

Supporting Document 4 – Outcome of Consultation and Engagement

This document brings together in one place the consultation and engagement outcomes from:

proposals for 280 dwellings South of Eye Airfield in 2015, the District Councils Joint Local Plan Consultation Document in October 2017 and the Housing Needs Survey in May 2018

- a. Consultation on the application for 280 dwellings South of Eye Airfield
- b. Consultation on the Joint Local Plan Consultation Document 2017
- c. Report of Stage 1 Consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan March/April 2018
- d. Report of Stage 2 Consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan July 2018
- e. Comments in housing needs survey

A Consultation on the application for 280 dwellings South of Eye Airfield 2015 - Report of written public comments made at the Drop-in event on 13th June 2015

The event was attended by approximately 150 people. While most of those attending live in Eye, there were a number of attendees from neighbouring parishes.

This report presents only the written comments recorded by attendees on the day. The Drop-in event provided an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions of town councillors and planning officers from Mid-Suffolk District Council. This report does not record the product of those conversations though the information gained by councillors will be used in preparing the Town Council's response to consultations on the proposed development. As may be expected, the number and range of views expressed verbally greatly exceeded the volume of written comments.

The written comments have been grouped and summarised to make it easy to understand and represent the views expressed. All the original material has been kept to allow further analysis if required.

Peter Gould

5 July 2015

Views were sought on the adequacy of current services before any increase in population and demand.

Appraisal of current services in Eye

	NEED		
	ADEQUATE	IMPROVEMENT	INADEQUATE
Doctor's Surgery	11	29	26
Primary School	5	21	5
Secondary School	8	16	9
Play group pre-school	6	4	3
Equipped play areas	2	6	24
Broadband	3	11	33
Sports facilities	4	13	7
Open space/amenity space	12	5	2
Car parking	6	18	10
Public transport	3	6	23
Church	9	3	0
Town Hall	5	9	6
Shops and services	7	20	8
Street lighting	16	3	12
Public rights of way	10	7	6

There was a little confusion with this question. Some understood the question to ask whether existing services would be adequate if population/demand increased.

What kind of housing would you need?

The question asked about personal requirements in the future. No responses appeared to describe an individual's personal requirements. Instead, all comments expressed a view about what the proposed development should provide.

There should be adequate affordable housing. 11 comments.

Affordable housing should not be at the expense of limited garden size. 1 comment.

There should be single-bedroom accommodation for the young and elderly with bus services to Eye and to Diss. 1 comment.

There should be starter homes for first time buyers. 8 comments.

There should be a mix of housing for all ages and stages of life. 4 comments.

The site should maximise the number of houses. 1 comment.

There should be a housing needs assessment to find out what local people need. 4 comments.

The quality of houses should be high and fit into the local styles. 2 comments.

Individual plots should be made available so that individuals can build original homes. 1 comment.

How do you think the proposals could make a contribution to the environment?

A smaller number of houses than that proposed would benefit the environment. 3 comments

Restrict parking spaces to one per household but provide some visitor parking. 1 comment.

Ensure there is a minimum of two spaces per house. 1 comment.

Ensure houses are energy-efficient – a minimum level of renewable energy including ground-source, solar panels. 4 comments.

Incorporate reed beds and water- management. Avoid the use of water tanks. 1 comment.

Include as many hedges and trees as possible – use indigenous species – integrate existing habitats – encourage bees and create sanctuaries for wildlife - use mature trees and plants to minimise delay – ensure future maintenance is funded by the developer. 5 comments

Yes! 2 comments

Infrastructure

Comments were sought separately for hard and soft infrastructure. Those attending didn't find this a meaningful or useful distinction and so the comments have been grouped under specific themes instead.

Roads and Traffic Management

Improved access to the A140 is essential. 7 comments.

Langton Grove should not be used as access to the development – visibility is poor and there is danger for Nursery users. 6 comments.

Langton Grove should provide through access to the whole development. 1 comment.

The traffic management of Church Street should be changed – possibly by making it one-way – to enable it to cope with increased traffic. 5 comments.

Castleton Way will need to be improved to provide better lighting and crossing facilities, better access to the allotments. 2 comments.

Castleton Way should be the only access to the development. 1 comment.

Castleton Way will become congested if it is the only access to the development. 2 comments.

Concern about the safety issues for schools – safe walking routes and safe drop-off and collection points. 3 comments.

Concern about the impact of construction traffic. 1 comment.

There should be more bridleways and the existing ones improved. 1 comment.

The pathways and cycle routes should be improved and extended. 3 comments.

