

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
1	Albury	Wick 1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection to 25 dwellings at Simon's Cross.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection to 85 proposed dwellings at Old School farm, High Street. A maximum of 40 dwellings would be more suitable to the plot and have less impact on the village.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plot of 4.4 HA is large enough for 85 dwellings within the constraints included in the NP</li> </ul>	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would have no objection to building on the Penny Field as an alternative to the above as its size would restrict the number of possible dwellings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Penny field has the potential for use as local green space and this is reflected in Wick 12</li> </ul>	None
		Wick 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed car parking site does not provide safe highway access onto Mill Lane or to the connection onto Chapel Lane.</li> </ul> <p>It would urbanise the appearance of Mill Lane which is currently a very attractive part of the village</p>	<p>There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP</p>	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.	
2	Bailey K	Wick 1		Additional houses being built should be affordable using schemes such as help to buy to keep families living locally. This will keep the community feel to Wickham Market	The guidance in the Local Plan (Policy SCLP5.10) covers affordable housing. Of these affordable dwellings, 50% should be for affordable rent / social rent, 25% should be for shared ownership and 25% should be for discounted home ownership.	None
			Para 3.2	Additional activities for families needing childcare such as summer and sports days.	Noted. However, these are activities rather than facilities and not covered in a NP.	None
			Para 9.2	Improvements to existing playground at Simons Cross. This is very dated. Evening facilities to be opened up to teenagers.	Improvements to existing play and youth facilities is an investment priority in the NP. It is also covered in Wick 13	None
			Para 7.1	Additional transports links to Woodbridge and Ipswich. Could community buses run services to train services to train stations.	The provision of public transport is outside the scope of a NP. However, the NP will clarify what the WMPC is doing to work with SCC, local bus companies and ESTA to improve transport services.	Section 7.6 has been updated to clarify what WMPC is doing to help alleviate issues..
			Para 7.9	Pedestrian walkways need to be considered as these are narrow in places. Pedestrian crossing needs to be added near the square to aid vulnerable users.	This is included in Wick 10 and Table 3.1 Objectives 7 and 11 and Table 3.2 Objective 12.	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
3	Barley B	Wick 13b		The affordable houses must be houses the local young people can afford	Ideally houses should be provided in the new developments that local young people can afford. However, ESC classify affordable housing in new developments as social rented.	None
		Wick 13c		This needs to be made clear as to where you think you can safely locate approximately 10 vehicles within Simons Cross	Access into the new Simons Cross development is being looked into further so this may not be an issue.	None
		Wick 13c		Where are you going to reroute all the people that use the bridleway to get to school, shops, doctors, village hall, and Simons Cross playfield and playground via the footpath.  The bridleway is also used by mobility scooters, horse riders and dogwalkers from all over the village (that's any time from 04.00hrs to 22.00 hrs)	Access into the new Simons Cross development is being looked into further.	None
		Wick 13d		There's 100 plus movements at that junction per day. What would be needed to make it a little safer would be a Puffin crossing	Noted. Access into the new Simons Cross development is being looked into further so this may not be an issue.	None
		Wick 13e		Leave it where it is. Are you going to put in additional play space	Intention is to provide a new play park within the new development - either in current location or a new location.	None
4	Barley P	Wick 13c		James Holland's vehicular access at the lower end of Simons Cross is much safer, also there is room for access without the need to remove garages between 57 and 59 causing more problems. Traffic would have to drive through Simons Cross.  This would be a good thing as it would slow traffic down	Access into the new Simons Cross development is being looked into further. Will need to seek advice from Highways.	Advice has now been sought from ESC and SCC regarding vehicular access. WICK 13 updated to indicate both possible access points. Final decision will be made when planning application submitted.
		Wick 13d		There is much less pedestrian footfall at the lower end of Little lane making it much safer for a road to cross.  The proposed crossing is used by everyone going to the village, the playground and the playing field	Access into the new Simons Cross development is being looked into further. Will need to seek advice from Highways	Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access points have been clarified in WICK13

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
5	Barrett L	Wick 12		I assume the footpath will be kept	It is our intention that the proposed footpath on the south of the development will be included	The requirement for this footpath is included as part of WICK12
		Wick 9		I assume residents of Church Terrace have been consulted	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
6	Crowley S		Para 7	Transport and Movement. There should be a speed restriction 20 mph in the centre of the village, traffic calming. There should be a weight restriction throughout the village. Large delivery lorries to the Coop should only approach from the south side.  As there will be an increase in population – more public transport and shuttle buses to Campsea Ashe station	Noted. This will be considered by the Traffic and Parking Working Group which is looking at ways to improve traffic flows and pedestrian safety.	None
		Wick 9		Car parking should return to being free to encourage more visitors to the village. If there were more buses there would be less need to park. Free parking would alleviate rogue/opportunist parking.	Unfortunately, the policy for charges in public car parks is set by the District Council	None
		Wick 10		Pedestrian safety. From the coop to the George should be pedestrian priority – level surface/more crossings and one way/vehicle priority/traffic calming strategies	Noted. This will be considered by the Traffic and Parking Working Group which is looking at ways to improve traffic flows and pedestrian safety.	None
		Wick 11		Cycling walking and disability access – make this safer	This is covered in Objectives 8, 9 and 33 of the Reg14 version of the NP. In the Reg 15 of the NP these have been renumbered and are now NP Objectives 7 and 12 , and Community objective 12.  We agree and this is why Wick 11 has been included in NP	None
		Wick 12d		Old school building would be an excellent venue for classes/courses/art centre/youth centre	Noted. The use suggested would be entirely appropriate.	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
7	Day J	Wick 10		To slow traffic create cobbled road surface from post office through the hill to the pub.	Noted. This will be considered by the Traffic and Parking Working Group which is looking at ways to improve traffic flows and pedestrian safety.	None
		Wick 10		Add electric charging points to car park. Electric is available	ESC are responsible for Car Parks and provision of charging points.	None
		Wick 3, 4, 7		More tree planting, create woodland	The WMPC E&L Committee are planting trees on a regular basis.	None
		Wick 9		Approve. Access to riverside make a feature of WM for walking and cycling.	Noted. However, The location of the car park is to be removed from the NP.	None
				Cycle route to Campsea Ashe Station?	Within the village, this is covered under WICK11. There is also a community action in Table 9.1 to cover cycle routes which will be progressed by the WMPC.	This will be progressed as a community action by WMPC - see Table 9.1
		Wick 11		Create walking and cycling routes to villages	Within the village, this is covered under WICK11. There is also a community action in Table 9.1 to cover cycle routes which will be progressed by the WMPC.	This will be progressed as a community action by WMPC - see Table 9.1
		Wick 13		Approved. Access to Simons Cross better than through the estate.	Access into the new Simons Cross development is being looked into further so this may not be an issue.	Advice has now been sought from ESC and SCC regarding vehicular access. WICK 13 updated to indicate both possible access points. Final decision will be made when planning application submitted.
8	Exton I&D	Wick 1		110 houses is enough, any more will ruin the village	Agree and we support this view. We have capped development at a total of 110 for Simons Cross and Old School Farm developments.	None
		Wick 9		Don't agree, not safe	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
9	Exton S		<b>Local context 2-3 2nd paragraph</b>	Text change: 'Today however with the ever increasing volume of traffic and cars parking on the roadside, possibly created by increased numbers of housing developments being built in surrounding villages (see 2.7)'.	Noted.	Amended para 2.7 to include road network within the village.
			<b>2.9</b>	Text Change Mortgage loans are based on 4 x earnings	Noted. But it is considered that including a specific figure in the NP of 4 times earnings is not appropriate as in practice this will depend on the mortgage lenders and will therefore differ.	Section 2.9 updated and is also partly addressed in 2.11.
			<b>4.2</b>	Text Change Can we state where?	No, but we can say that there is a significant development within the A12 corridor	Section 4.2 has been updated.
		<b>Wick 9</b>		Car Parking Wording should be changed to suggested instead of allocated and perhaps other avenues explored such as Green Parking and driveways being offered.	The idea has merit and will be followed by the Traffic and Parking Working Group.	None
		<b>Wick 13</b>		Text Change Remove comment about vehicular access	Advice received from EASC and SCC.	Advice has now been sought from ESC and SCC regarding vehicular access. WICK 13 updated to indicate both possible access points. Final decision will be made when planning application submitted.
10	Fleming G	<b>Wick 9</b>		Objection to proposal for parking on Mill Field. Junction of Chapel Lane to High Street is dangerous. The proposed site is a special landscape area, maintain the green environment.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
				What evidence do we have for more parking?	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
				Consider the creation of parking between bowls club and Coop.	This can only be progressed once the flooding problem is resolved.	WMPC will follow this up and this is included in Table 9.1
11	Gaily L	<b>Wick 9</b>		There is no need for a car park in Mill Lane it would be an eyesore and open to vandals. It would not give easy access to the village for people with mobility problems.  Wording should be changed to suggested instead of allocated and perhaps other avenues explored such as Green Parking and driveways being offered.  It would be sited on ancient land used for community games and early forms of football. It should be kept green.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
12	Greenhaigh J	Wick 9		Strongly objects to 80 place car park in Mill Lane. Questions if there is a need for another car park.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
				This is a conservation area a car park would affect wildlife and residents with noise and light pollution.	Noted. However, this is not within the conservation area.	None
				A small car park of maybe 10 cars would be more in keeping.	Noted	None
				Possible Alternatives: Extend VH car park to incorporate space between bowls green and Coop.	This is being reviewed within the scope of the T&PWG	WMPC will follow this up and this is included in Table 9.1
				Extend long stay CP into Football ground or have car park in Old School Farm development.	This has been considered, but is not considered feasible.	None
13	Hall B		<b>General</b>	Very good	Noted with thanks	None
			<b>Para 2.4</b>	It is essential to provide at least 30% of new builds as affordable social housing to encourage increased under 44 year old. Very evident demand via good neighbour scheme indicates number of older, retiring, non car driving increasing	This is included in the Local Plan and therefore does not need to be stated in the Neighbourhood Plan.	None
			<b>Para 4.3</b>	Reduction needed in empty or second houses. District Council housing tax of second homes should be introduced.	This is a very good point but is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan	None
			<b>Wick 1</b>	Adaptable dwellings for elderly essential and amend NP if necessary	This is covered in Wick 1 C in that 50% will be accessible and adaptable.  NP committee have reviewed the Local Plan and confirm that it is covered.	It is covered in Local Plan.
			<b>Wick 9</b>	Car parking pressures throughout Wickham Market, Mill Lane site is not perfect but best available option with passing places.	Noted.	None
			<b>Para 5.16</b>	All new builds to have solar power as standard.	This has been discussed at length and it we were advised that WICK 5 was about the most we could consider at this stage	None
			<b>Para 7.4</b>	Encourage improved surface of bridle path for cycling from Wickham Market to station. Mill Lane to White Bridges to Wickham station as station car park now filled daily. New faster trains will now put pressure on to improve station access.	Very good idea, but outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Parish Council will endeavour to take this forward separate to the Neighbourhood Plan.	WMPC will follow this up and this is included in Table 9.1
			<b>Para 8.4</b>	Consider Old School Farm buildings for heritage asset. It would make an ideal community pub as parking and access far superior to the George. Part paid by future developer and landowner 'gifted' and the George sell off.	The Old School Farm is identified as a Non Designated heritage asset. Whether it is considered for the future village pub will depend on whether the current request for heritage lottery funding for the George is granted.	None
			<b>Para 9.1</b> <b>Para 9.4</b>	Car Parking – Mill Lane to Church Terrace would benefit from passing places in Mill Lane. This may be possible from de Vere.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park in Mill Lane. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
14	Hall C		<b>Para 7.1</b>	The report acknowledges traffic and parking problems in WM and goes as far to propose the use of land to create new parking space and create safer pedestrian space. Improved public transport would reduce this need.	Noted, but public transport is currently outside the scope of our Neighbourhood Plan. It is considered we may need a policy to cover transport links.	NP Section 7 has been updated to cover this.
				The regeneration of the station house at Campsea Ashe, and improved station facilities have made it a desirable location to start and end train journeys. Nonetheless, public transport to and from the station is minimal with only a couple of busses per day (which exclude commuter travel times). This results in the car park there being full to capacity most days, meaning it is not always possible to travel from there. Increased bus services to/from the station would result in less cars being used as a mode of transport there. Suffolk Coastal Links responsive transport busses have been reduced, resulting in it not being responsive enough to meet the needs of potential users.	Very well made point. This will be investigated outside the Neighbourhood Plan.  Initiatives to take this matter forward will be supported by WMPC.	This will be investigated outside the Neighbourhood Plan
				Older residents are a higher percentage in WM. Young people have no choice but to leave the village for work purposes as the poor public transport service limits work opportunities.	The Neighbourhood Plan Committee have tried to identify land for light industrial use. Unfortunately the only piece of land that we identified as suitable was unavailable. Old School has been allocated for community and business/employment use if it becomes available.	The Riverside Industrial Estate is protected by Policy SCLP12.42 in the Local Plan. No amendment to NP is therefore required.
				SCC has publicly stated that cuts to public transport will be made over the coming year in a bid to save money. Your plan does not acknowledge how WM will be protected from potential cuts to an already dire service.	Unfortunately the Wickham Market Neighbourhood Plan only covers Wickham Market parish and public transport is a much wider issue. We will be making clear within the plan that a good bus service is essential for the village, but the truth is that it may not have any influence on future cuts in services.	NP Section 7 has been updated to cover this.
				Environmentally, how is the WM plan contributing to reducing the amount of cars on our roads?	A good point, the plan will not reduce the cars on our roads. Wickham Market is a rural village and the majority of residents use their private cars to get to work. Additional houses will be built with adequate parking. Local Plan still has the old SCC guidance with regard to residential parking. This policy tries to force people to use public transport by providing inadequate residential parking. This has proven to have had a very detrimental effect on some rural communities.	SCLP4.12 of the Local Plan protects the retail centre of Wickham Market. WICK11 sets out our requirement to improve cycling, walking, and disability access routes in order to minimise car use within Wickham Market. No update is required to NP.

