 	<p>Noted. The AONB will need to be addressed for development which falls within its boundary.</p> <p>There is no current proposal for the road link and land is needed for employment development.</p>
Appendix 3 Site Allocation	85 UC272 Halifax Road Sports	0	4		Sport England –East Region, SCC, I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting comments 	Noted.

**Appendix 2 – IP-One Area Action Plan DPD – Analysis of Preferred Options
Comments (2008) and Council Responses (2013)**

IP-ONE AAP - ANALYSIS OF PREFERRED OPTIONS COMMENTS (2008) AND COUNCIL RESPONSES (2013)

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Whole document	-	1	0	GO East, A M Hunter		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of the DPD is complicated and unclear (GO East). The submission DPD will need to draw together and more clearly articulate the strategy for the IP-One area linking the spatial strategy, policies, the 4 areas of activity (e.g. Waterfront) and the 12 opportunity areas (GO East). The area will prove too large for an area action plan and therefore the aims and objectives will not be manageable. The document lacks any real commitment to planning for people apart from some token greening. 	<p>Noted and has been addressed in the next stage of the development plan document (DPD) preparation.</p> <p>Noted and has been addressed in next stage of the DPD preparation.</p> <p>The area represents the central core of Ipswich, which will establish links between the town centre, the waterfront, Ipswich village and the education quarter. This area has been defined within the adopted Core Strategy and represents an appropriate boundary.</p> <p>The document deals with providing people with homes and jobs.</p>
Chapter 1 Introduction	1.8	1	0	English Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports need for action plan, as described in para. 1.8, but conservation areas, scheduled monuments, and Opportunity Areas should be defined on Proposals Map (EH). 	Conservation areas and opportunity areas are defined on the draft policies map (formerly Proposals Map).
Chapter 1 Introduction	1.9	1	0	English Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand para 1.9 to explain that the area is central to the image and identity of the Borough, due to many intact heritage assets (EH). 	This is now addressed in the introduction to Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy.
Chapter 2 Portrait of IP-One	2.1	1	0	Environment Agency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of open space in river corridor and Waterfront area should be mentioned in the portrait of IP-One (EA). 	The portrait now in chapter 2 of the combined IP-One and Site Allocations document gives a brief general overview.
Chapter 3 The Wider Policy Context	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	4	1	Home Builders Federation and EERA	The Ipswich Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferred Options documents should relate to National Planning Policies and advice - PPS1, PPS3, PPS12, PPS25, The East of England Plan, and PINS advice. Where a limited supply of brownfield sites is available, it is essential that sites identified and allocated are readily and realistically available for housing development. Must comply with the overall housing requirement. Need to ensure a range of both brownfield and greenfield sites are available. Must seek to ensure a range of different types of housing are provided in different forms and in different localities. Any planning gain requirement should be considered in relation to site viability. Planning gain requirements must be realistic, if not Council will struggle to meet its housing supply requirements. Re. affordable housing provision, proper and full regard must be had to overall viability of schemes in setting requirements. A proper SHMA is required, with the full involvement of the property industry to underpin the evidence base. Policies should not replicate or replace sustainability standards already being set by Building Regulations and supported by new Code for Sustainable Homes. 	<p>The DPD does do so. Conformity with national policy (now in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework) is a test of soundness is and therefore the DPD will take account of such policy.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies potential sites.</p> <p>Agreed. The requirement is now as set out in the adopted Core Strategy and updated through the focused review.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS3 states that sites and designated areas within the IP-One area will be identified on a revision of the Proposals Map. Core Strategy policies CS7 to CS9 cover the borough-wide approach to housing provision.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS8 requires a mix of dwelling types.</p> <p>The Council is now progressing with CIL which will be viability tested.</p> <p>The Council is now progressing with CIL which will be viability tested.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS12 sets the affordable housing target and refers to viability.</p> <p>The Strategy Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has been revised in 2012.</p> <p>The Planning and Energy Act 2008 allows local authorities to adopt standards which exceed the Building Regulations.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document is far too long, and separate, shorter DPD's should be prepared instead. A lot of options are put forward without any evidence base to justify them. Council's evidence should include a SHLAA. More practical to include all policy matters within the Core Strategy document. (EERA) Document is generally consistent with RSS but conformity issues would need to be addressed when specific schemes are progressed. (EERA) References require updating to reflect the current position with East of England Plan. (EERA) 	<p>The document has now been combined with the Site Allocations plan and shortened.</p> <p>A significant body of evidence exists in the Core Document Library and is being added to continuously, for example the Wildlife Audit update currently underway.</p> <p>A SHLAA was published in 2010 and a draft update in 2013.</p> <p>The Core Strategy was adopted December 2011 and covers development management matters. IP-One is about policies specifically for central Ipswich.</p> <p>The Regional Spatial Strategy (East of England Plan) was abolished in January 2013.</p> <p>The East of England Plan was abolished in January 2013.</p>
Chapter 4 Issues for IP-One	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	2	1	English Heritage, Environment Agency	Shearer Property Group Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific reference needs to be included to preserve and enhance the heritage assets including the spaces between and the settings of the historic buildings. (EH) Conservation area appraisals should include consideration of their settings and boundaries, especially in the transitional zones e.g. where Wet Dock and Central conservation areas conjoin. (EH) With Urban Design Guidelines we urge strong and where appropriate prescriptive advice. (EH) Re: Landmark Buildings need to give definition of 'tall' and other relevant terms should be explained. (EH) Urge strong guidance on the location of tall buildings. (EH) The 10 Key Issues as set out under para 4.2 are wide ranging and may make implementation of the plan's objectives and policies difficult to achieve over the plan period, but the EA is happy within its remit to help the Council achieve the vision. (EA) 	<p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS4 seeks to protect the Borough's assets.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The reasoned justification to adopted Core Strategy policy DM6 gives a definition of tall buildings.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy policy DM6 gives clear guidance on the location of tall buildings. Locations are indicated on the IP-One inset policies map.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Chapter 5 Vision and Objectives	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	6	4	Environment Agency, EERA, Go East, Shearer Property Group Limited, Crest Nicholson	University Campus Suffolk, Sustrans, EEDA, EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest vision should be more specific to the area rather than merely follow the Core Strategy. (EA) Objective 10 should go further and aim for creation of green areas, not just 'greening' of the streets, which is perhaps, prima facia, a token gesture. (EA) The conservation and enhancement of the historic environment should be covered by a policy not just an objective. (EERA) Need a policy dealing with sustainable construction in accordance with RSS policy ENV6. (EERA) Chapter 5 gives an objective for sustainable construction rather than policy. (EERA) 	<p>The DPD is part of the Borough's Local Plan and is prepared alongside the Core Strategy which is also part of the Local Plan. Alternative approaches were considered.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy policy CS16 seeks to protect the network of green corridors and policy DM5 requires all new development to be well designed and sustainable with greener streets and spaces.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS4 seeks to protect the Council's heritage assets, policy DM8 refers to Conservation Areas, policy DM9 refers to Buildings of Townscape Interest.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM1 deals specifically with sustainable development.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM1 deals specifically with sustainable development.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IP-One AAP vision should be more clearly articulated and include a reference to the end date of the plan and some specific, quantified issues. (GO East) • Object to vision that includes an aspiration for a less car dominated town centre - the town centre must continue to be accessible by all modes of transport. • The vision should also be to enhance the linkages between the station, Waterfront and the town centre. • Object to lack of clear timescale for AAP and lack of clear delivery targets for jobs and housing. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Central Government advice requires less reliance on the private car. The County Council scheme 'Travel Ipswich' seeks a reduction in dependency on the private car by 15% by 2027. A range of transport options would still remain.</p> <p>The preamble to Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS20 notes that this is a key Council objective.</p> <p>The timescale is set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme. Adopted Core Strategy policy CS13 sets targets for jobs growth and policy CS7 sets targets for housing growth.</p>
Chapter 6 Spatial Strategy	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	3	1	Environment Agency, Shearer Property Group Limited, David Wilson Homes	EEDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caution Council on the risk of providing cultural facility/visitor attraction on the Island site (para 6.9) in area of high flood risk because of potential for water damage to artefacts. (EA) • Expect to see creation of pocket parks along the river frontage and around the waterfront area. (EA) • Support safeguarding of a site for a new tidal flood defence barrier at the New Cut. (EA) • Object to extension of CSA boundary north across Crown Street to incorporate land north of Crown Street for retail development as it is separated from the main shopping area by the inner ring road. • Spatial strategy for central Ipswich should provide a programme for delivering each new retail area in phases starting with the Mint Quarter being developed first. • Object to the strategy because the capacity of land in IP-One is only for 1,300 to 1,500 dwellings, not the 3,000+ that the Council seeks to allocate. 	<p>Any proposed development would need to take flood risk into account.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Work on the defences has commenced.</p> <p>The detailed boundary for the CSA has not been extended north of Crown Street.</p> <p>Phasing of retail development in central Ipswich will be informed by the evidence base.</p> <p>The figure has been revised. The Adopted Core Strategy estimates in table 3 that IP-One will deliver 1,699 dwellings from 2010 to 2022 on land without planning permission.</p>
Chapter 7 Work	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	3	0	EEDA, Environment Agency, Robert Brett & Sons Ltd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should consider how the allocated B1 office-led town centre sites relate to development of Martlesham Innovation Park, aspirations for Crane's site as a strategic employment site, and Adastral Park. (EEDA) • Careful consideration needed of phased release of new employment land to ensure a balanced approach between jobs and houses. (EEDA) • EA comments submitted at Issues and Options stage apply to those sites that have come forward at Preferred Options stage (EA). • Some of proposed sites lie in the medium to high risk flood zones 2 and 3. Para 17 of PPS25 Development and Flood Risk is relevant here re: sequential test. (EA) • The Council need to provide evidence that demonstrates the Sequential Test has been carried out. (EA) 	<p>The employment allocations in IP-One reflect the policies of the adopted Core Strategy, the NPPF, the planning permission on the Crane's site and the proposals for Martlesham Innovation Park and Adastral Park.</p> <p>It is important to provide a choice of employment site locations to attract jobs - some will come forward later than others as a result of time needed to address constraints e.g. access.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>PPS25 has been superseded by the NPPF but the sequential test still applies. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses development in the flood plain and, together with the the sequential test statement, evidences the sequential test. See core documents ref. PCD93 and PCD87 respectively.</p> <p>The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses development in the flood plain and, together with the the sequential test statement, evidences the sequential test. See core documents ref. PCD93 and PCD87 respectively.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence, in the form of stand-alone Sequential Test report, should be presented as baseline evidence in support of IP-One AAP submission document. (EA) The Council should safeguard the aggregate wharf at Wherstead Road from developments nearby that could be sensitive to its 24 hour operation. 	<p>The need for further evidence will be considered in the light of the Council's published Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test statement - see core documents ref. PCD93 and PCD87.</p> <p>Noted. This is more likely to fall within the Site Allocations DPD area outside of IP-One.</p>
Chapter 7 Work	Policy Area 42 The Town Centre Boundary	4	2	The Ipswich Society, Suffolk County Council, J Norman, Shearer Property Group Ltd.	University Campus Suffolk, Turnstone Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confused about the different areas referred to in IP-One and their boundaries e.g. town centre, central car parking area, central shopping area – needs simplifying. Accept that the town centre boundary needs to be extended to accommodate necessary uses, but the southern extremities are too far (over 1km) from the central railway and bus stations so any major employers should be required to provide high quality public transport links. (SCC) Extending the town centre boundary south to the brewery and west to include Ipswich Village extends everybody's concept of the 'town centre' – should call it the central business district instead. Support widening the town centre boundary but object to inclusion of land north of Crown Street in the central shopping area. 	<p>Definitions for these areas are set out in the adopted Core Strategy and Policies and they are mapped on the IP-One inset policies map.</p> <p>Noted. However good accessibility does not require business uses to be located in close proximity to bus or train stations but to have safe and convenient access by foot, cycle and public transport including access to bus stops.</p> <p>The name 'town centre' boundary is appropriate as it accorded with national planning policy at the time PPS6, which was subsequently superseded by PPS4 and now replaced by NPPF. It also accords with the terminology stated in the adopted Core Strategy and Policies.</p> <p>Land north of Crown Street was included as an extension to the CSA in order to deliver additional retail floorspace, however this element of the extension to the CSA has not been carried forward into the adopted Core Strategy. The Core Strategy policy CS14 states that the CSA will be extended to include land south of Crown Street and Old Foundary Road, and no longer includes land north of Crown Street. The precise detailed boundary will be reviewed having regard to in particular the following: the Council's Town Centre Master Plan, the Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2010, Town Centre Opportunity Sites study, the NPPF and other relevant considerations.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Chapter 7 Work	Policy Area 43 Site Allocations for B1 Use	3	2	Suffolk County Council, Ashfield Land, Turnstone Estates	The Ipswich Society, EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All additional sites for travel intensive employment uses should be supported by improvement to access to public transport in accordance with PPG13 <i>Transport</i>. (SCC) The Council should estimate the number of net jobs likely to be generated on each site to clarify the contribution each makes to the overall employment target. Estimate that only 2,400 additional jobs are likely to be generated, assuming all sites come forward and that displaced uses can be relocated. Support 20% B1 use at the former Civic Centre site but the policy will need to be flexible to deal with the particular circumstances on a complex site. (Turnstone) 	<p>PPG13 has now been superseded by the NPPF. NPPF states that 'All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment'. Policy area 43 will be updated to reflect the NPPF and other relevant considerations.</p> <p>Agreed. The Council has in its evidence to the Core Strategy examination estimated job number likely to be generated on each site. This will be updated through the next consultation stage to the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The Council has demonstrated through evidence presented at the Core Strategy examination that it can through joint co-operation with local partners meet the jobs growth target set out in the former RSS.</p> <p>See Appendix A for site comments.</p>
Chapter 7 Work	Policy Area 44 Hotels	0	0			No comments received but see Appendix A for site comments.	See Appendix A for site comments.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Chapter 7 Work	Policy Area 45			Sport England, The Theatres Trust		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support identification of sites for large scale leisure in principle, but object to lack of reference to evidence that would support them, and more specific reference to how the allocations would meet sporting needs e.g. for sports halls and swimming pools – this must be addressed. (SE) Need more detail to be able to comment. Leisure should be described as activities involving sport and recreation, irrespective of any Use Class classification. 	<p>Both the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (PMP 2009, core document ref. ICD27) and the Cultural and Leisure Needs Analysis (PMP 2009, core document ref. ACD20) identify and quantify the need for new facilities such as swimming pools. Evidence will inform the site allocations and policies for sport and leisure provision in the Borough, and this will be demonstrated at the next stage of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>Further detail will follow at the next stage of preparation of the IP-One AAP which will be subject of consultation.</p> <p>IP-One AAP will address needs and site allocation for all types of sport and leisure provision. Different use types will be addressed by separate policy areas, reflecting the Use Classes Order.</p>
Chapter 7 Work	Policy Area 46 Protecting Existing Employment Areas	1	1	Mersea Homes	EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PA46 should provide a basis for protecting existing employment uses rather than employment areas Policy Area fails to provide an effective policy basis for decisions. Proposed approach has not been fully informed by an up-to-date evidence base. The policy link should be made with other policy areas where residential allocations are made on employment sites. The relocation of employment uses away from the town centre will affect their accessibility. The evidence base must be appropriate and up to date. 	<p>Policy CS13 of the adopted Core Strategy states that 'the Council will encourage the protection of employment uses as well as existing employment areas'. Policy DM25 states that 'sites and premises used and /or allocated for employment uses will be safeguarded for that purpose'.</p> <p>Evidence presented at the Core Strategy examination to support policies CS13 and DM25 demonstrates that employment land should be protected.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy CS2 of the adopted Core Strategy addresses location issues relating to new development and directs B1 uses to the town centre and other B class uses to employment areas. Policy CS5 requires improved accessibility and DM15 and DM16 addresses travel issues.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Chapter 8 Live	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	3	0	Home Builders' Federation, EEDA, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson & David Wilson Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Land Availability Study (2007) referred to is considered to be somewhat irrelevant now given the requirements of PPS3 and the accompanying SHLAA and SHMA Guidance. In delivering RSS housing targets, the AAP should respond to SHMA study, meeting local need and delivering mix of residential types. (EEDA) Loss of buy-to-let market from the apartments sector in conjunction with high levels of apartments supply raises questions over viability of further apartment building. Commercial land values have increased; the lack of new commercial sites will help to ensure existing land values do not fall. Cost of developing apartments is likely to escalate due to increased 106 provisions with respect to flood defence barriers, affordable housing, and need to satisfy the Code for Sustainable Homes. 	<p>Documents have been revised and updated.</p> <p>In light of local evidence the Council through the adopted Core Strategy is seeking to meet a target of 700 dwellings per annum, slightly lower than the RSS target, as stated in policy CS7. Policy CS8 seeks to achieve a mix of dwelling types.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS8 requires a balance between flats and houses. The SHMA provides evidence to support the policy.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy requires all developments to meet on and off site infrastructure requirements. Policy CS12 requires all new developments of 10 dwellings or more to include provision for affordable housing, however a reduced provision may be acceptable when justified on viability grounds. Policy DM1 requires all dwellings including apartments to meet specified Code for Sustainable Homes.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total units sought is not achievable during plan period - identified viable maximum number of 1658 units in IP-One, so there is a discrepancy of 1590 units (Island Site counted as non viable). The Council should safeguard the aggregate wharf at Wherstead Road from developments nearby that could be sensitive to its 24 hour operation – e.g. housing. 	<p>The adopted Core Strategy and supporting evidence base documents considered at the examination demonstrates the Council has at least 15 year housing supply.</p> <p>Noted. This is more likely to fall within the Site Allocations DPD area outside of IP-One.</p>
Chapter 8 Live	Policy Area 47 Residential and Residential-led Mixed Use Allocations	4	0	Home Builders' Federation, Ipswich School, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precise housing requirement will not be known until the Council has undertaken a SHLAA in conjunction with other key stakeholders. The overall housing requirement is a minimum requirement that should be exceeded. Sufficient housing provision will need to be made for at least 15 years from the date of the plan's eventual adoption. Suitable sites should be identified in 5, 10 and 15 year potential land supply in accordance with national policy. Too many of the sites are within the flood plain and adequate flood defences may not be in place for many years (land north of Valley Rd should be allocated instead). The sites fail to offer housing choice as required by PPS3. Object to conclusion that 3,459 homes can be provided through sites in the IP-One AAP because the figures do not reflect risks associated with delivery. Serious question of site viability (especially sites for flats) at time of worsening housing market and rising build costs. Preferred Options allocations have been completed before many of supporting documents are in place. <p>Please see Appendix A for site comments.</p>	<p>A revised SHLAA has been prepared and the housing requirement is set out in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Adopted Core Strategy policy CS7 states that the Council will enable continuous housing delivery for at least fifteen years.</p> <p>The housing trajectory, supported by the SHLAA, covers this point. The trajectory is updated annually through the annual Authority Monitoring Report.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses flood risk. Adopted Core Strategy policy DM4 only allows development where it is demonstrated that the proposal satisfies key criteria related to flooding.</p> <p>The Adopted Core Strategy policy CS2 looks at the location and nature of development with policy CS8 requiring a mix of flats and housing.</p> <p>The figure has been revised downwards in the Core Strategy to reflect anticipated delivery - see Policy CS3 and Table 3.</p> <p>The deliverability of sites is checked every year through the housing trajectory review and any SHLAA update at that time. Some of the sites listed in 8.11 have subsequently been recorded as not available through the SHLAA.</p> <p>Work on site allocations was halted to allow the Core Strategy to be put in place first. It has now been adopted so its policies and evidence base can inform further sites work.</p> <p>See Appendix A for site comments.</p>
Chapter 8 Live	Policy Area 48 Cultural Facilities	4	0	The Ipswich Society, Environment Agency, The Theatres Trust, Mersea Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need a significant project to make Ipswich a tourist destination and the DPD needs to be more explicit about how it intends to take this forward. Should not place valuable collections in an area of flood risk because of their vulnerability to water damage through flooding. (EA) Future leisure, arts and cultural facilities should be located in the centre and be part of a successful mixed use environment. Theatres can be a major tourist attraction, and a festival or summer season can also be a draw, but this is dependent on suitable venues - a policy to promote theatre use as part of relatively small developments could make a strong contribution to the character of the town and enhance the tourist experience. 	<p>The next stage of the IP-One AAP will consider the needs and site specific requirements for tourism and culture in Ipswich, based on evidence such as the Cultural and Leisure Needs Analysis 2009 (core document ref. ACD20).</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy policy DM4 only allows development where the proposals satisfy key flooding criteria.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM22 directs new cultural and tourist uses to the town centre first, in accordance with PPS4 approach (carried forward through the NPPF). Site allocations for these uses will be made at the next stage of IP-One AAP.</p> <p>Noted. Site allocations for these uses will be considered at the next stage of IP-One AAP.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration should be given to the opportunity to plan for a strategic cultural offer in IP-One, and sites proposed for development should be reconsidered for their potential to contribute to a network of cultural spaces and places e.g. parkland and civic spaces. 	Noted. Site allocations for these uses will be considered at the next stage of IP-One AAP.
Chapter 8 Live	Policy Area 49 Community Facilities	0	1		The Ipswich Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All are supported. 	Noted. Policy DM32 of the adopted Core Strategy also demonstrates how the Council will protect and make provision for community facilities.
Chapter 8 Live	Policy Area 50 Design and Amenity in Town Centre Living	5	0	Home Builders Federation, The Ipswich Society, CABE, GO East, The Riverside Group		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no evidence base to justify the policy requirement for balconies or minimum floor space and this would add costs and affect affordability. Strong support but the policy should apply borough wide as design quality falls off badly outside the centre. LDF should include robust design policies embedding design as a priority from strategic frameworks to site specifics (CABE standard comment - not specific to this policy area). Design should reflect understanding of local context and character and aspirations (CABE standard comment – not specific to this policy area). Some issues in para 8.65 go beyond the scope of the planning system e.g. internal layout requirements. (GO East) The submission policy should not include requirements that cut across other legislative requirements. (GO East) Support principles but object to minimum floor area and sound proofing. Affordable housing should not have to achieve higher standards than those imposed by grant providers. 	<p>The Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM3 requires a standard of outdoor amenity space in new and existing development. Policy DM30 Density of Residential Development paragraph 9.153 encourages minimum floor areas for dwellings.</p> <p>The Adopted Core Strategy Policy DM3 requires a standard of outdoor amenity space in new and existing development.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy policy DM5 requires all new development to be well designed.</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy policy DM5 criterion 'e' requires all new development to protect the special character and distinctiveness of Ipswich.</p> <p>The post amble to Adopted Core Strategy policy DM5 notes that Building for Life criteria is used to assess design quality of which flexible internal layout is a criterion.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Para 9.153 of the adopted Core Strategy states the Council will encourage developers to exceed minimum floorspace area (Quality Standards 2007). Points are awarded for sound proofing which is one measure to achieving appropriate code level in the Code for Sustainable Homes which is set out in policy DM1.</p> <p>The Council aims to achieve high quality housing across the board and will, as far as possible, use recognised national assessment methods such as Code for Sustainable Homes and Building for Life to assess quality.</p>
Chapter 8 Live	Policy Area 51 Sequential Approach to Location of Development	1	0	Mersea Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PA51 should reflect national planning policy guidance in respect of the decision-making process for new residential development, as set out in PPS25 (the sequential approach to flood risk issues) and PPS3 (the range of considerations which should inform locational decisions). As a consequence of this reappraisal, we would anticipate changes to the spatial pattern of development and the allocations made in support of that. 	PPS3 and PPS25 have been replaced by NPPF. The adopted Core Strategy policy CS2 sets the locational strategy for the location of new development. The Core Strategy is supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
Chapter 9 Travel	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	6	0	Cycle Ipswich, S Marginson, Sustrans		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient cycle provision. Object to overall lack of traffic free cycle facilities. Needs to be changed to increase mobility within this confined area. 	<p>The adopted Core Strategy addresses cycle provision in particular within policies DM15, DM17 and DM19. This demonstrates the Council's commitment to ensuring adequate provision for cycles.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policies DM15 and DM17 support the provision of dedicated cycle routes and policy CS5 prioritises the introduction of an integrated cycle network.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of traffic flow improvements, pedestrian and cycling improvements. The proposals will create a good deal more traffic - need to look at new infrastructure, traffic flow mechanisms, improved pedestrian facilities, improved cycle facilities. Several transport documents are listed, which the Council should take into account. RSS Policy T1 is not properly addressed in Chapter 9. Inter-urban transport is only mentioned briefly and therefore the DPD should address RSS Policy T5 setting out how inter-urban services could be improved, including the carriage of cycles on trains and cycle storage at stations. Cycling and walking should be considered separately to draw out the different requirements of each mode Funding for roads and car parks should be identified separately from money allocated for the support of sustainable modes and allocations aligned with RSS objectives. 	<p>The adopted Core Strategy policy DM15 requires a transport assessment to be undertaken for proposals over 10 or more dwellings or 1,000sqm or more non residential floorspace. Policy CS5 supports the Ipswich Major Scheme 'Travel Ipswich' and commits to working with the Highways Authority in managing travel demand in Ipswich.</p> <p>See comment above.</p> <p>Noted and will give consideration to. The evidence base will have moved on to an extent in the intervening time.</p> <p>The RSS was appropriately addressed in the Core Strategy which is now adopted. The tenets of RSS policy T1 are followed through into policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and will be reflected in the next stage of IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The RSS was appropriately addressed in the Core Strategy which is now adopted. The tenets of RSS policy T5 are followed through into policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and will be reflected in the next stage of IP-One AAP.</p> <p>Agreed. Core Strategy policy DM17 for example requires consideration of each in relation to new developments. The IP-One AAP would not identify funding. Funding would derive from the Local Transport Plan or Community Infrastructure Levy/Section 106 Agreements.</p>
Chapter 9 Travel	Policy Area 52 Key Cycle and Pedestrian Routes	9	1	Environment Agency, The Ipswich Society, Suffolk County Council, H Cooper, Waterfront Churches, Cycle Ipswich, Sustrans, J Norman	EERA,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broadly support, but any access across the lock gate (Opportunity Area A) must not interfere with its operation and navigation rights and nor should a bridge across the New Cut. (EA) The riverside green corridor (Opportunity Areas F & G) should include the provision of green spaces funded in part through land/contributions from developers. (EA) Support proposed development of comprehensive cycle network but must ensure through the planning stage that continuous cycle routes are developed. Use reallocation of road space to provide safe environment for cyclists and pedestrians. Support the policy area but we need to be more radical in designing these routes and get away from DfT manuals and move towards a shared space approach. Routes across the lock, from the Waterfront to the town centre, from the station to the town centre are uninviting in every way. Key cycle and pedestrian routes are shown on the Opportunity Area plans but not on the preferred options map and not as part of an integrated network for the wider borough. (SCC) 	<p>Comment noted and agreed.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policy CS17 requires contributions towards the provision of green spaces through a planning standard charge. The need for all types of site allocation will be considered through the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policy CS5 prioritises the introduction of an integrated cycle network.</p> <p>The Core Strategy policy CS5 encourages greater use by non car modes of transport, enabling safe and convenient access on foot and by bicycle and public transport. Reallocation of road space to non car modes is not appropriate where they are adopted highway, with exception to pedestrianised areas.</p> <p>View noted.</p> <p>Improving accessibility is a priority as stated in policy CS5 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support better links but would like to see pedestrian only options reviewed e.g. 9.29 the spine through the campus – cycling links with the campus will be important. • Object to the lack of practical and safe cycling routes – creating a dedicated and contiguous cycle network must be the goal of the Council if it wishes people to cycle. • A pedestrian and cycle route around the entire Wet Dock must be a central part of plans, to encourage healthier living and business activity. • The network Management Plan should be updated to cover on-street cycle routes and the necessary pressure should be brought to bear on the County Council to make these changes. • No mention is made of the benefits of reducing road speed on key cycle routes to 20mph even though this is recognised as an important tool to increase the safety of cyclists and pedestrians - 30mph limits should be reduced to 20mph. • Car clubs should be promoted to reduce levels of car ownership and use and to reduce parking pressure. • No mention is made of National Cycle Route 1 which passes through the town, and only brief mention of Route 51. • A budget allocation and commitment should be made to consulting widely with local cycling groups – Cycle Ipswich, Sustrans, CTC and Team Ipswich Cycling. • Considerable improvements to the walking environment have been made but much more could be done e.g. to redesign crossings so they do not become water filled dips in wet weather and tackle pavement parking. • Opportunity Area D para 9.29 – it is the intention of Suffolk New College and UCS to divert the path along the western edge of Alexandra Park to become the new spine through the Campus linking to the Waterfront. • More should be done to promote cycling with better cycling maps and promotion in schools, the health section and workplaces. • Seek introduction of safe segregated cycle contra flow lanes in the one-way system to shorten travel times. 	<p>Comment noted, the detail will be set out in the proposal map at the next consultation stage.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policy CS5 prioritises the introduction of an integrated cycle network. Suffolk County Council Major Transport Scheme: Travel Ipswich commits to improving cycling provision in Ipswich.</p> <p>Noted and will be considered at the next stage of preparation of the IP-One AAP policies map.</p> <p>Noted. This would occur outside the scope of the AAP.</p> <p>Comment noted. This would occur outside the scope of the AAP.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policy DM15 supports the introduction of car clubs as an integrated transport solution.</p> <p>The importance of cycle routes is recognised however e.g. Core Strategy Policy CS5 prioritises an integrated cycle network.</p> <p>The Statement of Community Involvement states which groups will be consulted, in addition all groups who have previously participated in the consultation will be kept informed of the plan's progress.</p> <p>Improving accessibility is a priority, including safe and convenient access on foot, as stated in policy CS5 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Noted and will be considered at the next stage of preparation of the IP-One AAP proposals map.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policies DM15 and DM17 support the provision of dedicated cycle routes and policy CS5 prioritises the introduction of an integrated cycle network. Suffolk County Council Major Transport Scheme: Travel Ipswich commits to improving cycling provision in Ipswich. Cycling promotion can take place outside the scope of the AAP.</p> <p>See comment above.</p>
Chapter 9 Travel	Policy Area 53 The Wet Dock Crossing	9	2	The Ipswich Society, Suffolk County Council, R Nunn, UCS, Cycle Ipswich, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson	EERA, C Vint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the single most important new road and the logical crossing would be to Bath Street – it would obviate the need for a roundabout and keep traffic out of the Island Site. • There should be no vehicular traffic through St Peter's Quay. 	<p>The current intention is for this crossing to link to Mather Way, however the details of this proposal will follow at a later stage. The Local Transport Plan (LTP 2011-2031) acknowledges this link will improve access to the Island site, however there is currently no funding in place for this scheme.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS20 proposes that the Waterfront Northern Quays are closed to general traffic but remain open to the shuttle bus and for access.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The crossing should not wait for development of the Island site. This scheme is not supported by the local highway authority and no funding is being sought for it. (SCC) To relieve east-west congestion, improvements to the gyratory are implementable along with the approach set out in the LTP 2006-2011 and this should be articulated in the DPD. (SCC) If the Wet Dock Crossing does not come forward in the plan period, it raises questions about the development of the Island site for such intensive levels of use – it would need to be accessed from the western bank. (SCC) The East Bank Link Road will not be built and therefore the Wet Dock Crossing is essential to provide an alternative east-west link – the route should be from Bath Street to Toller Rd crossing adjacent to the lock gates. Not opposed to a crossing in principle, but would need to be assured that it would not divert substantial volumes of traffic along Duke St as this would harm the environment of UCS. Managing traffic flows should be addressed as a top level issue across the whole document and the crossing should not be built. Demand management policies in the Ipswich Waterfront Transport Strategy & Ipswich Transport Strategy should be actioned urgently. There is no realistic prospect of the delivery of the crossing therefore it should be removed from the plan as it could blight land. Support in principle, but the link between delivery of the crossing and improvements to the Star Lane gyratory should be removed because there is uncertainty about the crossing's deliverability (e.g. it is dependent on development of the Island Site which itself depends on completion of the tidal barrier). The DPD has not been tested in transport terms and the proposed approach is inconsistent with the recommendations of the Waterfront Transport Study. 	<p>Funding for the crossing has yet to be secured through the Local Transport Plan, although it does acknowledge the improved access this crossing would bring.</p> <p>See above. The Council supports the scheme and will continue to seek funding and commitment to the project through the LTP.</p> <p>The next stage in the IP-One AAP should be updated to reflect the new LTP 2011- 2031.</p> <p>Comment noted and the position will be updated at the next stage in the plan preparation. However, the Core Strategy (8.229 b.) states that the Island site development does not depend on the Wet Dock Crossing.</p> <p>The Council supports the Wet Dock Crossing and will continue to seek funding and commitment to the project through the LTP.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Suffolk County Council Major Transport Scheme: Travel Ipswich will deliver improvements to the traffic flows in Ipswich. The Wet Dock Crossing is supported by Ipswich Borough Council as it will improve linkages to the Island Site.</p> <p>Demand management is being addressed through the Major Scheme: Travel Ipswich.</p> <p>The possibility of a crossing has not been ruled out and is recognised in the latest Local Transport Plan. See page 20 of LTP 3.</p> <p>The two are linked because reducing capacity in the Gyratory would need other measures to mitigate the loss. However it is acknowledged that other compensatory measures may be available as well as the Wet Dock Crossing.</p> <p>The Waterfront Transport Study made recommendations for the Gyratory but did not consider wider implications.</p>
Chapter 9 Travel	Policy Area 54 Star Lane and College Street Gyratory	4	1	The Ipswich Society, Suffolk County Council, UCS, Crest Nicholson	C Vint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As well as capacity reduction there should be demand reduction e.g more attractive footpaths. The suggestion of the traffic consultants should be followed as soon as the Wet Dock Crossing is in place (e.g. 2 way widened Star Lane with tree planting and Key Street as shared space). Improvements to Star Lane are implementable together with the approach set out in the LTP and should not be dependent on additional capacity being provided. (SCC) 	<p>The Suffolk County Council Major Transport Scheme: Travel Ipswich is designed to deliver improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users in central Ipswich.</p> <p>This would be a matter for decision once the Wet Dock Crossing had been completed.</p> <p>The Borough Council considers that changes should not be made without considering the wider impacts on traffic and movement in the town centre.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not opposed in principle to these works linked to a Wet Dock Crossing, but would not wish to see the crossing divert large volumes of traffic along Duke Street as it would harm the UCS environment – should use demand management methods also. • Support the Star Lane improvements but object to the link to the provision of a Wet Dock Crossing. 	<p>The Suffolk County Council Major Transport Scheme: Travel Ipswich is designed to deliver improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users in central Ipswich to reduce demand for road space.</p> <p>The Borough Council considers that changes should not be made without considering the wider impacts on traffic and movement in the town centre.</p>
Chapter 9 Travel	Policy Area 55 Public Transport Improvements	7	3	The Ipswich Society, R Nunn, Shearer Property Group Ltd, Cycle Ipswich Crest Nicholson, C Vint	UCS, EERA, Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the shuttle bus, close the Old Cattle market bus station, stop some old diesel buses, make shuttles more frequent, and use the Felixstowe railway line for a more frequent commuter service provided perhaps by trams or electric trains. • Close the Old Cattle Market bus station and move to tower ramparts. • Shuttle should link the station, town centre, Education Quarter and Waterfront. • Remove buses from the access only part of Fore Street. • Support many of proposals but any further alterations to Upper Brook Street and Upper Orwell Street would need careful consideration as to how this might impact on shoppers' ability to access the retail quarter. • Promote bus travel and ensure that travelling into town by bus is cheaper and more attractive than coming by car. • No information is provided on bus usage or cost – for many people cost is a deterrent. • No information is provided about a possible new riverside route between the station and Stoke Bridge and the effect this might have on timings. • No mention is made of quality partnerships or improved information. • Attention should be given to improving the bus stop environment. 	<p>Suggestions are noted. Some have been explored through the Town Centre Strategy adopted in February 2012 (eg. a single bus station). They will be considered at the next stage of Plan preparation. The Felixstowe line does not however fall within the remit of IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The Travel Ipswich scheme includes refurbishment to the two bus stations.</p> <p>Noted. This will be considered at the next stage of plan preparation.</p> <p>Noted. This will be considered at the next stage of plan preparation.</p> <p>Noted. This will be considered at the next stage of plan preparation.</p> <p>The Suffolk County Council Major Transport Scheme: Travel Ipswich is designed to deliver improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.</p> <p>IBC does not have any control over the fares set on commercially operated bus services (which is the vast majority of bus services in Ipswich) as these are the responsibility of the relevant bus operators. Fares on subsidised services are set at SCC levels but these are set so as not to undermine commercial interests in order to avoid problems under competition law. SCC, as the Local Transport Authority, have various statutory powers in respect of public transport services, which can include controlling bus fares, but these powers are not easily applied and a voluntary approach working in partnership with bus operators is the preferred method.</p> <p>Planning permission has now been granted for a retail development on the north bank of the river. It would preclude a bus through route if built.</p> <p>Improved information for bus users is one component of the Major Scheme works.</p> <p>Improved facilities for bus users are one component of the Major Scheme works.</p>
Chapter 9 Travel	Policy area 56 Parking Strategy	7	0	The Ipswich Society, UCS, C Vint, Cycle Ipswich, Crest Nicholson, Sustrans,		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support strategy overall but concerned about increase in commuter parking spaces which would increase congestion at peak times. 	<p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
				Shearer Property Group Ltd.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street parking within the parking core needs an overhaul because there are inadequate spaces outside working hours and signage is poor. Need to increase the use of sustainable transport modes for short trips by restricting parking for all but disabled in IP1. Object to the proposal to provide a 500 space multi-storey car park at Shed 7 as there is no reason why the University should provide public parking and it would add to congestion and fail to encourage modal shift. (UCS) Object to lack of consideration of residents' parking. Council should tackle pavement parking. Provision of additional parking spaces is against national and regional policy to manage traffic demand. The proposal to reduce the central parking core to accommodate more long stay parking at the eastern quays only fits the Ipswich Transport Strategy if Star Lane/college St capacity is reduced and parking in the centre is reduced and the Wet Dock Crossing is not provided. Reducing parking charges will increase congestion. Object to increase in long stay parking provision on the edge of the town centre which will increase car journeys to the centre – should expand existing park and ride. The number of spaces indicated for the Mint Quarter should remain flexible until a scheme is fully developed. 	<p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The Major Scheme aims to do this through the incentive of better facilities and information for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. However town centre parkign will be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>Residents' parking can be considered outside outside the scope of the AAP.</p> <p>The Core Strategy policy DM18 reintroduces a minimum standard for suburban residential developments to address problems such as pavement parking. Enforcement is a matter outside the scope of the AAP.</p> <p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The Council controls only a few car parks in the town centre and therefore the majority of charges are outside its control.</p> <p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p>
Chapter 10	Shop Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	1	0	D Saunders		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ipswich Town Centre does not provide the same incentive to visit as do our neighbouring towns. Should encourage quality shops and high street names. There is inadequate parking in peak periods and parking charges are too high – parking should be free after 6pm. 	<p>As well as a unique environment which combines a medieval centre with a modern waterfront, the town centre offers a good range of shopping including a frequently-held market and is supported by various initiatives from Ipswich Central.</p> <p>The Council aims to do this through the adopted Town Centre Strategy and the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park and Ride has been a success and provision of improved public transport service will become essential. 	Unfortunately the Bury Road park and ride has now closed and therefore any additional park and ride facilities need to be considered very carefully to ensure they can be sustained.