Green space and play areas

There should be much better playground facilities for children with better equipment and proper matting. 1 comment.

There should be smaller dispersed areas of green space. 1 comment.

Health

The facilities at the health centre and the hospital should be extended. There should be more doctors. 2 comments.

Education

Can Hartismere be compelled by the county council to expand? 1 comment

There must be proper expansion of the schools with no quick fixes. 1 comment.

Schools must be properly funded and expansion shouldn't be at the expense of the playing fields or outside play space. 3 comments

How can the schools possibly cope with the additional children? 1 comment

Why not move the primary school to the development site so it has room to expand? 1 comment.

The issue of schools hasn't been properly addressed. The Hartismere Head has said that the school is small and planning to stay that way. 1 comment.

Library

A larger library is needed. 1 comment.

Flooding and drainage

The flooding problem in Lambseth Street needs to be resolved. 1 comment.

There is little confidence in Anglian Water to deal with existing requirements let alone additional pressures from the development. 2 comments.

Links between the development and the rest of Eye

There is a need to encourage new residents to be 'Eye-facing' with easy access to shops and facilities. 1 comment.

What does a 'buffer zone' mean? 1 comment.

The buffer zone needs to be increased. 1 comment.

What should Eye be like in the future?

Those attending were asked for their vision of Eye in the future. The answers are varied but all are interesting!

The same as today – a small quiet town. 8 comments

A thriving town without a big town character. 2 comments

A busy thriving town – re-invigorated – livened up – vibrant and dynamic – character-filled - populated by a whole range of different people. 5 comments

A town which planners see as an integrated whole with no single aspect overloaded. 1 comment

A town with more houses and people as we want to keep our shops. 1 comment

A developing town but one where the pace of development doesn't drown its character but enhances it. 2 comments

A town with houses local people can afford. 3 comments

A town whose future housing needs are met through in-fill development and proportionate expansion

A town that has employment for local (young) people and more business units. 3 comments.

A town where several generations of a family could live- all enjoying a range of amenities and services. 1 comment

A greener town where new development encourages physical activity such as cycling, walking and play. 2 comments

A town without excessive or speeding traffic and where parking restrictions are observed. 1 comment.

A town where the chicken factory is replaced by housing. 1 comment.

B – Consultation on the Joint Local Plan Consultation Document 2017

Summary of results of drop in on the local plan

Nearly 100 people attended the drop in on Mid Suffolk District Council's Local Plan organised by the Town Council on the 20th September. They were able to feed back their views on the options presented by the District Council for the distribution of development across the District, the options for housing in Eye, the need for a Neighbourhood Plan for Eye, the potential of development of land owned by the Town Council and the priorities for infrastructure and services.

On the distribution of land for development across the District, 46 people supported options that might lead to less development being allocated to Eye while 10 supported the options that might lead to more development being allocated in Eye.

Regarding housing in and around Eye, 64 people opposed the allocation of all the options for housing development put forward by the District Council which would lead to around 300 houses in addition to the 290 houses already granted permission. But only 19 people opposed any further housing in addition to the 290 houses already granted planning permission. Of the 3 site options put forward by the District Council most people supported the use of the Paddock House site for housing.

The Town Council own some land used for agriculture at Victoria Mill north of the allotments. 56 people thought the site should be brought forward for housing while 19 were against this.

The preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan was supported by 91 people and opposed by 3.

The main concerns about infrastructure and services were concerned:

- Traffic in the town, now and how it would get worse with more development, the need for a 20 mph area and/or HGV controls.

- The need to increase the capacity of schools with some specific suggestions for how this can be achieved.
- The need for adequate doctors/local surgery capacity.
- Parking control, 'misuse' of parking, the need for more parking in the town centre and a suggestion for edge of town parking.
- How busy the A140 is, difficulty in accessing it and suggestions for improvements.

Strategy

Should more land than is strictly necessary be allocated?

46 people said no - nobody agreed land should be over allocated.

Is the emphasis on housing for older people correct?

17 people thought it is right to make special provision for older people while 24 people disagreed.

Which strategy do you support?

Option 1 – County Town Focused

14 people supported this option

Option 2 – Market Towns and Rural Areas Balanced

10 people supported this option

Option 3 – A12/14 Transport Corridor Focused

17 people supported this option

Option 4 – New Settlement

15 people supported this option

So 46 people supported options that might lead to less development being allocated to Eye while 10 supported the options that might lead to more development being allocated in Eye.

Housing

Should all these sites be allocated meaning more than 300 houses in addition to the 290 dwellings that have permission already?