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
15	Taylor H	Wick 1		The proposal for new homes - the recent development, as outlined in your plan, were purchased by retired people. WM is not desirable for younger families. I believe that the poor transport links contribute to this.	Policy SCLP5.10 of the Local Plan covers provision for affordable housing including discounted home ownership. Section 7 has been updated to promote better transport links.	Section 7 has been updated to promote better transport links.
		Wick 6		I would like to see the field which is on your right as you go down the cemetery access road designated as a local green space.	This field was considered and it was felt that it did not meet the required criteria.	None
		Wick 9		I am opposed to the proposal to site a long stay car park in Mill Lane because : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is development on a green field site</li> <li>- The access road to this car park is extremely narrow.</li> <li>- Visibility at the junction between Mill Lane and Chapel Lane is poor.</li> <li>- Increased risk to pedestrians walking to the village centre from residential housing further down Chapel Lane (ie Deben Court)</li> <li>- Visibility at the junction between Chapel Lane and High Street is poor and traffic volume is high.</li> <li>- A new long stay car park would be better placed at the edge of the Old School Development, it should be a condition of any development that space is allocated for this. The location mentioned would be safer for vehicles and remove risk to pedestrians.</li> </ul>	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
		Wick 10		I believe that the pedestrian route is particularly poor in the High Street between Chapel Lane and the entrance to the square.	Agreed, list of potential improvements to be added to the NP.	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC
				There is an urgent need for a pedestrian crossing and dropped curb close to the war memorial – this is a dangerous place to try and cross the road, particularly for those with mobility issues and wheeled walkers due to the high curb and the traffic.		New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC
	There is already an unofficial "priority system" for vehicles beside the Post Office, but I would like to see an official priority system in operation which would give scope for widening the walkway to allow pedestrians to pass each other on the path between the Post office and the Square.			New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC		
	Existing pedestrian crossings need to be maintained effectively (the one in the square needs re-painting)			New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC		
		General comments	It is disturbing to note the potential development of 150 homes within the Pettistree parish referred to in this plan. This will effectively merge Wickham Market and Pettistree on the southern approach to the village and I am opposed to development of this size on a green field site. I feel aggrieved that Wickham Market residents have not had the opportunity to comment on a development of this size which, although outside the parish, will have a tremendous impact on life in the village and on many of the issues you are aiming to address in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Wickham Market residents did have the opportunity to comment on the East Suffolk Council Local Plan. The Parish Council did comment and made it very clear that we were opposed to the Pettistree development. Despite this the development was approved.	None	



Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
16	Hayward	Wick 13		<p>Whilst the Hayward Family continue to utilise Old School Farm site as the centre of their farming operations and farm the land ourselves, it is not financially viable to relocate the centre of the farm elsewhere or have access through it and make this site available for redevelopment.</p> <p>We are not opposed to development of land to the west of Old School Farm however with the highway constraints within and through the centre of the village, and to the north off the B1078, consideration should be given to guiding future development to the south and west of Wickham Market, either side of Walnuts Lane, with a new purpose built access road serving this area from the B1438 to the south of Rogues Lane and to the west of the cemetery.</p>	A meeting was held with the Landowner and it was agreed that the Old School Farm site should remain in the NP.	WICK 12 amended to take account of owners requirements
17	Holland J	Wick 13		<p>Point c – Access. We intend to access this site at the end of Simon's Cross, towards the north end of the site, next to number 103. There are currently concrete bollards here and we believe there is direct highway access onto our site from here.</p> <p>If access was to come via your suggestion, garages would need to be demolished which would not be desirable. It could also lead to a "ransom strip" situation which could very easily make this site financially unviable, particularly in terms of the money we are spending on relocating the allotments. We have taken expert advice on this access and believe there should be no reason why not to come in via our suggested route.</p> <p>We would prefer to access directly from the B1078, but understand the reasons why this would not be desirable. We are therefore not requesting this. We hope that the access via our suggested route next to 103 Simon's Cross will be acceptable and welcomed.</p>	Access into the new Simons Cross development is being looked into further so this may not be an issue.	Having got advice from SCC and ESC there is no objection to accessing from the northern point as suggested. WICK13 amended accordingly. Both access options are included in WICK13.

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
18	Howland D	<b>Wick 9</b>	<b>Para 3.1.6</b> <b>Para 9.1</b> <b>Para 9.2</b>	There are 2 issues: 1. The lack of resident parking and the need to provide more on street parking. 2. The need to accommodate visitors in car parks. The 2011 Parish Plan questionnaire identified traffic and parking as the 2 most important issues for the village. The 2014 traffic and parking report identified numerous problem area. Unfortunately, nothing has been done to improve matters in the last 8 years. The problem has just got worse. Some members of the Neighbourhood Plan team are in denial that there is a problem. This should be the number one priority for the village. Table 9.1 needs updating to reflect the above. Wick 9 needs to include resident parking as well. 9.2 needs to reflect resident parking as well.	It is agreed that there are two issues. Following the 2011 Parish Plan, car parking in the village was radically overhauled in 2015. It is recognised that further improvements are essential and Traffic Regulation Orders are required to make any necessary changes. We need to ensure that the majority of village residents are supportive of any proposed changes so that effort in preparing Traffic Regulation Orders is not wasted. The T&PWG are currently investigating all possible options and will consult widely with the community before proposing changes.	Section 7 has been expanded to address these issues.
		<b>Wick 6</b>		The Glebe Allotments should not be afforded any special status. This land could easily be used for a variety of purposes including some development or even as a long stay car park. There is potential access via Yew Tree rise or even through The George once it is demolished. The close proximity to the village centre and the size of the plot would allow it to be used for allotments and other community uses. If the sighting of the long stay car park is reopened due to comments from villagers then the Glebe allotments should be added to the list of potential sites.	The Neighbourhood Plan Committee, having taken the Landscape Appraisal and the Site Assessment into account, felt that the Glebe Allotments were perfectly fitted to be designated as Local Green Space. The Glebe (formerly known as George Fields) is the last of the ancient field structure which once surrounded the centre of the village and is thus part of the Wickham's natural heritage. It has been in use as an allotment site for over 130 years. As such, the Glebe allotment site is registered as an asset of Community Value.	None
19	Hubert-Chibnall A	<b>Wick 9</b>		The car park as planned is quite a way from the centre of the village. A three-storey car park, with the second storey at ground level could be built on the current "Long Stay" car park. The current car park is an inefficient use of space. Parking charges would amortise the initial outlay.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
20	Hudson K&J	<b>Wick 1</b>		More affordable homes are needed, not just one or two on each site. Could homes be offered to local people first and no buy to let allowed for at least 2 years after purchase.	The guidance in the Local Plan (Policy SCLP5.10) covers affordable housing. Of these affordable dwellings, 50% should be for affordable rent / social rent, 25% should be for shared ownership and 25% should be for discounted home ownership.	Covered by Local Plan. No update required to NP.
			<b>9.4 &amp; Table 9.1</b>	Library enhancement. Could the library be open for the use of the high school age children one evening a week as a meeting place?	Noted. This is not within the scope of the NP.	None
			<b>9.4 &amp; Table 9.1</b>	Additional medical floorspace. Would this result in more doctors being available?	It is hoped that an upgraded and refurbished medical centre would provide more medical staff.	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
21	Hughes M	Wick 9		<p>The single lane approach and the lack of connectivity with the village centre, businesses and services suggests this site is totally unsuitable for development as a car park - not to mention the environmental issues such a development would raise. It is difficult to imagine who would park here and how they would walk into the village centre especially in winter. Pedestrians in Mill Lane and Chapel Lane (including numerous primary school age children) already have to contend with traffic (cars, vans, trucks and sometimes farm machinery) on roads without footpaths. Significantly increasing the traffic flow would be very problematic possibly dangerous also the junction of Mill Lane with Chapel Lane and the junction of Chapel Lane and High Street already present problems for road traffic and pedestrians - seemingly unsolvable given the age-old village layout of narrow lanes and buildings abutting the rights of way. I have lived in Wickham for 17 years and in the surrounding villages for 35 years prior to that, so for more than 50 years of shopping in the village visiting the Medical Centre and Dental surgeries as well as many local businesses and services. So I appreciate the need for additional parking but Mill Lanes is out of the way and difficult to access at the best of times. It is not where customers for the shops businesses and services need to be nor patients to the medical centre.</p> <p>Has anyone thought to explore the potential for extra village parking in the Percy Mason car park? The landscaping, while very attractive indeed does occupy considerable space that otherwise could be utilised for additional parking, possibly for as many as 20 extra spaces by my estimation. The car park could be taken back to its boundary especially in the main body of the car park creating at least 3 metres of extra space on the playing field side and as much as 10 metres on the opposite side for the full length of the car park. There is also the potential for about 4 additional spaces at the entrance, 2 by the existing ticket machine and 2 more opposite the existing toilet block Additionally the infrastructure is already in place so extending the number of parking space could be a comparatively cheap option it would also put visitors to the village where they want to be - at its centre.</p>	<p>There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP</p> <p>There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP</p>	<p>The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.</p> <p>The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.</p>
			Para 4	<p>The sewage works at the bottom of Mill Lane is already operating beyond its full capacity. Will the works be extended, updated and improved before anymore new homes are built in the village? If not this could cause a massive problem in the future, with sewage having to be carted away by tanker and overflow problems affecting the river Deben.</p>	<p>Agreed. It is covered within Wick 1 and is matter for local planning authority.</p>	<p>None</p>

