

Ipswich Local Plan

Proposed Submission Site Allocations and Policies (Incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) DPD

Statement of Consultation (Proposed Submission – Regulation 19)

September 2015



IPSWICH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Planning and Development
Ipswich Borough Council
Grafton House, Russell Road
Ipswich IP1 2DE
(01473) 432019

email: planningandregeneration@ipswich.gov.uk

website: www.ipswich.gov.uk

Contents

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Outline of the plan preparation process in Ipswich | 1 |
| Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) Consultation | 4 |
| Conclusion | 5 |
| Appendix 1 – Summary of Responses Received under Proposed Submission Consultation | 6 |

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) development plan document 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) development plan document (known hereinafter as the Site Allocations plan) to the Secretary of State, it has to comply with Regulation 22(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This requires a statement setting out:
- (i) Which organisations and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18;
 - (ii) How they were invited to make their representations;
 - (iii) A summary of the main issues raised;
 - (iv) How those issues have been taken into account;
 - (v) If representations were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number made and a summary of the main issues raised;
 - (vi) If no representations were made pursuant to regulation 20 a statement of that fact.
- 1.3 The Pre-Submission Consultation Statement (November 2014) contains details covering points (i) to (iv) above. This Regulation 19 Consultation Statement addresses point (v) above in relation to the proposed submission Site Allocations plan. Point (vi) is not relevant as representations were made.
- 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 plan 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 Site Allocations and Policies (Incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) development plan document preparation process in Ipswich

- 2.1 The Site Allocations 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 The Council's Local Development Scheme (July 2012) introduced a combined Site Allocations plan. 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.
- 2.5 A revised Local Development Scheme was published in July 2013 and a draft pre-submission Site Allocations plan 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.
- 2.6 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.
- 2.7 The timeline below sets out the broad timetable that the Site Allocations plan preparation has followed, and key changes to the process or context that relate to it. As stated above, the Pre-Submission Consultation Statement details consultation undertaken under each of these stages with the exception of consultation undertaken under Regulation 19 which is set out within this statement.

| 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 | Further issues and options consultation – February to March (Regulation 25 under the 2004 Regulations) | Revised Local Development Scheme published May 2007 |

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <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>Statement of Community Involvement adopted September 2007</p> |
| 2008 | <p>January to March consultation on Preferred Options (Regulation 26 under the 2004 Regulations)</p> | <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 | <p>Executive decision to combine Site Allocations and Policies plan and IP-One Area Action Plan at Executive meeting 3/7/12. September 9th 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> | <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> | <p>Revised Local Development Scheme published in July 2013</p> |
| 2014 | <p>Regulation 18 consultation carried out 13th January to 10th March 2014.</p> | <p>Statement of Community Involvement review adopted March 2014</p> <p>Revised Local Development Scheme published in September 2014</p> |
| 2014 / 15 | <p>Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) consultation carried out 12th December 2014 – 5th March 2015.</p> | |

- 2.8 A revised Local Development Scheme was published in September 2014. The Proposed Submission Site Allocations plan was approved by Council on 19th November 2014 and consultation took place between 12th December 2014 and 5th March 2015, under Regulation 19 of the 2012 Regulations.

- 2.9 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.

3 Proposed Submission Consultation (Regulation 19 under the 2012 Regulations)

- 3.1 A twelve week public consultation on the Proposed Submission Site Allocations plan was undertaken between 12th December 2014 and 5th March 2015. Comments were invited by:

- Publishing consultation documents and comment forms for the Core Strategy and Policies review;
- Writing to all relevant 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 seven venues including the Town Hall at various dates and times including evenings and weekends;
- Attending five Area Committee meetings and giving a presentation; and
- Placing a planning feature in the Council's Newspaper, the Angle, delivered to households in Ipswich.

- 3.2 Attendances at the drop in events varied and is detailed below:

- **Town Hall, Pickwick Room:**
Tues 20th January (11am – 4 pm) 6 attendees
Wed 21st January (11am – 4 pm) 7 attendees
Friday 20th February (3 pm – 8 pm) 10 attendees
Saturday 21st February (11 am – 4 pm) 14 attendees
- **Ipswich Sports Club, Henley Road:**
Friday 23rd January (11 am – 4 pm) 16 attendees
Saturday 24th January (11 am – 4 pm) 18 attendees
- **The Meeting Place, Limerick Close:**
Wednesday 11th February (3pm – 8pm) 2 attendees
- **All Hallows Church Hall, Landseer Road:**
Thursday 12th February (3pm – 8 pm) 9 attendees
- **Colchester Road Baptist Church:**
Friday 13th February (3pm – 8 pm) 14 attendees
- **St Peter's Church, Stoke Park Drive:**
Tuesday 17th February (3 pm – 8 pm) 4 attendees

- 3.3 Representations on the Proposed Submission Site Allocations plan were received from a total of 72 individuals and organisations amounting to a total of 182 representations. A further three representations were made in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal and one representation was made in relation to the IP-One Area Inset Map.

- 3.4 A summary of the representations is shown in Appendix 1. The policy site which attracted the highest number of objections was IP140 Land North of Whitton Lane

(22 objections), then IP061 Lavenham Road (12), then IP256 Artificial Hockey Pitch Henley Road (8). It is considered that the representations received do not go to the heart of the plan strategy or raise fundamental issues.

4 Conclusion

- 4.1 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 preparing the Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) development plan document, the Council has greatly valued the input received from all respondents.
- 4.2 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 Consultation, along with the Pre-Submission Statement of 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. In terms of liaison with key partners, formal consultation has supplemented ongoing liaison through the Duty to Co-operate, as outlined in the Duty to Co-operate Statement.
- 4.3 The Council considers that the approach taken has complied with Regulatory requirements and with the adopted SCI and its subsequent review.

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations on Proposed Submission Site Allocations and Policies (Incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan) development plan document (December 2014 – March 2015)

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

| REP ID | RESPONDENT NAME | SITE | SUPPORT/OBJECT | REPRESENTATION SUMMARY | CHANGE TO PLAN REQUESTED |
|--------|----------------------------------------------------|------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5217 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | 3.2 | SUPPORT | Our response to the Core Strategy Review seeks improvements to the vision which would carry forward into this plan. We welcome the reference to Objective 8 under paragraph 3.2, as there is a geographical element to the protection and enhancement of the environment (including heritage assets) that needs to be addressed by this plan. | |
| 5218 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | 4.1 | OBJECT | <p>There is sometimes a lack of detail and/or clarity in terms of development constraints and issues in the site sheets contained in Appendix 3. In particular, scheduled monument and archaeological issues are not always properly addressed (see individual sites) in terms of what is required and the implications for potential development schemes.</p> <p>The status of the site sheets in Appendix 3 is not entirely clear. We consider that the individual allocation policies should refer to the need to observe the site sheets in Appendix 3.</p> | <p>In order to make the plan sound, we recommend that all of the policies that allocate land for development (including SP2, SP5, SP6 and SP7) contain the following wording before the table in each policy:</p> <p>"Development proposals should accord with the information set out in the individual site sheets in Appendix 3"</p> |
| 5167 | Ipswich Wildlife Group (Mr Steve Pritchard) [1164] | 4.1 | OBJECT | Missing from the whole of part B - the relationship of these sites to the Ecological Network does not seem to have been considered. | <p>EITHER include an assessment of the impact on the Ecological Network under each site (stating 'None' if none)</p> <p>OR Include a general statement saying that all allocations will be subject to assessment of impact on the Ecological Network.</p> |
| 5344 | The Kesgrave Covenant Ltd (Mr Crispin Rope) [1439] | 4.5 | OBJECT | Table 1 - Whilst we accept that meeting the full housing requirement is highly likely to necessitate joint working with neighbouring areas, it is incumbent on Ipswich Borough Council to make best use of land within its own boundary first before it relies on assistance from others. The evidence base, in the form of the SHLAA, shows that it has not done that, because the SHLAA identifies additional opportunities within the Borough boundary, including my client's land, which has previously been tested through and found to be suitable for housing. | Table 1 of the Site Allocations Plan should also be amended to include North-East Ipswich as per the representations above, and any other post 2026 growth locations/allocations required. |
| 5247 | Environment Agency (Lizzie Griffiths) [1021] | 4.9 | OBJECT | <p>We support this policy and are pleased to note some of our previous comments have been taken onboard, with reference made to the requirement for site-specific Flood Risk Assessments to be submitted in support of new development in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>We have had sight of the Council's Flood Risk Sequential Test and Exception Test Statement, but this document is not referenced within the DPD. We strongly recommend this policy is amended, showing how you have had regard to the Sequential Test in the allocation of sites and include the requirement to apply the Exception test, as appropriate.</p> | |
| 5460 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | 5.13 | OBJECT | Section 5.13 (Page 40) - we disagree strongly that this is the only site available for retail development. Greater emphasis should also be placed upon finding alternative uses for uneconomic and underused retail units in secondary locations - primarily Carr Street (east) and Westgate Street (west) - and improvement to provision between Tower Ramparts/Cornhill southwards. | |
| 5255 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | 5.16 | SUPPORT | Our 2014 consultation response noted that the Waterfront area forms part of the town's historic environment and contains a number of important heritage assets including listed buildings and the Wet Dock Conservation Area. It is an area that has undergone much change in the past 15 years and continues to be identified for regeneration opportunities. Given the continued development opportunities and the importance of heritage assets, we sought greater reference to the historic environment. The additional wording in Paragraph 5.16 (last two sentences) is welcomed. | |
| 5254 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | 5.2 | OBJECT | <p>Support but require changes. We welcome the addition of paragraphs relating to the historic environment (5.2, 5.7 and 5.8). This helps towards meeting Paragraph 126 of the NPPF which requires Local Plans to set out a positive strategy for the historic environment. The IP-One Area is of considerable importance in terms of the historic environment, given that it contains the greatest concentration of the town's designated heritage assets, with a number of important sites and opportunity areas.</p> <p>It will be important that area and site specific proposals adequately consider impacts on heritage assets (see separate representations).</p> | It would be helpful if paragraph 5.8 referred to the national Heritage at Risk Register as well as the Council's approach to buildings at risk, as the national register contains more than just listed buildings. |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5456 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | 5.4 | OBJECT | Section 5.4 (P38) - whilst the document states that the plan is consistent with the Masterplan and Vision, there are substantial and important elements that are not consistent. The emphasis towards a north-south progression (section 5.5 P38) is not consistent with the planned retail development on the Westgate area. | |
| 5298 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | 5.41 | OBJECT | The County Council is content with policies SP15 and SP16, however the supporting text could be more accurate in respect of the Travel Ipswich programme. Paragraph 5.41 should be amended as follows: 'Due for completion in 2015, it forms part of a wider long term strategy to achieve a 15% switch to more sustainable modes, to enable Ipswich to accommodate planned growth without a corresponding growth in congestion. This will include some further improvements to walking routes from the railway station ...' | Amend 5.41 to read: Travel Ipswich is a £21m package of measures including traffic management and the promotion of smarter travel choices such as bus, walking and cycling. Due for completion in 2015, it forms part of a wider long term strategy to achieve a 15% switch to more sustainable modes, to enable Ipswich to accommodate planned growth without a corresponding growth in congestion. This will include some further improvements to walking routes from the railway station via Princes Street to the Central Shopping Area. |
| 5256 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | 5.46 | SUPPORT | We note that the provision of a new Wet Dock crossing would facilitate access and provide for through traffic, allowing for the calming of the Star Lane Gyrotory once completed. We support the principle of calming of the gyrotory and the opportunities that provides. However, care will need to be taken with regards to the design of the new crossing, as it passes through the conservation area. We welcome the inclusion of a new sentence at the end of paragraph 5.46 which notes the conservation area and requires the crossing to take account of heritage issues. | |
| 5464 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | 5.52 | OBJECT | Car Parking (section 5.52 P50) - we are not convinced that Travel Ipswich has "encouraged mode switching" in the way described or aspired to. It may, instead, have simply reduced visitors which is to the detriment of the town. We are extremely concerned about the way in which this section appears to indicate continuing with an anti-car direction. | |
| 5257 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | 6.1 | OBJECT | We welcome the identification of opportunity areas. However, the identification of development options in each opportunity area does not always correspond with site allocations and often goes much beyond the boundaries of proposed allocations. This potentially creates some confusion and needs clarifying. While we welcome the identification of development principles for each opportunity area, this does not overcome the need for the individual site sheets to contain specific development criteria. The key for each diagram shows listed buildings but not scheduled monuments, which is not helpful in terms of clarity. | In order to make the plan sound, the key to each diagram should include scheduled monuments. Clarification should also be provided regarding the extent of development options against site allocations. |
| 5469 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | 7.3 | OBJECT | Section 7.3 (P78) - we are disappointed and extremely surprised that neither Ipswich Central nor the Greater Ipswich Partnership are viewed as 'key partnerships' in helping to deliver any plans for the town centre or beyond. | |
| 5309 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | Appendix 3 - Site Allocation Details | OBJECT | SCC appendices to the full representation set out additional information relating to sites: Appendix 1: Potential developer contributions Appendix 2: Indicative highway requirements Appendix 3 (mis-labelled 2): Outline surface water assessment Appendix 5: amendments to the archaeological constraints comments affecting certain sites. | Update site sheets. |
| 5302 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | IP004 - Bus Depot, Sir Alf Ramsey Way | OBJECT | Allocation IP004 is in close proximity to permitted mineral and waste uses, which represent a constraint on the development of this site. In line with policies in the Minerals and Waste Plans and DM26 of the Ipswich Local Plan are likely to apply to ensure that the new development is compatible with that which is already permitted. If the design of new development at IP004 recognises these constraints, the allocation should prove deliverable. | |
| 5219 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP005 - Former Tooks Bakery, Old Norwich Road | SUPPORT | This site forms part of the approach to/from Whitton Conservation Area and is likely to form part of its setting. Development of 100 homes could have a notable impact on the conservation area, particularly if Site IP032 was also developed for a similar number of homes along with Site 140b for employment. We welcome the publication of a development brief for this and the adjoining site (although we have not had sight of the brief) and the requirement in the site sheet for development to have regard to the conservation area. | |
| 5647 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP005 - Former Tooks Bakery, Old Norwich Road | OBJECT | Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033, IP059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office. | |

| | | | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5459 | Boyer Planning (Mr Matt Clarke) [293] | IP006 - Co Op Warehouse, Pauls Road | SUPPORT | The East of England Co-operative Society support this proposed allocation for residential redevelopment. The site is in a sustainable location, close to a wide range of facilities and services, including shops, employment and public transport, with access to the town centre and railway station. | |
| 5122 | Co-op Juniors Theatre Productions Ltd (Mr Paul Lofts) [1080] | IP006 - Co Op Warehouse, Pauls Road | OBJECT | The current use as listed below does not include the use made of the warehouse by the Co-op Juniors Theatre Productions Ltd which has occupied part of the warehouse for over 25yrs. The Co-op Juniors is a charitable co-operative for the benefit of the community providing young people with training in dance, singing and stage craft. With a co-operative ethos the 'Juniors' provides young people with low cost training to a very high standard of performance. This amateur group is probably the largest in East Anglia. | Under Development constraints/issues. Need to relocate The Co-op Juniors to a building of suitable size and access. |
| 5458 | Boyer Planning (Mr Matt Clarke) [293] | IP010a - Co Op Depot, Felixstowe Road | OBJECT | The proposed allocation of this site for primarily residential use along with land for extension of the adjacent Rosehill Primary School is supported by the East of England Co-operative Society. To ensure that the policy is effective and justified the land required for school expansion should be more clearly substantiated. Exclusion of the southern part of land fronting Derby Road from the proposed allocation boundary is illogical and should be reinstated. A flexible approach to Section 106 contribution requirements needs to be applied in the context of viability considerations and competing demands from the site. | Include land fronting Derby Road (former car sales forecourt and garage workshop) within site boundary. Define site area for school expansion based on quantified assessment of operational need. Refer to the need for flexible application of Section 106 requirements in view of acknowledged constraints to ensure viability. |
| 5457 | Boyer Planning (Mr Matt Clarke) [293] | IP010a - Co Op Depot, Felixstowe Road | OBJECT | The East of England Co-operative Society considers that to ensure that the policy is effective and justified the land required for school expansion should be more clearly substantiated. | |
| 5299 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | IP010a - Co Op Depot, Felixstowe Road | OBJECT | This document allocates land at Felixstowe Road/Derby Road (site IP010a) for additional primary school provision. The allocation at IP010a is necessary to enable expansion of the school. The school is already on a small site to meet demand arising from the housing growth planned in the vicinity of the school. | |
| 5113 | Private Individual | IP010a - Co Op Depot, Felixstowe Road | OBJECT | This plan seems to contain our premises 22 and 22a Hines Rd. No one has contacted us about this proposal which seems a bit remiss! Concord Video & Film Council. | The premises 22 and 22a Hines Rd should be excluded. |
| 5347 | Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Simone Bullion) [1438] | IP010a - Co Op Depot, Felixstowe Road | OBJECT | Support the principle of development on the site but recommend that a reptile survey is undertaken prior to development. | Reptile survey required under constraints/ issues section |
| 5222 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP012 - Peter's Ice Cream | OBJECT | The development constraints mentions the area of archaeological importance and the adjoining Central Conservation Area and Grade II* Church of St Clement to the south. However, while the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation area and listed church. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005). | In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the current last sentence in the site sheet as follows: "Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance" |
| 5184 | Parliament (Mr Ben Gummer) [1404] | IP015 - West End Road Surface Car Park | OBJECT | A greater proportion of this land should be allocated for housing. | The site allocation should be amended. |
| 5648 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP029 - Land Opposite 674-734 Bramford Road | OBJECT | Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033, IP059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office. | |
| 5352 | Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Simone Bullion) [1438] | IP029 - Land Opposite 674-734 Bramford Road | OBJECT | Recommend an ecological assessment and reptile survey prior to site clearance | Recommend an ecological assessment and reptile survey prior to site clearance |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5224 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP031 - Burrell Road | OBJECT | The development constraints mention the area of archaeological importance, the adjoining Stoke Conservation Area (a conservation area on the Heritage at Risk Register), and the Grade I Church of St Mary at Stoke to the south. However, while the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation area and listed church. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005). | In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the last sentence in the site sheet as follows: "Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance" |
| 5375 | Boyer Planning (Mr Matt Clarke) [293] | IP031 - Burrell Road | SUPPORT | The East of England Co-operative Society support this proposed allocation for residential redevelopment. | |
| 5631 | Private Individual | IP031 - Burrell Road | OBJECT | I wish to register an objection to the planning application to build 20 houses on the site. It will lead to an increase in traffic whilst at the same time reducing the amount of parking available. Parking is already difficult in the area and the loss of the car park coupled with the parking needs of a whole new housing development will make it almost impossible. The adjacent conservation area is likely to be put at risk. A new development will be out of character in a part of the road that comprises older buildings. | |
| 5225 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP032 - King George V Field, Old Norwich Road | SUPPORT | As with Site IP005, this site falls within the setting of Whitton Conservation Area and could affect its significance, with the risk of cumulative impact. We welcome the publication of a development brief for this and the adjoining site (although we have not had sight of the brief) and the requirement in the site sheet for development to have regard to the conservation area. | |
| 5649 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP032 - King George V Field, Old Norwich Road | OBJECT | Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033, IP059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office. | |
| 5650 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP033 - Land at Bramford Road (Stocks site) | OBJECT | Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033, IP059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office. | |
| 5348 | Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Simone Bullion) [1438] | IP033 - Land at Bramford Road (Stocks site) | OBJECT | Recommend that a detailed ecological survey is undertaken as well as a reptile survey, but supports the need for a vegetation buffer around the pond. | Recommend that a detailed ecological survey is undertaken as well as a reptile survey, but supports the need for a vegetation buffer around the pond. |
| 5228 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP035 - Key Street / Star Lane / Burtons Site | OBJECT | This is a very sensitive site. It contains a Grade II building on College Street, adjoins the listed and scheduled Wolsey Gate and is located between two conservation areas and two Grade II* churches. In terms of archaeology, there are two scheduled monuments to the north while the site itself was the location of a priory&college. The wording of the site sheet is not effective with regards to archaeological considerations. The sheet should also be strengthened with regards to its wording on the conservation areas and listed buildings, and better linked to national policy wording. | In order to make the plan sound, the final three paragraphs of the site sheet for IP035 should be amended along the following lines: "The site lies within the Area of Archaeological Importance, adjacent to the Grade I listed and scheduled Wolsey's Gate (List Entry Nos. 1006071), between the Central and Wet Dock Conservation Areas, and contains a Grade II listed building. The Grade II* listed Churches of St Peter and St Mary at the Quay lie on either side of the site. Any proposals would need to consider the impact of development upon designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting, including any resulting benefit, harm or loss to their significance. Archaeological evaluations have revealed evidence of Anglo-Saxon occupation and St. Peter's Priory and there is a high potential for archaeological remains of possible national significance, such as important waterlogged remains and evidence Wolsey's College, and a Quaker Burial Ground. Detailed early pre-application discussions with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service and English Heritage [Historic England after 1st April 2015] would be required in order to agree the principle of development and inform design. Archaeology would be a major consideration for project costs and timescales. Proposals would need to be supported by programmes of pre-determination archaeological assessment. Total archaeological excavation of the site prior to development would be required and preservation of archaeological evidence in situ may also be a consideration as part of mitigation measures. Post-excavation analysis, assessment and reporting would also be necessary. Proposals impacting the scheduled monument of Wolsey's Gate or its setting would require detailed pre-application discussions with English Heritage [Historic England after 1st April 2015]. Development could present opportunities to enhance the significance of the scheduled monument. Scheduled Monument Consent would be needed for any works upon or within the scheduled monument. The SMC application would need to be accompanied by appropriate pre-application consultation and assessment and where consent is granted, comprehensive archaeological mitigation is likely to be required. There is a presumption in favour of conserving scheduled monuments, so the granting of consent is not guaranteed." |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5387 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | IP035 - Key Street / Star Lane / Burtons Site | OBJECT | The approach to proposals for retail development in the Site Allocations Plan is at odds with the evidence base and crucially underplays the need to accommodate retail growth in the town. Applekirk Properties Ltd supports the allocation of sites IP043, IP136, IP052 and IP035 for mixed use development that will contribute to the regeneration of the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter, but objects to the failure to provide for retail development in excess of 200 sq m within these sites. Policies CS2, CS3 and CS5 fail to meet the requirement for comparison retail identified in the evidence base. | Allocated sites within the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter should provide for a mix of residential and town centre uses including retail in excess of 200 sqm floorspace, to allow flexibility to assemble a viable development scheme. |
| 5229 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP037 - Island Site | SUPPORT | The Island Site forms a large part of the Wet Dock Conservation Area and contributes to the significance of this heritage asset. We welcome the wording in the development constraints regarding the retention and refurbishment of historic structures and the reference to archaeology including industrial heritage. The wording also helpfully refers to the principles contained within Opportunity Area A (which we broadly support). | |
| 5304 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | IP037 - Island Site | OBJECT | Allocation IP037 needs to recognise the mineral handling facilities at the Port, which are protected through the Minerals Plan and DM26 and are part of the delivery of a wider marine plan. | |
| 5185 | Parliament (Mr Ben Gummer) [1404] | IP037 - Island Site | OBJECT | The emerging consensus from NALEP, SCC, UCS and the owner of the port is for employment use. IBC has been involved in these discussions. | The document should reflect existing aspirations for development. |
| 5231 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP039a - Land between Gower Street & Gt Whip Street | OBJECT | The development constraints refer to archaeology and the adjoining listed building and conservation area and refer to the development principles contained within Opportunity Area A. However, while the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation area and listed church. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005). | In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the second sentence in the development constraints section of the site sheet as follows: "Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance" |
| 5233 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP040 and IP041 - Civic Centre Area / Civic Drive | OBJECT | The development constraints mention archaeology (if not the area of archaeological importance with covers over half of the site), and the nearby conservation areas and the Grade II* Church of St Matthew to the west. Reference is also made to the development principles contained within Opportunity Area E. However, while the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation areas and listed church. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. | In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the final sentence of the site sheet as follows: "Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance" |
| 5206 | The Theatres Trust (Planning Adviser) [278] | IP040 and IP041 - Civic Centre Area / Civic Drive | OBJECT | Support but require changes. The adjacent theatre should be noted as a constraint to ensure that noise, vibration and access issues are considered in the design. | |
| 5186 | Parliament (Mr Ben Gummer) [1404] | IP040 and IP041 - Civic Centre Area / Civic Drive | OBJECT | The primary allocation for this site should be residential - especially for sheltered and very sheltered accommodation. This reflects the aspirations for the town centre from Ipswich Central and SCC. | Use allocation should be changed. |
| 5453 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | IP040 and IP041 - Civic Centre Area / Civic Drive | OBJECT | Site IP040 and IP041 - this site should not be allocated for retail, but for primarily residential development. | |
| 5586 | Ipswich Conservative Group [1814] | IP040 and IP041 - Civic Centre Area / Civic Drive | OBJECT | IP040 and IP041 Civic Centre Area - this should not be designated as mainly a retail area and we believe that a shrinking of the town centre, by making both ends a mix of homes and small independent shops, as well as leisure facilities, would create footfall in the town centre and be a more attractive experience for shoppers. | |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5237 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP043 - Commercial Buildings and Jewish Burial Ground, Star Lane | OBJECT | <p>This is a very sensitive site partly within the Central Conservation Area and containing Grade II listed buildings while adjoining other listed buildings. The archaeological issues include the Jewish Burial Ground.</p> <p>Although the revised site sheet now refers to many of the above heritage assets, the wording is not effective with regards to archaeological consideration. The revised site sheet should also be strengthened with regards to its wording on the conservation area and listed buildings, and better linked to national policy wording. Clarity is also needed regarding the burial ground.</p> | <p>In order to make the plan sound, the final paragraph of the site sheet for IP043 should be replaced along the following lines:</p> <p>Any proposals would need to consider the impact of development upon designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting, including any resulting benefit, harm or loss to their significance. The site presents opportunities for enhancing the Jewish Burial Ground, which needs to be carefully respected by any development proposal. Archaeological evaluations and limited excavation have revealed evidence of Anglo-Saxon and medieval activity (there is outstanding post-excavation work under IP/11/00267). Detailed early pre-application discussions with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service and English Heritage [Historic England after 1st April 2015] would be required in order to agree the principle of development and inform design. Archaeology would be a major consideration for project costs and timescales.</p> <p>Proposals would need to be supported by programmes of pre-determination archaeological assessment and possibly evaluation. Complex archaeological mitigation is likely to be required which could include watching briefs, full excavation and / or design scheme changes to allow for preservation in situ. Post-excavation analysis, assessment and reporting would also be necessary."</p> |