64 people opposed the allocation of 300 additional houses – nobody supported it.

Should none of the additional sites be allocated?

19 thought no further land should be allocated over and above the site that already has permission.

If only some of the sites should be allocated which sites do you prefer?

An additional 30 dwellings north of Castleton Road?

17 people supported this

Land to the East of Century Road?

12 people supported this

Paddock House

43 people supported this

Town Council Land at Victoria Mill

Should the site be put forward in addition to the other sites?

23 thought it should

Should the site be put forward instead of other sites?

33 thought it should

Should the site not be put forward at all?

19 thought it should

So 56 people thought the site should be brought forward while 19 were against this.

Neighbourhood Plan

Do you support a Neighbourhood Plan being prepared?

Yes - 91

No – 3

Comments about infrastructure requirements and other issues

33 comments were concerned about traffic in the town, now and how it would get worse with more development, wanted a 20 mph area or HGV controls

29 comments concerned the need to increase the capacity of schools with some specific suggestions for how this can be achieved

25 comments were about the need for adequate doctors/local surgery capacity

24 comments were about parking control, 'misuse' of parking the need for more parking in the town centre and a suggestion for edge of town parking

20 comments concerned how busy the A140 is, difficulty in accessing it and suggestions for improvements

12 comments were against more major development

12 comments were concerned with the need for better drainage and sewerage

8 people wanted more/better policing

6 comments wanted more facilities of young people

6 comments wanted Hertismere Hospital to be better used.

6 comments were concerned about the attitude/ability of the District or Town Council

5 comments were concerned about toilets

5 comments supported more affordable housing

4 comments were about library facilities

3 comments wanted more dentist capacity

3 comments wanted more shops

2 comments wanted developer contributions to be well used

2 comments wanted the chicken factory moved and the site used for housing

2 comments were about the condition of Cross Street

2 comments wanted CCTV

One comment on these items

Road cleaning

What happened to the 2009 Parish Plan?

Use local suppliers for building

Is a new care home still proposed?

Public transport

Use ETC site as town would get more benefit

Make Paddock House into the library with a museum, gardens etc

Road access to Century Road site a concern

C - Eye Neighbourhood Plan – Report of Stage 1 Consultation - March/April 2018

Introduction

1. The content of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan must be fully consistent with the views and wishes of the people who live and work in the town. To help achieve this three stages of consultation and engagement are planned by the Town Council before a draft Plan is finalised and submitted to the District Council. They will also undertake a consultation stage and before the Plan can be adopted local residents will have the opportunity to vote to support the plan or to vote against it in a referendum.
2. This is the report of the first stage in the Town Council's consultation. It sought to get people's views on a series of statements about what the Town might be like in the future and some questions on specific local issues. It also asked people what local facilities were most important to them and what most needed improving. This report and a range of other technical work that is being undertaken in phase 1 of Neighbourhood Plan preparation will influence the proposals in phase 2. The second stage in consultation will present a series of options for the growth of the Town in diagrammatic form for comment. The third phase in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan is writing the Plan itself and this will be subject to a six week consultation period in the third consultation stage.
3. The stage 1 consultation coincided with consultations by the District and County Council's about the development of the Paddock House site and the proposed junction improvements on the A140. The approach was therefore taken to use these events for the Neighbourhood Plan consultation. Three events were held regarding the A140 improvements - the two in the Town were well attended and attracted people from neighbouring villages as well as people from Eye. The event held near the A140 and targeted at businesses on the Airfield was poorly attended. The event on Paddock House was well attended - mainly by Eye residents particularly those living in the 'old town'. Thanks to the District and County Councils for allowing the Town Council to use these events for the Neighbourhood Plan stage 1 consultation.
4. Additional events were held to engage people at the Dove lunch club (older people), at the Eye Works for You Group (young disadvantaged people), The Eye Business Forum (mainly town centre businesses) and members of the WI and Elderflower Club. The later was not well attended

- but provided an opportunity for more in depth discussion. An attempt to engage the Hartismere High School failed.
5. Based on the numbers of people who recorded their views about what facilities are most important in Eye about 200 people attended the various events in total and have made their views known.

Comments on statements about what Eye might be like in the future

6. A number of statements were set out in a leaflet accompanying this stage of the consultation and they were replicated on display boards. People we invited to comment on them.

An attractive town: using the historic core to attract visitors and setting high standards to ensure new development is in keeping with the existing.

7. It was interesting that only people who attended the Paddock House event commented on this leaving 7 comments. The statement was supported in the context of the historic environment. Some people made specific comments about the need to reinstate the public toilets, concern about the designs for Paddock House and the need to protect the open space between Paddock House and Church Street.