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
22	Hughes N	Wick 1		The sewage works is now at capacity and must be extended or replaced before any further building takes place.	Agreed. It is covered within Wick 1 and is matter for local planning authority.	None
		Wick 9		<p>The car park in Mill Lane is unsuitable on the following grounds: Mill Lane too narrow, bad visibility at all junction up to and including The B1438, no apparent provision suggested for essential footpaths, too far from village centre, dangerous plan for pedestrians and drivers.</p> <p>Additional parking could be made available in the "Long stay" car park if the shrubbery was taken away.</p> <p>Having lived in Charsfield for 20 years and come to Wickham Market for shopping and services over that period I know that if easy access to parking is unavailable residents from outlying villages will simply drive to Woodbridge or Framlingham.</p>	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
23	Jordan J		General	Kitson Court no longer coming under the sheltered housing umbrella works very much against what I see as your projections. Wickham Market has a good record for the provision of social housing but, with an aging population, many of those houses built to provide family accommodation stand a high probability of eventually housing single people who would benefit from having the option of moving into sheltered housing, thus freeing up properties needed for families. Can sheltered housing be considered as part of the building schemes?	Wickham Market Parish Council were dismayed when the financial decision to not keep Richard Kitson Court as sheltered housing was made. There is currently no plan to include sheltered housing within the Neighbourhood Plan, but it is fully understood that the requirement has not gone away.	None
		Wick 1		"Affordable" housing does not necessarily mean that young locals will buy those houses unless some kind of demand be put upon the developers to give them priority and affordable purchase schemes. In the Suffolk Coastal area many such houses are bought as second homes. This totally goes against the village or small-town ethos and works against the visions and principles of the WMNP.	The guidance in the Local Plan (Policy SCLP5.10) covers affordable housing. Of these affordable dwellings, 50% should be for affordable rent / social rent, 25% should be for shared ownership and 25% should be for discounted home ownership.	Covered by Local Plan. No update required to NP.
24	King Capt PC	Wick 10		Pleased to see pedestrian safety is on the agenda. Suggest Dallinghoo road from the Hill is made a priority road, this would enable the pathways to be widened. This comment would also be appropriate for the road from the Hill past the Post Office and Co-op. Definitely priority give way signs would be not difficult to action. This would reduce the width of the road to a single lane but would enable the pavements to be widened and safety enhanced	Agree. This will be considered by the Traffic and Parking Working Group which is looking at ways to improve traffic flows and pedestrian safety.	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
25	Lanman G	Wick 9		Although not against a car park here in principle, the proposal for 80 cars seems far too large.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
				I also understand that the proposed pedestrian access might be a footpath with lights across the pightle and I don't think this would be appropriate in the conservation area, unless it could run alongside Lehmann House to the Library, or Mill Lane is to widened, then a footpath for pedestrian and disabled access alongside the road.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
		Wick 12		I note that consideration is being given to using the area between the Coop and Bowling Green for car parking. This would open the possibility of a corner of WICK12 being used for parking – see attached map. It looks like there would be space to widen the access road to the village hall etc. to make this two-way to cope with extra traffic	This is another option to be considered by WMPC	WMPC will follow this up and this is included in Table 9.1
				Although the Parish Council Car Park Report says that Hopkins Homes will not consider this, could it be made a condition of Planning Permission, as a contribution to the local community?	The issue here is that the Parish Council have already made some policies regarding the development of the Old School Farm site which has reduced the land available for development. If any further land was taken away development of the site is unlikely to be viable.	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
26	Bruce Laws	Wick 12		Keen to see Penny Field incorporated into public access recreation.	This is what is intended and is linked to what happens to the Old School site as the land is owned by the same land owner.	None
				Feel very strongly that the fields to the north of the cemetery drive should <u>not</u> be developed, i.e. boundary of old school site should be maintained.	Noted	None
				How will vehicular access to Old School Farm development be achieved without using some of the frontage of the field north of cemetery drive?	As per Hopkins Plan	None
		Wick 9		Strongly support additional parking south of Camping Close/north of Mill Lane	Noted	None
		Wick 6, 7		Strongly support protection of Glebe allotments and Beehive Field	It is already protected in the Plan	None
		General		Basically, happy with the general approach and policy proposals	Noted	None
27	Jean Maxwell	Wick 9, 10		In fact, with EDF/SC that the High St narrowing/pedestrian access/parking issue are way underestimated.	Noted. The lower section of the High St (A1078) is already highly problematic and is likely to be further aggravated by increased traffic to proposed EDF park and ride. WMPC are fully aware that something needs to be done.	None
			General		Overall well written	Noted with thanks
				Main concerns are with EDF/Suffolk Coastal/WM – is there joined up thinking?	Collectively, WMPC, ESC, SCC are fully aware of the issues. Due to the possible Sizewell C development SCC, ESC and WM are working with EDF to see if solutions to these problems can be found.	Section 7 has been expanded to address these issues.
				1) Traffic – potential EDF + Pettistree development + Wickham = huge load	It is recognised that this is a significant problem and Parish Council and T&PWG are progressing.	Section 7 has been expanded to address these issues.
				2) Resources – shortage of doctors	Not within scope of NP	None
			3) Will, if huge increase in population, it changes the “personality” of WM	Noted	None	

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
28	J Osbourne	Wick 3	Key Views Assessment	KV2 – very important KV9 – very important KV11 – very important KV12 – very important KV13 – very important KV15 – very important	We agree. All key views are important	None
		Wick 6	Local Green Spaces	Vital that all are implemented and/or retained particularly in areas adjacent/near to development sites	Already defined within the NP.	None
		Wick 4	Wildlife	Vital that all are implemented and/or retained particularly in areas adjacent/near to development sites.	Noted	None
		Wick 12 Wick 13		Imperative that all new developments do not: · Increase pressure on road pinch points in village and add to traffic pollution · Compromise rural aspects of village – single track lanes – through entrances/exits to these places, i.e. Chapel Lane, Walnuts Lane, Gelham Hall Lane · Provide good & significant boundary/landscape planting	Noted	None
		Wick 9, 10, 11		Make an investment priority – proposed development will place tremendous strain on village infrastructure – developers <u>must</u> contribute <u>significantly</u> to support improvements	Developers already contribute through CIL. Wick 10 and 11 have been specifically included so that developers must consider how to improve pedestrian and cycling safety within the village.	None
29	Terry & Janet Peake	Wick 12		Land at Old School Farm. New Hopkins development, hate the idea, will overcrown the village. What about the sewers?	For the NP, we have to find location for 110 houses within the village boundary and this only one of two locations which are considered suitable. Impact on sewerage capacity will be considered at the design stage.	None
		Wick 9		Mill Lane Car Park. High St, Chapel Lane, Mill Lane are far too narrow for many vehicles to use on a daily basis. No room to expand the actual roads	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
		Wick 13		New development on Simons Cross.  If Allotment field is developed, access for building and road into and out should be the allotment entrance on the 1078 by the pill box and the 30mph sign should be moved up Dragarse Hill on 1078 then all the way down to High St.  The entrance should not be at Simons Cross as it will cross the bridal path "Little Lane" which is used by many families taking their children to school herby giving people the option not to use their cars and a parking problem at the school. The path is also used by many dog walkers and access to the sports field.	The access shown in the Reg14 version of the NP may not be the best option for this site. Two other options are also being considered: another access point from Simons Cross, and access from B1078. A decision will have to be made in conjunction with SCC on what is the preferred option.	Advice has now been sought from ESC and SCC regarding vehicular access. WICK 13 updated to indicate both possible access points. Final decision will be made when planning application submitted.