Chapter 10 Shop	Policy Area 57 The Central Shopping Area Boundary	8	1	K Phair, The Ipswich Society, C Vint, Turnstone Estates, Cycle Ipswich, Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd, Sustrans, Shearer Property Group Ltd	EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to para 10.24 'that no provision has been identified for cyclist to access and pass through the area'. Aspiration for the Turret area should include provision for cyclists. • Would prefer to see redevelopment of the town centre within a tighter more vibrant retailing zone – existing shopping areas are too spread out. • Should redevelop the Old Cattle Market having relocated the bus station for mixed use incorporating a tree lined walkway to link the Waterfront and town centre. • Shopping should not spread north across Crown Street. (more than 1 objector) • Fore St is missing and it is an important shopping street where small businesses can locate that help add to the range of shops available. • Must expand the shopping area to accommodate the additional retail requirements identified in the Retail Study – particularly support westward extension to allow integration of the Civic Centre site into the central shopping area. • Keep the existing central shopping area boundary to keep retail activity focused in a small area. • The Mint Quarter and other sites within the existing centre provide enough opportunities to attract higher quality shops. • Welcome allocation of the Mint Quarter for development. • Future retail development should be phased with the Mint Quarter being the first site to take up some of the capacity identified by the Retail Study. 	<p>Provision for cyclists has been considered in the Core Strategy policies and will be addressed in further detail through the next stage of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The CSA boundary will be reviewed at the next consultation stage, having regard to comments received, evidence based documents and the Town Centre Master Plan.</p> <p>These proposals reflect the broad intentions for future development of the town centre as set out in the Town Centre Master Plan. The details of this comment will be taken into account through the next consultation stage of the proposals map to the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>Land north of Crown Street was included as an extension to the CSA in order to deliver additional retail floorspace, this element of the extension to the CSA has not been carried forward into the adopted Core Strategy. The Core Strategy policy CS14 states that the CSA will be extended to include land south of Crown Street and Old Foundary Road, and no longer includes land north of Crown Street. The precise detailed boundary will be reviewed having regard to in particular the following: the Council's Town Centre Master Plan, the Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2010, Town Centre Opportunity Sites study, the NPPF and other relevant considerations.</p> <p>Fore Street currently lies outside the defined CSA. It is recognised it provides a link between the Waterfront and the CSA. Opportunities for this area will be considered at the next stage of the IP-One AAP. It is not intended that it should be included within the CSA boundary.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policy CS14 states that the CSA will be extended to include the Westgate quarter and the land south of Crown Street and Old Foundary Road. This will enable delivery of at least 35,000 sqm net additional floorspace to diversify and improve the retail offer.</p> <p>The extension to the CSA incorporates the permitted mixed use scheme comprising retail use which was granted consent subject to the s106 agreement on the former Civic Centre site. The proposal to extend the CSA north of Crown Street has not been included within policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy, this has been revised since the Preferred Options to IP-One AAP and now proposes to include the land south of Crown Street and Old Foundary Road only.</p> <p>The CSA boundary will be defined through the next stage of the IP-One AAP to provide opportunity to deliver additional retail floorspace to diversify and improve the retail offer.</p> <p>Opportunity for the development of the Mint Quarter will be addressed at the next stage of the IP-One AAP, having regard to the evidence base.</p> <p>See comment above.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Chapter 10 Shop	Policy Area 58 Primary, Secondary and Speciality Shopping Areas	5	4	The Ipswich Society, Suffolk County Council, C Vint, John Norman, Turnstone Estates	EERA, Shearer Property Group Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speciality Shopping Area should be expanded to include a redeveloped Old Cattle market. Not clear where in the document the district centres are allocated and the surrounding buffer zones. (SCC) Fore Street should be a speciality shopping area. Need to regroup into a tight central core with a diversity of attractors to save the town centre. Out of town superstores should be discouraged. The areas identified do not take account of the site specific retail proposals – the former Civic Centre should be identified as a primary shopping area. 	<p>Comment noted. Opportunity to redevelop the Old Cattle Market (Bus station) has been considered as part of the proposal for Opportunity Area B and in the Council's Town Centre Master Plan. Whether this will necessitate a review of the CSA boundary will be considered at the next stage of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The Proposals map shows the district shopping centres and the buffer zones, where they lie within the IP-One AAP area.</p> <p>Fore Street currently lies outside the defined CSA. It is recognised it provides a link between the Waterfront and the CSA. Opportunities for this area will be considered at the next stage of the IP-One AAP. It is not intended that it should be included within the Speciality Shopping Area.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council recognises the challenge ahead to enhance the town's vitality and viability.</p> <p>Policy DM23 of the adopted Core Strategy states that proposals which fall outside defined centre will only be permitted if they can demonstrate acceptability in terms of PPS4 and specified tests. The NPPF now replaces PPS4 but the sequential and impact test are still required to be satisfied when considering large out of town superstores.</p> <p>The IP-One AAP Preferred Options Proposals Map includes the Westgate site as a proposed extension to the CSA but does not commit to detailing whether this would be classed as a Primary, Secondary or Speciality area. However regard would need to be given to its peripheral location in relation to the existing CSA.</p>
Chapter 10 Shop	Policy Area 59 Waterfront Shopping	3	1	C Vint, Sustrans, N Agran	EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fore Street is a key link between the town centre and eastern Waterfront. Safe cycle routes to shops that provide for everyday needs must be included in developer plans (para 10.40). The policy approach to the Waterfront should be extended to the Turret Lane area to provide a retail link between the town centre and Waterfront. The size threshold seems somewhat arbitrary and not supported by evidence. 	<p>Fore Street currently lies outside the defined CSA. It is recognised it provides a link between the Waterfront and the CSA. Opportunities for this area will be considered at the next stage of the IP-One AAP. It is not intended that it should be included within the CSA.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policy CS5 prioritises the introduction of an integrated cycle network enabling safe and convenient access by bicycle. Policy DM21 supports accessibility to local and district centres.</p> <p>The Town Centre Master Plan proposes enhancement of the link between the town centre and the waterfront including identification of opportunities along Turret Lane. This will be covered at the next stage of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policy DM23 sets policy consideration for retail development outside defined centres over 200sqm gross, which includes the waterfront. The 200sqm threshold was accepted by the Inspector at the examination into the Core Strategy as appropriate.</p>
Chapter 10 Shop	Policy Area 60 Site Allocations for New Retail Development	3	2	Peacock & Smith Ltd, Indigo Planning Ltd, Turnstone Estates	EERA, Shearer Property Group Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to foodstore allocation at 'Westgate' (former Civic Centre) as the Retail Study does not indicate a need for it (the study underestimates the performance of the Morrisons store and therefore overestimates remaining capacity). 	<p>The permission granted on the Westgate site is for open A1, which could be either food or non-food, subject of a s106 agreement. Need is no longer a test as set of PPS4 and the NPPF which replaces it.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should identify sites for bulky good retailing as not all types of retailing can be accommodated in the town centre. • Support the allocation of the former Civic Centre but object to the residential element as it would be incompatible with office and retail uses. (Turnstone) • Support allocation of the Mint Quarter. (Shearer PG) 	<p>The Council will extend the CSA to deliver at least 35,000sqm of additional retail floorspace to diversify and improve the retail offer in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy policy CS14. In accordance with NPPF all in centre options should be considered first before edge or out of centre. Proposals for major retail development outside defined centres will be considered in relation to policy DM23 of the adopted Core Strategy, demonstrating acceptability with national planning policy. The Council has recently permitted bulky good retail units out of centre on the former Crane's site and does not consider there is a need or justification for further major out of town retailing in Ipswich.</p> <p>The former Civic Centre site is subject of a resolution to grant subject to a s106 agreement, this includes some residential development.</p> <p>The Mint quarter site is proposed partly to remain within the CSA designation reflecting the sites suitability for retail use.</p>
Chapter 11 Townscape	Comments on and/or omissions from whole chapter	1	0	EEDA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council may wish to consider developing additional supplementary planning documents or design codes to support the AAP. Consultation with Inspire East and Cabe would be beneficial. (EEDA) • Council should seek to apply the appropriate BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes ratings to new development in the IP-One area in line with RES Goal, priority 4. (EEDA) 	<p>The Council will consider how to take forward the Opportunity Area approach including the development principles at the next stage of plan preparation. We understand that Inspire East's work is now undertaken by Shape East.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policy DM1 requires a high standard of environmental sustainability and applies the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM to achieve this.</p>
Chapter 11 Townscape	Policy Area 61 Environmental Improvements	1	1	Sustrans	EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to para 11.18 - the disregard of the need for cyclists to have safe easy access from the Eastern Quays to Hollywells Park. National Cycle Route 51 uses a route through Hollywells Park and safe cycle links to and from the Merchant Quarter must be provided. 	<p>The needs of cyclists are recognised. The Holywells Opportunity Area C map on page 98 (Transport and Movement) shows cycle routes linking E-W to Hollywells Park.</p>
Chapter 11 Townscape	Policy Area 62 Green Space and Play	1	1	Mersea Homes	EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fail to demonstrate a unified approach to the development of a comprehensive green space network in IP-One – policy should acknowledge that urban space cannot be planned in isolation and link to policy areas 48 and 50. • The opportunity for a green or urban space network supporting cultural interest should be explored. • Policy should provide guidance on the positive use of hard landscaped areas. 	<p>Opportunities for new greenspace provision in IP-One are limited, however, the Opportunity Areas section indicates possible locations. The need for land allocations will be considered at the next stage of plan preparation.</p> <p>The need for site allocations for such uses will be considered through the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The Core Strategy policy DM5 Urban Design Quality emphasises that the design of the spaces between buildings is as important as the design of the buildings themselves. It is acknowledged that there are strong inter-connections between all the policy areas.</p>
Chapter 11 Townscape	Policy Area 63 Urban Design Guidelines	1	2	CABE	The Ipswich Society, I McKie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need robust design policies. • Treat design as a cross-cutting issue. • Include adequate policy hooks on which to hang other design tools e.g. design guides and site briefs. (standard CABE response) 	<p>Noted. Core Strategy policies CS2 clause g. and DM5 set out a strong framework for built and urban design across the whole Borough.</p> <p>Design is covered in the Core Strategy through both strategic and development management policies.</p> <p>Noted. The need for site development briefs will be considered through the site allocation process.</p>
Chapter 12 Infrastructure	Comments on and/or omissions from whole	1	0	Anglian Water Services		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water would like to see the Water Cycle Study included in the list of reference documents. 	<p>A Haven Gateway Water Cycle Study Stage 1 Report was published in 2008 and a Stage 2 report was published in 2010. Both are included in the evidence base for the Core Strategy.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
	chapter					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upsizing of strategic sewers may be required if densification of brownfield leads to an increase in foul water flows in the city centre. The implementation of policies relating to water efficiency, SuDS and grey water recycling will help to mitigate this. 	Noted. Adopted Core Strategy policy DM4 deals with development and flood risk.
Chapter 12 Infrastructure	Policy Area 64 Site for Ipswich Flood Barrier	0	1		EERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is consistent with RSS Policy WAT4. 	Noted.
Chapter 12 Infrastructure	Policy Area 65 Site for Town Centre Electricity Sub station	1	0	Crest Nicholson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being essential infrastructure, this should not be located within flood zone 3 without the appropriate tests in PPS25 being passed. 	Comment noted. This point is addressed in Appendix A, site ref UC057 below.
Part C Opportunity Areas (All)	Comments on and/or omissions from whole section	3	0	GO East, Crest Nicholson, Sustrans, W D Coe Ltd, English Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear why the AAP does not articulate what the preferred policy options are for the opportunity areas. (GO East) The opportunity area maps are unclear, difficult to read and do not clearly indicate what the proposals for the areas are. (GO East) The opportunity area maps identify constraints but do not suggest how they might be overcome which raises questions of deliverability. (GO East, Crest) The submission document should set out the preferred option for the opportunity areas and explain how they will be delivered, including risks and contingencies. (GO East) Object to overall lack of traffic free cycle facilities. Needs to be changed to increase mobility within this confined area. Object to the fact that no opportunity area covers St Matthews St and Norwich Road – no other shopping area is as poor in terms of local funding, and needs regeneration more - this would also improve a key artery into town. Welcome the preparation of guiding principles for these areas of regeneration and change as precursors to the preparation of master plans for each area with detailed development briefs for some sites, especially the Merchant's Quarter, Mint Quarter, Education Quarter and Island Site. (EH) Principles for each area should be informed by in depth characterisation of the areas. (EH) There are inconsistencies with e.g. a building identified as a landmark on one map but not on another. (EH) Frontages with positive character and important vistas seem rather arbitrary. (EH) Should identify where focus points and areas of taller buildings should be placed. (EH) 	<p>The preferred policy options for the opportunity areas is covered within the sites section part of the document, thus avoiding duplication of information.</p> <p>Comment noted and will be made clearer on the Proposals Map at the next stage of the plan preparation.</p> <p>Comment noted. The opportunity area constraints have been taken into account in identifying preferred options for the sites in the appendix to the document.</p> <p>Comment noted and will be addressed at the next stage of the plan preparation.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policies DM15 and DM17 support the provision of dedicated cycle routes and policy CS5 prioritises the introduction of an integrated cycle network.</p> <p>St Matthews Street in part lies within the CSA and IP-One AAP boundary, Norwich Road and the western part of St Matthews Street lie outside. The Site Allocation document covers areas beyond the IP-One AAP boundary.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>An urban characterisation study is being undertaken and will inform the next stage in the preparation of the plan.</p> <p>Comment noted and will be addressed at the next stage in the plan preparation.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The urban characterisation study being undertaken will have regard to these points and will be used to inform the next stage in the plan preparation.</p>
Part C Opportunity Areas	A Island Site	3	0	The Ipswich Society, Associated British Ports, Environment Agency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the old lock area as a public space with historic interpretation. Landmark building in this area. 	<p>The illustrative layout in the Opportunity Area material currently shows the open space focused around the historic lock.</p> <p>Existing landmark buildings and features have been identified on the Opportunities and Constraints, Public Realm and Townscape maps.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wet Dock Crossing to Bath Street rather than Mather Street and no roundabout. • Reduce and move yacht moorings to south end of dock. • The development of the Island site should not be unduly constrained by intended heights of the buildings. • A degree of flexibility needs to be provided to deliver this site because of the changing housing market and site development costs. • There is no evidence that a tree lined promenade existed, therefore object to large scale tree planting because roots could affect the stability of the Island walls and conflict with marina operations. • Agree some form of small-scale attraction is appropriate, but would not wish such a facility to sterilise any part of Island site to provide yet further constraint on its redevelopment. • Pedestrian/Cycle bridge between Stoke Quay and New Cut East is badly positioned as it will restrict the existing vehicular access onto the site. There is also a high voltage cable in this location. The bridge should be further south east or north west. • The extent of tree planting shown will be impractical and not easily related to intended uses – some will coincide with location of high voltage cable and others conflict with marine operations. • Public park on northern neck of island is badly sited – several smaller pocket parks would be better for permeability. • Wish to see major hotel facility on Island site to assist in regeneration. • Favour cycle and pedestrian access across the lock gate provided there is no interference with the operation of the gate and navigation rights – ditto the footbridge across the New Cut. (EA) 	<p>Comment noted. The current intention is for this crossing to link to Mather Way, however the details of this proposal will follow at a later stage. The Local Transport Plan (LTP 2011-2031) acknowledges this link will improve access to the Island site, however there is currently no funding in place for this scheme.</p> <p>The yacht moorings are subject of an authorised planning consent 08/00327.</p> <p>Policy DM6 of the adopted Core Strategy permits tall buildings within a specified arc of land extending from the Civic Centre to the northern Quays. The Island Site lies outside this area however the policy specifies circumstances where exceptions to policy may be permitted. Site ref: UC038 intends that building height should be limited to retain a more open aspect and allow views across and through from the river banks and northern quays.</p> <p>A mix of uses is considered appropriate to provide a return to investors and reconcile the different aspirations for the island site.</p> <p>Not only is it clearly shown on the 1882 1:500 Ordnance Survey map (and leading to a gazebo/bandstand called the 'Umbrello' at the southern end) but there is also extensive photographic evidence.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The detailed siting of the bridge will be considered at the project stage. The plan protects the principle of a link and indicates a broad location.</p> <p>The intended open space and tree planting as shown on the public realm and townscape plan is indicative only and therefore would be subject to detailed consideration at the planning application stage. The proposed reinstatement of the tree lined promenade is an aspiration of the Council, the detailed provision of which would be secured through negotiation at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Comment noted and will be considered at the next stage in the plan preparation. The Opportunity Area illustrative layout currently shows the open space located around the old lock.</p> <p>The proposed mix would allow for the development of a hotel.</p> <p>Comment of support is noted.</p>
Part C Opportunity Areas	B Merchant Quarter	3	0	The Ipswich Society, Sustrans, W Hammond		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Option B but it is not clear what redevelopment is proposed for the bus station. • No mention of cycle provision – it should include specific cycle desire lines. • This is a pivotal location – the bus station should be redeveloped as a landmark tower with restaurant and viewing gallery to provide a link between the Waterfront and town centre. 	<p>The Town Centre Master Plan sets out the Council's intentions for the redevelopment of the bus station. These intentions will be made clear at the next stage in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>Cycle ways are shown on the opportunity area maps, annotated as green dotted lines.</p> <p>Comment noted but such a scheme is not likely to be viable and may be better suited to a waterfront location.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Part C Opportunity Areas	C Holywells	3	0	The Ipswich Society, Sustrans, Associated British Ports		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to large public car park on dock side – wish to see a promenade. • Support Opportunity Area C but the cycle provision must be of the highest quality. • Support suggestion to promote redevelopment of former shipyard as a destination but should add 'at the appropriate time'. (ABP) • Object to reference to reducing the impact of port related traffic as Cliff Rd provides the main access into the most active area of the port and traffic uses it at all hours – to constrain this access would affect the viability of the port. (ABP) • If in future funding is found for an East Bank Link Rd we would support this as an alternative access. (ABP) • Object to the re-siting of the control point to the south and the location of a public car park in the area which could compromise port security and safety. (ABP) 	<p>The opportunity area C proposal is to create a riverside esplanade, with public car parking.</p> <p>The provision of high quality cycle provision is an aspiration shared by the council however this is dependant upon opportunities to create this through planning applications coming forward and contributions to new infrastructure delivered through the infrastructure planning charge secured through policy CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Intention of the development principal is to reduce impact of port related traffic via traffic management and improved public realm, it is not intended to constrain access to the port.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The re-sitting of the control point is an aspiration of the Council, which would be subject of detailed consultation with relevant interested parties. Detailed planning permission would also be required and this would require consideration of the impact.</p>
Part C Opportunity Areas	D Education Quarter	4	0	UCS, Sustrans, Associated British Ports, R Huq		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal for a 500 space public car park provided on the site – some parking will be provided on site primarily to serve the needs of University students and staff, but this will be limited in line with the travel plan. (UCS) • The Education Quarter Transport Study states that there should be no more than 846 parking spaces in the Education Quarter. (UCS) • The need for public parking was not raised by the Council when the study was commissioned nor in connection with the Phase 1 planning application. (UCS) • Some of the proposed parking could be available for visitor use when the University is closed. (UCS) • Object to lack of cycle provision – the spine route should be for cycles also, and cycle routes need to be defined and engineered within the Campus and between it and other destinations. • The Opportunity Area proposals fail to address the absence of residents' daytime parking for 25-37 Fore Hamlet – parking should be provided. (R Huq & 6 name petition) • Object to the addition of traffic lights or road marking where they could restrict parking further or cause access problems. (R Huq & 6 name petition) • Object to proposed access path between Back Hamlet and Fore Hamlet if any vehicular use is planned. (R Huq & 6 name petition) 	<p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The parking situation has changed, e.g. through the loss of Bury Rd Park & Ride and Crown Street multi storey and gain of temporary car parks, and therefore car parking will need to be reconsidered in the preparation of the IP-One AAP.</p> <p>The Transport and Movement plan for the Education Quarter (pg 102) has largely been overtaken by the redevelopment of the campus. It has included a N-S spine on a slightly different alignment, for pedestrian use.</p> <p>On street parking management takes place outside the scope of this plan.</p> <p>The provision of additional traffic lights would be outside the scope of this plan. It would be a measure introduced in connection with a development proposal to manage its traffic, or part of the package of measures proposed through the Ipswich Major Scheme linked to the Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>The route shown on the Transport and Movement plan for the Education Quarter is shown as a shared surface route. Objection to vehicular use is noted.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with identified key view identified on constraint map and suggest that the view from Coprolite Street towards the Old Custom House has greater significance. Concerned about suggested tree planting over the water and request that it is removed. 	<p>The urban characterisation study will look again at key strategic views to support Core Strategy policy DM11 Central Ipswich Skyline.</p> <p>Indications of existing tree lines, and proposed locations for tree planting are broad brush and indicative. Trees would not be planted in water.</p>
Part C Opportunity Areas	E "Over Stoke Waterside"	1	1	Sustrans	Messrs Websters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Opp Area E – National Cycle Route 1 uses it as its principal gateway into Ipswich – but cycle provision should be of the highest standard if it is to become a major cycle commuter route into town. Support cycle/ped bridge but concerned that current one way system along New Cut and Dock St needs to be revoked – adequate cycle provision needs to be planned and provided between Wherstead Rd and the Bridge St/Stokes St junction. 	<p>The provision of high quality cycle provision is an aspiration shared by the council however this is dependent upon opportunities to create this through planning applications coming forward and contributions to new infrastructure delivered through the infrastructure planning charge secured through policy CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>The deliverability and precise location of the bridge need to be considered, and also access to it. It is possible to allow cycle contraflow on one way roads, such as at Museum Street.</p>
Part C Opportunity Areas	F Riverside West	3	0	Sustrans, Applekirk Properties Ltd, Suffolk County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support in principle but concerned that width of proposed bridge does not meet necessary standards for shared use with pedestrians. IBC should refer to national standards in planning such facilities. The development opportunity mix should be amended to reflect the current commercial nature of the site occupied by units 3-6 Orwell Retail Park – the residential bias is neither deliverable nor realisable and a mixed use scheme based on retail, small scale district centre B1 employment and a little residential is more appropriate. Proposed cycleway in Opportunity Area F (SCC) 	<p>The new pedestrian and cycle bridge has now been implemented providing a link to Ipswich Village.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Development opportunities for the area will be updated to reflect the recent authorised planning consents but the principle of mixed use, predominantly residential is the preferred option for the area.</p> <p>Opportunity Area F has not been included in the plan.</p>
Part C Opportunity Areas	G River Corridor	4	1	The Ipswich Society, Sustrans, The Riverside Group, Spenhill Regeneration Ltd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly support the riverside strip but east connection needs to be made to Princes Street Bridge and the old railway bridge should be used as well. Strongly object to redundant rail area being used for public transport as for many years Sustrans has been working with the River Action Group to develop the goods yard as a green corridor with a cycle route. Object to protection of view of St Mary Stoke Church which will reduce the scaling of development on the river front near the building thus affecting viability. Object to suggested mix of uses on north side of river – delete reference to use of rail line as new public transport corridor and include support for an increased scale of development. 	<p>Part of this area is subject of a major redevelopment proposal incorporating a retail store and other mixed use development which was granted planning permission in February 2011(08/00953/FUL). Opportunities for this area will be updated in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>Part of this area is subject of a major redevelopment proposal incorporating a retail store and other mixed use development which was granted planning permission in February 2011(08/00953/FUL). Opportunities for this area will be updated in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>Protection of views to St Mary Stoke Church is an aspiration of the Council and a material consideration in determining detailed planning application submissions. The urban characterisation work will look further at defining strategic views.</p> <p>Part of the northern side of the river is subject of a major redevelopment proposal incorporating a retail store and other mixed use development which was granted planning permission in February 2011(08/00953/FUL). Opportunities for this area will be updated in respect of this scheme.</p>
Part C Opportunity Areas	H Ipswich Village West	1	1	Her Majesty's Court Service	The Ipswich Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to see Ipswich Village and in particular the area around Russell Road developed into a formal Civic Quarter together with further development around the area happening in a strategic and spatial manner. 	Comment noted.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objects	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites UC015, UC059, UC063, UC104 and UC271 – do not object to mixed use development provided they relate well to the existing and any new civic buildings and uses as part of an emerging Civic Quarter. 	Comment noted.
Part C Opportunity Areas	I Portman Road	1	2	Sustrans	The Ipswich Society, Peacock Short Ltd,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support, but it is important that National Cycle Route 51 which passes through this area is protected and enhanced by any future development. 	Comment noted. Cycle route 51 will be protected.
Part C Opportunity Areas	J Westgate	2	1	Sustrans, Turnstone Estates	Her Majesty's Court Service,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of proposed cycle provision in this area – cycle lanes on Civic Drive are too narrow alongside wide footways that could be converted to shared use. Support the redevelopment of the former Civic Centre but object to the prescriptive development principles, especially in relation to the residential element – the proposal has not been discussed with the landowner which raises doubt about its soundness and deliverability. Unclear about the status of the opportunity area maps. 	<p>The transport and movement plan shows integrated cycle ways throughout the opportunity area. Civic Drive currently has an on-road cycle route. Opportunities for enhancement will be explored at the next stage in the plan preparation.</p> <p>The former Civic Centre site is subject of a resolution to grant consent for a mixed use scheme comprising retail and other uses (08/00806/FUL). The scheme was approved subject to a s106 agreement which has to date not been entered into. Opportunity exists for redevelopment within the wider area, incorporating the police station and flats.</p> <p>Comment noted. This will be clarified at the next stage in the plan preparation.</p>
Part C Opportunity Areas	K Mint Quarter	3	0	Sustrans, Shearer Property Group Ltd, Christ Church United Reformed/Baptist Church		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome inclusion in the area of the Regent and Odeon site as part of wider regeneration, but these are not vital to the delivery of the Mint Quarter scheme nor should they be seen as a requirement in any scheme. The wording in italics should be identified on a plan in order to ensure a comprehensive approach to the Mint Quarter. There is no direct mention of the needs of cycling within this Opportunity Area – should include specific cycle routes and route standards. Opportunity Area K public realm map respects the graveyard but not the church halls – amend the boundary. 	<p>Comment noted. The opportunity area K relates to an area wider than the Mint Quarter site (UC051), details for this are set out on site sheet reference UC051. Delivery of the Mint Quarter site UC051 are not dependent upon bringing forward proposals for the Odeon and Regent Theatre.</p> <p>It is not considered to be necessary to insert the wording onto the map, as it is clear that the wording and illustrations should be read together.</p> <p>The cycle routes are annotated by a line of green dots on the transport and movement map.</p> <p>Buildings which contribute to the public realm are denoted on the map by a grey/purple line, this includes church halls neighbouring St Michaels Church, St Pancras Road Church and Christ Church.</p>
Part C Opportunity Areas	L Crown Street	4	0	The Ipswich Society, Sustrans, W J Hammond, Shearer Property Group Ltd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to proposals for Crown Street. Role of NCP car park needs to be seriously considered and should not be zoned for building of any sort – could provide extension to bus station. Object to lack of proposed cycle route in Opportunity Area L, especially as the area is such an important recreational, leisure, retail and transport interchange. If existing Tower Ramparts bus station cannot accommodate increased traffic, use part of site UC224 (NCP car park) for out of town buses and for servicing to the shops. 	<p>The proposals for Crown Street have been changed since the Preferred Options consultation. Now the only proposal is for a replacement car park.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The green dots denote the proposed cycle way which runs east-west along the north side of Crown Street and north along Fonnereau Road.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Preferred Option proposals for the bus stations will be reviewed in light of the Town Centre Master Plan and options being considered for accommodating the existing two bus stations on one site.</p>
Chapter 13 Delivery Plan	13.1 – 13.4	2	0	Go East		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear what the end date of this DPD is. Para 2.8 of PPS12 requires that the date is clearly stated. 	Comment noted. This will be clarified at the next stage in the plan preparation.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst we note that table D1 includes short/medium/long term timescales, we would expect the Submission document to be much clearer as to the timeframe of the DPD's policies and include such information in the early introductory chapters. Pleased to see beginnings of an implementation framework. However expect to see this further developed in the submission DPD by setting out what flexibility is built into proposals if certain matters don't progress as expected. The delivery framework should also cover risks to delivery and possible contingencies measures. 	<p>Comment noted and will be addressed at the next stage in the plan preparation.</p> <p>Comment noted and will be addressed at the next stage in the plan preparation.</p> <p>in terms of housing supply, this was covered by the Core Strategy.</p>
Chapter 14 Monitoring Framework		0	0			No comments received.	N/A
Appendix A	General comment	2	0	Suffolk County Council, GO East		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites should be allocated in terms of what would provide the best opportunities for achieving the principles of sustainable development as set out in PPS1 and RSS. (SCC) The Suffolk School Reorganisation Review and Building Schools for the Future programme may have implications for the future use of some education sites in Ipswich. (SCC) The proposals map currently includes sites outside IP-One and these should be deleted to avoid confusion. (GO East) The Proposals Map should identify the 4 distinct areas of activity referred to in paragraph 2.3 (Central Shopping Area, Ipswich Village, Waterfront, and Education Quarter) and the 12 opportunity areas. (GO East) 	<p>The site allocations will be updated in relation to the NPPF which replaces the PPS1, having regard to the RSS as a material consideration.</p> <p>Comment noted, although the Building Schools for the Future funding has since ceased.</p> <p>Noted. A new inset map will be prepared for IP-One in relation to the now adopted Core Strategy Proposals Map.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Key Diagram (Chapter 7, Diagram 3) now does this.</p>
Appendix A	UC001 Land between 91-97 Fore Street	3	0	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues with access. Listed buildings on site. Within Area of Archaeological Importance, Air Quality Management Area, Conservation Area and Floodplain. Absence of evidence of site's availability for housing. 	<p>Site is no longer being allocated for residential use but a planning application could be submitted for this use.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The SHLAA identifies these constraints.</p> <p>The site is not currently deliverable for housing.</p>
Appendix A	UC002 Handford Road (east)	4	4	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	Greenways Countryside Project, The Ipswich Society, Inland Waterways Association, River Action Group, River Action Group, Inland Waterways Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site within flood zone 3, and ground water source protection zone II and major aquifer zone HU. Impact of development on Alderman Canal and Nature Reserve. If developed should be at medium density. Number of houses proposed is unlikely to be more valuable than existing use when affordable housing and flood mitigation taken into account. Site should be retained due to need for employment sites to meet job targets. Existing use value is considerable. Flood risk issues are likely to require buffer zone which would reduce proposed densities. Increased densities would require razing of levels closer to Handford Road making site unviable in cost terms. 	<p>Development under construction for extra care accommodation (10/00935/FUL).</p>
Appendix A	UC003 Sir Alf Ramsey Way / West End Road	7	3	Environment Agency, Sustrans, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson,	Greenways Countryside Project, Inland Waterways Association, River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density of housing proposed will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Site at very low level and situated within flood plain. 	<p>Site is no longer being allocated for development.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
				David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council, Henry Cooper	Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement household waste recycling centre would need to be provided. (EA) Replacement would help drive forward the recycling of municipal waste. (EA) Need for provision of cycle routes linking to recreational ground and national cycle route 51. In conjunction with 40% affordable would not be viable at current sales rates. Much reduced housing density may be viable but will be unlikely to achieve the receipt required to relocated existing uses. There would be a requirement for safe pedestrian access to town centre. If possible, small employment uses should be expanded on to the RMC site to provide opportunities for new small businesses. Site provides valuable community and employment uses, uncertain of availability and deliverability. 	
Appendix A	UC004 Sir Alf Ramsey Way / West End Road	5	0	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to the proposed density of housing, will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Site situated within the flood plain. Extend employment use, consider industrial use. 50/50 housing and employment split seems plausible, but high density apartments cannot work at 40% affordable. Access issues into the former Harris meats site and cost implications of relocation [of bus station]. Need to ensure safe and convenient pedestrian access to/from the site due to surrounding busy urban roads. Proposed development would leave Harris Bacon Factory site vacant. Delivery of housing on this site has not considered implications of PPS25. On this site a bund in a floodplain could have the effect of increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere. Site provides valuable community and employment uses. 	<p>The indicative capacity has been reduced from 88 to 59 dwellings.</p> <p>Flood risk has been addressed strategically through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test. It would also need to be addressed through the detailed design of any scheme.</p> <p>The site is allocated for part employment use.</p> <p>Core Strategy policy CS12 addresses affordable housing matters.</p> <p>The Harris Bacon site is allocated for employment uses subject to access improvements.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Harris Bacon site is allocated for employment uses subject to access improvements.</p> <p>Flood risk is addressed strategically through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and would need to be addressed through the detailed design of any scheme.</p> <p>Core Strategy policy DM4 addresses this.</p> <p>Its reuse would also provide employment plus opportunities for living.</p>
Appendix A	UC006 Co-op Warehouse, Paul's Road	5	2	East of England Cooperative Society, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Pauline Walker, P A Finbow, Suffolk County Council	Windsor Clarke Brackenbury Ltd., Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site allocation should be changed to 100% high density housing. Confusion over why adjacent Ranelagh School Site has 100% residential allocation and this site does not. Co-op Juniors occupy top floor of Co-op Warehouse and development would remove community orientated facility. Concern that existing uses of site have not been properly considered. 	<p>Medium-density housing is more appropriate for this site.</p> <p>The site is now proposed for 100% residential.</p> <p>The landowner would need to consider this before development occurred.</p> <p>The existing uses have been considered in the development of this allocation.</p>
Appendix A	UC007 Ranelagh School, Paul's	4	0	Suffolk County Council, Mersea		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An alternative site with at least 5 acres within the school's catchment should be identified to accommodate pupil forecast. 	<p>The site is no longer being allocated for development.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supports	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
	Road			Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to relocate the school and teachers centre. Site within Ground Water Protection Zone II. Environmental Impact of adjacent railway marshalling yard. Proposed 18 dwelling will not generate sufficient funds to enable development of site. 	
Appendix A	UC011 Smart Street / Foundation Street	5	0	The Ipswich Society, Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site situated within flood plain, conservation area, tree preservation orders on site, within area of archaeological importance and air quality management area. Issues with site access onto Star Lane. Change allocation of site to employment to support increased in population that more houses will bring. Proposed density of housing will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Relocation of existing bus depot would be costly. Possibly difficulties in accommodating 10% open space requirements. 	<p>The constraints are noted on the site sheet in Appendix 3.</p> <p>See above. The site remains part allocated for employment use (20%). Other town centre sites are also allocated for employment use. The indicative capacity has been reduced from 112 to 61 dwellings (on a reduced site).</p> <p>The relocation of the existing bus depot is listed as a constraint. Employment land is available in a range of locations that could accommodate the bus depot.</p> <p>The Council considers that the open space requirement could be satisfied on the site which extends to nearly 0.7ha.</p>
Appendix A	UC012 Peter's Ice Cream, Portia Engineering and TGWU Offices, Grimwade Street	3	0	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density of housing high. Extend leisure use of site or retain industry. Proposed density of housing, will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Relocation of Portia Engineering and TGWU offices proving problematic, unable to achieve this in the past. Reduce density proposed to 25 units to incorporate associated uses. Site within conservation area, tree preservation orders on site, within an area of archaeological importance and air quality management area. 	<p>The indicative capacity has been reduced from 53 to 35 dwellings. Industry is not considered the most efficient use for this centrally located site. It is well placed for housing in relation to the Education Quarter and amenities on the Waterfront and in the town centre.</p> <p>The indicative capacity has been reduced from 53 to 35 dwellings.</p> <p>The SHLAA indicates that the site is deliverable.</p> <p>The indicative capacity has been reduced from 53 to 35 dwellings.</p> <p>The constraints are noted on the site sheet in Appendix 3.</p>
Appendix A	UC014 Orwell Church	2	0	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site cannot achieve proposed density due to sales rates achievable in view of the Fairview scheme and build cost. 	The site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix A	UC015 West End Road Surface Car Park	6	3	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Her Majesty's Court Service, Suffolk County Council	Greenways Countryside Project, Inland Waterways Association, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density of housing, will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Site situated within the flood plain, listed buildings on site, within ground water protection area. Extend employment use multi-storey car park. Delete plan for housing due to need for industry to support increase in population that housing would bring. Deliverability constrained by need to retain car park and major electricity cable running along site. 	<p>The indicative capacity has been reduced from 40 to 27 dwellings.</p> <p>Flood risk has been addressed strategically through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test. It would also need to be addressed through the detailed design of any scheme.</p> <p>The draft allocation includes a long stay car park for commuters.</p> <p>The site remains part allocated for employment use (10%). Other town centre sites are also allocated for employment use. The cable has now been relocated. A car park is included in the draft allocation.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing use values make alternative uses more attractive. 	The site is considered deliverable.
Appendix A	UC029 Land west of Greyfriars Road	4	0	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, PRUPIM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density of housing, will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. The existing use value of the site outstrips the potential for residential. Jewsons have refused to relocate on a number of occasions. Approach to development of site is too rigid to facilitate its redevelopment. Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space at density proposed. Most appropriate occupier would be retention as employment or redevelopment for leisure to link well with adjacent cinema and nightclubs and increase leisure offer in the locality. 	The site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix A	UC032 103-115 Burrell Road	4	2	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	East of England Cooperative Society, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density of housing too high, represents 4 times the surrounding level. Site is situated within the flood plain. Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Western half of the site is fully let and owner has stated it is unlikely to come forward for development. Difficulty in accommodating requirement of 10% open space. 	<p>The site area and housing densities have been reduced. The indicative capacity has been reduced from 122 dwellings to 20 dwellings.</p> <p>Flood risk has been addressed strategically through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test. It would also need to be addressed through the detailed design of any scheme.</p> <p>The site area and housing densities have been reduced. The indicative capacity is 20 dwellings, reduced from 122.</p> <p>The western half has been removed from the site.</p> <p>The Council considers that the open space requirement could be satisfied on the site which extends to 0.44ha.</p>
Appendix A	UC036 Key Street / Star Lane / Burton's Site	1	1	Henry Cooper	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site situated within the flood plain. Retain small scale retail / food and drink. Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Increase car parking and / or employment. Improve cross town route, add more lanes not less. 	<p>Flood risk has been addressed strategically through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test. It would also need to be addressed through the detailed design of any scheme.</p> <p>10% small scale retail is retained.</p> <p>The proposed allocation reflects an approved planning application.</p> <p>The proposed allocation reflects an approved planning application.</p> <p>The evidence in the Waterfront Transport Study does not support adding lanes to the gyratory.</p>
Appendix A	UC037 No 7 Shed, Orwell Quay	7	0	University Campus Suffolk, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Associated British Ports, Suffolk County Council, Paul Magnus - Orwell Lady, Henry Cooper		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Site situated in flood plain, no houses should be considered until flood barrier is built. Site within conservation area and area of archaeological importance. Development would remove car parking at the Waterfront for customers, visitors, tourists etc. Site should have an educational emphasis. 	The site is no longer being allocated for development but it is included within the Education Quarter.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficulty in accommodating the requirement of 10% open space. Precautionary approach to development of the site should be taken due to flood risk. 	
Appendix A	UC038 Island Site	10	2	Environment Agency, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Associated British Ports, Suffolk County Council, Henry Cooper, A M Hunter	Greenways Countryside Project, Inland Waterways Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site situated within flood plain. Site adjacent to conservation area, within area of archaeological importance and area of air quality management. Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Serious traffic issues around the only access point to the site. Additional access and egress would be required with this development. (EA) Unconvinced that the site is a unique and desirable location for housing given that site is working dock area. (EA) Unconvinced that it is rational to disregard flood risk on basis of location being considered unique and desirable. (EA) Further details required of strategic bund and how this may impact New Cut locality. (EA) Evidence will need to be provided to demonstrate Sequential Test has been carried out due to flood risk. (EA) Obligations to provide affordable housing at 40% and increased build costs combined with site constraints make site unviable. Concern that residential allocation will favour expensive properties which will not help meet housing shortage. Site forms significant part of working operational port, which creates a great deal of income for the area. Concern that proposed uses are likely to sterilise site and undermine viability of redevelopment. Policies for development should not be prescriptive, over-elaborate or potentially so costly. Development proportions should be 60% housing, 25% employment and leisure, 5% small scale retail and cafes, and 10% open space. Need for significant pedestrian and cycle access improvements to integrate site into the rest of the town. Need for piling due to the load exerted by development, this will increase construction costs. Flood defences failed on site in 1996 and 2004, therefore proposed numbers of homes should be reconsidered. There are claimed/deemed rights of way N-S along the quayside on opposite sides of both waterways. (SCC) There is scope for pedestrian/cycle links over the river and onto the site at both ends. (SCC) Site should not be allocated because of uncertainty over its delivery (for reasons of flooding, access and development costs). 	<p>Flood risk has been addressed strategically through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test. It would also need to be addressed through the detailed design of any scheme.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The housing density has been reduced. The indicative capacity has been reduced from 497 to 271.</p> <p>The allocation specifies that an additional access will be needed. See above.</p> <p>The heavier dock uses would be relocated prior to redevelopment.</p> <p>See above regarding the SFRA.</p> <p>See above regarding the SFRA.</p> <p>See above regarding the SFRA.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS12 sets out an affordable housing target of 35% which is applied subject to viability. Core Strategy Policy CS8 requires a mix of dwelling types to be provided.</p> <p>The interests of the port are protected by the plan as a whole, e.g through allocating expansion land. Viability would need to be considered at the time proposals for development were put forward.</p> <p>The policy allows for a mix of uses. It aims to provide some certainty for a very prominent site at the Waterfront. The site also forms an important part of the housing land supply.</p> <p>The open space requirement of 15% is considered necessary as there is a deficit of open space at the Waterfront. Generally the balance of uses is indicative and normally some flexibility would be allowed.</p> <p>The allocation specifies that additional access is needed.</p> <p>Development costs would be considered at the time proposals for development were put forward.</p> <p>The number of homes has been reduced and improved flood defences including a tidal barrier are being delivered.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Flooding issues will be addressed through delivery of the tidal barrier. Additional access is required but not necessarily in the form of a Wet Dock Crossing.</p>
Appendix A	UC039 Land	2	2	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson,		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rights of way abut and cut through the site. 	Residential development is under construction (10/00867/FUL).