A connected town: linking up the whole town, including old and new and housing, employment and services.

8. Again this attracted relatively few comments (7) of which most were made at the Paddock House event. Those that did comment wanted more integration in the Town as it stands and with the new housing when it comes. There was support for new/better walking and cycling routes particularly along the riverside and missing the junctions through the Airfield to the A140. One person was concerned that car parking needed to be improved to encourage incomers to use the Town Centre.

A green town: integrated into its countryside and with community projects to encourage green energy and conservation.

9. This attracted 10 comments at the Paddock House and the busiest A140 consultation event. These reflected the need for green spaces and gardens to support wildlife, the need to retain (at Paddock House) and plant more trees and maintain the open spaces for which more volunteers and Council support are/is needed.

A walkable town: development concentrated within walking distance of facilities, with great cycling facilities too – cutting congestion and improving the air we breathe.

10. This attracted 8 comments again from the Paddock House and first A140 events. Overall the tone of these comments was sceptical with one person asking 'what cycling facilities', two more questioning whether air quality could be improved or thinking it was being dealt with by Government and other wanting the emphasis to be on cars bring people to the town centre. In terms of development one response asked for no more development in the town centre and another wanted the open space in front of Paddock house to be kept for residents.

An enterprising town: focused on small businesses in the town centre and larger firms, especially those specializing in innovative clean technology and food production, on the former Airfield.

11. Only two people commented on this - once asking for the Chicken Factory to be relocated because of the smell and the other stating that current facilities would need improving if more houses are built.
12. The Business Forum identified three top priorities - better car parking, more control over speed and lorries in the town centre and more promotion of the town. For the latter they wanted to develop the 'Eye has it all' theme, to use the Town website better, improve signing and promote the town to the businesses on the Airfield.

A living town: growing in size to cope with new needs through new development providing sufficient low costs homes.

13. This attracted more comment - 18 comments in all. Most people were against more large housing developments but accepted a need for small scale/organic growth and affordable housing. Many recognised a need to provide housing for young people and some wanted to bring together different parts of the town and create social housing in the centre. Another wanted infrastructure to go with the housing including school places and recreational facilities.
14. The young people at Eye Works for You wanted social and specialist housing for their needs. There was also a comment by e-mail that there are 20 young adults in Eye with additional needs that will need somewhere to live.

Some specific Questions

15. Under the general statement below people were asked a series of specific questions:

An evolving town: changing gradually to meet new needs, locally and regionally, but with planned change when things need to alter.

Does Eye need a leisure centre?

16. There was strong support for a leisure centre in the Town from 16 people who commented on this question. A swimming pool was mentioned by a number of people, one person wanted to improve the community centre and a couple of people wanted to use the redeveloped Chicken Factory site for leisure facilities.

Should the Primary School be moved to a new site?

17. All seven people who commented supported this although one wanted to keep the existing school and build another near new development.

Should the chicken factory be redeveloped for housing or something else?

18. Moving the Chicken Factory was strongly supported with 25 people wanting it to be relocated and no comments against. Most people were in favour of affordable housing, car parking and leisure facilities as alternative uses.

Should Hartismere Health and Care be better use and what alternative uses would be suitable?

19. This also attracted a lot of comment - 22 in all. Nearly all thought it should be better used for health purposes - so local people have to travel less far. There were various suggestions for better uses including X ray, a minor injury centre, paramedic and convalescent facilities and the GP surgery. Suggestions for alternative uses included a leisure centre.

Is there a need for new roads?

20. 21 people commented on the need for new roads. Most comments were about reducing traffic speeds and the number of lorries. Some people wanted zebra crossings in the Town Centre and a 20 mph speed limit. The other group of comments wanted better junctions on the A140. Individual comments wanted Rectory Road closed, safer access to Tacon Close, making Church Street one way

Where should new cycleways and footpaths be located?

21. Five people wanted these including for safety and for mobility scooters.

How can car parking be improved?

22. This attracted the most comment of all - 24. There were a wide range of views though. The general tone was for more car parking. Some people

wanted free parking for a limited time with charging for longer term parking. Others wanted more control/enforcement over on street car parking. A few wanted free car parking to be retained. There were some specific comments such as the need for disability car parking, including at the Community Centre.

Should there be more community owned renewable power generation?

23. Two people wanted this while one thought it would be too ugly for Eye.

People were asked what facilities were most important in Eye

24. People were given three dots to indicate which facilities they thought were most important in Eye. There were 32 facilities to choose from so this required some difficult decisions.