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
30	Rayment D & E	Wick 12, 13		We agree with the policies contained in the NP but we strongly disagree with the proposed new developments. They are historically too expensive – "affordable" are not young people affordable. The land could be better used for the community	The guidance in the Local Plan (Policy SCLP5.10) covers affordable housing. Of these affordable dwellings, 50% should be for affordable rent / social rent, 25% should be for shared ownership and 25% should be for discounted home ownership.	None
31	Reeve N & R	Wick 12		We agree with the proposals to develop the Old School Farm.	Noted	None
			Para 4.2	We feel the development to the south of Wickham Market will pull the centre of growth of the village too far south. Wickham Market needs to have a say in how this land is developed. Legally it may lie in Pettistree but in reality it is part of Wickham Market. The new residents will use Wickham Markets doctors, shops, schools, etc.	Noted. The Parish Council view is that this development will not be positive for the village and as such objected to this development policy in the Local plan.	None
		Wick 10		Pedestrian safety. Something needs to happen the pavements are too narrow and unsafe.	Agree. This will be considered by the Traffic and Parking Working Group which is looking at ways to improve traffic flows and pedestrian safety.	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC



Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
32	Ryder-Davies P	Wick 9	Para 3.14	P9 Maintaining Re Green Environment. The intended large car park in Mill Lane with its construction, .... to traffic will completely destroy this nice corner of the village.  Landscape Character: see above.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
			Para 5	Biodiversity: see above. This amount of land substrate will effect .... next to it we have a wide variety of biodiversity insects and hedgerows and grass snakes. These two need a large area to support them.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
				The part of Mill Lane between the junctions with Chapel Lane and Church Terrace is not wide enough to create two way traffic because of the two pinch points covered by the bungalows and Kitson Court and is certainly not wide enough for a pavement. Pedestrian access would have to be provided a lane and wide path across the Church Pightle with lighting. This will not .... Attractive part of the village.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
				Infill development: gardens, parks, green spaces. Most of the large gardens in the village have been built in.	It is pleasing to note that there are still a considerable number of large gardens within the village that have not been developed and it is felt that this green space is an essential part of the village.	None
			Para 6,1	There is confusion about car parking. Visitors to the village do not stay for long as they come for shopping. There is nothing to detain them. All the existing car parks frequently have spaces. The provision of spaces for businesses at £10 a month is excessively low.	Noted	None
				For pedestrian access, see above. Safe highway access cannot be provided. Leaving Mill Lane to turn into Chapel Lane ifs dangerous as it is difficult to see traffic coming from the north. There are no pavements on Chapel Lane in that direction. The right corner bend in Mill Lane by number 1 is dangerous with the increase in traffic proposed for the new car park. Re suggested one way system is extremely irritating for those who live on it. The houses opposite the end of Church Terrace have doorways indirectly opening onto Mill Lane; with the increased traffic envisaged and is very inconvenient and dangerous especially for people with prams.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
		Wick 10	Para 7.19	The five lengths of roadway described are dangerous for pedestrians especially for children and those who are disabled or with prams.  How could footways be widened?	Agree. This will be considered by the Traffic and Parking Working Group which is looking at ways to improve traffic flows and pedestrian safety.	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
33	Sharpe B		Para 4.2	I strongly oppose the proposed development in the Pettistree Parish adjacent to Wickham Market. This would be a Pettistree development in name only. The detrimental effects would be felt in W.M. only.	Noted. The Parish Council view is that this development will not be positive for the village and as such objected to this development policy in the Local Plan.	Being progressed by WMPC
			Para 5.5	I would also object to the proposed EDF Park and Ride site. This would be another blot on the landscape however they try to disguise it.	The Parish Council are aware that it will have little influence on whether Sizewell C goes ahead and also if it does where the southern park and ride is located. The main focus of the Parish Council is to mitigate the adverse effects.	Being progressed by WMPC
			General Comments	The Neighbourhood Team have produced an excellent comprehensive document for which they should be commended.	Noted with thanks.	None
34	Statham J	Wick 9		Concerning on the Mill Lane site, I believe that the distance for people to make their way from the car park back to The Hill will put people off and they will just use any spaces on public highways around the village blocking 2 lane congested roads and creating more pinch points, plus using that site creates a problem getting to and from walking and driving down a small road which is not much bigger than single lane.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
			Para 4.2	Housing development around Wickham, obviously houses have to be built somewhere but why build a bunch of houses inside the Wickham boundary then some more barely ¼ mile down the road and tell us its ok its in Pettistree why not just build all the houses inside Wickham boundary and leave Pettistree alone as there are no shops or schools in that village. If the Developers are agreeing to build 'ECO' houses with large green spaces please make them stick to it not revising plans until we end up with another bunch of poorly built little boxes with no parking.	Noted. The Parish Council view is that the Pettistree development will not be positive for the village and as such objected to this development policy in the Local plan.	Being progressed by WMPC
35	Thomas C	Wick 9		Proposed car park in Mill Lane Wickham – ill conceived blind bend Mill Lane and Spring Lane, also top of Mill Lane at the current gate into the proposed site & Mill Lane into Chapel Lane – already difficult to see traffic heading towards the High St. There is already concern about traffic in Mill Lane heavy farm, Anglian Water & soon to be from the caravan site especially when the lodges are fully operational – there are no passing places save my drive & that of Mill House. There is a far more suitable site at the Old School site and is a direct route to the village square which should be 1 way – it would have been useful to have prior knowledge of meetings concerning important residential issues.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
36	Westover A		<b>Table 9.1</b>	<p><b>COMMUNITY ACTIONS</b> The third column could say Lead Party and Partners</p> <p>So partners would be: Cycleways: Developers and SCC Highways -Why don't we flag up the Quiet Lanes topic here to? i.e. Walnuts, Chapel Lane, Spring Lane. Car Park: partner would also need to be SCDC Highlight need for further investment in public transport and community transport links. Parish Council working with operators and SCC. Also EDF if Sizewell comes forward. Traffic calming: partner SCC Highways. Green spaces: partner would a also need to be developers and land owners (where PC are not owner) Other community actions: are there any other actions which arise from the Parish Plan?</p>	Noted. It will be for the Lead Party to coordinate all necessary partners who can assist in progressing these actions.	None
				<b>ADD something on the need to support public transport provision.</b>	Agreed	Section 7 amended.
			<b>Policies Maps</b>	In the final documents the maps need to be A3 fold out with the title blocks in lower right corner. Key on right side. The size is not easily legible.	The maps do need to be clear and readable.	Policy maps are to be included in Landscape format
			<b>Social Facilities</b>	<p>I have noted there is virtually no mention of protecting or enhancing/creating new facilities currently for the young, children (i.e. school), teenagers (Beehive), the Church and its community role, any 'sheltered housing' (Kitson Court), care home.</p> <p>I consider we need to add something. In addition, there is need to confirm the District centre boundary and a policy to protect and define the facilities we already have in the centre; parking provision, retail, restaurants, food, library, doctors, church and care home.</p>	It will be difficult to add much at this stage, but your point is fully understood.	None
			<b>Policies list</b>	Need to add page numbers for the policies clarity.	Page numbers cannot be added automatically for Policies. Links are available in the on line version.	None
			<b>Table 3.1</b>	Objective 6 talks about development and design. However, we have been a bit remiss I feel in terms of highlighted the need for good layout and architectural design and policy for new housing. Cllr Nicholl picks up on this in his comments too. Perhaps an answer may be to say that we expect new developments to be assessed by qualified design staff, and a team of suitable people within the Parish. Perhaps we can say we expect development to be reviewed by the Suffolk design panel. I can check it is up and running!	Wick1 para D now includes design guidance which addresses these points.	Wick 1 updated.
				I think there is some scope to strengthen WICK 2 and 3 as Cllr A Nicholl advises, particularly in light of the likely Pettistree site allocation.	Noted	WICK2 and WICK3 have been amended.