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
	between Vernon Street & Stoke Quay			Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	Messrs Websters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site has consent for 351 dwellings. 	This planning permission has been superseded by 10/00867/FUL.
Appendix A	UC040 Land between Vernon Street and Stoke Quay	3	2	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council, Henry Cooper	R.W. Bond, Messrs Websters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate Webster's sale yard into site UC040 as the yard does not currently enjoy planning permission, but allocation should not require comprehensive approach with UC040. Delivery of development difficult due to relocation required of existing viable uses. Site currently fully occupied by employment uses. Employment use should be retained and enhanced to meet RSS14 targets. Site within flood plain, listed buildings on site, within area of archaeological importance, and air quality management area. Number of proposed flats unviable due to already flooded market. Proposals for flats inconsistent with Environment Agency's approach to flooding. Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. 	<p>Site is allocated for residential on its own.</p> <p>Noted. Land between Vernon Street and Gower Street is no longer being allocated for development. Site between Gower Street and Great Whip Street is no longer fully occupied. Employment use is retained between Vernon Street and Gower Street.</p> <p>Noted. The SHLAA identifies these constraints.</p> <p>The plan projects at least 15 years forward.</p> <p>Disagree. A sequential statement was agreed with the Environment Agency at the Core Strategy Examination. Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services. The density is in line with adopted Core Strategy policy DM30.</p>
Appendix A	UC041 Civic Centre Area / Civic Drive	6	2	Turnstone Estates, Spenhill Regeneration Ltd, Suffolk County Council	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of the site will be developed for retail and other uses, therefore prescriptive number of residential units would not be compatible. Difficulty of accommodating 24 residential units in a large scale redevelopment. Residential development may hinder the creation of a suitable retail offer. Site should be included in secondary shopping designation to afford significant policy protection. Site not appropriate location for convenience food shopping. Site is too small and constrained by surrounding development and the sloping site to offer a viable food store location. Large food store would be in format of Single storey large shop which Council wish to avoid. Site space still insufficient even if combined with adjoining UC042 site. Proposed option of accommodating a number of comparison goods retailers would offer more urban design opportunities. Food store would not enhance town centre's role as a regional shopping centre. 	<p>It is proposed that residential would a small amount alongside retail uses as part of a larger Westgate site.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>Site is proposed in a secondary shopping designation.</p> <p>Site is appropriate for convenience and/or comparison retail. Retail use is proposed on this site as part of a larger Westgate site.</p> <p>A large food store could be on more than one level as proposed in the resolution to grant planning permission (08/00806/FUL). Site is considered to be of an appropriate size for a retail extension to the town.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Convenience retail can support a town centre's role as a regional shopping centre.</p>
Appendix A	UC042 Civic Centre Area / Civic Drive	6	0	Henry Cooper, Environment Agency, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. 	<p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services. The density is in line with adopted Core Strategy policy DM30.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
				Suffolk County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ipswich Police Station should not be relocated to within the tidal flood plain due to the need to remain operational during any flood event. (EA) Residential scheme on this site likely to have a questionable viability with alternative uses seeming more attractive in this location. Location of development more appropriate for town centre retail, office and community uses. Listed buildings on site and within conservation area. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is proposed that residential would a small amount alongside retail uses as part of a larger Westgate site.</p> <p>Retail use is proposed on this site as part of a larger Westgate site.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Appendix A	UC043 Land between Cliff Quay & Landseer Road	2	2	John Field Consultancy, Suffolk County Council	Savills, Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No real interest in developing site for office use resulted from exhaustive marketing exercise. Potential odour issue following refusal of application. 	<p>There is a resolution to grant planning permission for a mixed use development on this site (12/00700/OUT).</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Appendix A	UC044 Commercial Buildings and Jewish Burial Ground, Star	1	1	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site already has planning permission. 	<p>The site had planning permission (07/00643/FUL) for 211 dwellings. There is currently a resolution to grant planning permission for student accommodation (11/00267/FUL).</p>
Appendix A	UC045 South of Mather Way	4	0	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council, Henry Cooper		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to see housing forming a significant part of redevelopment as presently a car park. Site situated within flood plain and within area of archaeological importance. Site has poor access to shops and services. Strong pedestrian and cycle connection would be required if developed. Site currently a car park; redevelopment would have severe impact on Felaw Maltings offices. Potential requirement for safe access and ground raising due flood risk, which could cause flooding problems elsewhere. Difficulty in accommodating open space requirements of 10%. Site represents potential for continued employment and mixed commercial uses, alongside other retained employment uses in this area of the waterfront. 	<p>Site is no longer being allocated for development.</p>
Appendix A	UC046 Holywells Road (west)	5	1	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	Greenways Countryside Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Site situated within flood zone. Retain present use as industry in Ipswich is disappearing and is needed to support increased in population that more housing will bring. Existing use values make residential on the entire site debatable. Interested parties from current marketing are employment use orientated. Current values for employment uses will result in the need for a high density apartment scheme which would not be viable at today's date. Requirement for strong pedestrian and cycle links and improved bus service. Difficulty in accommodating open space requirements of 10%. 	<p>Site is no longer being allocated for development.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In view of RSS14 employment targets, sustainable location and successful occupancy rate site should be retained as existing use. Site performs important commercial role. 	
Appendix A	UC047 Wolsey Street	3	0	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site situated within the flood plain and only suitable for less vulnerable development even with defences. Floor levels need to be much higher than adjacent road due flood risk, safe access may not be possible Within area of archaeological importance. Introduce entertainment, offices, employment, café - industry in Ipswich is disappearing and is needed to support increased in population that more housing will bring. Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Site owned by Willis Coroon and is required as surface car parking. Current uses surrounding site have potential to have significant impact on environment of site e.g. noise at antisocial hours. Difficulty in accommodating open space requirements of 10%. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix A	UC048 Commercial Road	10	1	Greenways Countryside Project, River Action Group, Network Rail, Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Jones Lang LaSalle, Spenhill Regeneration Ltd., Suffolk County Council	Inland Waterways Association,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space proportion should be 30% Retail use should not be excluded from development. Proposed mix of uses and suggested proportions of land use is inappropriate. Conflicting approach between development of UC048 and adjacent sites UC015 and UC089. Development should not include reference to provide public transport corridor through the site, no justification of need for off road bus lane, this would conflict with other uses. Bus lane would not optimise use of riverside setting. Higher value land uses needed to ensure proposals are commercially viable. Three separate sites as shown in Issues and Options stage should be reinstated. Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Site situated within the flood plain. Site situated within conservation area. Safe, convenient pedestrian / cycle access across Commercial Road would be required. Retain existing use as industry in Ipswich is disappearing and is needed to support increased in population that more housing will bring. 	Since the Preferred Options consultation, planning permission has been granted on the majority of the site for retail-led mixed use. It includes housing, a (raised) riverside walkway and retains the skatepark.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing site use makes it extremely difficult to undertake comprehensive redevelopment. Network Rail have not agreed to release this land to date. There should be an increase in the flexibility for size and scale of the development in this riverside location. Delete reference to leisure, employment and bus lane, do not specify number of dwellings - wide range of uses proposed serve no effective planning purpose. Open space / recreation should be indicative and acknowledge that riverside path may contribute towards target of off site provision. There should be greater emphasis in proposals for the potential phasing of development. Should exclude residential from the mix because of uncertainty about delivery. Right of way abuts site. (SCC) 	
Appendix A	UC051 Mint Quarter	11	2	East of England Cooperative Society Ltd., Henry Cooper, Christ Church United Reformed/Baptist Church, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	City Grill, Shearer Property Group Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area covered by the allocation should be extended to cover the whole of land owned by the East of England Co-operative Society. This would enable greater integration into the overall concept, in particular for architectural, servicing and pedestrian integration purposes. Inclusion of extra land would allow for greater flexibility for comprehensive redevelopment of the site. Density proposed will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Proposed development should not include Christ Church graveyard, Church House and Christ Church Halls. Development of this site would be disrespectful of setting and would not enhance it. TPO's and historic monuments on site. Development of site would remove scarce and valuable open green area. Construction of high buildings would blight the enjoyment and use of the Church. Removal of Christ Church Halls would result in loss of accommodation for community activities. Site hindered by the land values for car parking in the vicinity. 	<p>Noted. The site now includes 48-68 Carr St (site ref. IP048).</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services. The density is in line with adopted Core Strategy policy DM30 and the site capacity has been reduced to 73 dwellings.</p> <p>Noted and now deleted from the site (site ref. IP048).</p> <p>The design of any scheme for the site adjacent to the church would need to comply with Core Strategy policy DM5 Urban Design Quality which requires new development to be well designed and to fit well with adjoining areas.</p> <p>The TPOs and potential for archaeology are noted in the site constraints. The churchyard is now shown in the SHLAA excluded from the site.</p> <p>The majority of the overall site consists of car parking. The churchyard is now shown in the SHLAA excluded from the site. The proposed allocation includes public open space.</p> <p>The design of any scheme for the site adjacent to the church would need to comply with Core Strategy policy DM5 Urban Design Quality which requires new development to be well designed and to fit well with adjoining areas.</p> <p>The church hall is now excluded from the site.</p> <p>The Council considers that residential led development incorporating parking is deliverable, based on evidence in the Study by DTZ.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty in turning many retail users onto the site instead of Carr Street and Upper Brook Street. • Any residential development will not exceed land values, therefore development dependent on a retail scheme. • Number of car parking spaces proposed should remain flexible until scheme is fully developed. • Site situated within flood zone, conservation area and area of archaeological importance. • Existing uses on the site provide an important function, development would require agreement between many different landowners. 	<p>Retail use is not now proposed on the east part of IP048.</p> <p>The Council considers that residential led development incorporating parking is deliverable, based on evidence in the Study by DTZ.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces would be determined in the light of parking standards. The proposal includes short stay parking.</p> <p>A small southern section of the site fronting Tacket Street lies within the conservation area. The site is not within a flood zone. The archaeological potential is noted in the site constraints.</p> <p>The proposad allocation recognises multiple ownerships and splits the site.</p>
Appendix A	UC052 No 8 Shed, Orwell Quay	3	1	Henry Cooper, Crest Nicholson, Suffolk County Council	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed density of houses too close to the town centre and will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services • Site situated within flood plain and conservation area. • Requirement for strong pedestrian / cycle links and possibly an improved bus service due to location. • Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. • Residential development in this location is contrary to current flood policy 	<p>The site is no longer being allocated for development but it is identified as part of the Education Quarter where education and ancillary uses would be permitted.</p>
Appendix A	UC053 Land west of New Cut, south of Felaw st	5	0	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council, JB Planning Associates		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site situated within the flood plain and conservation area. • Proposed density of houses too close to the town centre and will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. • Flood barrier would be required for delivery of site. • Mitigating the flood risk would require ground raising. • Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. • Area represents potential for continues employment and mixed commercial uses alongside other retained employment uses in this area. 	<p>Site is no longer being allocated for development.</p>
Appendix A	UC054 Old Cattle Market Site, Portman Road	3	1	Henry Cooper, Beeson Properties Ltd, Crest Nicholson, Suffolk County Council	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed density of houses too close to the town centre and will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. • Site situated within the flood plain, flood barrier would be required for delivery of site. • Mitigating flood risk would require ground razing. • Proposed density of houses too high and too close to town centre. • Proposals should include reference to Portman House. 	<p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services. The proposed use is now employment and leisure.</p> <p>Flood risk has been addressed strategically through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test. It would also need to be addressed through the detailed design of any scheme.</p> <p>Development of this site for employment and leisure use is dependent on the completion of the flood defence barrier.</p> <p>Site is no longer allocated for housing.</p> <p>The allocation does not set out this level of detail.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive redevelopment of site is unlikely to be viable given the proposed mix of uses. Safe access is difficult due to flood zone location. Leisure centre inappropriate as majority of water leisure facility users are not car drivers, therefore should not move away from existing Crown Street site. Development costs do not add up so unlikely that developer will be found. Crown Pools should be regenerated instead, Fore Street pool site should be sold off and funds used for regeneration. 	<p>The future use of this site needs to be reconsidered in the light of repairs made to Crown Pools (see site UC072/58). See flood risk responses above.</p> <p>This is a town centre location easily accessible by public transport, including the free town centre shuttle bus.</p> <p>The future use of this site needs to be reconsidered in the light of repairs made to Crown Pools (see site UC072/58). The site remains a good site for potential future redevelopment as it is large and highly accessible.</p> <p>The future use of this site needs to be reconsidered in the light of repairs made to Crown Pools (see site UC072/58).</p>
Appendix A	UC055 Land between Lower Orwell Street & Star Lane	5	1	The Ipswich Society, Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	Bullworthy Shallish LLP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land should be obtained from this site to ensure adequate width for Star Lane. Proposed density of housing too close to town centre. Proposed density of houses too close to the town centre and will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Site situated within flood plain. Site within conservation area, listed building on site and within air quality management area. High quality pedestrian environment to/from/within the site would need to be provided due to site location adjacent to Star Lane. Local traffic flows and carriageway geometry mean site access directly onto Star Lane may not be achievable. Alternative access onto Lower Orwell Street would have operational and safety issues. Site dependent on improvements to Star Lane. Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. 	<p>The site has planning permission for student accommodation. Housing and employment are considered appropriate for this site should student accommodation not be delivered.</p> <p>High density is considered appropriate in such an accessible town centre location and it complies with the approach to density set out in adopted Core Strategy policies CS2 and DM30. However the site now has planning permission for student accommodation.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services. The site now has planning permission for student accommodation.</p> <p>The site is part within the flood plain. It now has planning permission for student accommodation.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to a conservation area and the other constraints are noted in the constraints section.</p> <p>Noted, however the site now has planning permission for student accommodation.</p> <p>Noted, however the site now has planning permission for student accommodation.</p> <p>Noted, however the site now has planning permission for student accommodation.</p> <p>It is not considered that the site is dependent on improvements to Star Lane and indeed planning permission has been granted for student accommodation without improvements having been made.</p> <p>Do not agree. The open space requirement could be satisfied on the site which extends to 0.4 ha.</p>
Appendix A	UC056 Orwell Retail Park, Ranelagh Road	6	3	Henry Cooper, Firstplan, Orwell Motorcycles Ltd., Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, JB Planning Associates	Greenways Countryside Project, Inland Waterways Association, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site situated within flood plain. Proposed density of housing too close to town centre. Proposed density of houses too close to the town centre and will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Original use should be retained, especially highly successful Orwell Motorcycles. 	<p>Site is no longer being allocated for development.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry / employment is disappearing and the economy needs to be supported with increasing population. Preferred option should recognise existing uses already on the site. Severe constraints on site with regard to flooding and residential issues. Existing use or non-residential use would present less flood risk issues. Proposals are in contrary to the councils pledge to 'Benefit Existing Businesses'. Location of site between rail line and river therefore creating difficult pedestrian movement north-south and potential poor access to bus services. Site availability unlikely due to long leases. Site performs / has potential to perform a valuable retail operation in preferable edge of centre location. 	
Appendix A	UC057 Land between Old Cattle Market & Star Lane	13	6	The Ipswich Society, Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Archant Properties Ltd, Nick Palmer on behalf of Mr N Agran	C A Wall, Nick Palmer on behalf of Mr N Agran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land should be obtained from this site to ensure adequate width for Star Lane. Site situated within flood plain. Site within conservation area, listed building on site and within an area of archaeological importance. Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. Proposed density of housing too close to town centre. Proposed density of houses too close to the town centre and will bring intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Retain original use, especially EADT offices and print works, consider more office use. Industry / employment is disappearing and the economy needs to be supported with increasing population. Variety of piecemeal ownerships exist which will limit the ability to deliver the site. Council should take a more flexible approach to redevelopment proposals. Archant should retain some flexibility with the operational nature of the site from a commercial perspective. Perceived significant apartment growth on this part of the town may well challenge market demand. 	<p>There is not a proposal to widen Star Lane.</p> <p>This is noted in the site constraints. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses flood risk matters.</p> <p>These are noted within the constraints.</p> <p>The site is large enough to accommodate open space at 1.71ha. The density is considered appropriate in such an accessible town centre location and it complies with the approach to density set out in adopted Core Strategy policies CS2 and DM30. However the indicative capacity has been reduced from 141 dwellings to 28 dwellings and at a medium density rather than high density at the preferred options stage.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services. The density has been reduced from high to medium and is in line with the adopted Core Strategy policy DM30.</p> <p>The EADT print works has subsequently closed and therefore at least some redevelopment of this area is expected. The Council's preferred option for the whole includes some office use.</p> <p>The Council's aspiration for this site is for a mix of uses including some residential and some office use to support the economy.</p> <p>There are multiple ownerships on the site but the Council is in discussion with several parties. Deliverability will be a key consideration in any allocation made through the IP-One plan.</p> <p>The mixed use preferred option does offer some flexibility within the site.</p> <p>The print works has now closed but the Council is mindful that Archant continue to have an office presence at the site.</p> <p>The SHMA published in 2008 reported an oversupply of flats. However, the March 2010 SHLAA envisages this site coming forward between 2017 and 2022. It is expected that the market for flats will have recovered by then.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southern extent of site will require flood protection. Size and operational requirements for a sub-station would run counter to the aims of improving townscape and character. Site subject to flood risk therefore inappropriate for sub-station location. Onus should be on EDF Energy to find a site. Identification of site is not backed up by site-specific evidence. Provision for retail should be included in proposals. Site within an Air Quality Management Zone 	<p>Noted. The southern part does lie within the flood zone. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses flood risk matters. The March 2010 SHLAA suggests that the site would come forward after 2017. The barrier is scheduled for completion in 2017.</p> <p>Noted, however there are limited opportunities to locate the substation elsewhere and it is needed to serve this part of the town centre. The same design quality requirements would apply to the sub station as to other developments.</p> <p>Only the southern part of the site lies within the flood zone.</p> <p>The sub station is infrastructure needed to support town centre development. Since opportunities in the vicinity are limited it needs to be considered through the plan.</p> <p>Part of the site was a 1997 Local Plan allocation. The site is in multiple ownership but certain landowners have expressed an interest in redevelopment. Clearly before any formal allocation is made through the plan the Council will need to check the site is deliverable.</p> <p>Small scale retail forms part of the preferred option. The town centre masterplan approved by the Council in March 2012 envisages retail-led mixed use redevelopment within the Merchant Quarter that includes this site.</p> <p>Noted - the southern part of the site adjacent to Star Lane is in an AQMA as noted in the site constraints.</p>
Appendix A	UC058 Crown Street Car Park Site	6	0	Sport England, Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific replacement site for the Crown Pools complex has been identified. Alternative suitable site required to be allocated for replacing the swimming pool facility prior to any development. Finding a replacement site for a major leisure facility in a town centre can be difficult in practice due to size and accessibility requirements. More living accommodation in town centre will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Although car park is in poor state of repair it's use is economic and can be continued on this site. Site is located within air quality management area. 	<p>The site in Portman Road was identified as having potential for large scale leisure (UC054). The proposals for the Crown Pools complex will need to be reconsidered, as a significant refurbishment has now been carried out. The site is no longer being allocated for development.</p>
Appendix A	UC059 Russell Road / Princes Street / Chancery Road	1	1	Her Majesty's Court Service	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should relate well with the existing and any new Civic buildings. Would like to see further development around Russell Road encapsulating a number of adjacent development sites in a strategic and spatial manner. 	<p>The preferred option is to retain the existing use rather than redevelop the site. There are no known plans for the existing use to relocate.</p> <p>May not be achievable at present without compulsory purchase as many sites are in existing use.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Appendix A	UC060 Princes Street / New Cardinal Street	0	1		Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support employment. 	Noted. The site has planning permission for office development (granted 2008).
Appendix A	UC063 Fison House	3	2	Her Majesty's Court Service	The Ipswich Society, Crest Nicholson, Suffolk County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should relate well with the existing and any new Civic buildings. • Would like to see further development around Russell Road encapsulating a number of adjacent development sites in a strategic and spatial manner. 	Noted. The preferred option was to retain the existing use and the March 2010 SHLAA indicates that the site is not deliverable for residential use therefore the existing building is likely to remain. May not be achievable at present without compulsory purchase as many sites are in existing use.
Appendix A	UC067 Holywells Road (east)	5	2	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	Greenways Countryside Project, FIS Windows Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site situated within the flood plain. • Site within conservation area. • Strong bus / pedestrian / cycle links to town centre would be required due to distance. • More living accommodation in town centre will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. • Relocation of many of the existing uses is unviable in cost terms. • Current use as existing industrial estate is fully occupied. • Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix A	UC071 Truck and Car Company, Cliff Road	5	1	Suffolk County Council, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Associated British Ports	Cliff Road Developments Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site located in an area where there is traffic congestion. • Site located in flood plain. • Strategic bund would still be required for safe access even with tidal barrier. • Development could add significantly to the need for school places. • Accumulation of these developments may have implications given the limited site of Holywells High School. • Site location adjacent to one of the two primary accesses into the Port of Ipswich – redevelopment should not compromise access. • Although site has extant planning permission, deliverability still questionable since the scheme has not been developed in past 4 years. • Present commercial use has reached levels that exceed residential value of the site. • Part of site may be required for wet dock crossing. • Site located in poor residential location. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix A	UC072 Crown House, Crown Street	6	0	Suffolk County Council, Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, JB Planning Associates		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be considered in conjunction with site S058 and other town centre sites as it is of strategic importance to Ipswich Town Centre. • Requirements of the East of England plan policy E2 should be taken into account prior to considering any other uses on site. • Further discussion recommended on this site being beneficial for supported housing. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Existing offices on site are almost fully let, commercially successful and in good location. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site situated within air quality management area. Limited potential to redevelop site as office accommodation is of good quality, in excellent location and there is a need to provide additional office jobs in Ipswich. Any redevelopment would increase pressure within the town centre for delivery of high quality office space. Site already performs positive employment role. 	
Appendix A	UC074 Orwell Quay	4	1	Suffolk County Council, Waterfront Churches, Associated British Ports	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site best utilised to provide circulation space for a high density development area and a high quality public realm for the whole quayside area. Site located in traffic-congested area with poor air quality. Site more suited to open space and leisure use. Sympathetic planning and development required to make the site a vibrant area. 40% of site should be given over to a two or three storey retail/restaurant/café type use at the northern end and the remainder used as car parking/open space. Possible issue over historic width. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix A	UC075 St Edmund House, Rope Walk	2	2	Henry Cooper, Suffolk County Council	Suffolk County Council, Sustrans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office or retail use preferable. If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix A	UC078 Church/land at Upper Orwell St	1	1	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	David Barker on behalf of Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already has planning permission. 	There is uncertainty surrounding the future of this site following a change of ownership and subsequent fire in the church. However the permission for 12 flats in Reeves Yard was renewed in 2010 (10/00056/VC).
Appendix A	UC082 Drunken Docker Area	1	2	Associated British Ports	Crest Nicholson, Suffolk County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site should be considered comprehensively in conjunction with neighbouring land when development is being considered. 	This may be possible in future but considering this site now and in isolation, the Council considers it not suitable for development because of its constraints.
Appendix A	UC085 240 Wherstead Road	3	2	Suffolk County Council, Henry Cooper, Wherstead Road Residents Association	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spaces at Stoke High School could become an issues if the range of neighbouring sites are developed. Consider car parking instead for surrounding residents. Site will suffer from noise and air pollution due to proximity to busy road and railway. If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. 	The need for additional school places is considered during plan preparation, alongside site allocation. This would not be an efficient use for a site of nearly half a hectare. Potential noise and vibration will need to be considered but are not insurmountable problems. Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased development on Wherstead Road is putting further strain on local infrastructure. A health facility instead would benefit the local community and take the strain of nearby Stoke Park Doctors Surgery. 	<p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services.</p> <p>The health sector has not flagged up the need for a facility in this location.</p>
Appendix A	UC086 Land north of Ranelagh Road	5	4	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	Greenways Countryside Project, The Ipswich Society, Inland Waterways Association, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site situated within the flood plain. Site will suffer from noise and air pollution due to proximity to busy road and railway. Site located in area of traffic congestion. If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Viability of site extremely questionable. Lower density scheme would be more appropriate. In conjunction with other potential development sites nearby could create school place issue. 	<p>Site is no longer being allocated for development and there is a planning permission for a hotel on part of the site.</p> <p>The site enjoys the same amenities as the those to its west adjacent to the river which have been successfully developed for residential-led mixed use.</p> <p>The site is conveniently located in central Ipswich opposite the railway station which is also well served by buses. With such sustainable travel choices available on the doorstep, as well as cycling and walking, it is unlikely that it would contribute to any congestion.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services.</p>
Appendix A	UC088 15-19 St Margaret's Street	0	1		Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support no allocation 	08/00511/FUL for student accommodation lapsed in 2011 therefore the site's future may need to be reconsidered.
Appendix A	UC089 Banks of river, upriver from Princes Street	4	4	Suffolk County Council, Sustrans, Suffolk County Council	Greenways Countryside Project, Inland Waterways Association, River Action Group, Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site located in area of traffic congestion development would increase problems. In conjunction with other potential development sites nearby could create school place issue. Need to ensure that the proposed cycle route is not compromised by the suggested public transport route. Future of existing rail cord should be considered prior to any allocation for development. 	<p>The proposal is mainly for open space use with a small proportion of development. This could include small scale retail and the March 2010 SHLAA identifies the possibility of a small proportion being used for residential use, in conjunction with redevelopment of the site to the north (UC015). The primary use however would remain open space which would not impact on congestion.</p> <p>The need for additional school places is considered during plan preparation, alongside site allocation.</p> <p>Noted. The public transport route may need to be reconsidered following approval of the retail scheme to the east of Princes Street, which does not include it.</p> <p>Network Rail have not indicated that the line is still needed.</p>
Appendix A	UC090 Corner of Curriers Lane / Princes Street	0	1		Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support no allocation. 	The site has now been redeveloped.
Appendix A	UC091 County Hall, St Helen's Street	1	1	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site has planning permission. 	The planning permission for 79 dwellings has been implemented with 29 completed to date.
Appendix A	UC093 Area north of Carr Street	1	2	Suffolk County Council	Crest Nicholson, East of England Cooperative Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Right of way in vicinity of site 	Noted, however the site is not proposed for allocation for redevelopment.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
Appendix A	UC094 Car Park off St Nicholas Street	2	1	The Ipswich Society, Suffolk County Council	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cromwell Square is a visual disaster, reduce number of car parking spaces and introduce landscaping. • Suggest conversion of car park to open space to reduce traffic use of St Nicholas Street and improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. 	<p>A public realm improvement scheme for the Square has been designed (in 2009) but awaits funding.</p> <p>A public realm improvement scheme for the Square has been designed (in 2009) but awaits funding. It retains some car parking but includes tree planting for example.</p>
Appendix A	UC096 Waterworks Street	3	1	East of England Cooperative Society, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, C Vint	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site serves for operational purposes for businesses and other non-residential users. • Site is in multiple ownerships and holds significant existing use value to occupiers. • 80% residential preferred – additional facilities would need to be provided for influx of people to area. 	<p>Part of the site however is used for car parking which is not an efficient use of land. The site would offer a convenient location for living close to jobs, shops and facilities.</p> <p>The strength of the market will clearly play a part in the timing of this site's development.</p> <p>The site has good accessibility to community facilities.</p>
Appendix A	UC104 Rear of Grafton House, Russell Road	0	1		David Barker on behalf of Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support employment 	Noted.
Appendix A	UC109 Handford Road (east)	3	4	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	Greenways Countryside Project, The Ipswich Society, Inland Waterways Association, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site situated within flood plain. • Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. • Major difficulties in delivery of site due to flood risk and existing land values. • Site better retained for commercial development. 	<p>The site is only part within the flood plain and this is noted in the site constraints. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses flood risk matters.</p> <p>The open space requirement could be satisfied on the site and it is adjacent to the Alderman Canal County Wildlife Site and Alderman Road open space.</p> <p>These are not insurmountable problems as the adjacent planning permission to the west demonstrates (10/00935/FUL). The site offers a good environment for living in a very convenient location adjacent to existing housing. Residential use represents a more effective use of land than car parking.</p>
Appendix A	UC111 Transco, south of Patteson Road	4	1	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes,	Firstplan,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site situated within flood plain. • Flood defence barrier would be required. • If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. • Reduce density due to heights that would be required. • Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. 	<p>This is noted in the site constraints. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses flood risk matters. The barrier is scheduled for completion in 2017.</p> <p>This is noted in the site constraints. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses flood risk matters. The barrier is scheduled for completion in 2017.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services. Indicative site capacities have reduced slightly since preferred options stage as a result of the Core Strategy policy on density (DM30). The indicative capacity on this site is now 63 dwellings rather than 94.</p> <p>This is a central location close to jobs, shops and facilities and therefore high density is considered appropriate in accordance with adopted Core Strategy policy DM30.</p> <p>Do not agree. The open space requirement could be satisfied on the site which extends to over 0.5 ha.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density of housing proposed out of keeping with the area and inappropriate given the flood risk. Retain employment uses. 	<p>This is a central location close to jobs, shops and facilities and therefore high density is considered appropriate in accordance with adopted Core Strategy policies CS2 and DM30. Indicative site capacities have reduced slightly since preferred options stage as a result of the Core Strategy policy on density (DM30). The indicative capacity on this site is now 63 dwellings rather than 94.</p> <p>Residential use is considered more appropriate than the gas governor in this location close to existing housing in the waterfront regeneration area.</p>
Appendix A	UC199 Land east of West End Road	5	2	Greenways Countryside Project, Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	Inland Waterways Association, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement for allocation of open space to facilitate improvement of river path and corridor. Site situated within the flood plain. If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Retain present use, industry in Ipswich is disappearing and is needed to support the increase in population that more houses will bring. Buffer strip along part of site will be required even with flood defence barriers in place. Existing uses on site hold significant value. Delivery of site for residential almost impossible. Site is occupied by 4 viable businesses. Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. Site is within 60 metres of high voltage overhead transmission lines. 	<p>The Opportunity Area F Transport and Movement Plan on page 110 does indicate a riverside route through the site, however the site is not considered suitable for residential development. The London Road end now has planning permission for alternative uses (reference 10/00653/OUT, 11/00557/REM) and part has been developed.</p> <p>This is noted in the site constraints. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses flood risk matters. However the site is not considered suitable for residential development.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services. In this case the site is not considered suitable for residential use.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review indicates that demand for industrial land is strongest not in central Ipswich but in the A14 corridor (core document ref. ACD04). The need for additional jobs is acknowledged in the Core Strategy (e.g. policy CS13). However land is at a premium in IP-One and therefore higher density uses are generally considered more appropriate in this location, but in this case the site is not considered suitable for residential use.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses flood risk matters.</p> <p>The northern/London Road end of the site now has planning permission for non-residential uses and part of the site has been developed. The site is not now considered suitable for residential development. At present only two active businesses remain on the site. The open space requirement could be satisfied on the site which extends to over 1 ha. Transmission lines are not necessarily a constraint on residential development. However, the site is not now considered suitable for residential development.</p>
Appendix A	UC201 Land west of West End Road (south)	5	2	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council, Henry Cooper	Greenways Countryside Project, River Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing uses on site hold significant value, unlikely to exceed residential values. Site situated within flood zone. Site contaminated. Constrained location between river and busy road, difficult north – south pedestrian movement. Site location next to busy road will be subject to noise and pollution. 	<p>Site is no longer being considered for development.</p> <p>There is an existing road crossing and river bridge a short distance to the east.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of supporters	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forming an access junction on the A137 will cause operational difficulties. Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. Several of the established businesses have recently invested in new modern buildings at the site. Site would be better retained for existing retail uses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry in Ipswich is disappearing and is needed to support the increase in population that more houses will bring. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood barrier is needed. 	<p>There is already an access serving the car showrooms therefore access will not be an issue.</p> <p>The site is part in use as a car showroom and part vacant car showroom. This use is classed as 'sui generis' rather than retail.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review indicates that demand for industrial land is strongest not in central Ipswich but in the A14 corridor (core document ref. ACD04). The need for additional jobs is acknowledged in the Core Strategy (e.g. policy CS13). However land is at a premium in IP-One and therefore higher density uses are considered more appropriate, particularly residential use close to jobs, shops and facilities of all types. However this site is no longer being considered for development.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services. However this site is no longer being considered for development.</p>
Appendix A	UC224 Car Park, Crown Street / Tower Ramparts	3	0	W J Hammond, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retail outlet above lower level car park preferred. If bus station cannot accommodate increased traffic site should be used for 'out of town' buses and allow space for existing retailers to expand. Providing four units on this site seems implausible and is entirely dependent on alternative uses exceeding a high existing value. Site located within area of archaeological importance. Poor location for housing in respect of residential amenity. 	<p>The site is not available for development and therefore is not deliverable. Site is no longer being considered for development.</p> <p>There are amenities available in the town centre, it is close to Christchurch Park, and there are trees on the site and some landscaping across the road.</p>
Appendix A	UC249 St Matthew's Street	2	1	Henry Cooper, Crest Nicholson	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. Site partially listed within conservation area and area of archaeological importance. Listed building adjacent to site. Constrained access opportunities due to proximity of site to roundabout. 	<p>The site now has planning permission for mixed use comprising commercial at ground floor with hotel and very sheltered housing above - application reference 09/00782/FUL.</p>
Appendix A	UC251 Silo, College Street, Northern Quays (west)	4	0	Henry Cooper, Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	Mersea Homes, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes, Suffolk County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site situated within the flood plain. If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. 	<p>This is noted in the site constraints. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment addresses flood risk matters.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs are considered fully alongside potential site allocations and the views of key service providers are sought. None has indicated that development of this site would put intolerable demands on their services.</p>