The surgery 14%
The Post Office 11%
Hartismere Hospital 8%
Barclays Bank 8%
Pharmacy 6%
Supermarkets 6%
The Fire Station 5%
The Pub 5%
Car Parks 4%
Library 4%
Community Centre 3%
Town Hall 3%
The Pennings 3%
The Handyman 3%
Car Park Toilets 2%

People were asked which facilities were the highest priority for improvement

25. Again people were given three dots to indicate which facilities they thought most needed improving from the 32 listed:

Hartismere Hospital 19%
Car Park Toilets 13%
Car Parks 10%
Post Office 8%
The Surgery 6%
Moors Playground 6%

Library 4%
Supermarkets 4%
Community Centre 4%

People were asked what other facilities Eye should have.

26. In summary:

- 6 people wanted better public transport - more routes including to Bury, more bus stops and more reliable buses.
- 6 people wanted more police presence/visibility or CCTV.
- There were mixed views about new supermarkets - some thought there was a need for a larger supermarkets while others thought the two co-ops were sufficient and that other town centre shops would suffer if there was a new supermarket out of town.
- Two people wanted more residential homes
- Four people wanted more facilities and activities for children and young people.
- Two people wanted a bank and two people a museum (one for the 490)
- Individual comments were for better information, better toilets and better drains.
- The Eye Works for You Group top priorities were for better leisure facilities, cycle paths and a night club.

Individual Comments

27. The leaflet provided an email and postal address for views to be send in. Only one detailed response was received. The household supported any measures which will:

- help preserve the historic centre of the town while allowing it to develop and flourish;
- substantially reduce the volume of traffic passing through, particularly heavy goods vehicles;
- reduce the speed of traffic entering and leaving the town;
- lessen air pollution.

Group comments

28. A small group had a fairly in depth discussion of the issues. Four people attended. They were asked what concerns they have about what Eye might be like in 15-20 years' time. They were also asked what recommendations they would make to avoid those outcomes happening:

Concerns	Recommendations.
Traffic gets even worse	One way system but no new physical features such as traffic tables.
There are more lorries	New cycle ways and footpaths to get people out of their cars.
Shops closed	Lorry ban
No banking facilities	More car parking – use chicken factory.
No new facilities (eg leisure centre)	Make developers pay for new facilities
Car parking even more difficult	More houses to pay for new facilities.
Facilities under pressure from more people	Larger post office.

29. There was a discussion about the possible benefits of more development and the new facilities that should be provided by that development:

- A leisure centre
- More people to use shops and help maintain the historic centre.
- The Hartismere Health and Care Centre should be fully used even if it's all or part for housing.
- A museum
- A Theatre
- A new notice board
- More car parking.

All the comments are recorded on this mindmap:

[file:///C:/Users/Andy/Documents/Documents/Eye/Development%20general/Neighbourhood%20Plan/Consultancy%20Docs/Spring%20consultation%20results%20\(2\)%20\(2\)%20\(2\).html](file:///C:/Users/Andy/Documents/Documents/Eye/Development%20general/Neighbourhood%20Plan/Consultancy%20Docs/Spring%20consultation%20results%20(2)%20(2)%20(2).html)

Report prepared by Andy Robinson, Langton Brook Consultants, May 2018.

D - The Eye Neighbourhood Plan – Second Consultation Stage – July 2018

Introduction

1. The purpose of the second consultation stage was to feedback responses from the first consultation stage, to report other evidence that had been collected to inform the Plan and to seek views on:

- An opportunities plan containing proposals that reflected views and evidence collected so far.
- The green spaces most used by local people to provide evidence for listing as 'Assets of Community Value'.
- The community facilities that most people felt should be protected as 'Assets of Community Value'.

Comments on the Opportunities Plan

2. The Opportunities Plan set out proposals for 450 dwellings including the greenfield site south of Eye Airfield which already has planning permission and 5 other sites within the development boundary.

3. It also put forward two reserve sites which would only be included in the Plan if the District Council proposed more than the 450 dwellings described above. 55 people gave their preference with 44 (80%) preferring a site north of Castleton Way and west of the site with permission south of Eye Airfield and 11 (20%) preferring a site to the east of Century Road and north of Maple Way.

4. There was general support for infrastructure improvements to keep pace with population increase with the need to maintain the standards of service provided by the surgery and to improve the range of services at Hartismere Health and Care being of particular concern. Parking was also the subject of many comments with specific suggestions for new spaces behind the Fire Station, support for parking on the chicken factory site and between the trees on Lambseth Street. It was also suggested that the Paddock House site could be used for parking and that there should be charging and residents permits.

