

EASTON PARISH COUNCIL

Housing

Q1. Do you have any thoughts on the approach the Council has followed? Is there an alternative approach that you think should be considered for the more detailed distribution of housing in the Market Towns and Key and Local Service Centres set out in the Core Strategy and why?

A1. *Easton has been classified as a Local Service Centre, which the council feels is incorrect as the village no longer has all the facilities that would place it in this criterion. Despite this, there appears to be no scope for reassessment and the Parish Council feels this should be addresses*

Q2. Does the suggested amount of new housing to be provided in your village/town sound about right? If not, why not and what is an appropriate amount?

A2. *The Parish Council believes that the suggested amount (10) is too high. The original SHLAA suggested a total of 8 houses: 4 have already been built so the residual number should be 4.*

The process does not seem to be logical, as bigger villages than Easton have zero allocation.

Q3. Using the information in the Maps Booklet and the guidance set out in paragraph 26 (page 16) - If for your town/parish there is a residual housing requirement which site(s) do you think are most suited to meet this requirement and why?

A3. *Only one site has been suggested – 672A – which the Parish Council does not support, because the required allocation it feels is appropriate, i.e., 4, can be achieved by infill.*

Q4. Do you know of any other sites not identified through the SHLAA process which you think should be considered as potentially suitable housing sites to allocate? If yes, please provide details.

A4. *Sites to consider would be (as yet unspecified) on Framlingham Road.*

Q5. Thinking about your own community, the people who live there, the people who would want to live there but maybe can't because there is nowhere suitable – what type and mix of housing do you think is most needed to meet your community's needs?

Do you have any evidence which would support your comments and which could help support this Local

Plan document as it progresses? An example might be an up to date parish plan.

A5. *One or two smaller starter homes are required included for young people who wish to stay in their home village. All building should be to conservation standards, in keeping with the overall village aesthetic.*

Q6. Do you think allocated sites should be included within any updated physical limits boundary or should remain outside of the physical limits boundary but denoted by a specific housing allocation designation? (Once allocated sites are built out, the opportunity would exist for the physical limits boundary to be redrawn next time they come up for review).

A6. *The Parish Council feels the boundary should remain as it is, and updating should only be considered if any allocated sites outside of it are developed.*

Q7. Using the Map Booklet, for your village/town do you think the boundary line as it currently exists as shown on Map 1 needs amending?

A7. Yes.

Q8. For your village/town do you think the changes suggested on Map 2 are sensible and would you support them?

A8. Yes.

Q9. Would you want to suggest an alternative alignment to that set out in Map 2? If yes, please provide details and reasons.

A9. No.

Q10. If your village/town includes one or more Areas to be Protected from Development ("saved" policy AP28) is there still a need for them to be protected from development?

A10. *Two sites need to be protected:*

- *Brewery Meadow, adjacent to the car park (voted 4-1 (2 abstentions));*
- *Land at Pound Corner.*

There have been 3 applications for development on Brewery Meadow, 2 of which went to the Planning Inspectorate and were turned down owing to the potential adverse effect on what is a unique estate village. In addition, the site is subject to flooding.

Q11. Are there any other areas which you think should be designated to be protected from development? In answering this question please have regard to paragraph 2.35.

A11. *Yes, the following 3 areas:*

1. *Farm land to the north of site 672A;*
2. *Hunt kennels and the surrounding land;*
3. *Land south of the cemetery between Cemetery Lane and School Lane, IF protection can be rescinded in the future to allow extension to the cemetery.*

The Economy

Q12. What do you consider to be the main issues which need to be addressed to ensure the Martlesham site remains successful into the future?

A12. *An adequate traffic management system is vital.*

Q13. Do you have a preference for any of the three suggestions listed? Or do you have an alternative suggestion which should be considered?

A13. *Option 3 is the Parish Council's preference.*

Q14. Should the Ransomes Europark allocation be extended onto the land adjacent within the AONB?

A14. Yes.

Q15. Do you see a need to maintain separate planning policies for the former airfield sites of Parham, Debach and Rendlesham or could the future development of these sites be adequately controlled via a general employment area policy?

A15. *Yes, there is definitely a need to maintain three separate policies, as each of the sites has characteristics not shared with the others.*

Q16. Are there any other sites that you would want the Council to consider as potential future employment sites to be allocated in this Local Plan document?

A16. No

Q17. Are there any local employment areas or vacant or under-used sites which you think should be identified and protected for employment use?

A17. No

Q18. Are there any tourist related matters that you would like to bring to our attention that you think this Local Plan document could usefully address?

A18. No

Q19. Given the definition of Main Town Centre uses in the NPPF, the unique character of the individual market town and the desire to see the town centres remain viable and vibrant areas into the future, do you think the town centre boundary as currently defined is the most appropriate?

A19. *Easton Parish Council has no comment to make on this issue.*

Q20. What changes if any would you suggest to the town centre boundary as currently drawn and why?

A20. *Easton Parish Council has no comment to make on this issue.*

Q21. Do you think this Local Plan document should look to identify primary and secondary shopping frontages for each or any of the market towns (Aldeburgh, Saxmundham, Woodbridge)? If yes, which areas do you think they should apply to and why?

A21. *Easton Parish Council has no comment to make on this issue.*

Q22. Are there any areas which you would like to see allocated for new retail use?

A22. *Easton Parish Council has no comment to make on this issue.*

District Centres (Kesgrave, Martlesham Heath, Wickham Market and Rushmere St Andrew)

Q23. Do you see any need to change the District Centre boundaries from those shown above?

A23. *Easton Parish Council has no comment to make on this issue.*

Local Centres

Q24. Are there any local facilities that you would want to nominate for consideration as a local centre?

A24. *Easton Parish Council has no comment to make on this issue.*

The Environment

Coastal change Management Areas

Q25. Do you have any thoughts on the approach set out?

A25. *There appears to be no clear policy for management of coastal erosion*

Historic Environment

Q26. Are there any buildings/groups of buildings that you would wish to nominate for consideration as non-listed heritage assets?

A26. *No.*

Other Environmental Issues You May Wish To Consider

Q27. Is coalescence addressed sufficiently in the Core Strategy or should it be further considered in this document?

A27. *Easton Parish Council has no comment to make on this issue.*

Q28. Are the Biodiversity Action Plan, local ecological networks, priority habitats and priority species given sufficient policy coverage?

A28. *Easton Parish Council has no comment to make on this issue.*

Q29. Should there be further reference to Air Quality Management Areas?

A29. *Easton Parish Council has no comment to make on this issue.*

Community and well being

Q30. Thinking about your community do you have any specific concerns with regard to current community infrastructure provision that this Local Plan document could address?

A30. Yes:

1. *The extension of Fibre Optic Broadband Provision;*
2. *Adequate bus transport;*
3. *The extension of Wickham Market Station Car Park, the size of which is currently inadequate.*

Q31. Do existing facilities properly meet your needs?

A31. No, see **A30**.