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objections	No. of support sites	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site within conservation area, listed building adjacent, within area of archaeological importance and within air quality management area. • Difficulty in accommodating 10% open space requirements. • Development is dependent on tidal barrier. 	<p>These are noted in the constraints.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy policy DM29 requires 15% of high density sites to be open space. This should be achievable through appropriate design.</p> <p>The barrier is scheduled for completion in 2017.</p>
Appendix A	UC254 253/255 London Road	2	0	Mersea Homes, David Wilson, Crest Nicholson	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail likely to be most viable use. • TPO on site. • Poor location for residential development due to traffic noise and fumes and impact from the McDonalds. • Any residential development would lack adequate amenity space. 	The site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix A	UC256 Royal Mail Sorting Office, Commercial Road	0	1		Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support no allocation. 	Noted.
Appendix A	UC259 Duke Street, School Site	3	1	Suffolk County Council, Gordon Terry	Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful business exists on site. • Authorities would need to negotiate, leading to a possible compulsory purchase inquiry. • There would be costs for land and property replacement and compensation for loss of business. • Location causes concern due to proximity to busy road, lack of suitable space for grass playing fields (Holywells Park is not deemed to be suitable for this provision). • Potential problems concerning site acquisition. • Likely site contamination. • Council failed to notify all individual occupiers in the site area at the inception of the proposal. 	<p>The site now being allocated does not have any businesses on it.</p> <p>Any town centre location is likely to have such issues. Site is now being allocated for housing and public open space.</p> <p>No longer applicable as the site now being allocated does not have any businesses on it.</p> <p>Any contamination would be addressed at a planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council posted site notices and notified occupiers and neighbours by mail at preferred options stage.</p>
Appendix A	UC270 Car Park, Sir Alf Ramsey Way / Portman Road	0	1		Crest Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support employment use. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development.
Appendix A	UC271 2-6 Russell Road	5	0	Mersea Homes, Her Majesty's Court Service, Henry Cooper, Crest Nicholson, David Wilson Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site will be unavailable for development without the relocation of existing uses. • It is by no means obvious how housing could take up 50%. • Risk of flooding on site seriously prejudices residential development on this site. • Site situated within the flood plain. • TPO on site. • If more houses are built in town centre it will put intolerable demands on road infrastructure, health service, schools, police and emergency services. • Retail and industry are needed to support the increase in population that more housing will bring. • Existing uses on site hold significant value. 	Site is no longer being allocated for development.