5. A number of comments concerned the need to improve landscaping on Oak Crescent and to improve the Pocket Park.

6. On the Primary School, some people wanted to use Paddock House for a school extension and others wanted the new school to be used for juniors keeping the current school for infants.

7. The most requested additional facility was a Supermarket.

8. Turning to housing - some people were concerned about the pace and scale of housing - not seeing the justification for the scale proposed. Most comments about the type of housing were in favour of more social and smaller houses. Regarding the sites proposed - there was one comment in favour and one against Victoria Mill, general support for the redevelopment of the Chicken Factory and comments about the green space and point of access to the Paddock House site.

9. There was a call for housing standards in the NP to be higher than current standards (as allowed by the new National Planning Policy Framework).

10. There was support for footpath and road improvements with a couple of people suggesting Church Street should be one way.

11. The comments in full are:

- General
 - All infrastructure should be improved
 - Need for relevant infrastructure
- Hartismere
 - More use of Hartismere Hospital
 - More use of hospital
 - Hartismere H and C should be better used
 - Use Hartismere H and C better
 - Use Hartismere properly
 - Make better use of Hartismere H and C
- Surgery
 - The surgery is highly valued by most residents - concerned that extra housing would put a strain which would reduce the current high level of service
 - Surgery and other medical support services are very important
 - Surgery and pharmacy of vital importance
 - Surgery needs to increase no of Doctors to match growth
 - Surgery expansion needed
- Parking
 - Site adjacent the Fire Station ideal for much needed parking
 - Use some of the space between Lambseth Street and chicken factory for parking
 - Use some of the Paddock House site for car parking as well as housing and open space
 - Car parking essential - not enough currently - extending Cross Street Car Park is best solution
 - Some older people don't have cars or IT
 - Use the space between the trees on Lambseth Street as parking
 - Consider car park charges to limit all day parking
 - Introduce residents parking permits

- Improve parking
- Can the community centre car park be used everyday?
- Provision for electric vehicle charging
- Green spaces
 - More trees on Oak Crescent
 - Pocket park to be improved
 - No Parking on the (Oak Crescent) green
 - Upkeep of Oak Crescent and Pocket Park needs to be improved
 - Improve Pocket Park
 - Improve childrens centre, doctors and pocket park
- Schools
 - Keep current primary school for infants and new school for juniors
 - Use Paddock House for Primary School Extension
 - Keep current primary school for infants and new school for juniors
 - Where will new primary school site be?
- New facilities
 - Cinema, supermarket and bowling alley on airfield
 - Swimming pool
 - I would really like to see a supermarket on the airfield
 - Big Supermarket
 - Supermarket
- Type of Housing
 - Housing for young people
 - Concerned about lack of social housing
 - Concerned about low allocation of homes for social rent
 - Not all extra housing should be exec
 - More flats for downsizing into
 - Flats with lifts take less space than bungalows
- Scale and pace of housing
 - Phase housing
 - Proposals for housing exceed housing need estimate by 3 times so no additional site should be considered especially if of high landscape value
 - Housing development too large and too speedy to preserve the valuable community spirit
 - Slow the pace of growth and have a very hard line on providing the 143 units of accommodation for housing needs which should be a priority.
 - Don't see the need for so many houses
- New Housing
 - Victoria Mill
 - Please use landlocked agricultural land as green space
 - Makes sense to development Victoria Mill allotments and land
 - Paddock House
 - Where would Paddock House entrance be

- Keep Paddock House green space
 - Paddock House access should not be opposite Old Brewhouse court
 - Keep Paddock House Green Space
 - Chicken Factory
 - Development of chicken factory ideal
 - Get rid of Chicken Factory
 - Ditto
 - Support dwellings and car parks on the Chicken Factory site
 - Support Chicken Factory site for housing
 - support redevelopment of the chicken factory
 - Support housing on chicken factory
 - Primary School
 - School must be listed
- Reserve sites
 - Support 1a which would create a better boundary for the special landscape area with Maple Way
 - Okay with either greenfield site
 - Not at all certain about the drainage and sewerage at the Castleton Way site
- Standards of housing
 - New play areas needed in development
 - Town council land should be highest build standards
 - High quality housing
 - Need open space in new development to meet and build community
 - Have higher building standards in plan as enabled by the new NPPF
- Roads and Footpaths
 - Footpath from Ash Drive to Wellington Road
 - Improve the footpath through the Rettery to the High School
 - Church Street should be one way
 - One way system for church street
 - Improve Roads and Access
 - Support road improvements
 - Close vehicular access to green Oak Crescent
 - Concerned about traffic past high school, hospital and surgery
 - Support new road junctions
 - Encourage walking and cycling
 - Ditto
 - Bellands Way/Oak Crescent - 20 mph
- Community
 - Retain Eye' community feel
 - More police around the town
 - Reduce anti social behaviour
 - Control cars and bikes at night