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
		Wick 13	Para 8.4	<p>Current text: <i>If the existing Simon's Cross allotment are re-provided in a suitable location then the land that they are currently sited upon becomes suitable for development in the Site Assessment report (7). This development will generate additional traffic at the choke points within the village, but this increase is assessed to be manageable. The pedestrian access to the school and the village is excellent.</i></p> <p>I am concerned about this, who has assessed this? What if Sizewell goes ahead? Perhaps this needs to be 'toned down'.</p> <p>I also do not agree that the access is excellent. The Little Lane path is a good local path route but one could argue that it needs to be upgraded; without urbanising it. There are problems with the narrowness of the path, and dog fouling.</p> <p>I think we should say this is good but would benefit from some improvements if the use increases. Ideally this would also be reflected in the policy WICK 13 wording.</p>	In the Neighbourhood Plan team discussions the increase in traffic due to the Simon's Cross development was thought to be manageable and this has been borne out in that SCC have agreed that access to the development should be through the Simon's Cross estate. Pedestrian access to the village and the school will be via Little Lane and it is difficult to see how this can be improved as Little Lane is now being maintained by the Village Handyman.	None
		Wick 6		<p><b>The Cemetery; Local Green Space</b></p> <p>I think the Town Land Trust section of land should be included as Local Green space. This would help to highlight the importance of the space in its totality.</p>	NP to be amended to include the Cemetery as Local Green Space.	Local Green Space policy WICK6 has been amended.
				I know the cemetery is also non-designated Heritage asset but we do not prescribe the boundary for these.	Boundaries are held in the Land Registry	None
				Picture of Bier House should be included in accompanying non des HA document (I think the date on this should read 2019 (not 2018?))	Noted	Done
			Para 9.2	I think we need to try and identify areas for woodland used to help screen possible developments, we could perhaps suggest zones at the current time. If land is not allocated it may be difficult to ever achieve but at least we will have set a marker down.	Noted, but it may be difficult to action this	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
		<b>Wick 9</b>		<p><b>Mill Lane car park. I cannot support</b> this policy. I have advised for some time now that this site is not suitable for a large public car park. There will be conflicts with residential amenity, setting of Conservation area, appearance of the lane (removal of banks/hedges to enable a safe width, third party land needed, highway safety, and conflict with the High Street choke points highlighted in WICK 10. The High Street may experience significant impacts from Sizewell, new developments and an increase in cars travelling through the village generally.</p> <p>There will also be increased use of Spring Lane and Mill Lane which will damage this quieter part of the village and an area for walking.</p> <p>The footway link to the village is not suitable as proposed.</p> <p>We need to be providing for car parking provision (residents, employees, visitors/shoppers whilst keeping additional traffic out of the village centre.</p> <p>A car park served by Chapel Lane will create big problems in the High Street busy zone and make crossing the road junction by foot even more challenging for some groups of people.</p> <p>I think there is scope to improve parking on the playing field (the village hall proposed layout does not help), also at The Old School site subject to liaison with the landowner. The location is a short and safe walking distance into village and to COOP.</p>	<p>There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP</p>	<p>The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.</p>
		<b>Wick 10, 11</b>		I support these policies but they will both be undermined by WICK 9.	These and other options are being considered and being investigated by the WMPC T&PWG	Being progressed by WMPC
		<b>Wick 12</b>		I have previously suggested that this policy includes provision for public car parking. Also, that it states that the Old School be used for employment use (as currently/partly used) if the community use option is not achieved. Perhaps we should be firmer and say that Residential use would not be supported. The draft SCLP 12.61 policy for Pettistree states that Early year's provision could be made. Again the Old School, if in community use might be an ideal site/setting for such a use.	<p>The NP committee do not consider this to be the case as Wick 9 states that clear and safe pedestrian access will be provided.</p> <p>The provision of some car parking at Old School site will be investigated but any additional car park provision has been discounted by the land owner/developer. The suggestions for the use of the Old School building are noted and appropriate.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
37	White G	<b>Wick 9</b>		Mill Lane car park. Is there a proven need for this? Is the gain of a car park worth the loss of permanent pasture? A car park in Mill Lane is not the answer to Wickham Market's parking issues! Are you expecting a flood of shoppers or workers? Dangerous spot for a car park. I will vote against the plan if this remains in it!	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
38	White G Jnr	<b>Wick 9</b>		Do not car park Mill Lane field as it is countryside and grazed by the Suffolk Punch horses. Mill Lane is single track and dangerous for pedestrians.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
39	Wilby R	<b>Wick 9</b>		This is not the answer to car park problem. The access road is not wide enough. As we as live in Mill Lane our drive is now a passing place for lorries go to the sewage farm, camper vans and caravans going to the campsite as the owner put this route as the best way in. As to the suggestion to take out the hedge at Lemann house, this does not work as there will still be a pinch point at Chapel Lane. It is not safe now with vehicles coming up so fast we must get into the middle of the road to get out. People will not use it to go shopping they are too lazy to walk that far.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
40	Anonymous			Disregarded	No response	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
41	Historic England		<b>General</b>	Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Regulation 14 draft Neighbourhood Plan. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment, Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. We are therefore pleased to have the opportunity to review your neighbourhood plan at this early stage. The conservation officer at Suffolk Coastal District Council (soon to be East Suffolk District Council) will be the best placed person to assist you in the development of the Plan with respect to the historic environment and can help you to consider and clearly articulate how a strategy can address the area's heritage assets. Although the neighbourhood area does contain a number of designated heritage assets, at this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the detailed development of the strategy for your area, but we offer some general advice and guidance below.	Noted	None
		<b>Wick 1</b>		Paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) sets out that Plans, including Neighbourhood Plans, should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. In particular, this strategy needs to take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of all types of heritage asset where possible, the need for new development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and ensure that it considers opportunities to use the existing historic environment to help reinforce this character of a place. This will ensure that these assets can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure your plan is in line with the requirements of national planning policy, as found in the National Planning Policy Framework.	Wick1 para D now includes design guidance which addresses these points.	None
				The NPPF (paragraphs 124 - 127) emphasises the importance placed by the government on good design, and this section sets out that planning (including Neighbourhood Plans) should, amongst other things, be based on clear objectives and a robust evidence base that shows an understanding and evaluation of an area, in this case the Parish of Wickham Market.	Noted	None
				We note that your neighbourhood plan will allocate two sites for c.100 new residential units. The policies of neighbourhood plans should ensure that developments in the area establish a strong sense of place and respond to local character and history by reflecting the local identity of the place - for instance through the use of appropriate materials, and attractive design.	We have had a heritage character assessment completed by AECOM. This assessment did not recommend that all future development should follow a particular style due to the diverse nature of existing building design and materials used.	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
				Although we are pleased to note that the historic school house, as well as the provision of green space, is included in the policies supporting these allocations, we would recommend that greater consideration is given to factors of design in these policies. For example, your forum could - in line with the recommendations of NPPF para 126 - prepare a Design Code for each of the sites. These would normally be an illustrated document that uses a conservation area appraisal or character assessment to provide an evidence base, and then this information out in such a way as to encourage positive aspects of local character, including locally distinctive built forms, wall and roof materials, and styles of joinery or additional embellishments that contribute to what makes Wickham Market distinctive as a place.	see above	None
				We would strongly recommend also that the layout of any new development is required to follow best practice advice found in the government's guidance documents 'Manual for Streets' and 'Manual for Streets 2'.	Agreed. Developers must also follow these guidelines	Extra para added to Section 5.3 to require new developments to follow this guidance
				HE Good Practice Advice in Planning 3 - the setting of heritage assets: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/</a> .	review HE advice to see whether NP needs updating	Whilst this is not mentioned in WICK1 it is made clear in Section 6 that the setting is very important.
				Because you are considering including Site Allocations for housing or other land use purposes in your neighbourhood plan, we would recommend you review the following advice, which may be of use:  HE Advice Note 3 - site allocations in local plans: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans</a>	The guidance given in HE Advice Note 3 has been followed.	
				We recommend the inclusion of a glossary containing relevant historic environment terminology contained in the NPPF, in addition to details about the additional legislative and policy protections that heritage assets and the historic environment in general enjoys.	Look into including a suitable glossary	The NPPF contains a glossary of many terms used in the NP. This statement and reference to the NPPF glossary has been added to NP section 1.2
		Wick 8		We welcome the inclusion of a list of non-designated heritage assets and their protection through policy WICK8, but suggest a minor change to its wording to bullet point B. This is in order to strengthen the protection it affords heritage assets, and bring it into line with the requirements of national policy regarding the balancing of harm against other factors:  "Proposals for the re-use of Non-Designated Heritage Assets will be supported if they are compatible with the <b>significance of the asset, including its setting, and</b> use appropriate materials and designs in any construction work. <b>Applications should be accompanied by a heritage statement describing the significance of any heritage asset affected. The adaptive reuse of a non-designated heritage asset should not cause harm to its physical structure or setting. Where harm is unavoidable, it must be clearly and convincingly justified in the heritage statement.</b>	Noted	WICK 8 para B has been amended in accordance with this recommendation.



Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
42	Suffolk Preservation Society		<b>General</b>	The Society has reviewed all emerging Neighbourhood Plans in Suffolk and we consider that your plan is one of the strongest that we have seen. We are particularly pleased that the plan includes a list of non-designated heritage assets. You are one of a very few NP group to date that has recognised the importance of this area of heritage management from the outset and we applaud you for your insight.	Noted with thanks	None
		<b>Wick 1</b>		We are particularly impressed by the landscape led approach to the drafting of the plan and we congratulate the Neighbourhood Plan team on the outstanding draft document. The thorough assessment work that has been undertaken on landscape, design and heritage as part of the site allocations work is notable. The SPS strongly endorse the efforts to identify appropriate sites for new housing development while safeguarding the special heritage and landscape qualities of Wickham Market. The supporting documentation is particularly impressive and provides a robust framework for a raft of sound policies designed to protect and enhance the special qualities of your parish. This will be especially relevant when considering for example the largescale development associated with EDF's proposals on the edge of the village, which has recently been consulted upon.	Noted with thanks.	None
		<b>Wick 8</b>		We welcome your heritage policy WICK8 regarding non-designated heritage assets but note that the language could better reflect that of the National Planning Policy Framework, namely using the appropriate planning terms of <i>substantial and less than substantial harm</i> and <i>significance</i> to ensure that the policy is robust and defensible as a planning tool.	Noted	The plan has been amended as suggested.