Chapter	Policy Area / page / para / site	No. of objecti ons	No. of support s	Objector profile	Supporter profile	Objections issues raised	Officer's response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking ratios on site will be held under lease and will be required to maintain viability of existing uses. • Existing uses well established. 	

Appendix 3 – Summary of Comments to Draft pre-submission Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD (Jan – Mar 2014)

Draft Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) development plan document

Schedule of representations received during Regulation 18 consultation January-March 2014

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
Chapter 1: Introduction			
There is currently no Marine Management Organisation (MMO) plan for the area south of Felixstowe. In the meantime local authorities are advised to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity involving a coastline or tidal river. Document should refer to the need for early consultation with the MMO for work requiring considering under the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (rep 254).	Marine Management Organisation	As the Borough includes tidal reaches of the River Orwell, it is important that the plan addresses Marine Policy and Management.	Add the wording as advised to CS4 reasoned justification in the Core Strategy.
Support	Crest Strategic Projects	N/A	N/A
Chapter 2: The Ipswich Local Plan			
The need for the sometimes competing requirements of different land uses or development to be sensitively addressed and balanced to protect existing activities should be identified as one of the more detailed issues that the Site Allocations DPD must address.	Associated British Ports	The purpose of the planning is to reconcile competing demands for land. This is implicitly addressed through paragraph 2.11, which lists the different pressures on land – for housing, employment and town centre development, for example. Core Strategy policy DM25 protects the existing employment areas which include the port.	No change.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
The list of evidence at paragraph 2.9 should include historic environment evidence e.g. conservation area appraisals. Para 2.11 should recognise the need to address heritage assets.	English Heritage	Historic evidence has informed the plan and therefore it should be added to the list.	Add references to paragraphs 2.9 and 2.11 as required.
Chapter 3: Vision and Objectives			
At para. 3.2 Objective 8 should be mentioned as there is a geographical element to protection and enhancement of the environment and heritage assets that the Plan should address. It would be interesting to know how the town centre Master Plan informs the plan.	English Heritage	Agree that Objective 8 could be mentioned. The town centre Master Plan objectives are identified in Chapter 3 para 3.4. They are aspirational and have been reflected in the policies and proposals of the Site Allocations plan as far as is practicable taking into account the available evidence.	Add reference to Objective 8 at para 3.2.
The NPPF requires local authorities to support local strategies to improve health and wellbeing. SCC has a duty to consider the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The implications of these should be considered.	Suffolk County Council	Agree that health and wellbeing is a key consideration for the Local Plan. It has been addressed through, for example, identifying where new GP surgery facilities are needed and promoting cycling and walking routes.	Add explicit reference to health and wellbeing to paragraph 2.11 in Chapter 2.
Chapter 4: Area Based Policies – please note that these policies DM33 to DM37 have now been moved to the Core Strategy, as new policies or incorporated into existing ones, so that all the development management policies may be found in one place.			

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
DM33 Green Corridors (now Core Strategy policy DM33)			
Whilst supporting the principle of increasing open spaces, we object to the green rim which crosses the Ipswich administrative boundary. It could have significant policy implications for the Council's site allocations work.	Suffolk Coastal District Council	The Council is committed to the green rim principle as a long term aspiration. It was proposed through the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Study and has been incorporated into Core Strategy policies CS16 Green Infrastructure and DM33 Green Corridors (which has been relocated from the Site Allocations DPD). Maps and plans showing the green rim do so on an indicative basis only, a point which is made clearly in map keys. However, IBC acknowledges that some of the land lies outside its boundary and that this could be misinterpreted by plan users and create confusion.	Delete illustrations showing the indicative green rim (key diagram, ecological network map and green corridors map) but retain reference to it within the text of the plans and make it very clear that its delivery will need to be addressed jointly with neighbouring authorities. Please note that policy DM33 has been moved across into the Core Strategy.
Support the principle of establishing broad locations for green corridors, but developers should have an input to the detailed mapping of green corridors particularly for sites like the Northern Fringe which undergo master planning.	Crest Strategic Projects	This is the case at the Northern Fringe and would be in other large developments, taking into account all the relevant factors including existing natural features on the site and urban design considerations.	Add reference to the reasoned justification to the need for developers to be involved. Please note that policy DM33 has been moved across into the Core Strategy.
Support	Natural England	N/A	N/A

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
DM34 The Ecological Network (now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM31)			
Needs to be clearer that internationally and nationally important ecological sites both inside and outside core areas will be protected and wording added to reflect the protection afforded by the Conservation of Habitats and Species regulations 2010.	RSPB	All such ecological sites fall within the identified core areas of the ecological network, however the wording will be revisited to ensure clarity.	Amend the wording as advised within the policy and the reasoned justification. Please note policy DM34 is now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM31.
Anglia Retail Park is a large, built up site and has no ecological value. It should not be included within the ecological network (Plan 2). There is no evidence to support its designation as a potential development site with wildlife interest and this could threaten viability if ecological enhancement is required.	Barton Willmore LLP	The areas identified as core areas in the ecological network are based on the findings of the Wildlife Audit Update 2012-13 which is published on the Council's web site. The reasoned justification to the policy is clear that the ecological network is about maintaining links through sites where appropriate, not stifling development on sites which have been earmarked for development. The core areas have been identified on a consistent basis using the Wildlife Audit findings. The Council considers that this approach best ensures that it fulfils the Biodiversity Duty placed on public bodies under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.	No change to the plan. Please note policy DM34 is now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM31.
Support the policy, however remove the reference to 'within core areas' in relation to protecting sites of national and international importance as all	Natural England	All such ecological sites fall within the identified core areas of the ecological network, however the	Amend the wording as advised within the policy and the reasoned justification. Please note policy

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
such sites should be protected. Add reference to the requirement for proposals with the potential to affect European Sites to comply with the Conservation (Habitats and Species) Regulations 2010.		wording will be revisited to ensure clarity, and reference added to the Regulations as requested.	DM34 is now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM31.
DM35: Countryside (now Core Strategy policy DM34)			
Support the policy	Natural England, Crest Strategic Projects.	N/A	N/A
DM36: Employment Areas (now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25)			
Pleased to see the IBC intention to form a gateway to Ipswich and support the proposed employment use for Airport Farm Kennels.	Priory Park Ltd	N/A	Please note policy DM36 is now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25.
Support but request clear cross referencing of defined Employment Areas on the policies map. Consents and licences under other regulations within the Port, which allow certain activities, should also be referred to.	Associated British Ports	The Council will look at adding the Employment Area reference numbers to the policies map for ease of reference. The other consents governing activity at the Port will be referred to in the reasoned justification to the policy.	Amend policies map (add Employment Area numbers) and refer to other consents within the reasoned justification to the policy. Please note policy DM36 is now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25 (and the reasoned justification).
Object to Employment Area designation at Toller Road as it is unduly restrictive and ignores the market. Other uses e.g. retail should be allowed.	Corindale Properties Ltd	The purpose of identifying the Employment Areas is set out in the policy's reasoned justification. The principle of protecting Employment Areas is carried forward from the 1997 Local Plan. The policy has proved effective in safeguarding areas for employment uses. In	No change. Please note policy DM36 is now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
		defining the Employment Areas through this plan, the Council has reviewed all the areas and those which are no longer serving their purpose have been de-allocated.	
Support the definition of Ransomes Europark as an Employment Area.	Suffolk Coastal District Council	N/A	Please note policy DM36 is now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25.
Support the identification of Ipswich Business Park north of Whitton Lane for employment development.	Ashfield Land Ltd & Barton Willmore LLP	N/A	Please note policy DM36 is now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25.
The policy lists the Employment Areas but the cross reference to Core Strategy DM25 reaffirms the deficiencies of not having a specific policy to address established employment activities on port sites.	Lafarge Tarmac	The policy has been combined with DM25 and text has been added to the reasoned justification to address the issue of other consents existing at the Port, relating to hazardous substances etc.	No change.
The policy should make reference to the need for proposals to comply with the requirements of policies DM33 to DM35.	Natural England.	This should not be necessary as it is taken as read in the plan that all the relevant policies apply to each proposal. If this approach were consistently followed throughout the plan, there would be unacceptable levels of cross referencing between policies.	Consider whether to add cross reference to the reasoned justification to Core Strategy policy DM25 where this policy now sits.
DM37: District and Local Centres (now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM21)			
The policy should make reference to the need for proposals to comply with the requirements of policies DM33 to DM35.	Natural England.	This should not be necessary as it is taken as read in the plan that all the relevant policies apply to each	No change.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
		proposal. If this approach were consistently followed throughout the plan, there would be unacceptable levels of cross referencing between policies.	
The centres proposed at the Northern Fringe should be built into the policy and identified on the policies map.	Crest Strategic Projects	This representation relates to Core Strategy CS10 and therefore needs to be considered under that document.	To be considered in terms of what level of detail is shown on the policies map for allocations at the Northern Fringe ('Ipswich Garden Suburb').

Policies DM38 and DM39

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
Chapter 5: Site Allocations			
DM38: The Protection of Allocated Sites (now called policy SP1)			
Policies DM38-42 should require that proposals must comply with the biodiversity protection and enhancement requirements of policies DM33-35.	Natural England	This should not be necessary as it is taken as read in the plan that all the relevant policies apply to each proposal. If this approach were consistently followed throughout the plan, there would be unacceptable levels of cross referencing between policies.	No change.
Support the allocation of sites to deliver development.	Crest Strategic Projects	N/A	N/A

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
DM39: Land Allocated for Housing (now policy SP2)			
General Comments / New Sites			
Allocation of a site does not prevent the Environment Agency lodging an objection to a subsequent application. Recommend wording for addition relating to contaminated land.	Environment Agency	Agree that wording on contaminated land would be helpful to clarify what would be required from applicants.	Add contaminated land wording to the reasoned justification of Core Strategy policy DM26 (Amenity) which deals with pollution issues.
Some proposed sites are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The Council will need to produce evidence that demonstrates that the sequential test has been carried out for sites IP004, 011b, 015, 031, 037, 039a, 043, 096, 098 and 136. Planning applications in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will also need to be supported with a Flood Risk Assessment. Developments on river frontages should enhance the appearance of the site.	Environment Agency	A sequential statement will be published to support the allocations. This will build on the work undertaken for the adopted Core Strategy, the Council's SFRA and the Planning and Flood Risk SPD. The text about site specific FRAs will be added to the reasoned justification to DM39 (now policy SP2). Policy DM33 green Corridors (now in the Core Strategy) addresses development on river frontages.	Publish a sequential test report and add specific FRA wording to policy SP2 reasoned justification (formerly DM39).
The allocated sites will yield 205 early years pupils, 512 primary school pupils, 369 secondary school pupils and 82 sixth form pupils. Early years provision may be needed within IP037 and IP116. Allocations within some primary school catchments need urgent discussion. Secondary capacity needs to be carefully managed.	Suffolk County Council	Discussions regarding the education needs arising from new development and how best to meet them are ongoing with the Education Authority. A site has been allocated for a new primary school through the Site Allocations Plan (policy SP7). The site sheet for site IP037 Island Site will be updated to flag up the	Update site sheet for site IP037 Island site to highlight the potential need to make early years provision within the site.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
		possible need for early years provision. Site IP116 St Clements is subject to a planning application, however.	
Need to ensure a suitable mix of housing for older people and encourage building to Lifetime Homes standard.	Suffolk County Council	Acknowledge the implications for housing provision of an ageing population. Add references to the reasoned justification to DM39 (now SP2).	Add text to reasoned justification.
Housing delivery of 2,409 dwellings underscores the need to allow the Northern Fringe to come forward to deliver the balance and meet targets.	Crest Strategic Projects	The comment relates more to Core Strategy policy CS10.	No change to Site Allocations DPD.
Propose the allocation of land north-east of Humber Doucy Lane for housing development (c. 300 dwellings).	Kesgrave Covenant Ltd	The SHLAA update 2013 identifies that there are infrastructure constraints and that the site (IP184) is likely to come forward as part of a larger development beyond a 15 year period. The Council considers that this would be better considered jointly with Suffolk Coastal District Council through planned future work on joint housing delivery within the Ipswich Policy Area.	No change.
Site-specific comments DM39			
Housing allocations – detailed historical and archaeological background comments and advice about the need for archaeological investigation are provided on many of the allocated housing sites. It is not proposed to list them all separately here.	Suffolk County Council	The comments will be added to the site sheets in Appendix 3 to the Site Allocations plan so that developers are clear about potential heritage constraints and what will be required of them to overcome the constraints.	Add historical and archaeological comments provided to the individual site sheets as appropriate.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
IP005 Former Tooks Bakery – Whilst the healthcare impact arising from this site alone would not necessitate the provision of a new GP surgery, a site for a new health centre to accommodate planned growth may be warranted subject to securing pooled funding from other major housing sites as necessary and subject to NHS Business Case approval procedures.	NHS Property Services Ltd	The Council will retain the requirement for the site to provide land for such a facility. Evidence of need will be required from the NHS to justify the health use allocation.	No change to plan.
IP005 Former Tooks bakery – site forms part of the approach to the Whitton Conservation Area and could impact upon it therefore it will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impact and appropriate development criteria set if taken forward.	English Heritage	Its proximity to the conservation will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet. There is already a development brief for the site, which does identify the Conservation Area as a constraint. Core Strategy Review policy DM8 now sets appropriate development criteria relating to heritage.	Add reference to Conservation Area to site sheet in Appendix 3.
IP005 Former Tooks Bakery – Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth, or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	This will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet.	Add reference to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP006 Co-Op Warehouse Pauls Road – May be suitable for loft conversions? Agree with residential use subject to noise attenuation.	Ipswich Society	Residential use could result from redevelopment or conversion of the existing building. Noise is highlighted as a constraint in the site sheet at Appendix 3.	No change.
IP006 - Should ensure that space is left along London Road to allow separated cycle facilities to be put in. Access to London Road should be avoided as this would cause traffic problems.	Private individual	Cycle provision and access details would be considered alongside an application under Core Strategy review policy Dm17.	No change.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
IP009 Victoria Nurseries – Suitable for housing but the convenience store should be included in the plan as the nearest is some distance away.	Ipswich Society	The priority on this site is housing delivery. The Northern Fringe / Ipswich Garden Suburb development will provide additional district and local centre facilities once complete for residents living in this part of Ipswich.	No change.
IP010a Co-Op depot Felixstowe Road – Allocation is broadly supported and indicative capacity of 98 dwellings is achievable. However the affordable housing element may not be viable. The use of part of the site for community facilities (school extension) could further harm viability.	East of England Co-Operative Society	Welcome support for the allocation. Suffolk County Council confirms that expansion land is needed for Rosehill School and therefore it is important that this opportunity is safeguarded. Affordable housing targets have been revisited in the Core Strategy in association with whole plan viability assessment. Individual site viability is a matter for consideration at the application stage and would inform negotiation with the developer on the precise level of affordable housing provision.	No change.
IP010b Felixstowe Road – Do not necessarily object to the housing allocation but the following issues need consideration: conflict with the commercial use of the Hughes site if Hughes remain in situ, or alternatively if Hughes are required to move, the requirement for a commensurate site to be provided and Hughes' costs to be covered.	Hughes Electrical Ltd	Welcome the absence of objection for the allocation. It would be for the landowner to decide to bring the site forward for redevelopment, wholly or in part. The value created through the allocation would be expected to cover relocation costs to new premises.	No change.
IP011b Smart Street / Foundation Street – land should be retained for road widening / segregated cycle track / tree planting.	Ipswich Society	This would best be achieved as part of a comprehensive approach to improving the Star Lane gyratory and	Amend site sheet and Opportunity Area development principles.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
		no such scheme is currently proposed by the Highway Authority. However, once the site is developed the opportunity would be lost. Therefore, reference will be added to the site sheet and the Merchant Quarter Opportunity Area to encourage site layouts to consider this.	
IP011b Smart Street / Foundation Street – a very sensitive site where care is needed to avoid harming the historic environment. Scheduled monuments and conservation areas should be mentioned as development constraints. Archaeology could extend beyond the scheduled monuments. Assessment of the archaeology is recommended.	English Heritage	Detailed archaeology comments will be added to the site sheet in Appendix 3. The additional heritage constraints will also be highlighted. The site is needed to deliver growth in accordance with national and local planning policies. Further desk based work to be investigated.	Ensure site sheet makes full reference to all heritage constraints so that developers are clear what will be needed to enable the development of this site. Undertake desk based assessment of heritage impacts to support the allocation.
IP012 Peter’s Ice Cream – There are heritage issues at this site so the development constraints should also mention Central Conservation Area and St Clements Church. The allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts and appropriate development criteria set if taken forward.	English Heritage	Detailed archaeology comments will be added to the site sheet in Appendix 3. The additional heritage constraints will also be highlighted. The site is needed to deliver growth in accordance with national and local planning policies.	Ensure site sheet makes full reference to all heritage constraints so that developers are clear what will be needed to enable the development of this site. Further assessment of heritage impacts will be undertaken before submission of the plan.
IP029 Land Opposite 674-734 Bramford Road - object because the road will not be able to sustain the traffic generated. There are already queues on Bramford Road and problems at Copdock cause traffic to rat run along Bramford Road. Residential parking on Bramford Road under the A14 narrows	Private individual	The Highway Authority has not raised an objection to the allocation on traffic or road safety grounds. The development may incorporate a link road through to Europa Way to help to ease queuing at the	No change.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
the carriageway and creates a danger.		Bramford Road/Sproughton Road junction, however this is subject to impact testing.	
IP031 Burrell Road – Support the allocation and density. Constraints such as flood risk / contamination might affect viability as the site was previously a petrol station car showroom and workshop.	East of England Co-Operative Society	Welcome support for the allocation. Flood risk and possible contamination are already identified as possible constraints in the site sheet at Appendix 3. Site specific viability issues would be considered at planning application stage.	No change.
IP031 Burrell Road – there are heritage issues at this site. The site sheet mentions some but should also mention St Mary at Stoke Church (Grade 1) to the south. The allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts and appropriate development criteria set if taken forward.	English Heritage	The proximity to the listed St Mary Stoke church will be highlighted on the site sheet. The site is needed to deliver growth in accordance with national and local planning policies.	Add reference to St Mary Stoke to constraints section of site sheet. Further assessment of heritage impacts will be undertaken before submission of the plan.
IP032 King George V Field – Object to the allocation unless replacement playing field(s) can be provided, which are of equivalent or better quality and quantity in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements prior to the commencement of development. As the site contains Whitton Utd ancillary facilities will need to be replaced also.	Sport England	The need to replace facilities lost is acknowledged already in the site sheet at Appendix 3. However, it will be stated explicitly within policy DM39 (now SP2) also and the text in the site sheet will be expanded. Currently there is planning permission in place for replacement pitches and facilities to be provided on land within Mid Suffolk District north of Whitton Sports Centre (application reference 0254/13 which renewed application 1117/10).	Add text to Table 1 of SP2 (formerly DM39) flagging up the need for replacement playing field(s) and facilities and expand text in the site sheet also to make the requirement clear.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
IP032 King George V Field – as with site IP005, this site falls within the setting of Whitton Conservation Area and could affect its significance with a risk of cumulative impact. The allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts and appropriate development criteria set if taken forward.	English Heritage	The site sheet at Appendix 3 already highlights the conservation area, however the text will be expanded and the risk of cumulative impact referred to. There is already a planning brief for this site (and the Tooks site adjacent IP005) which identifies the Conservation Area as a constraint.	Add text to site sheet emphasising the need to take account of the conservation area in terms of cumulative impacts.
IP032 King George V Field – infrastructure and / or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth, or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	This will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet.	Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP037 Island Site – the site forms a large part of the Wet Dock Conservation Area and contributes to the significance of this heritage asset. Clarification on redevelopment of the site, including which buildings should be retained, is essential. There may also be archaeological issues in relation to industrial heritage.	English Heritage	The site sheet at Appendix 3 already refers to the conservation area, however this reference will be updated to reflect English heritage's points and reference to archaeology will be added. The opportunity area guidelines in chapter 7 identify buildings to be retained.	Add detail to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP037 Island Site - – infrastructure and / or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth, or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	This will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet.	Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP037 Island Site – Whilst it is recognised that DM39 requires new access to enable the development of the Island Site, development should include consideration of access for emergency vehicles as a priority.	Suffolk County Council	The requirement for a new access would include access for emergency vehicles, however reference to emergency vehicles will be added to the site sheet at Appendix 3.	Add reference to emergency vehicle access to Appendix 3 site sheet.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
IP037 Island Site – ABP supports the allocation but requires more flexibility in the mix of uses to support its viability and deliver its successful regeneration.	Associated British Ports	Policy DM39 (now SP2) already flags up the need for a master plan on this important site. An indicative mix is specified to allow capacity estimates etc. to be made. However, the Council is mindful of viability issues and will add wording to make this clear.	Add wording about the viability of mixed uses to the reasoned justification to policy SP2 (formerly DM39).
IP039a Land between Gower St and Great Whip St – there is potential for redevelopment of the site although there are heritage issues with the conservation area to the north and archaeology. Further site specific criteria should be set.	English Heritage	The site sheet at Appendix 3 already highlights its proximity to the conservation area. Archaeological comments will be added.	Add archaeological comments to the Appendix 3 site sheet. Further assessment of heritage impacts will be undertaken before submission of the plan.
IP039a – Development here should enhance National Cycle Route 1 to enable increased cycling from Shotley into the town centre. S106 money should be used to convert a motor vehicle lane on Stoke Bridge to a cycle lane. Conditions for pedestrians and cyclists should not be worsened.	Private individual	Cycle provision in new developments is addressed through policy DM17. The Council is due to prepare a cycling strategy supplementary planning document which will consider strategic routes around the Borough.	Strategic cycle routes to be addressed through Cycling Strategy to be prepared.
IP040 & 041 Civic Centre Area / Civic Drive – development constraints should also mention the proximity of Burlington Road Conservation Area and St Matthew’s Church (Grade II*) to the west. The site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts and appropriate development criteria set if taken forward.	English Heritage	The proximity to the conservation area and St Matthew’s church will also be highlighted on the site sheet. The site is needed to deliver growth in accordance with national and local planning policies. A draft planning brief has been prepared which identifies the heritage assets and what the potential heritage issues may be.	Add further conservation constraints to Appendix 3 site sheet. Further assessment of heritage impacts will be undertaken before submission of the plan.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
<p>IP043 Commercial Buildings and Jewish Burial Ground – this is a very sensitive site partly in the Central Conservation Area containing Grade II listed buildings and adjoining others. Archaeological issues include the Jewish Burial Ground - how would development respect this asset in terms of its significance and setting? The site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts and appropriate development criteria set if taken forward, notwithstanding the broader development principles set out in Chapter 7.</p>	English Heritage	The Council is confident that a form of redevelopment could be found which addresses appropriately the heritage assets mentioned. Heritage constraints are highlighted in the site sheet at Appendix 3 but more detailed information will be added including detailed archaeology comments. Further desk based work to be investigated.	Add heritage comments to the Appendix 3 site sheet. Undertake desk based assessment of heritage impacts to support the allocation.
<p>IP048 Mint Quarter – about half the site contains a scheduled monument (part of the Saxon town) which is not mentioned as a development constraint even though the archaeology of the site could greatly influence its redevelopment and could extend beyond the site. There is a risk that development could harm the significance of the scheduled monument, which may need to be excluded from the allocation boundary. Further assessment of archaeology is recommended and provision of guidance. The site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts and appropriate development criteria set if taken forward.</p>	English Heritage	Detailed archaeological comments will be added to the site sheet at Appendix 3. Further desk based work to be investigated.	Add archaeological comments to the Appendix 3 site sheet. Undertake desk based assessment of heritage impacts to support the allocation.
<p>IP054 Land between Old Cattle Market and Star Lane – very sensitive site containing built heritage, scheduled monument and archaeological potential. Archaeology could greatly influence its redevelopment, as it may extend beyond the scheduled areas. Recognition of and development</p>	English Heritage	Detailed archaeological comments will be added to the site sheet at Appendix 3. Further desk based work to be investigated.	Add archaeological comments to the Appendix 3 site sheet. Undertake desk based assessment of heritage impacts to support the allocation.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
<p>of criteria for scheduled monuments are needed, to avoid risk of harmful proposals. Monuments may also need to be excluded from the allocation boundary and clear guidance given. Further assessment of archaeology is strongly recommended before allocation is finalised to ensure the site is justified. The site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts and appropriate development criteria set if taken forward.</p>			
<p>IP061 Lavenham Road – multiple objections (36) to the allocation on a range of grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - shortage of car parking and parked cars blocking roads, including Kelly Road ; - traffic volume and congestion on Lavenham Road/Kelly Road, lack of access points and road safety; - access for emergency vehicles could be affected; - the condition of local roads (pot holes, icy in winter on the hill); - the site is opposite a retirement home; - it would reduce light to Chantry Home Farm Park and other surrounding properties; - it is used as a children’s play area and for recreation, dog walking and community events; - development should take place elsewhere e.g. Elton Park Works vacant site or Hadleigh Road (Harris Bacon); - loss of views; - noise, dust and nuisance from traffic including construction traffic; 	<p>Private individuals</p>	<p>The site has long been allocated for development – until now the expectation has been that it would be developed as a primary school but the County Council has confirmed that the site is no longer needed for this purpose. The Highway Authority has not raised safety or access objections to the allocation. Although some of the open space would be lost, an area would be retained for children’s play and informal recreation. It is also close to Chantry Park which offers extensive opportunities for recreation. Views and house values are not planning considerations. Detailed traffic and drainage issues would be taken into account through</p>	<p>Retain the allocation for housing and open space.</p>