- Concerned about assets of community value criteria

Comments on Green Spaces

12. People attending the exhibition were asked to indicate which green spaces they used in the Town. The outcome is listed below in order of the most used. The usage of Oak Crescent may be overstated because one of the four exhibitions was held there. Attendees added Paddock House to the list but it should be noted that the green space there does not have public access and therefore its value is for visual amenity.

13. The votes in full were:

- The Castle - 40
- Community Centre - 39
- The Pennings - 32
- Town Moor - 29
- Oak Crescent - 26
- The Rettery - 22
- The Boardwalk - 13
- Bowls Club - 12
- Paddock House - 9
- The old Railway Embankment - 6
- Cricket Field - 3

Which are the most important assets of community value?

14. Many of the proposed 'Assets of Community Value' were supported by one or more comments, particularly Hartismere Health and Care. There were also a number of comments wanting some of the facilities that probably do not meet the criteria for Assets such as the supermarkets, post office and pharmacy to be included.

- Community Centre
- Improve the drive at the community centre
- Community Centre and Pub
- The pub
- Ditto
- Another pub
- Ditto
- Minor Injuries Unit at Hartismere Hospital

- Hartismere Health and Care should be better used
- Hartismere Health and care
- Hartismere Hospital
- Ditto
- Ditto - use more
- Ditto
- Ditto
- Ditto
- Hospital
- Supermarket and Post Office
- Bank Arts Centre
- Supermarkets very important
- Cash Machine and Post Office
- Car Parking toilets and post office
- Support the whole list but would like to add the surgery
- Ditto
- A good library and scout hut needed for new development
- Library
- Ditto - use as community hub
- Moors fens
- Buckshorn Lane Car Park
- Should include Bank, PO, Pharm, Supermarket
- Bank needed
- Should include pharmacy/supermarkets
- Ditto
- Ditto
- Ditto
- Ditto
- Indian Restaurant please!
- Leisure centre and pool
- Ditto
- Ditto
- Allotments
- Football Pitches
- The Bank Café

Andy Robinson
 Langton Brook Consultants
 July 2018

Addendum – one response was received by letter in August:

Concerns about on street car parking – parking on paths and leaving engines running causing air pollution.

Car parks full more often and fewer spaces for residents parking.

Traffic and noise and pollution effects have increased.

Concerned about access to 280 homes site and over development of the area.

E – Comments in the 2018 Housing Needs Survey

3.9 Further comments

Respondents were finally asked for any other comments they may have regarding housing needs in Eye; 103 comments were made and a summary of the key aspects mentioned are shown in **Table 3.9** below with further explanations following the table. The highest proportion of comments were attributed to the need for affordable housing in Eye, additional parking requirements and ensuring that the local infrastructure can cope with any increase in housing supply.

Table 3.9: Coded comments (If you have any further comments on housing needs within Eye, please write them below)

Count Column N %

Additional parking needed	25	24%
Affordable housing needed	34	33%
Do not build more housing	13	13%
No affordable housing wanted	3	3%
Range of housing required	13	13%
Community	10	10%
Lack of employment opportunities	5	5%
Town needs younger residents	9	9%
Ensure services/infrastructure can cope	23	22%
No buy to rent/profit allowed	6	6%
Bungalows needed/provision for elderly	9	9%
Criticism of survey/Council	14	14%
Aesthetics, greenery	15	15%

3.9.1 Affordable housing

The highest proportion of free comments made were regarding the need for affordable housing in the area. Respondents commented that “*there are plenty of big houses*” in Eye and that there is no need for any more four bed executive homes. It was mentioned that some of the smaller one and two bed properties are holiday lets and are not occupied all of the time and that properties under £200,000 should not be sold to private landlords or second home owners increasing the availability of the local housing stock.

“We need to avoid ‘Executive’ housing and to cater for the young and lower income markets also giving consideration to housing for older people who can no longer manage their own homes.”

“Affordable housing for young people should be a priority within Eye.”

“Eye needs more small/ish homes for young and elderly locals rather than huge executive detached houses.”

Comments stated that affordable housing is “scarce” in Eye and that it should be provided both to buy and rent to keep and entice young people and families to the town.

