

Eye Neighbourhood Plan Examination

Eye Town Council (ETC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the responses on the Eye Neighbourhood Plan (ENP). Its comments are as follows:

Housing Issues

Representations regarding Tuffs Rd – ETC understands that representations by AAH Planning, COP Solutions and TW Gaze all relate to the land at Tuffs Way. The owners of that site have made planning applications for the development of 120+ houses on the site and one of those applications is currently being considered on appeal. The owners have not engaged at all in the ENP process despite a number of opportunities at earlier stages. They generally suggest that other housing sites will not come forward for development – see response below.

The viability of housing sites and the overall housing requirements – a number of representations (those regarding Tuffs above and Pegasus for Baldwin) suggest that various housing sites proposed in the ENP will not come forward. ETC considers that the active participation in the process of the owners of the Paddock House, Chicken Factory and Health Centre sites indicate their intent to develop those sites. However, ETC acknowledges that the Health Centre proposals (Policy 4) are intended as an enabling policy to allow consolidation of health facilities and investment in Hartismere Health and Care and the development of the site is less certain. It also acknowledges that, although it is confident that the measures it is taking to work with relevant interests will be successful, it cannot at this stage demonstrate that the access constraint can be overcome to allow the development of its land at Victoria Mill to proceed. Regarding the windfall allowance, ETC remains of the view that 50% of past completions is a reasonable assumption for future supply.

ETC wishes to consider this issue further and will make a supplementary response by 8th August.

Suffolk County Council (SCC)

Policy 14 – The County Council's support for the proposed Leisure centre is welcome

Policy 9 – ETC does not oppose the proposed amended wording regarding flooding but notes that the representation by Pegasus on behalf of the landowner considers the current wording too restrictive. ETC also does not oppose the requirement for an early years facility in principle but it would be concerned if that requirement held up the redevelopment of the Chicken Factory site which is a priority for local residents.

Policy 34 – ETC agrees that strategic infrastructure spending will sometimes be required outside of Eye to support development within it and it did not intend that the policy wording should preclude that. It would not oppose rewording if the Examiner considers that would clarify the policies intent.

Infrastructure Plan – SCCs willingness to work with ETC on the Plan is welcome – it would also welcome the support of Mid Suffolk District Council (MSDC) which has hitherto not met ETCs request to work together to ensure the right infrastructure is provided to meet the growing needs of the Town.

Mid Suffolk District Council (MSDC)

Policy 5 and Policy 20 (re Paddock House) – ETC welcomes the District Council's withdrawal of its objection to Policies 5 and 20, its commitment to retain the Local Green Space at Church Street and to work with ETC to agree an appropriate scheme for the site. *Further discussions are being held with MSDC to seek agreement about the development of the site and it is hoped that a proposal can be considered by the Town Council by the 8th August so that a joint proposal can be put forward for the Inspectors consideration.*

Policy 9 – ETC also does not oppose the requirement for an early years facility in principle but it would be concerned if that requirement held up the redevelopment of the Chicken Factory site which is a priority for local residents.

Policy 34 – MSDC has consistently refused to work with ETC regarding the relationship between the neighbourhood and local plans and on infrastructure issues. ETC has not been consulted on or involved with the preparation of the District Infrastructure Plan and its experience suggests MSDC will not provide adequate investment for Eye. In the absence of evidence that adequate investment will be made ETC opposes any amendments to Policy 34

Environment Agency

Flooding – ETC would not oppose a separate section on flooding.

NHS Property Services

Policy 4 – This policy is an enabling policy to allow consolidation of health facilities and investment in Hartismere Health and Care. ETC accepts decisions need to be taken by the Health sector before the proposed development can take place but it remains of the view that the decision making process should not be referred to in the Policy.

House types and mix– these are based on detailed assessments of local need and strongly supported by local people who want the needs of young people/families and older people to be met. Neighbourhood Plans are a vehicle which allows local people to influence how their neighbourhood should change.

All Saints School

Policy 20 – the ownership of Local Green Spaces is not relevant and ETC notes that All Saints Schools comments are contradictory – on one hand it says that the school playing fields are protected by the Secretary of State for education while on the other it states that the area may be needed to extend the school. ETC opposes the removal of this LGS designation.

Policy Eye 13 and supporting text – All Saints School is correct that ETC resolved to amend this policy to refer more generally to education provision rather than specifically a primary school but in error the amendment was not made. ETC would therefore support the changes requested by All Saints School.

Suffolk Preservation Society

Design Guidance – ETC would have no objection to the guidance being referred to in Policy 16c.

Landscape Designations – the Landscape Area terminology was amended in response to comments by SCC and MSDC to conform to local plan policy – they have made no further comments on this matter. Visually Important Open Spaces should have been identified on the Policies Map (Para 7.10) but there wasn't space on the Maps. ETC would support them being identified in the policies Map in final plan.

Pegasus for Amber Holdings

Policies 1 and 9 – ETC has no objection to the rounding of the number of houses proposed to 80.

Para 5.7 – ETC acknowledges that the old station building is not in good condition which is why its retention is not proposed in the Policy.

Para 5.11 – a transport assessment would be acceptable to ETC.

Policy 9 – the archaeology requirements were requested by SCC (which has now requested revised wording)

Policy 32 – the policy does not require developers to prepare the Traffic Management Plan – ETC is working with SCC and MSDC on it.

Pegasus for Baldwin

Affordable Housing – the Plan proposes 90 affordable houses which is 10% of the District requirement of 900 – well in excess of the pro rata requirement. ETC would welcome the increase in the number of affordable houses being provided on the land south of eye airfield above the 20% currently proposed.

House types and mix– these are based on detailed assessments of local need and strongly supported by local people who want the needs of young people/families and older people to be met. Neighbourhood Plans are a vehicle which allows local people to influence how their neighbourhood should change.

Eye Town Council

24th July 2019