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reducing property values and reducing quality of life; - changing the character of the area and town cramming; - drainage issues on Lavenham Road so the development would increase flood risk; - new homes would be occupied by criminals; - old trees and a listed building on or near the green; - people cannot use Chantry Park as it contains snakes in the wildlife areas and has no lighting and children would be out of sight; - privacy and peace would be lost; - reduce the number of homes proposed on the site and retain more open space (70%) and trees; - it should be a play area for young people with a skate park, football, basketball, etc.; - a building site could tempt local young people into “misadventure” and greater density of housing might have the same affect; - The Green is an important place for the community, helping with young people’s social and personal development. 		<p>the detailed planning of the development at planning application stage. The allocation establishes the principle of residential use on the site.</p> <p>There is no evidence that new homes would be occupied by criminals or encourage such activity. Residential development is proposed at Elton Park Works as well as this site – development opportunities within the Borough are limited. The Hadleigh Road site (former Harris Bacon) is needed for employment uses and is bounded by railway lines.</p>	
<p>IP061 Lavenham Road – the County Council is the landowner and would wish to discuss the need for open space provision in light of existing provision locally and the objectives of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.</p> <p>The site may contain archaeology therefore any permission may need to be conditioned to secure a programme of archaeological works.</p>	Suffolk County Council	<p>The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Study 2009, as updated by the Ipswich Open Space and Biodiversity Policy 2013 indicates that in the South West area of Ipswich, there is an over provision of parks, natural and semi-natural space, allotments and children’s</p>	<p>Add archaeological detail to Appendix 3 site sheet.</p>

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
		facilities, but an under provision of amenity open space, outdoor sports facilities and young people's provision. There is also under provision of tree canopy cover. Therefore a proportion of the site should be retained for open space to address the deficits. Archaeological advice will be added to the site sheet at Appendix 3 so developers are clear about what is required.	
IP061 Lavenham Road – Support the allocation as the park is not extensively used and there is a large park 100 yards away with access from Lavenham road. It would be a positive use of the site to address the housing shortage.	Private individual	Support is welcomed.	No change.
IP065 Bader Close - Object to the allocation unless replacement playing fields can be provided, which are of equivalent or better quality and quantity in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements prior to the commencement of development. May agree to mitigation to require improvement of other playing fields in the vicinity.	Sport England	The site has been deleted as it now has planning permission.	Delete the allocation from DM39 (now policy SP2).
IP065 Bader Close – infrastructure and /or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth, or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	The site has been deleted as it now has planning permission.	Delete the allocation from DM39 (now policy SP2).
IP080 – Cycle Ipswich wish to have a link through this site to the housing behind as an alternative to using Wherstead Road. There is also potential for a new pedestrian and cycle tunnel under the railway	Private individual	Cycle provision in new developments is addressed through policy DM17. The Council is due to prepare a cycling strategy supplementary	Strategic cycle routes to be addressed through Cycling Strategy to be prepared.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
to make this journey more convenient than the current tunnel.		planning document which will consider strategic routes around the Borough.	
IP089 Waterworks Street – allocation broadly supported but would need to retain part of site at northern end as car park to serve the Co-Op Education Centre. Development could take place leaving a reduced parking area.	East of England Co-Operative Society	The parking constraint is noted and will be added to the site sheet at Appendix 3. The site capacity will not be reduced at this stage as it may be possible to achieve the redevelopment including parking through good design.	Add this constraint to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP089 Waterworks Street – there is potential for the redevelopment of this site although there are heritage issues. The development constraints mention these issues but appropriate development criteria must be set if the site is taken forward.	English Heritage	The need for appropriate development criteria will be added to the site sheet at Appendix 3.	Add this constraint to the Appendix 3 site sheet. Further assessment of heritage impacts will be undertaken before submission of the plan.
IP096 Handford Road - Support the allocation for residential use but object to the timescale imposed by the policy (short term delivery). The timing will be a commercial decision.	RCP Parking Ltd	The timescales for delivery indicated in Table 1 in policy DM39 reflect intelligence gathered through the SHLAA process (update completed Nov 2013). It is not intended that sites identified for the medium or long term would be held back should development come forward sooner but the Council needs to estimate delivery timescales in order to complete the housing trajectory and support delivery. There is no intention by the Council to compulsorily purchase the site therefore it will be for the owner to decide when to bring it forward.	Change the delivery timescale from short to medium term. This would not prevent the site from coming forward sooner if so desired by the landowner.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
IP096 Handford Road - there is potential for the redevelopment of this site although there are heritage issues. The development constraints mention these issues but appropriate development criteria must be set if the site is taken forward.	English Heritage	The need for appropriate development criteria will be added to the site sheet at Appendix 3.	Add this constraint to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP116 St Clement's Hospital Grounds – the site is used by football clubs and it is critical that the needs of existing users of the site are met in any redevelopment. Object to development unless replacement playing fields and ancillary facilities can be provided which are of equivalent or better quality and quantity in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to development commencing. Any new senior football pitch should be of an equivalent size and quality to the existing.	Sport England	The site sheet at Appendix 3 already highlights the need for replacement sports facilities to be provided but additional wording regarding quality will be added.	Add further information about the requirement for replacement sports facilities to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP116 St Clement's Hospital Grounds - infrastructure and /or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth, or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	This will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet.	Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP116 St Clement's Hospital Grounds – Identification of the site is welcomed. Confirm most of the site will be available within 5 years. Costs of redevelopment will have a bearing on infrastructure and affordable housing. NSFT will require an additional hectare for healthcare purposes within the site and a revised planning application will be submitted around August 2014. Table 1 should be updated to reflect the reduced site area.	Lawson Planning Partnership for Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust.	Welcome support for the allocation and confirmation of the delivery timescale. The site area will be adjusted in Table 1 and the site sheet at Appendix 3. The use split is specified in policy SP6 (formerly DM43) as 80:20. The site includes protected trees and existing sport and recreation facilities and	Amend the site area and capacity at Table 1 (DM39/SP2) and on Appendix 3 site sheet.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
The redevelopment for up to 227 dwellings is considered appropriate. NSFT are currently reviewing land take requirement for retained health care uses on the site and overall masterplan. The specific percentage of the site used for housing, sport and open space would be determined at the planning application stage and may vary from the 60:40 split specified.		connects well with the ecological network via the golf course and railway line. The North East area committee area within which the site falls has a deficit of many types of open space and therefore on-site provision will be necessary to meet the needs of the development.	
IP116 St Clement's Hospital Grounds – the people of Ipswich do not want any more big housing estates built. Roads, utilities and services cannot cope. St Clement's grounds are also a no go area.	Private individual	The Council needs to plan to meet its objectively assessed housing need. The St Clement's Hospital Grounds site is an important part of the housing land supply. No insurmountable issues have been raised by infrastructure providers.	No change.
IP121 Front of Pumping Station Belstead Road – The two boreholes on site constitute a major constraint to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve the proposed growth.	Anglian Water	Delete the allocation as it is needed for water supply purposes.	Delete the allocation.
IP136 Silo, College Street – this is a sensitive site within the Central and Wet Dock Conservation Areas and opposite the Grade I listed and scheduled Wolsey Gate. The development constraints mention these issues apart from the scheduled monument, but further assessment of heritage impacts will be needed to justify the site for allocation. Appropriate development criteria will need to be set if the site is taken forward.	English Heritage	Reference to the scheduled monument will be added to the site constraints in the site sheet at Appendix 3, and the need for appropriate development criteria. Further desk based work to be investigated.	Add this constraint to the Appendix 3 site sheet. Undertake desk based assessment of heritage impacts to support the allocation.
IP150c Land south of Ravenswood – multiple (3) objections to additional housing on the grounds that: - Additional homes here would create	Private individuals	Site IP150c was identified broadly as part of the Ravenswood development through the 1997 Local Plan proposals map. At that time,	Allocation is now for employment land as per the 1997 Local Plan.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
<p>additional traffic when there is already congestion at the Ravenswood roundabout;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is already traffic congestion in the wider area which needs resolving before any further development; - It will affect road safety; - Residents believed this land was to be country park; - The site contains nesting skylarks and black redstarts; - It would have negative visual and environmental impacts. 		<p>the end uses were expected to be employment uses and sports park. A slightly smaller area is now identified through this plan for the sports park (reference IP150b). The employment allocation was considered by the Council for housing in the draft Site Allocations Plan to help meet the Borough's objectively assessed housing need, however this has now reverted to employment uses to support economic growth. Whilst it is recognised that there is congestion in the Nacton Road corridor, the Highway Authority has not raised objections to the allocation on access grounds and is currently implementing improvements to corridor. An ecological survey would be required to be carried out before an application was submitted which would enable biodiversity impacts to be considered and mitigated if necessary.</p>	
<p>IP150c Land south of Ravenswood – land was previously allocated at Airport Farm Kennels for a park and ride site (IP152). Traffic flows in east Ipswich on Nacton Road/Landseer Road have increased significantly with the development around Ransomes Europark. Consideration should</p>	<p>Ipswich Buses</p>	<p>The previous park and ride allocation was not carried forward because the Highway Authority produced no evidence that it could be delivered. Indeed, the service at Bury Road has been withdrawn. However, the</p>	<p>Further discussion needed with Ipswich Buses and the Highway Authority.</p>

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
be given in the area of Airport Farm or land off Alnesbourn Crescent to a park and ride car park into which buses presently serving Ravenswood would be diverted. The bus service element would be provided at little or no cost to the public purse as it would involve diverting a service already in the area.		Council will investigate some form of park and ride facility in this area.	
IP150c Land south of Ravenswood - infrastructure and /or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth, or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	This will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet.	Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP150c – With the recent restaurant/bar uses this would better suit employment uses possibly with live/work units or residential uses on upper floors or possibly as an eco-business park. Consider transport implications following recent withdrawal of public transport services. There should be a constraint to ensure no residential development takes place until the residential land by the primary school is under construction.	Private individual	The allocation has been changed to employment uses to support economic growth.	Allocation is now for employment land as per the 1997 Local Plan.
IP150c – Support but would suggest consideration is given to allocating some of the land to accommodate park and ride to be served by the existing bus network. This may assist some traffic pressure on Nacton Road.	Private individual	The previous park and ride allocation was not carried forward because the Highway Authority produced no evidence that it could be delivered. Indeed, the service at Bury Road has been withdrawn. However, the Council will investigate some form of park and ride facility in this area.	No change at present.
IP150c – Ensure continuation of high quality cycle network from Ravenswood if possible making it even higher quality to discourage car use.	Private individual	Cycle provision in new developments is addressed through policy DM17. The Council is due to prepare a cycling strategy supplementary	Strategic cycle routes to be addressed through Cycling Strategy to be prepared.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
		planning document which will consider strategic routes around the Borough.	
IP165 Eastway Business Park - infrastructure and /or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth, or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	This will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet.	Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP172 15-19 St Margaret's Plain – this would be a fine green in one of the town's most heavily polluted spots, opening out views of the manor and church.	Ipswich Society	Vegetation would benefit air quality but it is unclear how a green space would be funded, delivered and maintained. Residential use has been established through a previous permission for student accommodation and sites are needed to meet objectively assessed housing need.	No change
IP172 15-19 St Margaret's Plain – there is potential for redevelopment of the site although there are heritage issues. These are mentioned as constraints but the site sheet does not mention the nearby scheduled monument. Further assessment of heritage impacts will be needed to justify the allocation. Appropriate development criteria will need to be set if taken forward.	English Heritage	Reference to the scheduled monument will be added to the site constraints in the site sheet at Appendix 3. Core Strategy Review policy DM8 now sets appropriate development criteria relating to heritage. Housing sites are needed to meet the Borough's objectively assessed housing need.	Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet. Further assessment of heritage impacts will be undertaken before submission of the plan.
IP188 Webster's Saleyard, Dock Street - there is potential for redevelopment of the site although there are heritage issues. These are mentioned as constraints but further assessment of heritage impacts will be needed to justify the allocation. Appropriate development criteria will need to be set if taken forward.	English Heritage	Housing sites are needed to meet the Borough's objectively assessed housing need but they need to respond sensitively to heritage constraints. Core Strategy Review policy DM8 now sets appropriate development criteria relating to	Further assessment of heritage impacts will be undertaken before submission of the plan.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
<p>IP256 Synthetic pitch at Ipswich Sports Club – multiple objections (4) to the allocation on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is not needed as 3,500 homes will be built at Ipswich Garden Suburb; - The pitch is well used and is accessible by cyclists and pedestrians as well as motorists; - Alternative sports provision would be needed; - The sports facility is needed for people’s health and wellbeing and to tackle obesity; - The pitch is also needed for the future growth of the sports club; - Housing density would not be in keeping with the area and would affect the quality of life of new residents in relation to amenity space; - The site area is incorrect and the capacity should be reduced; - The site would better suit fewer 4 bed family homes with decent plot sizes; - The site area should exclude the access road; - It has poor access; - It would create traffic on already overcrowded roads. 	Private individuals	<p>heritage.</p> <p>The site is needed as well as the Garden Suburb, in order to meet objectively assessed housing need. The club asserts that the pitch is surplus to its requirements. The allocation policy already requires the provisions of policy DM28 to be met which would mean either that the facility is considered surplus or it is replaced elsewhere. The site density and capacity has been reduced to better fit in with the character of the area. The Highway Authority has not identified an issue with the access. The allocation remains subject to the terms of policy DM28 in relation to replacement provision if information shows a need for such pitches.</p>	Retain the allocation showing a reduced capacity and housing density.
<p>IP256 Synthetic pitch at Ipswich Sports Club – object to development unless replacement playing fields can be provided which are of equivalent or better quality and quantity in a suitable location</p>	Sport England	<p>The Council has allocated the site for residential use because its sporting use is constrained during the winter by the absence of floodlighting (for</p>	Retain the allocation showing a reduced capacity and housing density.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
<p>and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to development commencing. In this instance we are concerned that loss of the facility would be detrimental to existing users of the site even if an alternative site was secured, as users would lose access to ancillary facilities. Any alternative facility would need to replicate not just the pitch but all ancillary facilities that serve it.</p>		<p>residential amenity reasons). Should information indicate that the pitch is still needed, replacement provision or enhancement of an existing facility will be required in accordance with policy DM28. The Playing Pitch Strategy published in March 2009 indicates that at 2007 and 2021, the North West area into which the pitch falls has a surplus of hockey pitches, as does the adjacent Central Area, however the North East area has a deficit of 4.5 pitches rising to 5.5 pitches. Borough wide there was a 1.5 pitch surplus at 2007 which becomes a deficit of 0.3 hockey pitches by 2021. The Council is currently reviewing the Playing Pitch Strategy which will report in early 2015 and provide updated information about need.</p>	
<p>IP256 Synthetic pitch at Ipswich Sports Club – the area is shown as 0.6ha in DM39 and 0.87ha in Appendix 3. The former gives a density of 50dph contrary to policy DM30c. Although an allocation of just under 30 dwellings would comply with the policy, it would be out of keeping with the neighbourhood. A density of 15dph is suggested. As the hockey pitch is classified as sport provision it would need to be replaced before change of use for housing could be sanctioned. The current access is considered inadequate.</p>	<p>Northern Fringe Protection Group</p>	<p>The site area discrepancy relates to whether the access road is included or not. This has been clarified both in the allocation policy and in the site sheet at Appendix 3. The site density and capacity has been reduced to better fit in with the character of the area. The Highway Authority has not identified an issue with the access. The allocation remains subject to the terms of</p>	<p>Retain the allocation showing a reduced capacity and housing density. Clarify site area.</p>

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
		policy DM28 in relation to replacement provision if information shows a need for such pitches.	
<p>IP256 Synthetic pitch at Ipswich Sports Club – this site is fully available and surplus to the Club’s requirements. Opposition by the local planning authority and neighbours to floodlights which would enhance usage prospects renders the pitch useless for hockey and other sport. The site is available short term.</p>	Ipswich Sports Club	<p>The Council has allocated the site for residential use because its sporting use is constrained during the winter by the absence of floodlighting (for residential amenity reasons). Should information indicate that the pitch is still needed, replacement provision or enhancement of an existing facility will be required in accordance with policy DM28. The Playing Pitch Strategy published in March 2009 indicates that at 2007 and 2021, the North West area into which the pitch falls has a surplus of hockey pitches, as does the adjacent Central Area, however the North East area has a deficit of 4.5 pitches rising to 5.5 pitches. Borough wide there is a 1.5 pitch surplus at 2007 which becomes a deficit of 0.3 hockey pitches by 2021. The Council is currently reviewing the Playing Pitch Strategy which will report in early 2015 and provide updated information about need.</p>	Change delivery timescale from medium to short term.
<p>IP257 Felixstowe Road – multiple objections (8, including one supported by a 149-signature petition) to the allocation on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is still in use as a Children’s facility; 	Private individuals	The site has been deleted as it is still in use as a children’s facility.	Delete the allocation.

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is protected by a covenant; - it would create access and traffic issues, in particular the narrow access; - it would increase congestion and pollution; - it would put local community infrastructure especially schools and doctors' surgeries under strain; - level differences would mean overlooking and loss of privacy; - it would affect house values; - sewerage is inadequate; - 			
<p>Support - IP257 Land at Felixstowe Road east of Malvern Close – We support the allocation of site IP257 (see report), the existing access is suitable for 27 dwellings, and a suitable location, unconstrained and subject to very few site specific issues so housing development could be “achievable” when the plan is adopted. 27 houses is viable and available, the community facility is redundant in accordance with DM32. Site outline needs to be amended in accordance with submitted plan.</p>	<p>Evolution Town Planning</p>	<p>The site has been deleted as it is still in use as a children’s facility.</p>	<p>Delete the allocation.</p>
<p>IP257 Land at Felixstowe Road east of Malvern Close – Ormiston Trust’s Ipswich Centre provides services to the local community on the site. The Trust intends to continue to provide children’s and family services from this location. The services meet the needs of residents in the vicinity, many of whom are vulnerable or suffer deprivation, and are greatly valued by the community. The Centre is</p>	<p>Priory Heath Councillors</p>	<p>The site has been deleted as it is still in use as a children’s facility.</p>	<p>Delete the allocation.</p>

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
on an accessible but secluded site with outdoor play areas, pleasant landscaping, and a section of a wild-life corridor. The site is not particularly suitable for housing development, owing to its backland position, proximity to the railway, uneven levels and restricted access.			
IP257 Felixstowe Road - Support the allocation of site IP257 Felixstowe Road.	Ormiston Children and Families Trust	The site has been deleted as it is still in use as a children's facility.	Delete the site allocation.
IP259 Former Holywells School – the allocation appears to affect only the former school buildings on the site leaving the built sports facilities and playing fields available for community use. This approach was agreed with Sport England at the time of the planning application for the new Ipswich Academy building, therefore Sport England support the allocation.	Sport England	The support is welcomed.	No change.
IP259 Former Holywells School – hopefully Birkin Haward's space efficient geodesic dome can be retained and a use found for it in the future.	Ipswich Society	The comment is noted, although the building is not nationally or local listed. The sports facilities are to be retained.	No change.
IP259 Former Holywells School – the County Council owns the site. The Borough Council is correct to note that development for housing is subject to the school being declared surplus to education requirements and consent for disposal from the Secretary of State. Therefore it may not become available for the purposes of this plan.	Suffolk County Council	The constraints are acknowledged on the site sheet. Whilst the site could be de-allocated and left as a potential windfall gain for housing, the Council prefers to indicate its preferred use through the allocation for residential use to help meet the objectively assessed housing need.	No change.