| 5384 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | IP043 - Commercial Buildings and Jewish Burial Ground, Star Lane | OBJECT | <p>The approach to proposals for retail development in the Site Allocations Plan is at odds with the evidence base and crucially underplays the need to accommodate retail growth in the town. Applekirk Properties Ltd supports the allocation of sites IP043, IP136, IP052 and IP035 for mixed use development that will contribute to the regeneration of the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter, but objects to the failure to provide for retail development in excess of 200 sq m within these sites. Policies CS2, CS3 and CS5 fail to meet the requirement for comparison retail identified in the evidence base.</p> | <p>Allocated sites within the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter should provide for a mix of residential and town centre uses including retail in excess of 200 sqm floorspace, to allow flexibility to assemble a viable development scheme.</p> |
| 5240 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP048 - Mint Quarter / Cox Lane | OBJECT | <p>This is a very sensitive site, where approximately half of the site is designated as a scheduled monument and there is considerable archaeological potential across the whole site. The site also adjoins the conservation area and listed buildings.</p> <p>Although the revised site sheet now refers to the above heritage assets the wording is not effective with regards to archaeological considerations, particularly with regards to the scheduled monument. The revised site sheet should also be strengthened with regards to its wording on the conservation areas and listed church, and better linked to national policy wording.</p> | <p>In order to make the plan sound, two amendments are required to the site sheet for IP048. There should be three new sentences at the end of the second paragraph of the development constraints section as follows:</p> <p>"Approximately half of the site is designated as a scheduled monument (List Entry No. 1005983) and represents a large portion of the Anglo-Saxon and medieval town preserved under car parks. Excavations and interventions have taken place in parts of the site and revealed evidence for occupation and activity from the Middle Saxon period onwards; the rest of the site is undisturbed from modern development and is anticipated to contain rich and well preserved archaeological remains. Any proposals would need to consider the impact of development upon designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting, including any resulting benefit, harm or loss to their significance."</p> <p>The final paragraph should be replaced along the following lines:</p> <p>"There is a high potential for archaeological remains of national significance and detailed early pre-application discussions with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service and English Heritage [Historic England after 1st April 2015] would be required in order to agree the principle of development and inform design. Archaeology would be a major consideration for project costs and timescales. Proposals would need to be supported by programmes of pre-determination archaeological works which may include desk-based assessments, historic building analysis, survey works and archaeological evaluation. Complex archaeological mitigation is likely to be required which could include watching briefs, full excavation and / or design scheme changes to allow for preservation in situ. Post-excavation analysis, assessment and reporting would also be necessary.</p> <p>Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) would be needed for any works within the Scheduled Monuments. The SMC application would need to be accompanied by appropriate pre-application consultation and assessment (with English Heritage) and where consent is granted, comprehensive archaeological mitigation is likely to be required. There is a presumption in favour of conserving scheduled monuments, so the granting of consent is not guaranteed."</p> |
| 5374 | Boyer Planning (Mr Matt Clarke) [293] | IP048 - Mint Quarter / Cox Lane | OBJECT | <p>The East of England Co-operative Society support redevelopment of the Mint Quarter. It is considered that an element of flexibility should be applied to the mix of uses that would be considered acceptable in this area, in order to maximise the potential for achievement of regeneration of this important site. Such flexibility should also extend to the façade of parts of the former Co-operative department store frontage to Carr Street, following inclusion in the Local List SPD.</p> | <p>To ensure this policy is both justified and effective reference should be made to a flexible approach the mix of uses considered acceptable.</p> <p>In respect of the facade of part of the former Co-operative department store frontage to Carr Street reference to this being retained should either be qualified by further assertions that loss would potentially be considered in the context of a high quality design solution, or in light of viability considerations, or alternatively reference to retention should be deleted completely, being adequately addressed within the Local List SPD itself.</p> |
| 5454 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | IP048 - Mint Quarter / Cox Lane | OBJECT | <p>Site IP048 - the area of this site that sits closest to Upper Brook Street should be allocated for a modern 'big-box' retail cluster. We envisage something like an out-of-town retail development with parking, built on this in-town site.</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5242 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP052 - Land between Lower Orwell Street & Star Lane | OBJECT | <p>The development constraints mention the area of archaeological importance, the adjoining Central Conservation Area and nearby scheduled monuments, but only refers to the Grade II* listed building to the north when there is also a Grade II building (26-28 Fore Street). While the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation areas and listed buildings. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005).</p> | <p>In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the current last sentence of the site sheet as follows:</p> <p>"Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance"</p> <p>The first sentence of the site sheet should refer to the Grade II listed building, while the ID numbers used for the scheduled monuments should use the modern list entry numbers for clarity (Nos. 1005985, 1002973, 1005986).</p> |
| 5386 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | IP052 - Land between Lower Orwell Street & Star Lane | OBJECT | <p>The approach to proposals for retail development in the Site Allocations Plan is at odds with the evidence base and crucially underplays the need to accommodate retail growth in the town. Applekirk Properties Ltd supports the allocation of sites IP043, IP136, IP052 and IP035 for mixed use development that will contribute to the regeneration of the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter, but objects to the failure to provide for retail development in excess of 200 sq m within these sites. Policies CS2, CS3 and CS5 fail to meet the requirement for comparison retail identified in the evidence base.</p> | <p>Allocated sites within the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter should provide for a mix of residential and town centre uses including retail in excess of 200 sqm floorspace, to allow flexibility to assemble a viable development scheme.</p> |
| 5244 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP054 - Land between Old Cattle Market and Star Lane | OBJECT | <p>This is a very sensitive site partly within the conservation area and containing two Grade II buildings and two scheduled monuments with considerable archaeological potential across the site. The site is flanked by the conservation area and several listed buildings, with two Grade II* churches to the south.</p> <p>Although the revised site sheet now refers to some of the above heritage assets, the wording is not effective with regards to archaeological considerations. The revised site sheet should also be strengthened with regards to its wording on the conservation areas and listed buildings, and better linked to national policy wording.</p> | <p>In order to make the plan sound, the final paragraph of the site sheet for IP043 should be replaced along the following lines:</p> <p>"The site lies within the Area of Archaeological Importance, partly within the Central Conservation Area, contains and adjoins listed buildings and includes a Scheduled Monument (List Entry No. 1005987), which is split into two separate areas. Any proposals would need to consider the impact of the development upon the designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting, including any resulting benefit, harm or loss to their significance. The route of Turret Lane should be protected.</p> <p>Previous archaeological works have demonstrated strong evidence for well-preserved of waterlogged and organic deposits and there is a high potential for archaeological remains of national significance. Detailed early pre-application discussions with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service and English Heritage [Historic England after 1st April 2015] would be required in order to agree the principle of development and inform design. Archaeology would be a major consideration for project costs and timescales.</p> <p>Proposals would need to be supported by programmes of pre-determination archaeological works which may include desk-based assessments, survey works and archaeological evaluation. Complex archaeological mitigation is likely to be required which could include watching briefs, full excavation and / or design scheme changes to allow for preservation in situ. Post-excavation analysis, assessment and reporting would also be necessary.</p> <p>Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) would be needed for any works within the Scheduled Monuments. The SMC application would need to be accompanied by appropriate pre-application consultation and assessment (with English Heritage) and where consent is granted, comprehensive archaeological mitigation is likely to be required. There is a presumption in favour of conserving scheduled monuments, so the granting of consent is not guaranteed."</p> <p>The archaeological potential of this site could greatly influence its redevelopment (bearing in mind that archaeology could extend beyond the scheduled areas). Including the scheduled monuments within the site without any recognition or development criteria increases the risk of proposals that directly or indirectly harm their significance.</p> |
| 5123 | Private Individual | IP054 - Land between Old Cattle Market and Star Lane | SUPPORT | <p>We believe the Local Plan is of sound judgement and agree with what has been proposed.</p> | |
| 5187 | Parliament (Mr Ben Gummer) [1404] | IP055 - Crown Car Park, Charles Street | OBJECT | <p>IBC should retain the option of an allocation for housing or mixed development, should they be able to relocate the car park to south of Crown Street.</p> | <p>Greater flexibility in this allocation.</p> |
| 5436 | Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [359] | IP058 - Former Volvo Site, Raeburn Road South | OBJECT | <p>Relating to the proposed sites located in proximity to the Water Recycling Centres- WRCs (formally referred to as Sewage or Wastewater Treatment Works), -although reference is made in the text to their location in relation to the WRC, it is recommended that there is a requirement that an odour assessment (in liaison with the WRC operator) is carried out to assess the risk of odour impact on the proposed development to ascertain the suitability of the site for residential development. The sites are IP058 IP067 and IP099</p> | |
| 5353 | Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Simone Bullion) [1438] | IP058 - Former Volvo Site, Raeburn Road South | OBJECT | <p>This site is currently a County Wildlife Site a detailed survey will need to be undertaken prior to development.</p> | <p>This site is currently a County Wildlife Site a detailed survey will need to be undertaken prior to development.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5651 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP059a - Elton Park Industrial Estate, Hadleigh Road | OBJECT | Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033,I P059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office. |
| 5628 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | It would become a slum area - houses/flats on top of each other; it would be cramming houses/flats into such a small area which draws a fine line between planning and cramming; noise pollution; we are very quiet whereas with an extension of houses, we would loose our peace and tranquillity; overlooking existing properties, therefore invading their privacy and lost of their natural light; there are plenty of boarded up houses/factories/empty offices along Hadleigh Road - why are they not being used for housing? |
| 5520 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | The green is a strong local asset which allows residents to meet regularly. The development of the green will have a detrimental effect on house values, lead to loss of light to existing property, exacerbate existing parking, traffic flow and road safety issues, and lead to loss of wildlife habitat. Concern that the consultation was not adequately advertised. |
| 5323 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | The Green is an area for the local community. Children play football there and there are many community and sporting events. Concerned about anti-social behaviour if the green is taken away. It was reported in the press that the Council were trying to improve the area for youngsters, why take all this away? Concern expressed about existing and potential problems of parked cars and road safety in the Lavenham Road and Kelly Road area. The Green is lovely to look at and enjoy and should be preserved. |
| 5312 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | We object to the proposed building of houses on this area. The area needs a suitable place for children to play safely, residents to walk their dogs and an area where the local community can socialise. This area if utilised properly could be the hub of this area, bringing all residents together. These days people complain that their children need to get out more; this area is an ideal area for this to happen if it is kept as an open green space, and as previously stated this would be an ideal area for the outside Gym and Play Area. |
| 5554 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | I cannot believe that this may still be passed as I feel that not only will added traffic going through this quiet road be dangerous but especially in winter when Lavenham Road hill is already a hazard in icy conditions with cars etc unable to get up the hill as hardly ever gritted and my property at the bottom of the hill is just another accident waiting to happen AGAIN! When we bought our first house in Milden Road which was a new build, we were told that the green would never be built on. |
| 5525 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | The Green is currently a nice open space used by youngsters and for fetes and football. Do not wish to be overlooked and surrounded by more houses. The open space is lovely and well kept, not a derelict building site. |
| 5492 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | The roads in Lavenham Road are not wide enough to cater for more cars, the dust carts can't even access roads when cars are parked on it. Also there aren't enough green/natural areas in the area so why do you need to take more away from the community. |
| 5652 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033,I P059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office. |
| 5572 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | Object to development of this land as it is an open area used for community events, dog walking, and by children playing. There is already parking congestion and this will add additional pressure. Understood the land could only be used for building a school. |
| 5553 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | I am writing to object to the proposed plans for building on the green between Lavenham and Kelly Road. My fiancée and I are new residents to Lavenham Road as we bought our house in December and we are extremely upset to hear that there are plans to build on the green. |

| | | | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5524 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | Wish to object to the proposed allocation as the Green is used by local children to play football and cricket, children feel safer playing there than out of sight in the park, the Green is used by the local church for fun days and concerned about the increase in traffic on the narrow road. | |
| 5519 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | The green is a strong local asset which allows residents to meet regularly. The development of the green will have a detrimental effect on house values, lead to loss of light to existing property, exacerbate existing parking, traffic flow and road safety issues, and lead to loss of wildlife habitat. Concern that the consultation was not adequately advertised. | |
| 5272 | Private Individual | IP061 - Former School Site, Lavenham Road | OBJECT | Concerned about increases in traffic and concerned about anti-social behaviour including speeding vehicles. Believe there is sufficient social housing in the area. Would not like to see Lavenham Road joined with Kelly Road. | |
| 5437 | Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [359] | IP067 - Former British Energy Site | OBJECT | Relating to the proposed sites located in proximity to the Water Recycling Centres- WRCs (formally referred to as Sewage or Wastewater Treatment Works), - although reference is made in the text to their location in relation to the WRC, it is recommended that there is a requirement that an odour assessment (in liaison with the WRC operator) is carried out to assess the risk of odour impact on the proposed development to ascertain the suitability of the site for residential development. The sites are IP058 IP067 and IP099 | |
| 5349 | Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Simone Bullion) [1438] | IP067 - Former British Energy Site | OBJECT | Recommend an ecological survey prior to vegetation clearance. | Recommend an ecological survey prior to vegetation clearance. |
| 24213 | EDF Energy Plc (Miss Nicola Forster) [248] | IP067 - Former British Energy Site | OBJECT | Pleased that the site has been allocated for development. Housing could be accommodated in the northern part with employment on the southern part and a buffer in the middle. The NPPF states that planning policies should avoid long term protection of allocated employment sites where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose. It is not feasible to allocate the site for 100% employment. There has been previous interest from residential developers. The site can be configured to offset impacts of the water treatment works. The site boundary should reflect land ownership arrangements. | The allocation should include an element of housing and the site boundary should be amended to land ownership arrangements. |
| 5303 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | IP080 - 240 Wherstead Road | OBJECT | Site IP080 needs to recognise the mineral handling facilities at the Port, which are protected through the Minerals Plan and DM26 and are part of the delivery of a wider marine plan | |
| 5354 | Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Simone Bullion) [1438] | IP083 - Banks of river upriver from Princes Street | OBJECT | This area is allocated for public open space and we support the requirement for survey work prior to clearance, as well as retaining the river path and its setting, the design must take into account the need to avoid light spillage within the river corridor. | This area is allocated for public open space and we support the requirement for survey work prior to clearance, as well as retaining the river path and its setting, the design must take into account the need to avoid light spillage within the river corridor. |
| 5245 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP089 - Waterworks Street | OBJECT | The development constraints mention the area of archaeological importance, the part location within the (Central) conservation area and adjacent listed building (although there is more than one listed building in the vicinity). However, while the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation area and listed buildings. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005). | In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the current last sentence in the site sheet as follows: "Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance" The first sentence of the development constraints section should clarify that the site is adjacent to listed buildings (not just the one). |
| 5428 | Boyer Planning (Mr Matt Clarke) [293] | IP089 - Waterworks Street | SUPPORT | Support allocation | |
| 5246 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP096 - Car Park Handford Road East | OBJECT | The development constraints mention archaeology and the adjoining (Burlington Road) conservation area. However, while the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation area. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005). | In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence before the last sentence of the first paragraph in the development constraints section of the site sheet as follows: "Development should have regard to the conservation area and other heritage assets and conserve their significance" |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5528 | RCP Parking Ltd [1418] | IP096 - Car Park Handford Road East | OBJECT | RCP Parking Ltd support the allocation of their site in principle for residential purposes but the decision of when to develop/dispose should be part of their commercial strategy rather than the council is planning authority or a third party. The draft allocation indicates that has a short term delivery timescale but the company has not been consulted on its own business plans. Had it been so consulted it would have reaffirmed the need for flexibility and the certainty of interim beneficial uses such as shortstay car parking in a continuing difficult economic climate. | There is a need for greater flexibility either within the specific wording of SP2 to facilitate interim alternative uses until the viability/returns of the alternative use of the land for residential development fits within the site owners business strategy. |
| 5306 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | IP098 - Transco, south of Patteson Road | OBJECT | Allocation IP098 needs to recognise the mineral handling facilities at the Port, which are protected through the Minerals Plan and DM26 and are part of the delivery of a wider marine plan. | |
| 5438 | Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [359] | IP099 - Part former Volvo Site, Raeburn Road South | OBJECT | Relating to the proposed sites located in proximity to the Water Recycling Centres- WRCs (formally referred to as Sewage or Wastewater Treatment Works), - although reference is made in the text to their location in relation to the WRC, it is recommended that there is a requirement that an odour assessment (in liaison with the WRC operator) is carried out to assess the risk of odour impact on the proposed development to ascertain the suitability of the site for residential development. The sites are IP058 IP067 and IP099 | |
| 5662 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP105 - Depot, Beaconsfield Road | OBJECT | Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033, IP059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office. | |
| 5761 | Private Individual | IP116 - St Clement's Hospital Grounds | OBJECT | Site has injunction on it to prevent any other use other than for mental health. | |
| 5220 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP11b - Smart Street, Foundation Street | OBJECT | This is a very sensitive site. In particular, the site contains three scheduled monuments, with considerable archaeological potential across the site. The site also adjoins the Central and Wet Dock Conservation Area, along with the Grade II* Church of St Mary at the Quay. Although the revised site sheet now refers to the above heritage assets, the wording is not effective with regards to archaeological considerations. The revised site sheet should also be strengthened with regards to its wording on the conservation areas and listed church, and better linked to national policy wording. | In order to make the plan sound, the final two paragraphs of the site sheet for IP011b should be amended along the following lines: "The site lies within the Area of Archaeological Importance, includes three scheduled monuments (List Entry Nos. 1005985, 1002973, 1005986) and is located adjacent to the Central and West Dock Conservation Areas with the Grade II* Church of St Mary at the Quay to the south. Any proposals would need to consider the impact of development upon designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting, including any resulting benefit, harm or loss to their significance. There is a high potential for archaeological remains of national significance and detailed early pre-application discussions with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service and English Heritage [Historic England after 1st April 2015] would be required in order to agree the principle of development and inform design. Archaeology would be a major consideration for project costs and timescales. Proposals would need to be supported by programmes of pre-determination archaeological works which may include desk-based assessments, survey works and archaeological evaluation. Complex archaeological mitigation is likely to be required which could include watching briefs, full excavation and / or design scheme changes to allow for preservation in situ. Post-excavation analysis, assessment and reporting would also be necessary. Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) would be needed for any works within the Scheduled Monuments. The SMC application would need to be accompanied by appropriate pre-application consultation and assessment (with English Heritage) and where consent is granted, comprehensive archaeological mitigation is likely to be required. There is a presumption in favour of conserving scheduled monuments, so the granting of consent is not guaranteed." |
| 5248 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP133 - South of Felaw Street | OBJECT | We note this site is now proposed for allocation following the lapse of planning permission. The site adjoins the Wet Dock Conservation Area and the Grade II listed building of 42-48 Felaw Street, and is within the area of archaeological importance. While the development constraints refer to the area of archaeological importance, there is no reference to the conservation area or listed building, or what the implications are for development. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site, notwithstanding the reference to the development principles set out in Opportunity Area A. | In order to make the plan sound, the development constraints section of the site sheet should refer to the conservation area and listed building, and state that "development should have regard to heritage assets and conserve their significance". Clarification of the archaeology issues should also be included. |
| 5305 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | IP133 - South of Felaw Street | OBJECT | Allocation IP133 needs to recognise the mineral handling facilities at the Port, which are protected through the Minerals Plan and DM26 and are part of the delivery of a wider marine plan. | |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5126 | Private Individual | IP133 - South of Felaw Street | OBJECT | Given the number of identified brown field sites in the consultation document, the development of 33 houses on this site is an unnecessary conversation of a green space into a built environment. This is the only area of green land available to children in the area and is used by adults and children for recreational purposes. There is a high density of housing around the space, with a young population and no other available recreational area nearby, within walking distance available to children. The council should reconsider the allocation of any building on this land. | Retain it as green space not suitable for development |
| 5127 | Private Individual | IP133 - South of Felaw Street | OBJECT | Given the number of identified brown field sites in the consultation document, the development of 33 houses on this site is an unnecessary conversation of a green space into a built environment. This is the only area of green land available to children in the area and is used by adults and children for recreational purposes. There is a high density of housing around the space, with a young population and no other available recreational area nearby, within walking distance available to children. The council should reconsider the allocation of any building on this land | If the number of dwellings was significantly reduced with a green space included as central to the development - this would be beneficial to the new and existing families in the area. Perhaps a nice "green" or eco development, with living walls, very energy efficient, lovely green space and SUDS to allow grass to grow and cars to park. |
| 5249 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP136 - Silo, College Street | OBJECT | IP136: College Street This is a sensitive site within the Central and West Dock Conservation Areas and opposite the Grade I listed and scheduled Wolsey Gate, plus sits within the area of archaeological importance. The development constraints mention these heritage assets, but apart from archaeology, there is no explanation of the implications for specific proposals with regards to the conservation area and listed/scheduled gate. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005). | In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the current last sentence in the site sheet as follows: "Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance" |
| 5385 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | IP136 - Silo, College Street | OBJECT | The approach to proposals for retail development in the Site Allocations Plan is at odds with the evidence base and crucially underplays the need to accommodate retail growth in the town. Applekirk Properties Ltd supports the allocation of sites IP043, IP136, IP052 and IP035 for mixed use development that will contribute to the regeneration of the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter, but objects to the failure to provide for retail development in excess of 200 sq m within these sites. Policies CS2, CS3 and CS5 fail to meet the requirement for comparison retail identified in the evidence base. | Allocated sites within the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter should provide for a mix of residential and town centre uses including retail in excess of 200 sqm floorspace, to allow flexibility to assemble a viable development scheme. |
| 5250 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | As with Sites IP005 and IP032, this site falls within the setting of Whitton Conservation Area and could affect its significance, with the risk of cumulative impact. The conservation area is not mentioned in the development constraints (although archaeology is). The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site, and is not consistent with the wording used in the site sheets for IP005 and IP032. | In order to make the plan sound, the development constraints section of the site sheet should refer to the conservation area, and state that "development should have regard to the conservation area and conserve its significance". |
| 5663 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033, IP059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office. | |
| 5615 | Ashfield Land Limited (Mr Paul Derry) [1122] | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | SUPPORT | Ashfield Land supports the identification of the site 'Land North of Whitton Lane' Site ref IP140 (UC257) for employment development. The site is strategically located within the Ipswich Policy Area beside the A14 and adjoins the existing Anglia Park employment area. | |
| 5703 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sroughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. | |

| | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 5702 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. | |
| 5701 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. | |
| 5514 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. | |
| 5188 | Parliament (Mr Ben Gummer) [1404] | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | This site might be needed as one of the options for a northern route. | Allowance made. |
| 5493 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | The potential change and the development seems badly conceived, serving the interests of the developer but no-one else. Our green spaces need to be protected not destroyed. | |
| 5784 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. | |
| 5797 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. | |

| | | | | |
|------|--------------------|------------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5796 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5795 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5794 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5793 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5792 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5791 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |

| | | | | |
|------|--------------------|------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5790 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5789 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5787 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5786 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5785 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |
| 5788 | Private Individual | IP140 - Land North of Whitton Lane | OBJECT | Object to the allocation of this greenfield site. There are considerable 'brown field' sites standing idle e.g. the sugar beet factory in Sproughton, Hadleigh Road Industrial site, etc. Power lines and a gas pipeline cross the site. Development would have a significant visual impact on the area. There is already congestion so significant new infrastructure would be needed. Development would impact on wildlife and protected species including badgers and slow worms, pollute the air and land, harm Whitton conservation area and destroy pathways. The land has significant drainage issues and includes medieval hedgerows. Claydon and Whitton will lose their identity. |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5115 | Ravenswood Residents Association | IP150b (UC267 part) - Land south of Ravenswood | OBJECT | <p>Road access and egress to and from Ravenswood is a growing problem. We will want to be satisfied that this development has new and adequate road access and that the opportunity is taken to relieve pressure on the single access point that currently exists.</p> <p>As the Residents Association we wish to participate in early consultation and to be kept informed of progress of the site development proposal in general and any specific plans in particular.</p> | To incorporate improved road access to Ravenswood |
| 5116 | Ravenswood Residents Association | IP150c (UC267) - Land South of Ravenswood | OBJECT | <p>Road access and egress to and from Ravenswood is a growing problem. We will want to be satisfied that this development has new and adequate road access and that the opportunity is taken to relieve pressure on the single access point that currently exists.</p> <p>As the Residents Association we wish to participate in early consultation and to be kept informed of progress of the site development proposal in general and any specific plans in particular.</p> | To improve road access to Ravenswood |
| 5117 | Ravenswood Residents Association | IP152 - Airport Farm Kennels, North of the A14 | OBJECT | <p>Road access and egress to and from Ravenswood is a growing problem. We will want to be satisfied that this development has new and adequate road access and that the opportunity is taken to relieve pressure on the single access point that currently exists.</p> <p>As the Residents Association we wish to participate in early consultation and to be kept informed of progress of the site development proposal in general and any specific plans in particular.</p> | To improve road access to Ravenswood |
| 5667 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP165 - Eastway Business Park, Europa Way | OBJECT | <p>Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033, IP059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office.</p> | |
| 5251 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP172 - 15-19 St Margaret's Green | OBJECT | <p>The development constraints mention the site's location within the Central Conservation Area and area of archaeological importance and the nearby listed buildings and scheduled monument. However, while the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation area and listed buildings. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005).</p> | <p>In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the current last sentence in the site sheet as follows:</p> <p>"Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance"</p> |
| 5252 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP188 - Websters Saleyard site, Dock Street | OBJECT | <p>The development constraints mention the site's location within the Stoke Conservation Area (currently on the Heritage at Risk Register) and area of archaeological importance and the nearby listed building. However, while the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation area and listed building. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005).</p> | <p>In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the current last sentence in the site sheet as follows:</p> <p>"Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance"</p> |
| 5672 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | IP221 - Flying Horse PH, 4 Waterford Road | OBJECT | <p>Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033, IP059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office.</p> | |
| 5518 | Sports England (Mr Philip Raiswell) [290] | IP256 - Artificial hockey pitch, Ipswich Sports Club | OBJECT | <p>No objection provided the supporting text clearly indicates the need for quantitative or qualitative replacement provision, depending on the findings of the Playing Pitch Strategy currently being carried out by Ipswich Borough Council.</p> | |
| 5825 | Private Individual | IP256 - Artificial hockey pitch, Ipswich Sports Club | OBJECT | <p>Access is limited and not suitable for the volume of traffic development would create, the hockey pitch has been well used and we should not reduce community facilities.</p> | |
| 5321 | Private Individual | IP256 - Artificial hockey pitch, Ipswich Sports Club | OBJECT | <p>Pleased to note that the number of dwellings has been reduced to 18. However, the density is out of character with the area and a lower density should be recommended. The development would diminish the effective use and potential for sport in the local area. It is important to encourage local facilities, especially when considering the effect of traffic related to the planned Northern Fringe development.</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5601 | House of Commons (MP Dan Poulter) [1170] | IP256 - Artificial hockey pitch, Ipswich Sports Club | OBJECT | Understand that Ipswich Sports Club has applied to Ipswich Borough Council for the land that the artificial grass hockey pitch sits on to be included in the local plan for building, in order to increase its leisure facilities and create a 'hockey-hub'. I also understand that Ipswich Borough Council are conducting a strategic review of sports facilities which is due to be completed in March/April 2015. Wish to support Ipswich Sports Club and ask the Council to consider the development of their sports facilities in the strategic review. | |
| 5136 | Private Individual | IP256 - Artificial hockey pitch, Ipswich Sports Club | OBJECT | I object to this proposal the site area of the hockey pitch is not 0.87 but in fact 0.80 as the former figure includes the access road to the club. the hockey pitch has been well used since 1952 and with the development of 3500 homes on the Northern fringe the retention of this sporting facility is important for health of residents and feel confident will thrive and prosper. Once this land is lost there will be nowhere for the club to grow. if allocated the maximum density should be 12 units in keeping with surrounding area. | Reduction in density to 12 should it be allocated. |
| 5135 | Private Individual | IP256 - Artificial hockey pitch, Ipswich Sports Club | OBJECT | I object to the inclusion of site ref IP256 for the following reasons: - site has drainage problems - access to Henley Road is inadequate - density is completely out of keeping with the surrounding area | Delete |
| 5533 | Ipswich Sports Club [1417] | IP256 - Artificial hockey pitch, Ipswich Sports Club | SUPPORT | Support the allocation of land for residential development and confirm that the site is available and deliverable now. | Remove the need to retain a facility for recreational requirements |
| 5826 | Private Individual | IP256 - Artificial hockey pitch, Ipswich Sports Club | OBJECT | The access is limited and not suitable for the volume of traffic the development would create, the hockey pitch is a well used community facility. | |
| 5253 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | IP258 - Land at University Campus Suffolk | OBJECT | The development constraints mention the adjoining conservation area and archaeology issues, but do not refer to the Grade II listed Church of Holy Trinity to the south. However, while the wording explains the implications for development in terms of archaeological matters, there is no explanation of the implications for development in terms of the conservation area and listed building. The lack of clarity could affect proposals for this site. Other sites are clearer in terms of such matters (e.g. IP005). | In order to make the plan sound, there should be an additional sentence after the current last sentence in the site sheet as follows: "Development should have regard to the above heritage assets and conserve their significance" The listed church should be mentioned in the first paragraph of the development constraints section. |
| 5300 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | IP258 - Land at University Campus Suffolk | OBJECT | This document allocates land at the University (site IP258) for additional primary school provision. Site IP258 is not deliverable for the purposes of Policy CS15 or for mitigating the impact of Town Centre Housing sites. The County Council is considering other options for making suitable primary school provision for demand arising from the Town Centre and intends to have identified another deliverable option by the time of the examination. | |
| 5243 | Associated British Ports [209] | Opportunity Area A - Island Site | OBJECT | ABP supports the identification of the Island Site as an opportunity area, and generally supports the points set out under 'Development Opportunities' and 'Development Principles'. However, ABP requests the removal of reference to "lower rise development" in the supporting text and to "generally low to medium 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 on this site. ABP also requests the removal of "(max 50%)" against the residential reference, allowing a more flexible proportion of acceptable uses. | ABP requests the removal of reference to "lower rise development" in the supporting text and to "generally low to medium 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 on this site. ABP also requests the removal of "(max 50%)" against the residential reference, allowing a more flexible proportion of acceptable uses. |
| 5258 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | Opportunity Area A - Island Site | OBJECT | Support but require changes. This opportunity area is relatively coherent in terms of the sites it covers along the waterfront. References to the historic environment are good, including consideration of archaeology issues. We welcome statements such as maintaining the character of the conservation area and the retention of historic structures. The two diagrams show a number of non-listed buildings in bold outline. The key does not explain what these denote, but it appears to relate to retained buildings. This should be clarified. | |