Some suggestions were made about a priority allocation scheme for affordable housing with preference being given to young people from the area, essential workers and people with family links to Eye.

“The town needs to attract younger people and younger families if it is to continue to prosper. We have an affluent, often older, property owning demographic. If we do not attract a younger age range to the town, shops will begin to close and the town will gradually atrophy over the next two decades.”

“A mix of starter, family and elderly and social housing would keep Eye relevant and financially available to more people.”

“It is important that low-cost housing both to rent and buy is available for local people. This is a low wage area and too many young people cannot afford the high rents in the private sector.”

People indicated that affordable housing should be maintained as such not reverting to market value once the first resident moves out. Converting existing properties into smaller housing units was also suggested; Paddock House, Library and Hospital were examples.

A number of respondents felt that developers should be less commercially focused building fewer properties on sites.

“...So forgetting what is commercially viable I would recommend more single storey dwellings, usually a developer is reluctant to provide these because houses are more profitable if density per acre is not controlled national target of 35 to the hectare wont usually include bungalows. However, on the airfield development the OPP I believe is for 285 dwellings maximum and this allows for substantial single storey development to the Northern fringe and against existing development boundaries. The retention of this permission for this land is essential as any resubmission will no doubt be for say 400 dwellings at a much higher density to the detriment of Eye and the benefit of the developer’s bottom line.”

“...too many houses are squashed onto sites with no green space which would benefit families and the community.”

“If Eye is indeed to build housing for the future, it needs to concentrate on good quality housing that embraces friendly details, not simply focusing on the maximum profit that can be extracted out of the land.”

3.9.2 Supporting Infrastructure

Concerns were raised that future housing development in the town should not be excessive needing to ensure that local services such as roads, public transport, schools and medical facilities can cope with the additional demand. There was concern that should this not occur Eye could become *“...a satellite community where people have no need to contribute to the local economy.”*

“There is a need for affordable housing but these will need to be supported by an extended and improved infrastructure (roads, schools, health care, parking, traffic calming measures and integrated walking/cycling, encouragement for businesses to open/stay in Eye.”

Comments were made regarding the need to resolve issues with the existing infrastructure before any further development occurs.

“Fix the potholes...school parking – absolute nightmare in Church Street”

“Can’t get a doctor’s appointment now, schools can’t cope, too much traffic.”

“Eye is a small town with limited infrastructure e.g. healthcare, parking for shoppers as well as workers. Roadworthy, as the volume of traffic currently is quite high in particular along Castleton Way and highway maintenance through Eye is poor.

There would have to be a massive resource input into the town to accommodate a high volume of housing as is currently planned.”

“...already overloaded drains, small roads, sewers and supporting infrastructure in danger of being overloaded.”

3.9.3 Parking

The lack of available parking in Eye was mentioned by many respondents.

“It is impossible to find a parking place in either of the two car parks after 0700 hours on a weekday.”

“The problem in Eye is parking as the streets aren’t able to cope with double parking and large vehicles.”

There were several suggestions that the Paddock House site should be used for car parking, although others disagreed with this proposal.

“We are already struggling with parking...please do not build on Paddock House, a parking space would be better there.”

“Paddock House could be used as an additional car park for the CO-OP and primary school to stop congestion on Church Street.”

“The Paddocks provide an echo of historical practice where livestock were held prior to market. This is within the conservation area. I have heard that this area has been proposed for additional car parking; if this is so I would strongly disagree. If new housing is to be built on this site the new residents’ parking could be problematic... Having a small car park fronting Church Street with presumably some new affordable housing behind would not make sense.”

Several comments were received about new housing having adequate parking.

“Housing is needed for rural living with PARKING for multiple vehicles and gardens.”

“We need more town parking and make Church Street one-way. Any homes should have adequate parking.”

3.9.4 No new housing

The majority of comments relating to not building houses in Eye referred to the Paddock House site with respondents suggesting alternative uses for the site (see text following Figure 3.5). However, some people did not want additional housing in Eye.

“No more houses in Eye!”

“Eye is a small market town and it needs to stay this way. No more houses and doing away with the country side.”

“We don’t need hundreds of estate houses; we don’t need to change the nature of the town that we have all chosen to live in by making it something else.”

3.9.5 Range of housing needed

Some respondents felt that a range of housing is required in Eye and that new buildings *“should be sympathetic”* to the existing property.

“A range of housing size and type will allow a range of people – individuals, couples and families – to remain or move into Eye. This is likely to create the type of balanced community that will best serve all our needs.”

“Eye needs mixed housing options to include single storey bungalows, single person housing, retirement housing and affordable family housing.”