Policies DM40 to DM57

Comment	Respondent	IBC Response	Action required
DM40 Land with planning permission or awaiting a Section 106 (now called policy SP3)			
Housing allocations - historical and archaeological background comments and advice about the need for archaeological investigation are provided on many of the allocated housing sites. It is not proposed to list them all separately here.	Suffolk County Council	The sites listed in Policy DM40 (now SP3) already have planning permission and therefore archaeological matters would have been dealt with through the application process. However, the permissions could lapse and therefore constraints information will be provided for these sites in a separate section of Appendix 3.	Add constraints information (rather than a full site sheet) to Appendix 3 for the sites listed in Policy SP3 (formerly DM40).
The policy fails the tests set by the NPPF paragraph 182. It is neither justified, effective nor consistent with national policy. It cannot be certain that residential use will be the most appropriate future alternative use for such sites, circumstances can change. Other reasonable alternatives may be preferable on their own merits and the default use may not prove deliverable. It could frustrate the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Savills	The Council is required by the NPPF to meet the borough's objectively assessed housing need. These sites with planning permission and either not started or started and stalled, or awaiting the signing of a Section 106 amount to nearly 2,000 dwellings. This is a significant part of the housing land supply. In an under-bounded borough where options for delivering housing are limited, this supply needs to be protected. The policy allows for mixed use as well as residential therefore it offers some flexibility.	No change.
IP132 - Beeson Properties Ltd consider that alternatives uses for the site are possible whilst not objecting to the allocation proposed.	Beeson Properties	The Council is required by the NPPF to meet the borough's objectively assessed housing need. These sites	No change

<p>However, as part of a retail led regeneration of this part of the Waterfront, this site could accommodate a special, architecturally imposing development with a high component of retail floor space. It is acknowledged it can only achieve this in conjunction with the allocation of other sites for similar purposes in line with the representations made by Applekirk Properties Ltd or independently. Widen the available land uses for the site to include retail.</p>		<p>with planning permission and either not started or started and stalled, or awaiting the signing of a Section 106 amount to around 2,000 dwellings. This is a significant part of the housing land supply. In an under-bounded borough where options for delivering housing are limited, this supply needs to be protected. The policy allows for mixed use as well as residential therefore it offers some flexibility. Any retail element would be considered against the retail policies of the Core Strategy.</p>	
<p>Crest welcomes the acknowledgement that housing needs are to be met in full. Crest considered that deliverable sites should be allowed to come forward now. This could reduce reliance on sites listed under this policy for achieving the targets. Sites may continue to be stalled so their contribution to the supply should not be assumed. However Crest welcomes the proposed approach to safeguard the sites for residential development as one component of the housing land supply.</p>	<p>Crest Strategic Projects</p>	<p>The Site Allocations plan is not preventing deliverable sites from coming forward. The policy simply safeguards some housing delivery from stalled sites or sites awaiting the signing of a Section 106.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>IP052 Land between Lower Orwell Street & Star Lane – land should be retained for road widening / segregated cycle track / tree planting.</p>	<p>Ipswich Society</p>	<p>Whilst this would best be pursued as part of a comprehensive approach to improving the Star Lane gyratory and its links at either end, widening the pavements to allow for localised tree planting or enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes could improve the environment of the area.</p>	<p>Add reference to possible widening in the Appendix 3 site sheet.</p>

<p>IP052 Land between Lower Orwell Street & Star Lane – Development Constraints do not mention the Grade II* listed building to the north or scheduled monuments Saxon and medieval defences) to the west of the site. The archaeological potential of the site will need to be understood along with the impact on the significance and setting of heritage assets. The allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts and appropriate development criteria set if taken forward, notwithstanding the development principles in chapter 7.</p>	<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>The sites listed in Policy DM40 already have planning permission and therefore heritage matters would have been dealt with through the application process. However, the permissions could lapse and therefore constraints information will be provided for these sites in a separate section of Appendix 3. Housing sites are needed to meet the Borough’s objectively assessed housing need.</p>	<p>Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet. Further assessment of heritage impacts will be undertaken before submission of the plan.</p>
<p>DM41 Land allocated for Gypsy and Traveller sites (now called policy SP4)</p>			
<p>DM41, IP261 Land at River Hill - multiple objections (118) to the allocation of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation on a range of grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dangerous access on a busy road near bends; - Unsuitable residential environment next to the A14; - Development of a greenfield site which separates Bramford from Ipswich; - Too much provision in west Ipswich; - Social impact on the community and community cohesion; - Effect on house prices; - Effect on perceptions of safety; - Effect on businesses nearby; - Concerns about rubbish and anti-social 	<p>Private individuals; Bramford Parish Council;</p>	<p>A need for additional pitches in Ipswich has been identified through the Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2013. The local planning authority is required to address this need. The allocation has been deleted as a result of concerns about its deliverability, but the general guidance in the policy is retained. The Council plans to work with other local authorities in Suffolk to plan strategically for permanent pitch provision across the county once current work to identify 3 sites for short stay or transit provision has</p>	<p>Delete the allocation and work towards permanent pitch provision (via a planning application) through the Suffolk-wide group.</p>

<p>behaviour;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-conformity with national policy and the criteria in policy CS11; - No alternatives have been properly considered; - Need for more discussion with the local community; - Poor access to basic services; - Extend West Meadows instead; - Only a small part of the field is allocated and the use could extend onto the rest of the site; - Dispute the need for additional pitches. 		<p>been completed.</p>	
<p>DM41, IP261 Land at River Hill – no objection to development in principle but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p>	<p>Suffolk County Council</p>	<p>The allocation has been deleted.</p>	<p>Delete the allocation.</p>
<p>DM41, IP261 Land at River Hill – it would be poor practice to meet all Ipswich’s need on one site and would dominate Bramford village. If planned as an affordable site, fewer than 10 pitches is unlikely to be viable. More discussion is needed with neighbouring councils and the Gypsy community. The land area exceeds the allocation site with no barriers to expansion.</p>	<p>Babergh District Council</p>	<p>The allocation has been deleted as a result of concerns about its deliverability, but the general guidance in the policy is retained. The Council plans to work with other local authorities in Suffolk to plan strategically for permanent pitch provision across the county once current work to identify 3 sites for short stay or transit provision has been completed.</p>	<p>Delete the allocation and work towards permanent pitch provision through the Suffolk-wide group.</p>

DM42 Land allocated for employment use (now SP5)			
IP152 – Support but TPOs should be reassessed as some have been dead for a number of years.	Private individual	This is noted and the information will be passed to the arboricultural officer.	Pass information to arboricultural officer.
IP152 – Support but suggest giving consideration to retaining some of the site to accommodate car parking for possible park and ride. This need not be a dedicated park and ride area as the area is served by the existing bus network provided access can be achieved in conjunction with site 150c. This may address traffic pressure on Nacton Road.	Private individual	The previous park and ride allocation was not carried forward because the Highway Authority produced no evidence that it could be delivered. Indeed, the service at Bury Road has been withdrawn. However, the Council will investigate some form of park and ride facility in this area.	The Council will investigate some form of park and ride facility in this area.
IP152 - There should be park and ride here to help alleviate congestion issues.	Private individual	The previous park and ride allocation was not carried forward because the Highway Authority produced no evidence that it could be delivered. Indeed, the service at Bury Road has been withdrawn. However, the Council will investigate some form of park and ride facility in this area.	The Council will investigate some form of park and ride facility in this area.
IP152 – Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	This will be added to the Site Sheet in Appendix 3.	Add information to Site Sheet.
IP152 – Traffic flows along Nacton Road and Landseer Road have increased significantly with the development around Ransomes Europark. Consider Park and Ride in the area off Airport Farm or land off Alnesbourn Crescent into which buses on service 1 would be diverted. The bus element would be provided with little or no public money as it would involve diverting existing buses.	Ipswich Buses Ltd	The previous park and ride allocation was not carried forward because the Highway Authority produced no evidence that it could be delivered. Indeed, the service at Bury Road has been withdrawn. However, the Council will investigate some form of park and ride facility in this area.	The Council will investigate some form of park and ride facility in this area.

<p>IP152 Airport Farm Kennels – support employment use and welcome intention to form a gateway to Ipswich.</p>	<p>Priory Park Ltd</p>	<p>The support is welcomed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>IP035 Key Street / Star Lane / Burtons Site – object to the allocation for employment. This ignores the multi-use mixed scheme for which the site already has planning permission as well as the pivotal / enabling role that this site could perform in a retail-led regeneration of this end of the Ipswich Waterfront.</p>	<p>Applekirk Properties Ltd / Leslie Short</p>	<p>The site has been allocated in accordance with the lapsed planning permission. Policy DM42 (now SP5) shows IP035 allocated for ‘employment uses with a mix of other uses’ and 30% of the site allocated for B1. The Council’s approach to large scale retail is set out in CS14.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>IP140a and b Land North of Whitton Lane – support in principle the allocation of land for employment and park and ride extension. However, the existing park and ride is closed and there may be viability issues over the land coming forward for the extension. Given that the sites are adjacent and should be comprehensively master planned, there should be a single overall allocation to amalgamate IP140a and IP140b, resulting in a deliverable and viable development. Current access exists via Anglia Parkway North therefore access improvements are not needed.</p>	<p>Mockbeggars Hall Farms / Strutt and Parker</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges that the existing park and ride site is not currently in use. However, park and ride provision is part of an overall approach to sustainable transport in the town, and the site could be brought back into use in future, should demand or subsidies increase. However, there is insufficient evidence at present to demonstrate the need for and viability of an extension to the facility and, therefore, the park and ride extension allocation will be deleted. Regarding the access, the Highways Agency has previously indicated that the scale of the development would impact on the A14 junction and therefore access improvements would be necessary.</p>	<p>Amend the allocation to amalgamate IP140a and IP140b and remove the requirement for an extension to the park and ride site. Retain the reference to access improvements. Make consequential amendments to DM45 (now SP9).</p>

<p>IP037 Island Site – support the allocation of site IP037 but request amendment to the wording to allow the expansion of boat building and marine leisure uses where appropriate, and more flexibility in the proportional split of acceptable uses where a master plan or the preparation of more detailed proposals show this is expedient.</p>	<p>Associated British Ports</p>	<p>Policy DM39 (now SP2) already flags up the need for a master plan on this important site. An indicative mix is specified to allow capacity estimates etc. to be made. However, the Council is mindful of viability issues and will add wording to make this clear.</p>	<p>Add wording about the viability of mixed uses to the reasoned justification to policy SP2 (formerly DM39).</p>
<p>IP067 Former British Energy Site – object to the 100% allocation for employment and request 75% residential and 25% employment. This is in line with the NPPF which advises against long term protection of allocated employment sites.</p>	<p>EDF Energy / BNP Paribas Real Estate</p>	<p>The Council made a mixed use allocation at preferred options stage in 2007 (housing and employment). Since that date, both Anglian Water and the Council’s Environmental Health team have indicated that the site is not suitable for residential use because of proximity to the sewage works. Therefore a residential allocation is not appropriate.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>IP058 – Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required.</p>	<p>Anglian Water</p>	<p>This will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet.</p>	<p>Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet.</p>
<p>IP058 – No concerns regarding the use of the site for low key industrial uses however 50% housing would be inappropriate as it would conflict with existing industrial uses to the south.</p>	<p>Lafarge Tarmac</p>	<p>The site is allocated for 100% employment use.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>IP058 – The Council should work with Anglian Water to resolve the local odour issue to aid the attractiveness of this site. Further development risks worsening the problem. IBC should commit to improving potentially problematic brownfield sites to make them more attractive to developers including setting up a steering group to tidy up Ipswich waterfront in preparation for</p>	<p>Northern Fringe Protection Group</p>	<p>Improvements have been made at the Cliff Quay sewage works to address odour issues. The Council is taking action at the Waterfront to support its regeneration. It aims to buy two key sites at the western end of the Waterfront to provide private housing and improve public access</p>	<p>No change.</p>

development.		from Stoke Bridge. The Council also seeks support e.g. through the Suffolk Growth Strategy for the delivery of brownfield sites.	
IP067 - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	This will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet.	Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP067 – no concerns over use of the site for low key industrial uses but object to allocation for either office or residential use which would conflict with existing industrial uses to the south including Lafarge Tarmac’s asphalt plant which lawfully has unrestricted hours of operation and vehicular movements.	Lafarge Tarmac	The site is allocated for 100% employment use excluding office.	No change.
IP099 - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required.	Anglian Water	This will be flagged up in the Appendix 3 site sheet.	Add to the Appendix 3 site sheet.
IP099 – 100% employment will be appropriate with appropriate restrictions.	Lafarge Tarmac	The site is allocated for 100% employment use.	No change.
IP099 - The Council should work with Anglian Water to resolve the local odour issue to aid the attractiveness of this site. Further development risks worsening the problem. IBC should commit to improving potentially problematic brownfield sites to make them more attractive to developers including setting up a steering group to tidy up Ipswich waterfront in preparation for development.	Northern Fringe Protection Group	Improvements have been made at the Cliff Quay sewage works to address odour issues. The Council is taking action at the Waterfront to support its regeneration. It aims to buy two key sites at the western end of the Waterfront to provide private housing and improve public access from Stoke Bridge. The Council also seeks support e.g. through the Suffolk Growth Strategy for the delivery of brownfield sites.	No change.
IP140b Land North of Whitton Lane – support the allocation for employment but object to the table	Ashfield Land / Barton Wilmore	A mix of employment (B class) uses is permitted. The uses are	No change.

<p>notes. Rather than primarily B1 uses, a variety of uses (B1, B2, B8 and sui generis) should be permitted. Reference to medium or long term delivery should be deleted to promote flexibility. Reference to the adjacent unallocated site in Mid Suffolk should be deleted.</p>		<p>considered appropriate to the site's location, and to complement employment sites in the vicinity including the former sugar beet factory, which is allocated as a strategic employment site within Babergh Core Strategy for port related and other employment uses. The timescale is indicative and would not prevent the site from coming forward earlier. Whilst the land adjacent to the north which lies within Mid Suffolk District is not currently allocated, development on the area within Ipswich should not prejudice its future development. The best way to achieve this is through a comprehensive planning approach.</p>	
<p>IP146 (UC263) Ransomes Europark East – Much work is needed to ensure improved cycling facilities, which are not legalised pavement cycling, or placing cyclists with motor vehicles, so that there aren't huge increases in motor traffic caused by this development.</p>	<p>Private Individual</p>	<p>Core Strategy policy DM17 deals with cycling provision within new developments. The Council's proposed Cycling Strategy supplementary planning document (SPD) would provide a vehicle for addressing strategic cycling routes.</p>	<p>No change – consider cycle access to Ransomes as part of Cycling Strategy SPD.</p>
<p>IP147 (UC264) Land between railway junction and Hadleigh Road – There should be a cycle and walking link through this land, under the Ipswich Chord railway line, over the river and on to the cycle path on the other side of the river. This would be an extremely useful link to implement to encourage walking and cycling into the town</p>	<p>Private Individual</p>	<p>The proposed pedestrian and cycle bridge location has been moved to site IP059a Elton Park Works as it is considered to better link with the former Sugar Beet Factory site and cycling / pedestrian use would be more compatible with residential</p>	<p>No change.</p>

centre from this site and the nearby area. This would also link into National Cycle Route 51.		use than possible industrial uses at IP147.	
DM43 – Land allocated and protected as open space (now SP6)			
IP037 Island Site – Supports the overall allocation but requests amendment to the wording of the policy to allow for a lesser amount of open space in the proportional split of acceptable uses where a master plan or the preparation of more detailed proposals show this is appropriate and expedient. The requirement for 15% open space is excessive and ignores the amenity function that the water area plays.	Associated British Ports	Support is welcomed. The Waterfront area contains little usable public open space and no green space therefore it is important that large sites such as the Island Site include such provision. 15% accords with policy DM29.	No change.
IP116 St Clements – The site would provide for significant areas of open space to conserve the level of tree interest and parkland character. NSFT are currently reviewing land take requirements for retained healthcare uses. The percentage split requiring 20% open space should therefore be determined at planning application stage.	Lawson Planning Partnership	The site includes protected trees and existing sport and recreation facilities and connects well with the ecological network via the golf course and railway line. The North East area committee area within which the site falls has a deficit of many types of open space and therefore on-site provision will be necessary to meet the needs of the development.	No change.
Generally welcome this policy subject to development being required to comply with DM33 – DM35. Development or enhancement of open space for recreation should not contribute to increased disturbance effects to designated sites. Support recognition of the essential value of open space to quality of life.	Natural England	Cross referencing should not be necessary as it is taken as read in the plan that all the relevant policies apply to each proposal. The plan has been subject to Appropriate Assessment to check that there would not be significant effects on designated European sites.	No change.

<p>IP061 – The site should be allocated as a play area for young people for football, skateboarding, basketball etc. The estate currently has no play / outdoor space resulting in children playing in inappropriate locations.</p>	<p>Private individual</p>	<p>The site has long been allocated for development – until now the expectation has been that it would be developed as a primary school but the County Council has confirmed that the site is no longer needed for this purpose.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has not raised safety or access objections to the allocation.</p> <p>Although some of the open space would be lost, an area would be retained for children’s play and informal recreation. It is also close to Chantry Park which offers extensive opportunities for recreation.</p>	<p>No change. Please see also comments about site IP061 logged to policy DM39 (now SP2).</p>
<p>IP061 – The reduction in open space is not acceptable. Kelly Road and Lavenham Road are often busy and there is often double parking, particularly if roadworks on Hadleigh Rd. The houses would create more traffic and on-street parking. Building work would create more noise. Concern over impact for dog walkers and children who use the green. Also currently used for community events.</p>	<p>Private individual</p>	<p>The site has long been allocated for development – until now the expectation has been that it would be developed as a primary school but the County Council has confirmed that the site is no longer needed for this purpose.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has not raised safety or access objections to the allocation.</p> <p>Although some of the open space would be lost, an area would be</p>	<p>No change. Please see also comments about site IP061 logged to policy DM39 (now SP2).</p>

		retained for children's play and informal recreation. It is also close to Chantry Park which offers extensive opportunities for recreation.	
Support – IP263 West of Bridge Street, north of the River Orwell – Having a more direct cycle and foot route from Stoke Bridge to the crossing on Grafton Way would aid the current desire line which already exists with the worn grass.	Private Individual	The support is welcomed and paths could be considered when the open space is delivered.	No change.
IP263 West of Bridge Street, north of the River Orwell – The site is opposite the Wet Dock Conservation area, but given its proposed use as a public open space there will be limited impacts. The suitability of this location as public open space is queried given the existing road network and consider that efforts to increase open space within the town centre should be pursued.	English Heritage	The Waterfront area lacks open space and there is already a skatepark facility next to this area.	No change.
DM44 Land allocated for leisure uses or community facilities (now SP7)			
IP260 - Turn the former Odeon into a film/music museum	Private individual	The Council does not own the site and there has been no indication from the owner that this is a use they are considering. Therefore there is too much uncertainty about the proposal to include it in the plan. However, such a proposal would be considered on its merits.	No change.
IP005 – Whilst the healthcare impact arising from this allocated site in isolation would not necessitate provision of a new GP surgery, a site for a new health centre to accommodate planned growth may be warranted, subject to securing	Lawson Planning Partnership / NHS Property Services Ltd	The clarification relating to the possible need to reserve land for a doctor's surgery is welcomed.	No change

pooled funding from other major housing sites as necessary and subject to NHS business case approval procedures.			
IP260 – The Theatres Trust should be consulted on the redevelopment of the Odeon cinema.	The Theatres Trust	Noted. This will be added to the site sheet at Appendix 3.	Add information to site sheet.
IP149 – Support the principle of new recreational areas reducing impact on the integrity of the SPA, but concerned about close proximity of Pond Hall Farm to SPA. Suggestions made in the Appropriate Assessment of the Site Allocations DPD should be incorporated into DM44.	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	The Pond Hall Farm allocation has been clarified as an extension to the Orwell country park, with further feasibility and impact assessment work to be carried out on any potential visitor centre. It will be separated from DM44 (now SP7) and given its own policy SP8 to reflect the sensitivity of the site’s location adjacent to the SPA.	Create new policy SP8 to address Pond Hall Farm and the Orwell Country Park extension.
UC029 (Jewsons site) should be allocated for leisure uses / town centre uses reflecting the aspirations of the landowner in the medium term. The term ‘leisure uses’ should be clarified in DM44. The 2013 DTZ report identified a lack of leisure uses in the town centre.	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	The site is currently in use as a builders’ merchant and therefore an allocation is not considered appropriate. The site lies within the town centre boundary and an application for main town centre uses excluding retail would be considered on its merits against Core Strategy policy DM22. The particular leisure or community uses are specified in the table.	No change.
The Borough Council should be having full and detailed discussions with NHS Property Services with regard to provision of primary care services. Serious consideration should be given to whether there is a need to allocate land for medical services.	Suffolk County Council	Land has been identified and safeguarded for health facilities where the NHS has indicated that there is a need, for example in connection with site IP005.	No change.

Generally welcome this policy subject to development being required to comply with DM33 – DM35. Development or enhancement of open space for recreation should not contribute to increased disturbance effects to designated sites.	Natural England	Cross referencing should not be necessary as it is taken as read in the plan that all the relevant policies apply to each proposal. The plan has been subject to Appropriate Assessment to check that there would not be significant effects on designated European sites.	No change
IP010a – Welcome the reservation of land at the Co-op on Felixstowe Road to enable the expansion of Rose Hill Primary School. The County Council would be pleased to supply information to justify this.	Suffolk County Council	Evidence will be required to support the allocation.	Request evidence from Suffolk County Council.
IP149 – Support the allocation of the County Park but object to the provision of the visitors’ centre because: it will require a car park, Gainsborough Lane would need improvement and maintenance, cars would be a danger to visitors and affect ambience, access via Bridge Wood would require a new track, the area is at saturation point for recreation, attract more visitors and dogs to the Ramsar site which would impact on wildlife and provision of facilities would attract vandals.	Private individual	The Pond Hall Farm allocation has been clarified as an extension to the Orwell country park, with further feasibility and impact assessment work to be carried out on any potential visitor centre. It will be separated from DM44 (now SP7) and given its own policy SP8 to reflect the sensitivity of the site’s location adjacent to the SPA.	Create new policy SP8 to address Pond Hall Farm and the Orwell Country Park extension.
IP149 – Significant concerns over the allocation. Existing significant visitor pressure is believed to contribute to damage and bird disturbance on the SSSI and SPA. The allocation has potential to increase effects. Support the allocation of land for leisure and community uses provided in the least environmentally sensitive locations where there will be no adverse effects on designated sites.	Natural England	The Pond Hall Farm allocation has been clarified as an extension to the Orwell country park, with further feasibility and impact assessment work to be carried out on any potential visitor centre. It will be separated from DM44 (now SP7) and given its own policy SP8 to reflect the sensitivity of the site’s location adjacent to the SPA.	Create new policy SP8 to address Pond Hall Farm and the Orwell Country Park extension.

<p>IP150b – Object to sports park allocation. There are sufficient existing facilities at Gainsborough Sports Centre and David Lloyd. Previous allocation was smaller. Concerns over traffic congestion and road safety, particularly cumulative effects with Futura Park and further development at Ravenswood. Charles Church houses were designed to overlook a Country Park. The land is a habitat for skylarks.</p>	<p>Private individual</p>	<p>The sports park was identified broadly through the 1997 Ipswich Local Plan as proposal 7.10 for 14.29ha. The current proposal is slightly smaller at 9.6ha. Whilst it is recognised that there is congestion in the Nacton Road corridor, the Highway Authority has not raised objections to the allocation on access grounds and is currently implementing improvements to corridor. An ecological survey would be required to be carried out before an application was submitted which would enable biodiversity impacts to be considered and mitigated if necessary.</p>	<p>No change, however playing pitches have been removed from the allocation.</p>
<p>IP150b – Object to sports park allocation due to impact on wildlife area, loss of sound buffer to A14, noise from sports events and general use, increases in traffic and effects on interchanges, impact on value of homes with open views and security risks from increase in people. There are better sports parks elsewhere.</p>	<p>Private individual</p>	<p>An ecological survey would be required to be carried out before an application was submitted which would enable biodiversity impacts to be considered and mitigated if necessary.</p> <p>Any potential noise issues would be dealt with through the planning application process.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that there is congestion in the Nacton Road corridor, the Highway Authority has not raised objections to the allocation on access grounds and is currently implementing</p>	<p>No change, however playing pitches have been removed from the allocation.</p>

		improvements to corridor. There is not currently a cycle track facility within Ipswich.	
IP150b – There are already ample sports facilities in Ipswich including at Gainsborough, the noise would affect residents of Dunwich Close and the Care Home and the facility would create a lot of extra traffic on already congested roads and roundabouts.	Private individual	Any potential noise issues would be dealt with through the planning application process. There is not currently a cycle track facility within Ipswich. Whilst it is recognised that there is congestion in the Nacton Road corridor, the Highway Authority has not raised objections to the allocation on access grounds and is currently implementing improvements to corridor.	No change, however playing pitches have been removed from the allocation.
IP150b – Object to sports park allocation. Land has wildlife and recreation value. There would be increased noise from the A14 and the sports facility. Light pollution could affect bats. The area is already gridlocked, roads should be improved. Crime and anti-social behaviour will increase. The area is already served by sports facilities at Gainsborough. It is a waste of public money.	Private individual	An ecological survey would be required to be carried out before an application was submitted which would enable biodiversity impacts to be considered and mitigated if necessary. Any potential noise and lighting issues would be dealt with through the planning application process. Whilst it is recognised that there is congestion in the Nacton Road corridor, the Highway Authority has not raised objections to the allocation on access grounds and is currently implementing improvements to corridor. There is no evidence that crime and	No change, however playing pitches have been removed from the allocation.

		antisocial behaviour would increase. The facility at Gainsborough does not offer an outdoor cycle track.	
IP150b – Object to the sports park. The roads in the surrounding area cannot cope with existing traffic. There are already facilities at Gainsborough Sports Centre. We do not wish to look onto sports facilities. Has wildlife and noise been considered?	Private individual	An ecological survey would be required to be carried out before an application was submitted which would enable biodiversity impacts to be considered and mitigated if necessary. Any potential noise issues would be dealt with through the planning application process. Whilst it is recognised that there is congestion in the Nacton Road corridor, the Highway Authority has not raised objections to the allocation on access grounds and is currently implementing improvements to corridor. The facility at Gainsborough does not offer an outdoor cycle track.	No change, however playing pitches have been removed from the allocation.
IP150b - The site is regenerating heathland rich in flora and fauna. There is already serious traffic congestion on Ravenswood roundabout. The 10 pitches at Gainsborough Sports Centre appear underused. Not know if there is demand for a cycle track. There is a BMX track nearby.	Private individual	An ecological survey would be required to be carried out before an application was submitted which would enable biodiversity impacts to be considered and mitigated if necessary. Whilst it is recognised that there is congestion in the Nacton Road corridor, the Highway Authority has not raised objections to the allocation on access grounds and is currently implementing improvements to corridor. The facility at Gainsborough does	No change, however playing pitches have been removed from the allocation.

		not offer an outdoor cycle track. The nearest cycle track facility is in East London. The BMX track at Landseer Park is dated.	
IP150b (UC267 part) Land south Ravenswood – Objects on the grounds of wildlife, skylarks, lizards and black redstarts. Light pollution from sports lights, gathering of youths, parking, road congestion, traffic flow, noise pollution, and the potential for disruptive behaviour.	Private Individual	An ecological survey would be required to be carried out before an application was submitted which would enable biodiversity impacts to be considered and mitigated if necessary. Any potential noise and light pollution issues would be dealt with through the planning application process. Whilst it is recognised that there is congestion in the Nacton Road corridor, the Highway Authority has not raised objections to the allocation on access grounds and is currently implementing improvements to corridor. There is no evidence that it would cause disruptive behaviour.	No change, however playing pitches have been removed from the allocation.
IP150b (UC267 part) Land south Ravenswood – Need to ensure that the quality cycle and walking infrastructure that has been implemented in Ravenswood, is also implemented here too, so that people from Ravenswood will cycle here, and also encourage people from outside Ravenswood area to cycle or take the bus here.	Private Individual	Noted. Core Strategy Review policy DM17 addresses cycle access within new developments. Strategic route matters could be picked up through the proposed Cycling Strategy supplementary planning document (SPD).	Ensure cycling route matters explored through the SPD.
IP258 Land at University Campus Suffolk – The site is located north of Central Conversation Area and the Holy Trinity Church. Given that the site is already in use for educational purposes, a new	English Heritage	Noted – Core Strategy review policy DM8 sets out generic development criteria.	No change.

primary school is unlikely to have considerable impact on these heritage assets. Appropriate development criteria would need to be set if this site is taken forward.			
IP258 – Land allocated for a new primary school at Suffolk New College is welcomed and, assuming it will provide a 420 place school, will relieve pressure on Cliff Lane, St Helens and Rose Hill Primary Schools.	Suffolk County Council	The support is welcomed.	No change
DM45 – Safeguarding land on development sites for transport infrastructure (now SP9)			
IP140a and b Land North of Whitton Lane – support in principle the allocation of land for employment and park and ride extension. However, the existing park and ride is closed and there may be viability issues over the land coming forward for the extension. Given that the sites are adjacent and should be comprehensively master planned, there should be a single overall allocation to amalgamate IP140a and IP140b, resulting in a deliverable and viable development. Current access exists via Anglia Parkway North therefore access improvements are not needed.	Strutt and Parker / Mockbeggars Hall	The Council acknowledges that the existing park and ride site is not currently in use. However, park and ride provision is part of an overall approach to sustainable transport in the town, and the site could be brought back into use in future, should demand or subsidies increase. However, there is insufficient evidence at present to demonstrate the need for and viability of an extension to the facility and, therefore, the park and ride extension allocation will be deleted. Regarding the access, the Highways Agency has previously indicated that the scale of the development would impact on the A14 junction and therefore access improvements would be necessary.	Amend the allocation to amalgamate IP140a and IP140b and remove the requirement for an extension to the park and ride site. Retain the reference to access improvements. Make consequential amendments to DM45 (now SP9).
IP037 – Support the allocation of the Island Site.	Associated British Ports	The support is welcomed.	No change.