| 5465 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | Opportunity Area A - Island Site | OBJECT | Island Site (P56) - we are encouraged by the 'Enterprise Island' plans, particularly if an integrated transport improvement is included. The plans most recently revealed go further than the Development Plan suggests. | |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5259 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | Opportunity Area B - Merchant Quarter | OBJECT | This is a more complex and diverse area than Area A, and perhaps less coherent making it difficult to establish specific development principles relating to specific sites. Current references to the historic environment are welcomed, but there needs to be greater detail with regards to scheduled monuments and archaeology given the rich potential of this area. Scheduled monuments are not shown in either diagram, with 'development options' mapped over the top of every scheduled monument within this area. This is misleading and does not provide sufficient clarity for development proposals. | In order to make the plan sound, the two diagrams for Area B should show the extent of the area's scheduled monuments. Given the uncertainty regarding the full extent of archaeology within this part of Ipswich, we do not require the 'development options' shading to be modified, but the text before the table of development opportunities/principles should clarify that the full extent of development will be subject to archaeological evaluation. We also consider that the bullet point relating to scheduled monuments and archaeology in the development principles column should be amended and strengthened along the lines of "development to address and conserve scheduled monuments and archaeology". |
| 5466 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | Opportunity Area B - Merchant Quarter | SUPPORT | Merchant Quarter (P62) - we are broadly supportive of a mixed residential, retail and restaurant/café development. Car parking should be included, if possible. | |
| 5395 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | Opportunity Area B - Merchant Quarter | OBJECT | The Opportunity Area guidance in Part C is inconsistent with the assumptions and content of site specific allocations in Policies SP2, SP3, SP5, and Tables 1-3. Opportunity Area B Merchant Quarter identifies a Development Opportunity for mixed use (max 50% [residential]). In SP2/Table 1 and SP3/Table 2 there are instances where the assumed residential component exceeds 50% (IP043, IP052, 1P136). Development Principles suggest that there should generally be a limit of 3 storey development, rising to 5 storeys in some instances, but for allocations IP136 and IP132, the assumed capacity is derived from a development scenario which is 10 storeys. | The schedules provided within Part C which describe the development opportunities and development principles should be consistent with the development descriptions and capacity evidence set out in Tables 1, 2 and 3 in Part B. Alternatively it should be made clear which content will take precedence. |
| 5260 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | Opportunity Area C - Mint Quarter / Cox Lane regeneration area and surrounding area | OBJECT | As with Area B, this is a complex and diverse area in terms of the historic environment. Current references to the historic environment are welcomed, but there needs to be greater detail with regards to scheduled monuments and archaeology. The large scheduled monument that runs through this area is not shown on either diagram, with 'development options' mapped over the top. This is misleading and does not provide sufficient clarity for development proposals. | In order to make the plan sound, the two diagrams for Area C should show the extent of the area's scheduled monument. Given the uncertainty regarding the full extent of archaeology within this part of Ipswich, we do not require the 'development options' shading to be modified, but the text before the table of development opportunities/principles should clarify that the full extent of development will be subject to archaeological evaluation. We also consider that the bullet point relating to scheduled monuments and archaeology in the development principles column should be amended and strengthened along the lines of "development to address and conserve scheduled monuments and archaeology (much of the Mint Quarter site is a scheduled monument)". |
| 5467 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | Opportunity Area C - Mint Quarter / Cox Lane regeneration area and surrounding area | OBJECT | Mint Quarter (P64) - the name should be dropped as it is associated with failure. In addition to the proposals, we consider this site could be used for the 'big-box retail cluster' outlined above. There may also be potential for it to be used as a single bus station, although the site currently occupied by Jewsons may offer this potential also. | |
| 5261 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | Opportunity Area D - Education Quarter and surrounding area | OBJECT | Support but require changes. References to the historic environment are welcomed, including archaeology, although there are three conservation areas which overlap this opportunity area, not just the Wet Dock (also Central and St Helen's). We note the reference to a minimum of six storeys along the waterfront which could have implications for the historic environment, including the Wet Dock Conservation Area. | |
| 5308 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | Opportunity Area D - Education Quarter and surrounding area | OBJECT | The County Council proposes a minor amendment to the approach proposed for the Education Quarter, to slightly widen the range of ancillary education projects which could come forward in the area. It is proposed that the final sentence of the first paragraph be amended as follows: 'Within the defined Education Quarter, development for education and ancillary uses such as student accommodation, heritage and cultural facilities or offices will be permitted.' | Final sentence of the first paragraph to be amended as follows: 'Within the defined Education Quarter, development for education and ancillary uses such as student accommodation, heritage and cultural facilities or offices will be permitted.' |
| 5262 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | Opportunity Area E - Westgate | SUPPORT | Although this area does not contain any designated heritage asset, it is situated between two conservation areas (Central and Burlington Road) and a number of listed buildings, including the Grade II* Churches of St Matthew and St Mary at the Eims and the Grade I Willis Building. Part of the site also lies within the area of archaeological importance. We welcome the additional reference to heritage assets and archaeology as a development principle. | |
| 5263 | Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [243] | Opportunity Area F - River and Princes Street Corridor | SUPPORT | This area contains a listed building and is situated near to other listed buildings (e.g. the Willis Building) and the Central Conservation Area. There may also be archaeology issues, with the area of archaeological importance covering part of the opportunity area. We welcome the additional reference to the historic environment as a development principle. | |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5468 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | Opportunity Area F - River and Princes Street Corridor | OBJECT | River and Princes Street Corridor (P74) - we have previously resisted comprehensive retail development on part of this site. We continue to do so and are pleased that this has been dropped in the new plan. We consider there to be potential on the waterfront element for residential development. We fully support new office development in Princes Street. | |
| 5397 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | Opportunity Area F - River and Princes Street Corridor | OBJECT | The Opportunity Area guidance in Part C is inconsistent with the assumptions and content of site specific allocations in Policies SP2, SP3, SP5, and Tables 1-3. In Opportunity Area F, River Corridor, the Development Opportunity identified is for office -led, mixed use with leisure and car parking. Under SP3, Site IP047 which lies within this Opportunity Area is allocated for residential-led mixed uses. It is not clear which content will take precedence. | The schedules provided within Part C which describe the development opportunities and development principles should be consistent with the development descriptions and capacity evidence set out in Tables 1, 2 and 3 in Part B. Alternatively it should be made clear which content will take precedence. |
| 5358 | Legal and General Assurance Society Limited (L&G) (Mr Alfred Yeatman) [1454] | Opportunity Area F - River and Princes Street Corridor | OBJECT | The Jewson site (IP028b/UC029) should be allocated as a development site and the frontage along this site highlighted as an area for improved public realm/pedestrian links. Its allocation [to meet the scale and type of retail and leisure development needed in town centres] would help meet the shortfall in sites against the identified needs. The site was identified as a development site within Opportunity Area G (now F) at Preferred Options stage. L&G understand that the owners indicated that it would not come forward for redevelopment. However, L&G acquired the site in 2009 and the site will now become available. | The boundary of Opportunity Area F should be drawn as per Opportunity Area G within the 2007 IP-One AAP Preferred Options. The Opportunity Area F Analysis map should highlight the Jewsons site frontage as detracting from the urban structure an area for improved public realm/ pedestrian links. The Opportunity Area F Development Option map should allocate the Jewson site as a Development Option. Insert the following Development Principle from the 2007 IP-One Area Action Plan into the Opportunity Area F - River Corridor and Princess Street Development Opportunities and Principles Table: "To improve legibility of routes through Cardinal Park and between the station and the shopping centre". |
| 5515 | Corindale Properties Ltd [1424] | SP1 The Protection of allocated sites | OBJECT | The company's land located off Toller Road is annotated on the proposals map as a site to be used exclusively for employment purposes. This is considered to be unduly restrictive in the context of a still uncertain economy and ignores attempts to market the site for employment use over 10 years. The policy ought to reflect that at the very least an element of other land uses e.g. limited retail and/or residential should be incorporated into the policy for the allocation of the specific parcel of land (reference 208). The allocation should be changed or mixed use to deliver regeneration. | Either change the wording of policy SP1 and SP5 to provide for flexibility or in the alternative change the allocation for this specific site from exclusively employment and retain for the purpose to that of a mixed use containing an element of retail/residential as well as employment. |
| 5435 | Coes (Mr William Coe) [1435] | SP10 Retail Site Allocation | OBJECT | This policy of focussing on the Westgate seems to contradict everything within that master plan and sends another skewed message in terms of where development in the town should take place. We believe that the council should stick with the town centre master plan and focus on the north/south access development rather than divert anything to a Westgate development, which runs contrary to this policy as set out in the master plan. We would urge the Council, despite the so called knowledge of the DTZ report, to work together with local stakeholders and follow the consensus view. | |
| 5392 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | SP10 Retail Site Allocation | OBJECT | SP10 is not positively prepared or justified as the allocations included do not seek to meet the requirement for comparison retail identified in the evidence base. Insufficient sites are identified to meet the requirements for retail floorspace over the plan period, particularly for comparison goods. The evidence base identifies a requirement for additional retail floorspace. A single site is proposed for new retail development in the town centre (Westgate), which is carried forward as an existing commitment. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail development needed. | Policy SP 10 should be amended to identify further retail allocations which will address the identified comparison and convenience retail capacity within Ipswich to 2026 and 2031. Sites allocated in the Waterfront for mixed use development comprising small scale retail as well as other commercial, residential, leisure and cultural uses should be allocated to allow for a more flexible quantum for the retail component, to allow for a viable mix of uses to be developed. |
| 5360 | Legal and General Assurance Society Limited (L&G) (Mr Alfred Yeatman) [1454] | SP10 Retail Site Allocation | OBJECT | The DTZ report provides insufficient evidence to justify the reduction in new retail floorspace. The 2010 retail capacity study should be updated now to inform policy. Policy is not positively prepared and could sterilise Ipswich town centre for medium to large scale retail development for 11 years, having serious implications on the vitality and viability of the centre. The Jewson site must be considered for town centre use including retail. | Policy SP10 needs to be reworded to include allocation of commercial retail and leisure use at Site UC029 (Jewsons, land west of Greyfriars Road) [SHLAA reference IP028b]. Policy SP10 supporting text needs to be updated accordingly. |
| 5239 | Associated British Ports [209] | SP11 The Waterfront | SUPPORT | ABP welcomes the recognition given at paragraph 5.20 (in support of Policy SP11) to the need for new development to take account of the Port's operational needs given its situation within and adjacent to the Waterfront. | |

| | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5394 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | SP11 The Waterfront | OBJECT | <p>SP11 is not positively prepared or justified as the allocations included do not seek to meet the requirement for comparison retail identified in the evidence base.</p> <p>Insufficient sites are identified to meet the requirements for retail floorspace over the plan period, particularly for comparison goods. The evidence base identifies a requirement for additional retail floorspace. A single site is proposed for new retail development in the town centre (Westgate), which is carried forward as an existing commitment. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail development needed.</p> | <p>Policy SP11 should be amended to identify further retail allocations which will address the identified comparison and convenience retail capacity within Ipswich to 2026 and 2031. Sites in those parts of the Waterfront that lie within the identified town centre boundary that are allocated for mixed use development comprising small scale retail as well as other commercial, residential, leisure and cultural uses should be allocated to allow for a more flexible quantum for the retail component, to allow for a viable mix of uses to be developed. The Central Shopping Area boundary should be extended to include the main routes through the Merchants Quarter at Star Lane and College Street.</p> |
| 5211 | The Theatres Trust (Planning Adviser) [278] | SP14 Arts, Culture and Tourism | OBJECT | <p>Support but require changes. The Theatres Trust supports this Policy as it reflects guidance at item 70 of the NPPF which states that planning policy should protect existing cultural facilities.</p> <p>However, it is a concern that it only covers facilities in the main town centre area. This type of policy is normally included as a core strategy or a general development policy.</p> | |
| 5461 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | SP14 Arts, Culture and Tourism | OBJECT | <p>Policy SP14 (P44) - the support that the Council shows for a conference/exhibition space is welcomed, but substantially more detail is required for what exactly is planned here and how it could be achieved. There has been talk of a new 'attraction' and, again, this needs consideration.</p> | |
| 5452 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | SP15 Improving Pedestrian and Cycle Routes | SUPPORT | <p>We also support improved pedestrian routes and vistas from the town centre to/from the Waterfront. Equally, we do not think that the traffic on Star Lane should be thought of as preventing this.</p> | |
| 5455 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | SP15 Improving Pedestrian and Cycle Routes | OBJECT | <p>Upper Brook Street (P46) and Museum Street - we would like to see both streets pedestrianised and high-quality residential development returned to Museum Street south. The latter appears to be omitted.</p> | |
| 5241 | Associated British Ports [209] | SP16 Transport Proposals in IP-One | SUPPORT | <p>ABP welcomes the approach taken in the wording of Policy SP16 and paragraph 5.46.</p> <p>ABP recognises the desire for a new crossing and will assist the Council in seeking to develop a feasible solution which addresses all safety, security and operational issues and avoids any adverse impact on port operations.</p> | |
| 5527 | RCP Parking Ltd [1418] | SP17 Town Centre Car Parking | OBJECT | <p>RCP Parking Ltd object to the delineated boundary of the central parking core as shown on the proposals map and considered that it should be changed and extended to include a number of sites which are making a very effective contribution towards parking provision for the people of Ipswich and will do so and can do so for the foreseeable future. In particular, the exclusion of sites:- Duke Street on Orwell Quay Princes Street Handford Road East Ranelagh Road, St Peter's Warehouse site on Bridge Street Should be included and the boundary adjusted accordingly.</p> | <p>Alter the specific delineation of the central parking core on the proposals map to include the site currently operated by RCP Ltd. as listed above.</p> |
| 5517 | RCP Parking Ltd [1418] | SP17 Town Centre Car Parking | OBJECT | <p>RCP parking Ltd considers that the whole approach to the control of parking in the central area and the future of provision of multi-storey car parks is entirely aspirational and not deliverable. Further, this policy ignores the very real contribution that sites such as those operated for a temporary period for short-stay parking (e.g. Handford Road, Princes Street, St Peters Warehouse site for example) make to the people working, shopping and undertaking leisure pursuits in Ipswich.</p> | <p>Change the policy to reflect the contribution made by short-stay car parking on vacant land for a temporary period thereby providing valuable use for a number of stakeholders and making a contribution towards Ipswich's parking needs. The council should recognise and accept that vacant sites in the central area are a permanent feature of the dynamics of the property development cycle and that it is a valid and sound planning objective to make best use of vacant land. They should adjust Policy SP17 accordingly.</p> |
| 5463 | Ipswich Central (Mr Paul Clement) [1423] | SP17 Town Centre Car Parking | OBJECT | <p>Car Parking (SP17) - Ipswich must be made more appealing to the car-borne visitor, not less. Plans to rebuild Crown Street car park are to be welcomed. The new car park must include good quality spaces and a much improved link across Crown Street.</p> | |
| 5234 | Associated British Ports [209] | SP2 Land Allocated for housing | SUPPORT | <p>ABP supports the allocation of Site IP037 - Island Site for housing as part of a mixed use development. Given the nascent proposals for the site, the notional housing capacity set out in the policy can only be indicative at this stage, although it is below ABP's expectations. ABP welcomes the recognition in the Policy that the precise split should be a matter for a future master plan and/or planning application having regard to viability (consistent with para 2.11).</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5295 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | SP2 Land Allocated for housing | SUPPORT | It does not appear that any sites are undeliverable for transport reasons when considered individually and if an assumption is made that proper provision is made for sustainable transport measures and highway mitigation. This statement needs to be considered against those made on the Core Strategy and cumulative transport impacts. | |
| 5301 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | SP2 Land Allocated for housing | OBJECT | This document is only deliverable with sufficient infrastructure. Indicative Section 106 costs (education, libraries, waste) and highway requirements are set out in the full representation. Early years: larger sites (>200 dwellings) may need to make on site provision. Primary: in principle, primary school places can be provided (predicated on development funding places, where compliant with the CIL Regulations). Secondary: the new secondary school planned at Garden Suburb (CS10) will also need to mitigate demand arising from background and housing growth across Ipswich. Sites should be deliverable with suitable (SFRA) flood risk measures. Archaeology does not prevent sites being allocated. | |
| 5669 | Ministry of Defence (Louise Dale) [1057] | SP2 Land Allocated for housing | OBJECT | Sites IP005, IP029, IP032, IP033, IP059a, IP061, IP105, IP140a and b, IP165, IP175, IP221, IP265 and IP261. These referenced sites fall within the 91.4m height consultation zone surrounding Wattisham airfield. Therefore, any proposed structures in these areas which may exceed 91.4m need to be reviewed by this office. | |
| 5339 | The Kesgrave Covenant Ltd (Mr Crispin Rope) [1439] | SP2 Land Allocated for housing | OBJECT | The Core Strategy Review fails to identify either sufficient specific deliverable sites for years 1-10 or broad locations for the full housing requirement, and therefore fails the tests of Soundness in terms of Effectiveness, being Positively Prepared, and being consistent with the NPPF. | In accordance with our representations to the Core Strategy Review, there is a need to allocate additional strategic sites for the last part of the Plan period (2026-2031) or identify deliverable broad locations. In that context, land at North-East Ipswich should be identified on the Key Diagram and Site Allocations Proposals Map as a growth location or strategic site for post 2026 development. |
| 5381 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | SP2 Land Allocated for housing | OBJECT | The approach to proposals for retail development in the Site Allocations Plan is at odds with the evidence base and crucially underplays the need to accommodate retail growth in the town. Applekirk Properties Ltd supports the allocation of sites IP043, IP136, IP052 and IP035 for mixed use development that will contribute to the regeneration of the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter, but objects to the failure to provide for retail development in excess of 200 sq m within these sites. Policies CS2, CS3 and CS5 fail to meet the requirement for comparison retail identified in the evidence base. | Allocated sites within the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter should provide for a mix of residential and town centre uses including retail in excess of 200 sqm floorspace, to allow flexibility to assemble a viable development scheme. |
| 5190 | ALDI stores Ltd (Peter Griffiths) [1060] | SP3 Land with planning permission or awaiting a Section 106 | SUPPORT | We continue our support for the allocation of a District Centre at Sroughton Road. We have concern in respect of the prescriptive nature of Uses being identified for site IP090, including that uses on the site should be in line with site's historic planning permissions. We request the Council acknowledges the NPPF (p.173) which states when pursuing sustainable development careful attention is made to ensure viability and deliverability of schemes. It's not suggested that residential is not possible, but rather the scale of residential must be commercially realistic and not impede upon delivery of the commercial element of the Centre. | It is respectfully submitted that the creation of a District Centre is a key aim of the policy and has been identified as a much needed facility to serve north east Ipswich, including significant housing growth in the area. In order for the new District Centre to compete with other Centres in Ipswich the scheme would be more suited as a commercially led scheme rather than a residential led scheme. This would ensure viability and deliverability of the scheme and act in line with the para.173 of the NPPF. For the avoidance of doubt, it is not suggested that residential is not possible, but rather the scale of residential must be commercially realistic and not impede upon delivery of the commercial element of the District Centre. |
| 5382 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | SP3 Land with planning permission or awaiting a Section 106 | OBJECT | The approach to proposals for retail development in the Site Allocations Plan is at odds with the evidence base and crucially underplays the need to accommodate retail growth in the town. Applekirk Properties Ltd supports the allocation of sites IP043, IP136, IP052 and IP035 for mixed use development that will contribute to the regeneration of the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter, but objects to the failure to provide for retail development in excess of 200 sq m within these sites. Policies CS2, CS3 and CS5 fail to meet the requirement for comparison retail identified in the evidence base. | Allocated sites within the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter should provide for a mix of residential and town centre uses including retail in excess of 200 sqm floorspace, to allow flexibility to assemble a viable development scheme. |
| 5273 | National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr Roger Yarwood) [1213] | SP4 Land protected for Gypsy and Traveller sites | OBJECT | SP4 is different to CS11 in the Core Strategy but they cover the same activity. There should be a single policy covering gypsies and travellers. Policy SP4 is not compliant with paragraph 10 of Planning Policy for Traveller sites under which criteria for considering applications should be established. Criteria a), b) and c) of SP4 should be deleted and applications determined against criteria in the Core Strategy. | Delete criteria a), b) and c) of SP4 and have a single policy for dealing with applications for traveller sites. |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5235 | Associated British Ports [209] | SP5 Land allocated for employment use | SUPPORT | ABP supports the allocation of Site IP037 - Island Site for employment as part of a mixed use development. Given the nascent proposals for the site, the notional area/split set out in the policy can only be indicative at this stage. ABP welcomes the recognition in the Policy that the precise split should be a matter for a future master plan. | |
| 5296 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | SP5 Land allocated for employment use | SUPPORT | It does not appear that any sites are undeliverable for transport reasons when considered individually and if an assumption is made that proper provision is made for sustainable transport measures and highway mitigation. This statement needs to be considered against those made on the Core Strategy and cumulative transport impacts. | |
| 5614 | Ashfield Land Limited (Mr Paul Derry) [1122] | SP5 Land allocated for employment use | OBJECT | Ashfield Land supports the identification of the site 'Land North of Whitton Lane' Site ref IP140 (UC257) for employment development. The site is strategically located within the Ipswich Policy Area beside the A14 and adjoins the existing Anglia Park employment area. Table 3 within draft policy SP5 notes the site is 'suitable primarily for B1 with some B2 and B8'. Whilst the introduction of reference to classes B2 and B8 is welcomed, the emphasis on class B1 remains adversely restrictive. | |
| 5516 | Corindale Properties Ltd [1424] | SP5 Land allocated for employment use | OBJECT | The company's land located off Toller Road is annotated on the proposals map as a site to be used exclusively for employment purposes. This is considered to be unduly restrictive in the context of a still uncertain economy and ignores attempts to market the site for employment use over 10 years. The policy ought to reflect that at the very least an element of other land uses e.g. limited retail and/or residential should be incorporated into the policy for the allocation of the specific parcel of land (reference 208). The allocation should be changed or mixed use to deliver regeneration. | Either change the wording of policy SP1 and SP5 to provide for flexibility or in the alternative change the allocation for this specific site from exclusively employment and retain for the purpose to that of a mixed use containing an element of retail/residential as well as employment. |
| 5383 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | SP5 Land allocated for employment use | OBJECT | The approach to proposals for retail development in the Site Allocations Plan is at odds with the evidence base and crucially underplays the need to accommodate retail growth in the town. Applekirk Properties Ltd supports the allocation of sites IP043, IP136, IP052 and IP035 for mixed use development that will contribute to the regeneration of the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter, but objects to the failure to provide for retail development in excess of 200 sq m within these sites. Policies CS2, CS3 and CS5 fail to meet the requirement for comparison retail identified in the evidence base. | Allocated sites within the Waterfront/Merchant's Quarter should provide for a mix of residential and town centre uses including retail in excess of 200 sqm floorspace, to allow flexibility to assemble a viable development scheme. |
| 5236 | Associated British Ports [209] | SP6 Land allocated and protected as open space | OBJECT | ABP supports the overall site allocation (IP037) 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. | 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. |
| 5297 | Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [356] | SP7 Land allocated for leisure uses or community facilities | SUPPORT | It does not appear that any sites are undeliverable for transport reasons when considered individually and if an assumption is made that proper provision is made for sustainable transport measures and highway mitigation. This statement needs to be considered against those made on the Core Strategy and cumulative transport impacts. | |
| 5359 | Legal and General Assurance Society Limited (L&G) (Mr Alfred Yeatman) [1454] | SP7 Land allocated for leisure uses or community facilities | OBJECT | Policy SP7 does not allocate sufficient sites to meet the projected demand for commercial leisure space. The Jewson site (IP028b/UC029) must be considered for town centre use including leisure. The [NPPF] requirement to allocate sufficient sites for leisure development is reinforced by the 2013 DTZ report, which recognises that the centre has a relative lack of leisure and food/drink units. Policy SP7 allocates only one site for leisure development (the former Odeon Cinema, c. 2,500 sq m). This does not meet demand for commercial leisure (A3-A5 only) up to 2016 (forecast at 2,660-4,000sq m (net)). | Table 5 of Policy SP7 should be changed to include the Jewsons site, west of Greyfriars Road [SHLAA reference IP028b] allocated for town centre use development including leisure. |
| 5740 | Private Individual | SP8 Orwell Country Park Extension | OBJECT | Object to a visitors centre because it will require parking and a new access; it will bring people and dogs close to the SPA and increase pressure on it; IBC has not adequately managed the inter-tidal area to date; the site is already at saturation point for public recreation; cars via Gainsborough Lane or Bridge Wood would pose a danger to people and impair the local ambience; the centre would not benefit local people; a centre would attract vandalism; the infrastructure and habitat management of the park have been neglected. The park needs resources to warden and manage it properly. | Delete visitor centre allocation. Provide more resources to manage and warden the country park. |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5619 | Natural England (Mr John Jackson) [1413] | SP8 Orwell Country Park Extension | OBJECT | <p>Further to our previous concerns about Pond Hall, we welcome the inclusion of new policy SP8. IBC has committed to carrying out a study into visitor use and bird disturbance around Orwell Country Park and Pond Hall, which will provide a baseline and be used to inform visitor management measures at the park. Natural England advises that with these measures in place, as informed by the study, the policy is not likely to have a significant effect in terms of the Habitats Regulations. The planned visitor centre feasibility study should include a separate project level Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p> | <p>As part of policy SP8, the Council will investigate further the feasibility of including a visitor centre facility within the site, including any potential impacts on the SPA. This feasibility study should include a separate project level Habitats Regulations Assessment to examine effects on the SPA.</p> |
| 5238 | Associated British Ports [209] | SP9 Safeguarding land for transport infrastructure | SUPPORT | <p>ABP is content with the wording in Policy SP9 as it relates to Site IP037 that the development layout should not prejudice future provision of a Wet Dock Crossing, provided that this does not ignore that the critical challenge to realising successful redevelopment of the Island Site will be viability (which is recognised at paragraph 2.11 as one of the more detailed issues emerging from the evidence which this plan needs to address).</p> | |