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
43	Berlain	Wick 1		Sites 776i and 776L have not been considered for development as an unpublished reference has been used to discount these sites.	AECOM have now agreed that the reference "Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document" which was the preferred options consultation document dated October 15 was published under PO consult Oct15 Dated 15 October 2015.  The references in the latest SHELAA are now 881 and 878 respectively. Irrespective, neither site would be suitable for development because of access and traffic issues which have already been highlighted in the SHELAA.	None
		Wick 1		It is felt that the housing mix proposed in the NP is not suitable. If the housing allocations in the NP are to make any headway into redressing the significant ageing population imbalance then a much higher proportion of the proposed homes should be targeted towards smaller dwellings more suited to attracting a younger demographic.	The SCDC local plan has a higher proportion of 2 bedroomed dwellings than the previous version. Without concrete evidence it is felt that the housing mix put forward in the Local Plan is adequate for this neighbourhood plan.	None
		Wick 1		The NP is not compliant with para 68 of the NPPF 2019 which states; "Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should: a) identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved;	Wickham Market does not have any available brownfield sites to develop. It is felt this is for the local planning authority to address rather than this Neighbourhood Plan.	None
		Wick 1		Wickham Market is one of the few 'Key Service Centres' in Suffolk Coastal but there is no public house. At clause 2.6 there is mention of The George which burnt down in 2013 and there is a local hope that it can be acquired by the community and restored. The George is a listed building that occupies a prominent frontage that helps define the core of Wickham Market but there are no policies in the NP that help to achieve this. There is only one site that is capable of providing a car park and improving the garden area to the George (thereby increasing its future viability) and that is Site 776L/881 yet (as seen from the above) the NP Committee has denied the opportunity for the whole community considering this.	There has been a pub at the site of The George since 1500. The lack of car parking close to the public house is not thought to be a significant drawback to its development.	None
		Wick 1		Suggested acceptable walking distances' (IHT 2000 Table 3.2) recommends that a desirable walking distance (for people without mobility impairment) is no more than 400m. Both Wick 12 and Wick 13 are outside these limits whereas development of the 776i and 776L would be closer.	Noted	None
		Wick 12		The fact that this site is said to have a safe pedestrian route to Wickham Market is disputed	One of the community actions listed in table 9.1 is to address pedestrian safety issues. This matter will be considered by the T&PWG	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
		<b>Wick 12</b>		SCDC have classed the Old School Farm site as unsuitable for development as it has been considered as backlands. No reasons have been given as to why this assessment is no longer viable.	In the latest SHELAA this site is now considered potentially suitable The Old School Farm site will be accessed from the a B 1438 as the farm will be relocated.	None
		<b>Wick 9</b>		The proposed site is not thought to be suitable as the owner will not pay for development of the car park, the vehicular access is poor and the difficulty of getting safe pedestrian access to the village.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
		<b>Wick 13</b>		It is felt that the owner has been given preferential treatment to develop this site as he is a friend of the NP Chairman.	The Simon's cross site has been chosen for development following the recommendations from the independent reports that have been completed as part of this Neighbourhood plan	None
		<b>Wick 13</b>		A Land registry search has shown that there is a strip of land across the proposed access of the Simon's Cross development owned by SCDC. This could block this development.	There is a ransom strip at the southern access point. Having sought advice from SCC and ESC it is concluded that the northern access point is the preferred option.	Wick13 has been amended accordingly
				Allocating site SCLP12.61 is fundamentally against the principle of localism and if the deficiencies in the NP process identified in this submission are to be addressed the opportunity still exists to extend the NP area and to bring this proposed allocation back to the WMNP Committee to consider.	East Suffolk Council have been asked if we could change the boundary of our neighbourhood plan at this stage. We have been informed that if we do change the neighbourhood plan boundary then we will have to start again from scratch.	None
		<b>General</b>		There is also a glaring omission in the NP. The NP does not address the future employment needs arising from a growing population. It has nothing to say on this important matter. It appears from the minutes from the WMPC that this is solely because the owner of the employment site expressed a view that he was not interested in expanding it.	At the outset the Neighbourhood Plan attempted to identify all possible known locations for employment sites. Unfortunately the only site identified was withdrawn for employment development by the landowner.	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
44	Stephen Brown BSC MTP MRTPI, Planning Officer, Planning Policy & Delivery, Suffolk Coastal District Councils (now East Suffolk Council)		<b>Supporting Aecom 2018 Site Assessment report</b>	The supporting Aecom 2018 Site Assessment report is questioned in relation to SHLAA site 776L / SCDC Site 881 Glebe Allotments/ Land rear of The New Vicarage. Do not recognise the statement in relation to an unpublished document from the 2015 SCDC Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Preferred Option. The Council's 2018 SHELAA identifies the site as not a potential site because landowner availability of the site was not confirmed to the Local Plan 'call for sites' process. It is understood that the site has been made available to the neighbourhood plan process that is identifying housing site allocations for the neighbourhood plan area.	AECOM have now acknowledged that there was a document in the public domain which gave the detail about site 776L/881 which was "Preferred Options Public Consultation (19 October - 30 November 2015) Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies" which was distributed under cover of SCDC PO Consult Oct15 dated 15 Oct 15. It is interesting to note that this site was not made available by the landowner in the call for sites, it is suspected that they thought that the neighbourhood plan would take precedence.	None
		<b>Wick 2</b>	<b>Landscape Section and Policy</b>	<u>Suggest additionally referring to the Alison Farmer Associates July 2018 Suffolk Coastal District Landscape Character Assessment.</u> <a href="https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Suffolk-Coastal-Local-Plan/First-Draft-Local-Plan/SCDC-Landscape-Character-Assessment.pdf">https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Suffolk-Coastal-Local-Plan/First-Draft-Local-Plan/SCDC-Landscape-Character-Assessment.pdf</a>	Noted. We will add text and this link.	Section 5.1 has been amended to include reference to the Suffolk Coastal Landscape Assessment and a link added to References
		<b>Wick 3</b>		Criteria B is beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan because it cannot impose policy on locations outside the neighbourhood plan area.	Noted. Criteria B removed.	WICK3 updated.
		<b>Wick 7</b>		Spaces adjacent the Conservation Area can be described as forming the setting to the Conservation Area rather than contributing to the character of the Conservation Area.	Noted	Wick7 updated.
		<b>Wick 9</b>		Recommend requesting County Council Highways advice in relation to the deliverability of this policy.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
45	Ufford Parish Council	<b>Wick 9</b>		The word 'parking' appears 50 times in the document which serves to prove how important this issue is. We applaud the document for tackling this issue and trying to find solutions.	Noted with thanks.	None
		<b>Wick 12, 13</b>		Although Ufford Parish Council appreciate that Wickham Market is a sensible location for further housing development, due to the services and facilities within the village, we fear greatly for the amount of additional traffic this will create through Ufford.	Noted	None
				Any vehicle leaving Wickham Market has to travel through Ufford, along the High Street, in order to access the south-bound A12. This additional volume of traffic will be too much for Ufford to cope with.	We accept the point but this is outside the scope of the NP	None
				We would like to put forward a suggestion that a slip road southbound on to the A12 at Pettistree be put in. This would see a massive reduction in traffic through Ufford and this could be funded by CIL money with additional contributions from developers.	We support this idea but is outside the scope of the NP	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
46	Councillor Alexander Nicoll (Member, Wickham Division)	Wick 2, 3	Para 5.4	<p>"The growth proposed in the draft SCLP (20), whilst in Pettistree parish, will form an extension of Wickham Market village that will bring the two settlements closer together. It is particularly important that, to retain their distinct identities, the two settlements are not allowed to coalesce. One of the main implications of such a scenario would be the loss or significant reduction in the quality of a number of views in both directions"</p> <p>My comments: it is vital that the past mistakes of suburban sprawl are actively discouraged by the NP. This is much more important in a rural setting interspersed by villages than, say, the urban creep witnessed in the past at the edges of London and other major cities. Wickham Market and Pettistree have rich but welcomingly distinctive characteristics and should these villages grow into each other as, essentially, Woodbridge and Melton (and some would say Ufford) have done great damage would be done in landscape and other terms. WICK2 and WICK3 should be beefed up more specifically to guard against this.</p>	<p>Noted Key views are important and are identified in the policy maps. It is unfortunate that the Pettistree Development is considered to be within the settlement bounday of Wickham so a degree of coalescence is unavoidable. WICK 2 , 3 will be strengthened.</p>	WICK 2 and WICK 3 have been amended
			para 2.8	<p>"It is important that future developments are designed to provide sufficient off-road parking. These developments have also added to the traffic congestion in the village."</p> <p>My comments: The above demonstrates an inconsistency unless the NP considers the better provision of local public transport fully and indicates that as part of the aims of the NP (and the use of any generated CIL) would be to discuss with relevant commercial bus operators how their services might better serve existing and future residential housing in Wickham Market.</p>		
		Wick 12, 13	para 2.9	<p>My comments: Many will be interested to know more about how the NP and the planning authority would condition outcomes which, for example, avoided any new housing on the Old School Farm site simply replicating the architectural and social outcomes seen at Wickham Place and especially as that would be the preferred outcome e.g. Wickham Place of the known developers operating in the Wickham Market area. Unless this is strongly written into the NP, with the accepted risk that housing of any other type may take longer to deliver, the developer is very likely to win on appeal even if East Suffolk Council refuse permission e.g. Woods Lane.</p>	<p>Lessons learnt from the Wickham Place development have been included in Wick 12</p>	None
			General	<p>Overall, I strongly support the desire of many in Wickham Market to put a Neighbourhood Plan in place. My brief comments above must be viewed as constructive individual observations and do not undermine my view of the overall benefits of having a Plan nor my public support for Wickham Market to successfully achieve this outcome.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>	None
47	Jane Wallace Business Manager Wickham Market Medical Centre			<p>Dr Lal has reviewed the document on behalf of the practice and asked me to advise you that all seems ok regarding the practice and therefore no need to comment</p>	<p>Yes</p>	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
48	Ken Williamson Area Commander Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service Fire and Public Safety Directorate			Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service has considered the plan and are of the opinion that, given the level of growth proposed, we do not envisage additional service provision will need to be made in order to mitigate the impact. However, this will be reconsidered if service conditions change. As always, SFRS would encourage the provision of automated fire suppression sprinkler systems in any new development as it not only affords enhanced life and property protection but if incorporated into the design/build stage it is extremely cost effective and efficient. SFRS will not have any objection with regard access, as long as access is in accordance with building regulation guidance. We will of course wish to have included adequate water supplies for firefighting, specific information as to the number and location can be obtained from our water officer via the normal consultation process.	Noted. Consideration will be given to amending WICK12 and WICK13 to include automatic fire suppression sprinkler systems.	None. We note the desire to install fire suppression systems in new houses. This has not been adopted in the local plan. Our concerns if we specified that new developments should have such systems would have an adverse affect on their affordability.
49	Purkiss	<b>Wick 9</b>		Car park placement in Mill Lane wrong – unsuitable location, too far from shops, pathway access could spoil Pightle, remote site could result in antisocial behaviour. (Mill Lane resident)	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
50	Walton	<b>Wick 9</b>		Mill Lane car park site unsuitable – reasons as for Purkiss. (Mill Lane resident)	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
51	Colbear	<b>Wick 9</b>		Inadequate access via Chapel Lane / Mill Lane to Mill Lane car park. (Mill Lane resident).	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
			<b>Para 4.2</b>	Future development of land south of Morris Road development will spoil countryside and 'no provision has been made for adequate parking and many policies have been breached'.	Wickham Market PC is making representations regarding any potential development to ensure no policies are breached and parking is adequate.	Being progressed by WMPC