<p>IP116 / IP257 / IP10a and IP10b – consider potential for a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway crossing. Note the County Council has no plans to bring the Bury Road Park and Ride site back into use.</p>	<p>Suffolk County Council</p>	<p>The pedestrian and cycle bridge was included as a proposal at Preferred Options stage on site IP010. It was not included in the Regulation 18 informal consultation draft plan October 2013 because of uncertainty over its deliverability. However, the opportunity to link development to the north of the railway with the district centre and school to the south and vice versa is an important one to support sustainable travel and accessibility. Therefore it will be included in policy DM45 (now SP9). The Council acknowledges that the existing park and ride site is not currently in use. However, park and ride provision is part of an overall approach to sustainable transport in the town, and the site could be brought back into use in future, should demand or subsidies increase.</p>	<p>Include the proposal in policy SP9 (formerly DM45). Work towards its delivery via the Local Transport Plan.</p>
<p>No comments subject to a requirement for proposals to comply with DM33 – DM35.</p>	<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Noted – see previous response regarding cross referencing.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>IP140a – Policy CS17 deletes reference to Park and Ride assumed to be Bury Road but site allocations DPD proposes extension of the facility and elsewhere in the plan there is commitment to re-opening the Park and Ride. Consistency is required across the whole document. Re-opening of the Park and Ride site is supported.</p>	<p>Northern Fringe Protection Group</p>	<p>Noted. The extension to the Bury Road park and ride has now been deleted from policy DM45 (SP9) because of concerns about its deliverability.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Support - IP140a (UC0257) Land North of Whitton Lane - I very much approve of measures to prevent more motor vehicles coming into the town centre and encouraging people to leave their cars at the edge of town to come in. Could facilities be built or publicity to promote park and cycle, which avoids having to have huge increases in the bus capacity.	Private Individual	The extension to the Bury Road park and ride has now been deleted from policy DM45 (SP9) because of concerns about its deliverability. However the existing park and ride site is protected through policy SP9 for future re-use (formerly DM45). Cycle facilities would need to be looked at when the site is brought back into use.	No change.
IP140a (UC0257) Land North of Whitton Lane – As with site IP005 and IP032 the site is within the setting of Whitton Conservation area and could affect its significance with the risk of cumulative impact. The conservation area is not mentioned amongst the constraints. The site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	English Heritage	The extension to the Bury Road park and ride has now been deleted from policy DM45 (SP9) because of concerns about its deliverability. However IP140a has been incorporated into IP140b. There is a requirement for a comprehensive planning approach to the site including a potential future section within Mid Suffolk and this would provide the opportunity to fully investigate conservation area issues.	No change.
IP140a (UC0257) Land North of Whitton Lane – Any building work here needs to incorporate Dutch style infrastructure to link in with the local road network and cycle routes. The site must be sign posted as the route to minimise the motor car use to the site.	Private Individual	The extension to the Bury Road park and ride has now been deleted from policy DM45 (SP9) because of concerns about its deliverability. However the existing park and ride site is protected through policy SP9 for future re-use (formerly DM45).	No change.
IP037 – Welcomes the requirement to provide additional vehicle access. This will need to be subject to a risk assessment.	Suffolk County Council	The need for a risk assessment is noted.	Add reference to risk assessment to site sheet at Appendix 3.

DM46 – Port of Ipswich (policy deleted and some content incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25)			
Supports the allocation but requests the addition of details of wording noting that the site forms part of a larger site in ABP’s ownership which spans the adjoining administrative area of Babergh District Council which is suitable for port-related use.	Associated British Ports	The cross boundary matter is noted. However, the allocation has been deleted, as the Appropriate Assessment identified the potential for significant effects on the SPA, e.g. in connection with jetties. The Appropriate Assessment indicates that the issues are not necessarily insurmountable (see paragraph 6.1.7) but the level of uncertainty has informed the de-allocation of the site. The site remains within an employment area which is covered by Core Strategy policy DM25. The Port is a statutory undertaker and therefore subject to regulations requiring Appropriate Assessment for any projects (requiring planning permission or not requiring planning permission).	Some elements of the policy now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25.
The Appropriate Assessment identified that DM46 could have an adverse impact on the integrity of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA. The recommendations have not been incorporated into DM46 and it should therefore be revised to ensure there is no significant adverse impact on integrity of the SPA.	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	See above – the allocation has been deleted although the site remains within an employment area.	Some elements of the policy now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25.
IP262 – Support the allocation. However the policy should allow suitable flexibility to encourage other suitable industrial uses which may be	Lafarge Tarmac	See above – the allocation has been deleted although the site remains within an employment area.	Some elements of the policy now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25.

appropriately suited to the port site. Industrial activity and associated HGV movements must be appropriately accommodated within wider regeneration proposals.			
No comments subject to a requirement for proposals to comply with DM33 – DM35.	Natural England	Noted – see previous response regarding cross referencing.	Some elements of the policy now incorporated into Core Strategy policy DM25.
Chapter 6 – IP-One Draft Site Allocations and Policies			
Disappointing that there is not more specific reference to the historic environment. This would help to meet NPPF para 126 which requires local plans to set out a positive strategy for the historic environment. Measures to tackle heritage risk could be included plus reference to updating conservation area appraisals and managing change to heritage assets through enforcement powers or Article 4 Directions for example. This could be in policy or supporting text and should be mindful of DM52 or DM54.	English Heritage	It is acknowledged that the IP-One area of central Ipswich has a rich historic environment and reference to this will be increased throughout the plan.	Add reference to the historic environment where relevant.
In favour of improving retail in town centre and using brownfield sites for residential. Concerned at lack of plans for attracting new employment to the wider Ipswich area and reliance on service growth. Support idea that varied and high quality housing will attract people from London and the suburbs. Small speciality shops should be encouraged. Quality of design not improving as much as had been hoped, DM5 needs to ensure poor design is refused. Support central skyline policy and DM23.	The Ipswich Society	Work is being undertaken to attract new employment. The key contribution of the Local Plan is to allocate land which it does, for a range of business, industrial, leisure, retail and other commercial uses. DM5 is retained in the Core Strategy review and the skyline policy has been incorporated in it as a more general statement about views, and in DM6 Tall Buildings.	No change to Site Allocations plan.
Welcomes the principles of regeneration and development strategies. Advise caution in	Crest Strategic Projects	The flood barrier is due for completion in 2017. Site allocations	No change.

assuming deliverability of residential sites in the IP-One area in the absence of certainty over the flood barrier. Consider there is greater certainty of the delivery of high quality residential development at the Northern Fringe and that this can take place alongside all residential development in central Ipswich.		are made within this plan and the Core Strategy review for central brownfield sites and the Ipswich Northern Fringe (or Garden Suburb).	
DM47 – Central Shopping Area (now moved to Core Strategy policy DM20)			
There is excess town centre retail space in Ipswich resulting in vacant properties and feeling of decline.	Private individual	The Central Shopping Area boundary has already been amended to reduce the area at the eastern end of the centre in the vicinity of Cox Lane, and extend it at Westgate to include a new retail site.	No change.
The central shopping area should be extended to include the area in and around the northern end of the waterfront at the end of St Peter Street including site IP035.	Applekirk Properties	The Town Centre Opportunity Areas Study 2013 (DTZ) indicates that this is too far from the prime pitch to attract retailers.	No change.
DM49 – Retail Site Allocation (now SP10)			
IP040 – This is the wrong location to deliver the retail aspirations. There is opportunity at the waterfront. The site would perpetuate the east-west alignment of the central area due to which the extremities of the area fail.	Applekirk Properties	The Town Centre Opportunity Areas Study 2013 (DTZ) advises that there is a need to prioritise certain sites and to support these where possible through policy and other corporate means. Westgate offers a deliverable site for a retail led scheme due to its proximity to the prime pitch and an appropriate retail scheme here would be likely to reinforce the existing prime commercial retail pitch to a greater extent than other sites investigated.	No change.

There is insufficient evidence to justify the reduction in new retail floorspace. The NPPF states that a range of suitable sites should be allocated. The 2010 retail capacity study should be updated to inform policy and the Jewson site should be allocated for town centre uses.	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	The Town Centre Opportunity Areas Study 2013 (DTZ) advises that there is a need to prioritise certain sites and to support these where possible through policy and other corporate means. Westgate offers a deliverable site for a retail led scheme due to its proximity to the prime pitch and an appropriate retail scheme here would be likely to reinforce the existing prime commercial retail pitch to a greater extent than other sites investigated. Land also remains within the Central Shopping Area on the western part of the Mint Quarter. The Jewson site lies outside the Central Shopping Area.	No change.
Proximity of Burlington Road Conservation Area and St Matthews Church (grade II*) should be mentioned. The allocation should be justified in terms of its heritage impacts and appropriate development criteria should be set. These issues could be set out in the supporting text.	English Heritage	Noted. Reference will be added to the site sheet for site IP040 in Appendix 3.	Add heritage constraints information to site sheet in Appendix 3.
DM51 – Town Centre Boundary (now moved to Core Strategy policy DM22)			
Support the extent of the town centre boundary and the inclusion of sites IP035 and IP132.	Applekirk properties	Support noted.	No change.
DM52 The Waterfront (now SP11)			
Requests that recognition is made in Policy DM52 and its accompanying text to the Port and to other important existing employment activity within and adjoining the Waterfront area which the Council	Associated British Ports	The Port is already mentioned in the explanation to this policy and also that of DM25 in the Core Strategy. The policies already provide for	Add supporting text about the port.

wishes to safeguard and support. New development in the Waterfront should be sensitive to these existing uses and avoid potential impacts which may prejudice the continued operation and, where appropriate, expansion of these uses.		these matters to be considered however some supporting text will be added.	
The land use policies for the waterfront are inadequate for the waterfront's regeneration needs. The policy needs more flexibility and to recognise that interim uses can make a contribution. Retail uses should be acceptable in the waterfront area.	Applekirk Properties.	The Council's strategy based on the NPPF and the evidence base is to focus retail development within the Central Shopping Area.	No change.
Greater reference should be made to the historic environment in the policy and supporting text.	English Heritage	Noted and will be added.	Add reference to the historic environment of the Waterfront to supporting text.
IP049 – There is potential to redevelop No. 8 Shed although there are heritage issues with the conservation area to the west and archaeology.	English Heritage	The site sheet for IP049 identifies the conservation area and area of archaeological importance.	Add wording re. archaeology to Appendix 3 site sheet.
DM54 – Arts, Culture and Tourism (now SP14)			
DM54 could be with the Development Management policies in the Core Strategy DPD, all DM policies should be in the same document to avoid confusion.	The Theatres Trust	The policy addresses uses included within the 'main town centre uses' definition in the NPPF and includes support for a potential facility at the Waterfront, therefore it is considered appropriate to include the policy here.	No change.
Retaining and enhancing existing facilities will benefit heritage assets currently used for arts, culture or tourism whilst new facilities could be beneficial provided they are sympathetically designed. The policy should contain references to the historic environment.	English Heritage	The historic environment is now covered by Core Strategy review policy DM8, however wording has been added to the supporting text.	Add wording to supporting text.

DM55 Improving Pedestrian and Cycle Routes (now SP15)			
Support the policy subject to a change to DM44 to reinstate UC029 (Jewsons) for town centre use including some leisure.	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	See response above.	No change.
The in-principle support offered to pedestrian and cycle routes is welcomed. However, as most of the projects are not identified in the Local Transport Plan the County Council cannot guarantee support.	Suffolk County Council	There may be an opportunity to include these projects within the forthcoming review of the LTP.	No change.
Welcome DM55.	Natural England	Support welcomed.	No change.
DM56 Transport Proposals in IP-One (now SP16)			
IP037 – Development does not require provision of a wet dock crossing. ABP will however support the Council in seeking to develop a feasible solution which addresses all safety, security and operational issues and avoids any adverse impact on port and marine operations.	Associated British Ports	This support is welcomed. The supporting text is clear that the full Wet Dock Crossing is not necessary to deliver development of the Island.	The policy (now SP16) has been amended in response to the Highway Authority's comments.
Support the calming of the gyratory and opportunities for linking the town to the waterfront and encouraging the enhancement of heritage assets. Care will be needed with the design of the crossing as it passes through the Island Site and Wet Dock conservation area. Welcome further discussion and heritage issues should be referenced in the supporting text.	English Heritage	Heritage issues will be mentioned in the supporting text.	Add reference to heritage issues in supporting text.
Concerned over proposals to reduce Star Lane Gyratory to one lane each direction following provision of the wet dock crossing. This is likely to have implications for through traffic from Ipswich port. The implications of port traffic must be appropriately considered in the absence of any other links to the A14.	Lafarge Tarmac	The Highway Authority would consider how the Waterfront Transport Study could be implemented.	The policy (now SP16) has been amended in response to the Highway Authority's comments.

No options assessment or public consultation has been carried out in relation to the Wet Dock crossing route. The Highway Authority recognises the aspiration for a crossing in the Local Transport Plan but is not currently promoting the scheme. Therefore it does not require any particular route to be safeguarded. Regarding the delivery of a Wet Dock Crossing / Star Lane gyratory, the County Council is committed to considering how the Waterfront Transport Study can be implemented, but decisions about the highway network will rest with the County Council as Highway Authority.	Suffolk County Council	The policy will be amended to reflect the comments on the route.	The policy (now SP16) has been amended in response to the Highway Authority's comments.
Various housing allocations – suggestions have been made regarding strategic cycle routes associated with sites IP006, IP039a, IP150c and IP080. They are logged separately under policy DM39 above.	Private Individual	Please see responses above.	No change but Cycle Strategy supplementary planning document will need to look at strategic routes.
No comments on DM47 to DM57 provided developments comply with DM33 to DM35.	Natural England	Noted – see previous response regarding cross referencing.	No change.
DM57 Town Centre Parking (now SP17)			
Beeson Properties Ltd and RCP Parking object to the delineation of the central parking core. This should include sites at Burrell Road, Duke Street/Orwell Quay, Handford Road, Lower Orwell Street, Princes Street, Ranelagh Road, Rose Lane and St. Peters Warehouse site off Bridge Street.	RCP Parking	The car parking core has been defined according to where the Council considers parking should be limited to short stay shopper parking, in order to support sustainable travel choices.	No change.
RCP parking consider the approach to parking is too aspirational and undeliverable. It ignores the contribution to working shopping and leisure parking made by sites at Burrell Road, Duke Street/Orwell Quay, Handford Road, Lower Orwell Street, Princes Street, Ranelagh Road, Rose Lane	RCP Parking	The approach to car parking has been determined by weighing the need to support town centre vitality and viability with the need to encourage sustainable transport. In relation to temporary car parks, the	No change.

and St. Peters Warehouse site off Bridge Street. There is no detail of the viability of the proposed multi-storey car parks. Should recognise the above car parks as a permanent feature of the car parking offer.		Council has successfully resisted further provision at appeal.	
Revisions to car parking in the town centre should take account of historic environment issues. Many surface car parks have considerable archaeological importance with some designated as Scheduled Monuments or lying within the Area of Archaeological Importance.	English Heritage	Heritage matters would be addressed through site redevelopments.	No change.
IP055 (UC058) Crown Car Park – Can the car park have a portion of it allocated to secure bicycle parking, with the potential for a local business doing bike maintenance and hire.	Private Individual	The Council owns the Crown car park and therefore this suggestion could be considered through the Cycling Strategy supplementary planning document (SPD) which is to be prepared.	No change – pick up strategic cycling matters through the proposed SPD.
The intention to support the town centre economy and limit congestion is welcomed. The Council seeks reassurances that the car parking policy will support the Travel Ipswich scheme.	Suffolk County Council	The Council considers that additional short stay parking will support shopper visits but not encourage long stay commuting trips by car.	No change.
Policies map			
The Site Allocations Map and IP-One Inset should show the Scheduled Monuments.	Suffolk County Council	These will be added.	Add scheduled monuments to the policies map.
The policies map should show the port areas protected for mineral handling facilities.	Suffolk County Council	The port areas are included as parts of the existing employment areas and safeguarded for employment uses through Core Strategy policy DM25.	No change.
Proposed site allocations and Policies map IP-One Area Inset – The Council encourages applicants to contact the archaeological service in advance of seeking planning permission, to discuss	Suffolk County Council	This matter will be clarified through Core Strategy review policy DM8.	Amend DM8 to address the area of archaeological importance.

assessment and recording requirements. This simplifies the application process and reduces risk of underground heritage assets presenting an obstacle to delivery. The policies maps both include an area of archaeological importance (AAI). AAI designations can be helpful in identifying to developers those areas which have a greater than normal chance of revealing significant archaeological remains. However the document is not clear how the AAI is to be used, therefore a policy is needed within the next iteration of the plan.			
Further loss of countryside off Tuddenham Road in addition to the Garden Suburb is not acceptable or sustainable. No traffic assessment has been made including effects on the humpback bridge, absence of footways on the adjacent narrow stretch of road, increased coach usage and the use of Humber Doucy Lane as a rat run. These issues should be resolved before the site is allocated.	Northern Fringe Protection Group	This comment relates to the Core Strategy review allocation via policy CS10 therefore it will be addressed with other representations to that policy.	No change.

Chapter 7

Comment	Source	IBC Response	Action required
Example IP089/ IP039a number of opportunity areas has reduced since 2007 so there are gaps between some of the remaining areas. This means some important sites fall outside opportunity areas so their development may not align with aspirations for the opportunity areas. Identification of development sites in each opportunity area does not always correspond with	English Heritage	The remaining opportunity areas pick up most of the site allocations retained within the IP-One area. Detailed site allocations are made through the relevant policies of the plan e.g. SP2 for IP039a. References to the historic environment have been added and generic	Ensure historic environment information included.

site allocations (e.g. IP039a) and needs clarifying. No references to scheduled monuments and archaeology is also a concern. Development principles for each area are welcomed but development criteria are needed for specific sites.		development criteria are now included in Core Strategy Review policy DM8.	
Chapter 7 - we have no specific comments on these policies subject to proposals being required to comply with policies DM33 – DM35.	Natural England	Noted – see previous response regarding cross referencing.	No change.
Concerned that the Westgate site has no occupier, suggests residential accommodation. Grafton Way site could be a residential/ hotel led. Tacket St/ Cox Lane should have a short mall linking Carr Street to Upper Brook Street plus Multi- Storey car park and residences. Need for increased long stay car parking capacity questioned, main problems are cost and access. Suggest review of parking needs, switching long stay to short stay, reopening Bury Road, Park and Ride. Air quality needs to be assessed and short stay car journeys discouraged accordingly.	Northern Fringe Protection Group	The Westgate allocation can be made without an occupier – it is to meet need over the plan period and is supported by the Town Centre Opportunity Areas Study 2013. The Grafton Way site is safeguarded through policy SP3 (formerly DM40). The western part of the Mint Quarter site remains identified as Central Shopping Area and therefore could include retail development. The eastern side is allocated for residential use, short stay parking and public open space. Short stay shopper parking on that site would need to be provided as the surface parking would be lost. Bury Road park and ride is protected through policy SP9 (formerly DM45).	No change although Bury Road park and ride is now included within policy SP9.
A The Island Site			
Support – ABP supports the identification of the Island site as an opportunity area, and generally supports the points set out under “Development Principles”. ABP requests the removal of reference to “lower rise development” in the supporting text	Associated British Ports	For clarity the reference will be changed to low to medium rise as the development principles state 3, 4 and 5 storeys. The proportion of different uses has been addressed	Amend reference to low rise.

and to “generally low rise development (3, 4, and 5 storeys)” to allow more flexibility in the development of a viable scheme capable of addressing the particular development costs of the site. ABP also requests the removal of “max 50%” against the residential reference, allowing a more flexible proportion of acceptable uses.		through policy DM39 (now SP2).	
Support IP037 (UC038) Island Site – ABP supports the allocation of Site IP037, but requests amendment to the wording of the site allocation details to allow: 1) more flexibility in the proportional split of acceptable uses where a master plan or the preparation of more detailed proposals show this is expedient or necessary to deliver successful regeneration of the Island Site. 2) a higher density of housing 3) a higher indicative capacity and 4) inclusion of B2 as an acceptable use (to allow for expansion of existing boat building uses)	Associated British Ports	This has been addressed above through policy DM39 (now SP2).	See above.
Support - It is important to retain employment on the site for economic reasons but also it is valuable socially and historically to retain those links	The Ipswich Society	Support is welcomed.	No change.
IP037 (UC038) Island Site – This area would be ideal for a right of way for walking and cycling to cross the docks and river, please can this be added as part of the planning requirements? It should not be opened as a motor through route, otherwise there will be far more motor traffic than could be coped with currently never mind when housing is built on this land.	Private Individual	Cycle and pedestrian facilities are already included in the development principles.	Reference has been added to westward connection.
This opportunity area is relatively coherent in terms of the sites it covers along the Waterfront.	English Heritage	Low rise will be clarified.	Clarify that it is low to medium rise development (i.e. 3, 4 or 5 storeys).

References to the built historic environment are good, but there also needs to be consideration of archaeology issues. We welcome statements such as maintaining the character of the conservation area and retention of historic structures. Low rise development is appropriate although it is debatable whether 4/5 storeys qualifies as low-rise.			
B Merchant Quarter			
This is a more complex and diverse area than A and less coherent, making it difficult to establish specific development principles regarding the historic environment. The transition area needs careful planning. Design issues e.g. building heights need to be clarified and further masterplanning may be useful. There are substantial archaeological issues in this area to be addressed, including scheduled monuments. Low rise in this area is defined as three storeys, where A is up to five; consistency and clarification is needed on this point, along with further refinement of development principles and specific criteria for specific sites.	English Heritage	Reference will be added to archaeology. Master planning could take place but has not been specified.	Add reference to archaeology considerations.
C Mint Quarter and Surrounding area			
The redevelopment of the area with a mix of uses is supported but the retention of the Carr St frontage is considered excessive and it is said that it could potentially affect site viability. The frontage is locally listed but the local listing SPD does not rule out demolition if a high quality design replaces it. It is suggested that in the Plan, after the stated desire for retention, the text should indicate that demolition will be considered	East of England Co-Operative Society	Core Strategy review policy DM9 allows for consideration of the local listed frontage but the starting point is its retention.	No change.

if the replacement is of high Quality; alternatively the reference to retention should be removed.			
Interesting to include the Odeon and Regent, this is a sensible way forward which the Society has been advocating. Some of the retail outlets with more interesting facades should be retained; a possible use might be “loft” style residences of which Ipswich has few if any.	The Ipswich Society	Core Strategy review policies would apply to existing facades, e.g. if locally listed (policy DM9).	No change.
This area is complex and diverse, but the current development principles relating to the historic environment are very generic. There is no mention of archaeology or scheduled monuments. Further refinement of the development principles is needed along with specific criteria for specific sites.	English Heritage	Reference will be added to archaeology. Generic development criteria are set out in Core Strategy review policy DM8.	Add reference to archaeology.
Minor comments in relation to the indicative proposals for the six opportunity areas, highway officers would like to hold more detailed discussions. Initial issues; Consideration needs to be given to how traffic will access the site from the East. How will development relate to bus movements in the area (Mint Quarter and Upper Brook Street)	Suffolk County Council	Officer discussions have taken place - no changes to be made, but these matters will need to be addressed through any planning application(s).	No change.
D Education Quarter and surrounding area			
A more refined and less generic set of development principles is required relating to the historic environment, including reference to archaeology issues. Reference to a minimum of 6 storeys along the waterfront needs to be justified in terms of potential heritage impacts, including the adjoining Wet Dock conservation area.	English Heritage	Reference will be added to archaeology. Generic development criteria are set out in Core Strategy review policy DM8.	Add reference to archaeology.
E Westgate			
Possibly Ipswich’s last hope for prime retail, it has	The Ipswich Society	Noted.	No change.

car parking and relatively easy access, a chance for something good with the inclusion of the former courts and police station.			
Although this area does not contain any designated heritage assets, it is situated between two conservation areas (Central and Burlington) and near several listed buildings (e.g. St Matthews Church Grade II*, Willis Building Grade I). Part of the site also lies in an area of archaeological importance. There is currently no reference to the historic environment in the development principles and supporting text, which needs addressing. See also comments on site IP040.	English Heritage	Reference will be added to the historic environment.	Add reference to the historic environment.
With regard to the proposals for the Westgate area, is there an opportunity to increase the quality of pedestrian access from the vicinity of Arcade Street.	Suffolk County Council	Reference will be added to eastward linkage.	Reference will be added to eastward linkage.
F River Corridor and Princes Street Corridor			
Support - Another prime site which has been badly used over the years, nothing can be added to the stated development principles	The Ipswich Society	Noted.	No change.
References to Heritage issues are largely missing from this area, even though it contains a listed building and is near to others (e.g. the Willis Building) and in the Central conservation area. The boundary of the area is also unclear, as the development principles refer to improved frontages and public realm on the street adjacent to St Nicholas Church, but the map shows the church some way outside the opportunity area.	English Heritage	Reference will be added to heritage issues and the St Nicholas' Church reference will be removed for clarity. This opportunity area was previously two and the Church reference was retained in error.	Add reference to heritage issues, and delete reference to St Nicholas' Church.

<p>There may be archaeology issues also, with the area of archaeological importance covering part of the opportunity area.</p>			
<p>Site UC029 – Objection to its omission from site allocation on the “development options” map. The site will be available for redevelopment in the plan period which the owners wish to promote. It is considered that the Council is failing to allocate a suitable site to meet the scale and type of retail and leisure development needed in the town centre. Development would address poor environmental quality in the area and heal the fragmented townscape between the town centre and Cardinal Park.</p>	<p>Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners</p>	<p>This matter has been addressed above through policy DM49 (now SP10).</p>	<p>See above.</p>