Proposed Submission Supporting Documents

| REP ID | RESPONDENT NAME | DOCUMENT | SUPPORT/ OBJECT | REPRESENTATION SUMMARY | CHANGE TO PLAN REQUESTED |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5398 | Applekirk Properties Ltd (Teresa Cook) [1452] | Local Plan IP-One Policies Map Nov 2014 (Amended 07/01/2015) | OBJECT | Applekirk Properties Ltd objects to the IP-One Area Inset to the Local Plan Policies Map as the boundary indicated for the River and Princes Street Corridor Opportunity Area is not justified as it is not consistent with the boundary shown in the Part C of the Site Allocations Plan. | The IP-One Area Inset to the Local Plan Policies Map should be amended so that the boundary shown on the Map for the River and Princes Street Corridor Opportunity Area is the same as that shown on the plan in Part C of the Site Allocations Plan. |

Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal - Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Area Action Plan)

| REP ID | RESPONDENT NAME | CHAPTER | SUPPORT / OBJECT | REPRESENTATION SUMMARY | CHANGE TO PLAN REQUESTED |
|--------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5509 | Northern Fringe Protection Group (Mr Brian Samuel) [976] | 4.3 Appraisal of Site Allocations | OBJECT | The viability of the allocation of the Westgate site for Retail has been questioned by Ipswich Central and the alternative options proposed by Ipswich Central for Retail sites need to be considered in the SA of the Site Allocations accordingly. | Alternative options for retail sites proposed by Ipswich Central need to be considered in the SA. |
| 5739 | Save Our Country Spaces (Mrs Barbara Robinson) [978] | 4.3 Appraisal of Site Allocations | OBJECT | SOCS endorse the Northern Fringe Protection Group's points. The viability of the allocation of the Westgate site for Retail has been questioned by Ipswich Central and the alternative options proposed by Ipswich Central for Retail sites need to be considered in the SA of the Site Allocations accordingly. | Alternative options for retail sites proposed by Ipswich Central need to be considered in the SA. |
| 5621 | Natural England (Mr John Jackson) [1413] | Chapter 4: APPRAISAL OF THE SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD | OBJECT | Natural England is reasonably satisfied that the SA considers the impacts of the Core Strategy and Policies [sic] on relevant aspects of the environment within our remit, including biodiversity and geology, landscape, green infrastructure and soils. We particularly welcome SA objectives to protect and enhance designated sites, including SSSIs, SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites, in addition to locally designated and non-designated areas of biodiversity. However, we would advise that the SA should cross-reference with the findings and recommendations of the AA which identifies potential recreational disturbance effects on European sites, and measures to mitigate these. | We would advise that the SA should cross-reference with the findings and recommendations of the AA which identifies potential recreational disturbance effects on European sites, and measures to mitigate these. |