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
52	Ashburn		<b>Para 7.4</b>	On street parking problems in the village impeding access by mobility scooters and pushchairs using pavements.	Traffic and Parking group to make recommendations for WMPC to discuss with SCC Highways and any other relevant body.	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC
			<b>Para 7.10</b>	Dallinghoo Road parking and access problems, overhanging shrubs over pavements, faded line markings here. Generally faded road line markings	Recent remarking of lines has taken place. WMPC to monitor effectiveness and report any deterioration.	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC
			<b>Para 7.6</b>	Flashing speed signs – any plans to use information gathered to introduce any traffic calming measures? Plans for future siting where speeding may be occurring.	In hand by Traffic and Parking group who are currently gathering evidence for use in making a case with relevant authorities.	No amendment to Plan needed. Will be progressed through WMPC/T&PWG
			<b>Para 6.7</b>	The George is an eyesore, needs demolishing, site the pub elsewhere – old school?	Issue for George group not PC but monitoring of progress ongoing. George team are currently progressing all options to either rebuild the pub if funds are available or demolish Old School is not available for this purpose.	None
			<b>Para 7.9</b>	Little Lane – good it's being cleared for better access, hope this will go all the way down.	Appreciate positive comment and monitor.	None
			<b>Para 7.4</b>	Safe crossing needed across High Street from medical/ resources centre to Post Office / Coop.	Traffic and Parking group to gather evidence to present to relevant authorities.	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC
53	Ryder Davies	<b>Wick 9</b>		Mill Lane car park - access problems to / from Chapel Lane, car park will spoil countryside and impede access to existing properties. Inadequate pavements. Serious safety risk if it goes ahead. (Camping Close / Church Terrace resident)	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
54	Howes D	<b>Wick 9</b>		Car Park at Mill Lane will inconvenience residents at Kitson Court. (Mill Lane resident)	As above. PC is holding discussions with Flagship on the Kitson Court parking issue.	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
55	Drayson, A		<b>Para 5.13</b> <b>Para 5.14</b>	Retro fitting solar panels is significantly more expensive than fitting to the property when built. With the reduction in government subsidies retrofitting by residents is unlikely to happen. Therefore, new builds should either have solar panels fitted on have "green" roofs planted appropriately	The fact that retro fitting of solar panels is more expensive is agreed. The Neighbourhood Plan strongly recommends that solar panels should be fitted as standard, but as the houses will be built by a commercial builder, it is understood that this cannot be dictated.	None
			<b>Para 5.15</b>	Grey water recycling should be fitted to properties when built	This is already recommended	None
			<b>Para 5.16</b>	To encourage more cycle use new properties should have cycle storage, either private sheds or covered cycle stands where bikes can be locked.	Noted	None
		<b>Wick 9</b>		The car park is disproportionately large. Why do we need 80 spaces? No point in providing cycle parking in the car park as cyclists will park in the centre of the village. We should be getting people to use their cars less and spend the money on Public Transport.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
56	Burch, L		<b>Para 12.9</b>	Houses should be affordable for young local people. Very worried that my children will not be able to afford to live in the village. Primary school numbers are reducing.	The guidance in the Local Plan (Policy SCLP5.10) covers affordable housing. Of these affordable dwellings, 50% should be for affordable rent / social rent, 25% should be for shared ownership and 25% should be for discounted home ownership.  Social rented housing is allocated to those at the top of the housing ladder and not necessarily to local residents. This issue cannot be properly addressed unless Wickham Market sets up its own housing association and currently there are no plans to do this.	No change to NP needed.
			<b>Para 7.4</b>	The footpath by the Post office is very dangerous, it is not wide enough for two cars! A priority system should be put in place. It is an accident waiting to happen.	This point is fully understood and has already been made to SCC, unfortunately they do not have the money to fix the problem. It is planned to spend some of the Community Infrastructure Levy in addressing problems such as this.	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC
			<b>Para 5.5</b>	The EDF Park and Ride site is of great concern to the village. It would not be able to cope with the additional traffic and the possible loss of parking is a great concern	This is fully understood, but is not part of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council are working very hard to try to ensure that, if Sizewell C goes ahead and the Southern Park and Ride is in the Wickham Market location then the impact will be as small as possible.	Being progressed by WMPC
			<b>Para 3.2</b>	Playparks could benefit from being updated. Zip wire is good but the play equipment in the park needs updating, it is only really suitable for nursery children.	The Parish Council is currently only in control of the playpark on the Village Hall playing field. The fact that some of the play equipment needs to be updated is currently in hand.	Being progressed by WMPC
57	Grenham, M	<b>Wick 1</b>		• That any new housing should be lived in permanently and not used for second homes or holiday lets or rented out privately. See St.Ives Council example.	We have considered this and do not believe this to be a significant issue for the Parish	None



Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have we not already reached a maximum of new housing on 'green field' sites?</li> </ul>	Unfortunately, not	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are we only looking at 'new builds' to obtain CIL?</li> </ul>	Yes	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The large size of any new development in any one place in the village, appears to cause the residents of the new build to not interact with the rest of the village.</li> </ul>	Agree that this is a potential issue.	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building of new developments will not retain the rural character/physical structure of WM and will not conserve or enhance the historic environment. This is just a 'wish list' as developers are very unlikely to do any of these proposals.</li> </ul>	Yes but we have to try	None
		<b>Wick 4</b>		By developing 'green field' sites and old allotments you are destroying wildlife habitat.	Noted	None
		<b>Wick 6</b>		Should include 10. Town Lands	This field was considered and it was felt that it did not meet the required criteria.	None
		<b>Wick 9</b>		Item A. The proposal for an additional car park down Mill Lane is not appropriate, it is away from the village centre and access is down a narrow lane, unsuitable for the flow of traffic to and from a car park.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
		<b>Wick 10</b>	<b>Para 7.4</b>	Details four areas that are difficult traffic problems but what about the section from the Border Cot junction to Rackham's Bridge? This is the most dangerous road in WM and the safety of pedestrians and vehicles is paramount.	Noted. This section of road is being considered for inclusion in the next revision of the NP.	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC
				Any further development in this village will only increase traffic problems. This is clearly a worry to many WM residents but appears to go unnoticed by WMPC.	WMPC are fully aware of the impact of new development on traffic and parking which is already an issue for the village. T&PWG has been set up to identify issues and their mitigation	None
				Traffic flow will only increase, the cut through on the B1078 from the A14 to the A12 will only increase unless something is done about it. Traffic calming measures should be added to the five sections of road to discourage speeding by motorists.	This is already being looked into by the T&PWG	None
		<b>Wick 11</b>		It would mean completely redesigning the whole village to meet the criteria in this policy statement. Lack of infrastructure design in the past, cannot be changed at this stage to make the suggested improvements.	It is appreciated that implementation of this policy will not be easy, however, it is believed that the current situation can be improved for the benefit of the community.	None
				All new development will only have a negative effect on the village.	The NP is being written so that residents have some say where any developments take place in the future.	None
				I suggest you look at a scheme that stops vehicles using the village roads as 'cut throughs' then you might improve the impact of excessive cars in the village.	Noted but this is a particularly difficult issue to resolve.	None
		<b>Wick 12</b>		<p>The proposed housing development at Old Scholl Farm is not appropriate the rural location of WM village.</p> <p>This is a 'green space' which will be removed if the development goes ahead.</p>	All sites around Wickham Market were assessed and only Old Farm and Simons Cross were considered suitable for development.	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
		Wick 1		I am concerned over the environmental impact that new developments are having on Wickham Market. Trees, hedges and wildlife are particularly at risk. Even when the Planning Department give specific conditions for these to be protected, they are still vulnerable at the building stage and then when the houses are completed, and owners take up residence.	These issues are covered under Wick 4	None
58	West, R	Wick 1		The NP says; "... 110 dwellings between 2018 and 2036 whereas the SCDC Local Plan states 90 dwellings between 2016 and 2036. Which is correct? and as of 01.04.2018 20 dwellings have already been allocated leaving 70 - is this still correct?	110 dwellings is correct.	None
		Wick 6		Town Lands either side of the access route to the cemetery should both be included in the Green Space allocation.	This field was considered and it was felt that it did not meet the required criteria.	None
		Wick 10		Car Park provision. The existing car parks should be looked at and re-configured before extra land is taken into new car parks. For example, the one including the toilet block was designed 20 years ago and a lot of green planting has been included where if this was redesigned today the would be more space for parking. Four disabled spaces seem excessive and are ALL used at the same time.	The WMPC/T&PWG are currently looking at existing car park provision to see whether some reconfiguration may be possible.	Being progressed by WMPC
		Wick 10		The stretch of road from the Border Cot Lane through to the bridge is the busiest piece of road in Wickham Market, with vehicles breaking speed limits consistently. There are frequent accidents - eventually someone will be injured or worse.  7.4 of the NP does not include this piece of road. Why not? 7.6 Needs to include traffic calming measures.	Noted. This section of road is a key part of the traffic and parking review and measures to improve the situation will be proposed .	New section 7.14 includes potential improvement works which will be progressed as a Community Action by WMPC

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan	
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f	
59	Suffolk County Council	<b>Wick 6</b>		Whilst the intention for the protection of local green spaces in WICK6 is understandable, the policy would prevent improvements to the highways, for traffic and pedestrians for example, and to facilities at the primary school, such as play equipment. This would not deliver on objectives 6 and 7 for traffic and better facilities. The qualification in Part B could be clarified to relate to improvements to the highway and to community facilities.	Noted	Part B has been amended to take this into account.	
				<b>Archaeology</b>	Neighbourhood Plans often refer to historical events and features and this plan refers to 18 non- designated heritages assets. The context of the assets could be reinforced by a background paragraph detailing the archaeology of the parish, which could be informed by the Historic Environment Record (HER) held by Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS). This includes, for example, that ironworks was shown to the east of the A12 on the 1841 Tithe Map (HER ref: WKM016).	In Section 2 - Historical Development of Wickham Market - a description of the archeology is given.	None
					Reference could also be made to the need for consideration of archaeology early in the planning process and that SCCAS is available for advice as to whether archaeological investigation will be required. In terms of the consideration of sites identified in the Plan, the following comments have been made by SCCAS:	This is already covered in general within the Local Plan in Policy SCLP11.7:	None
			<b>Wick 9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WICK9: This site is on the location of a post medieval mill (WKM 017). A trenched archaeological evaluation by condition of any planning permission will be required.</li> </ul>	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.	
			<b>Wick 12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WICK12: This site is directly opposite a known excavated area of Mesolithic to Roman Occupation (WKM 037), there are also dense findspots recorded on the Portable Antiquities Scheme Database. Investigation using geophysical survey to inform trenched evaluation prior to determination of any application for planning permission will be required.</li> </ul>	Noted and we will amend the policy to take this into account	Wick12 amended	
			<b>Wick 13</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WICK 13: This site has cropmarks (WKM 010) of a likely enclosure of possibly prehistoric date and, therefore, a trenched archaeological evaluation by condition will be required.</li> </ul>	Wick 13 amended to include this requirement.	WICK 13 amended	
	Suffolk County Council	<b>Para 9.4 Early Years Education</b>		Depending on the mixture of types and sizes, the additional 110 homes could generate the need for an additional place, at a cost of £8,333 would be provided through the Community Infrastructure Levy	Noted	None	
			<b>Para 9.4 Primary Education</b>	The latest forecast for Wickham Market Primary School indicates a total pupil roll of 166 by 2022/23. The school has a total capacity of 263 places. The school is forecast to have 84 spare places by 2022/23 based on 95% capacity (a level used in school-place planning for operational purposes and to allow parental choice). The development sites identified in the Neighbourhood plan are estimated to generate demand for 28 additional primary school places. The development planned for in the neighbourhood plan is not expected to necessitate expansion of the primary school.	Noted. It is hoped that this additional housing will generate a demand for at least 28 Children.	None	

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
			<b>Para 9.4 Secondary Education</b>	Capacity at Thomas Mills High School is forecast to be exceeded by the end of 2023/24. Therefore, the County Council expects to seek financial contributions from development through the Community Infrastructure Levy in order to provide additional places at the school. However, the school has limited ability to expand on within its current site. It is expected that the level of growth currently proposed in both the neighbourhood plan and local plan can theoretically be accommodated on the existing site. Further land would need to be obtained and policy FRAM21 of the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan does allocate land next to the school for educational use and the potential for this area to act as an education hub.	Due to changes in the allocation of Secondary School places it is expected that Farlingaye School in Woodbridge will become the default school for secondary education in Wickham Market as it is the nearest. This change is going to be particularly difficult for Wickham Market residents.	None
		<b>Wick 12, 13</b>		Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service (SFRS) would encourage the provision of automated fire suppression sprinkler systems in any new development as it not only affords enhanced life and property protection but if incorporated into the design/build stage it is extremely cost effective and efficient.	We note the desire to install fire suppression systems in new houses. This has not been adopted in the Local Plan. Our concerns if we specified that new developments should have such systems would have an adverse affect on their affordability.	None - see response
			<b>Para 5.9 – 5.11</b>	The Neighbourhood Plan relates to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and paragraphs 5.9 –  of the Neighbourhood Plan provides some useful context, which could direct to other sources of advice such as the protocol and design guide produced by the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Partnership, see - <a href="http://www.greensuffolk.org/flooding/flood-risk-management-strategy/">http://www.greensuffolk.org/flooding/flood-risk-management-strategy/</a> .	Noted. The plan will be amended to take this into account.	Updated

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
	Suffolk County Council	<b>Wick 4</b>		<p>Policy WICK4 does need to be clear about which elements are related to viability. The County Council's concern is that the whole principle of surface water management through SuDS would be set against viability. This would not address the clear need for major developments to incorporate SuDS (NPPF, para.165) unless inappropriate, which is different from resulting in unviable development. The policy does appear to direct developments to consider "creative" measures with examples of green roofs, water recycling (WICK5) and rain gardens, which could be related to viability but would still not be clear. Below are some suggested policy wording for WICK4:</p>	Need to amend the policy.	Wick 4 amended - see below
				<p>B. <b>Major development should provide on site</b> Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), unless there <i>is clear evidence</i> why this is not <b>appropriate</b>. Such development is encouraged to demonstrate the use of a wide range of creative SuDS solutions, for example through the provision of SuDS as part of green spaces, green roofs, permeable surfaces and rain gardens.</p>	Note. This advice will be followed.	Wick 4 has been amended to include the suggested text
				<p>C. SuDS provision <i>should be designed to</i> enhance wildlife and biodiversity as well as minimise the impacts of flooding.</p>	Note. This advice will be followed.	Wick 4 has been amended to include the suggested text
		<b>Wick 12</b>		<p>This proposed development is adjacent to some areas of minor pluvial flooding, which would need to be assessed as part of any Flood Risk Assessment completed for the development.</p> <p>On looking at the actual minerals data from the British Geological Survey (BGS), only 0.2 of the site is predicted to have sand and gravel deposit beneath it. Therefore, it is not worth perusing extraction or use on site.</p>	Noted	None
		<b>Wick 13</b>		<p>BGS data shows potential deposits throughout the majority of the site. Prior extraction is unlikely to be an option due to the proximity to the existing residential area. Use of sand and gravel found within the site during construction might be possible and conditioned as such unless prior testing demonstrates insufficient quality and quantity of resource that could be used or that the resource is needed for infiltration.</p>	Noted.	None
			<b>Para 7.4 – 7.10</b>	<p><u>Public Rights of Way (PRoW)</u></p> <p>Whilst the neighbourhood plan covers the issue of pedestrian and cycle access well, reference could be made to paragraph 98 of the NPPF, which seeks developments to take "opportunities to provide better facilities for users".</p>	This aspect has been included in Para 7.12	

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
	Suffolk County Council	<b>Wick 10</b>		<p>There are points along Hill Street where the footway for pedestrians narrows and does not provide sufficient space for vulnerable road users. The highway authority will work with the parish to progress schedules that balance the needs of all users. The specific policy on pedestrian safety (WICK10) is welcome as it acknowledges the potential need for development to address pedestrian safety. Whilst planning conditions are preferred, including to require works to be undertaken before the use or occupation of a development, planning obligations may also be used and reference to such should be added to the end of policy WICK10.</p> <p>The aspirations to improve pedestrian and cycle facilities is commendable. Attention will need to be paid to ensure that additional provision is not detrimental to the numbers of on street parking spaces and the smooth flow of traffic through the village. Otherwise this would be contrary to the achievement of the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives and policy WICK1.</p>	This comment is welcome and we look forward to working with SCC to address these issues.	None
		<b>Wick 9</b>		Land at Mill Lane.	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision for addition parking within the village centre would help to reduce on-street parking;</li> </ul>	Noted	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The supporting text (para. 7.2) suggests that this would be long stay but not clear in policy;</li> </ul>	Agreed, but since ESC have introduced a new parking charges regime since Reg14 , the situation has changed and introduced uncertainty about future car parking needs. WICK 9 will be amended to remove the requirement for a long stay car park	The requirement for long stay car park has been removed from WICK9
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visibility from Mill Lane onto Chapel Lane is a constraint and will need to be improved;</li> </ul>	Noted	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regardless of intended length of stay, a separate footpath to village centre would need to be provided (properly surfaced for year-round use and disabled access);</li> </ul>	Noted	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mill Lane is narrow and the pattern of traffic would require additional passing places, and</li> </ul>	Noted	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to be offset from others such as the Lehman House entrance if feasible.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
				Policy WICK9 requires more detail about how the requirements for: improved visibility, passing places, the pedestrian route and the location of the access will be addressed. Whilst solutions to these points may well be possible and the Parish Council might already be addressing these, currently the Neighbourhood Plan does not adequately address how these will be considered when a planning application is determined.	Noted	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
	Suffolk County Council	<b>Wick 11</b>		Where feasible and proportionate in scale (and where evidence can be provided to show that development would not be acceptable without it), highway improvements will be requested to support this policy.	Noted	None
		<b>Wick 12</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As set out in the policy, vehicular access must be to High Street as Walnuts Lane is not suitable for increased traffic usage;</li> <li>Pedestrian links to playing field and primary school should be provided;</li> <li>Site should also connect to existing PROW along northern boundary of site;</li> </ul>	Agreed	Wick12 amended to include a footpath along eastern side of Walnuts Lane and vehicle access from B1438
		<b>Wick 13</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Main access onto Simon's Cross [via] existing residential estate roads;</li> </ul>	Access into the new Simons Cross development is being looked into further	Advice has now been sought from ESC and SCC regarding vehicular access. WICK 13 updated to indicate both possible access points. Final decision will be made when planning application submitted.
				Pedestrian/cycle provision to relocated allotments should be provided through recreation area along with suitable crossing location	Agreed	Wick13 has been amended to include this provision
		<b>Wick 14</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In responding to the planning application, the County Council has recommended conditions for a suitable highway access with suitable visibility splays;</li> </ul>	Noted	None
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian link will not be provided by the above application due its very minor nature, so needs to be provided as part of the Simon's Cross housing site.</li> </ul>	Noted	None

Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
60	Stewart Patience (Anglian Water Services Ltd)	Wick 4	<b>PROVISION FOR WILDLIFE IN NEW DEVELOPMENT</b>	Reference is made to the development proposals within the Parish incorporating the provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which is fully supported. The use of SuDS would help to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding.  Anglian Water would ask that the requirement for applicants to include the provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) be wherever technically feasible (rather than viable as currently proposed) so as not to increase flood risk and to reduce flood risk where possible.	Agreed	WICK4 amended
		Wick 5	<b>DESIGNING FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY AND CARBON REDUCTION</b>	Reference is made to the development proposals within the parish achieving water efficiency through the use of grey water, rainwater harvesting and SuDS schemes which is fully supported.  We would suggest the wording could be strengthened by including it make clear that list of water efficiency measures identified in Policy Wick 5 is not intended to be an exhaustive list. For example, stormwater harvesting as well as rainwater harvesting could also be considered.	Agreed	WICK5 amended
61	Environment Agency	Wick 12		Old School Farm development policy states that additional land to the west of the cemetery will be used for a cemetery extension. At planning application stage a tier 1 risk assessment will be required at a minimum as the land falls within a source protection zone. A tier 1 risk assessment will be required to assess the risk to groundwater and provide suitable measures to mitigate those risks is required	Agreed	None
		Wick 9, 12, 13		<u>Groundwater and Contamination</u>  The Neighbourhood Plan outline falls our Source Protection Zones 1, 2 and 3. For land that may have been affected by contamination as a result of its previous use or that of the surrounding land, sufficient information should be provided with the planning application to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF for dealing with land contamination. This should take the form of a Preliminary Risk Assessment (including a desk study, conceptual model and initial assessment of risk), and provide assurance that the risk to the water environment is fully understood and can be addressed through appropriate measures.	In the supporting text for WICK12 and WICK13 this requirement has been mentioned. The proposal to construct a Car Park in WICK9 has been withdrawn.	NP amended
62	White, F	Wick 9		Mill Lane site is not suitable as a car park because:  It is countryside and outside the physical limits. It is the only pastureland in the village and meets the criteria for 'Local Green Spaces'. It should be protected as an important community asset. Suffolk Punch horses graze in this field! Single track road infrastructure is very unsuitable - ridiculous! Have SCC Highways supported this proposal?  <b>WICK9 completely contradicts WICKIO, WICKII, WICK3</b>	There is now no longer a requirement for a long stay car park. See Section 7 of the NP	The requirement for a long stay car park has been removed from WICK9.



Ref	Name of Body/ 'Resident'	Policy	Para	Representation	Response by Qualifying Body	Amendment to Plan
a	b	c	c1	d	e	f
				<p>The majority of parking need is for residents and not at this end of the village – how will this proposal help other residents?</p> <p>Having lived in a neighbouring village in the past and shopped in Wickham Market I find it difficult to believe that visitors would choose to park in this tucked away car park some distance from village centre facilities.</p> <p>Lehmann House has failed to implement planning consent for additional parking spaces. Why would public money support the parking needs of a private company?</p> <p>A parking scheme included in The Old School proposal would make more sense- more obvious for visitors, keep cars away from choke points, less visual impact, pavement already exists. There are other sites which could also be considered or add additional spaces piecemeal throughout the village.</p> <p>This proposal dramatically fails to comply with stated 'Vision and Objectives' of the Neighbourhood Plan - particularly point 4. Maintaining the Green Environment and point 6 - Traffic and Parking.</p> <p>How are we to expect developers to respect protection policies when we so obviously disregard them in the NP?</p>		