# Neighbourhood Plan Refresh and CIL Project Spend

1. Melton Neighbourhood Plan Refresh

| **1. Public TransportUnder the current policy MEL 4 we do not include the encouragement of any new Community Transport Schemes. Do you think this should be included:** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 60.34% | 35 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 39.66% | 23 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Comments: (10) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 14:59 PM | Why is this a Yes/No question, as this does not include how it would be funded. | | 2 | 05/02/2020 17:21 PM | Get advice from successful FACTS (Felixstowe Area Community Transport Service) https://www.factsbus.org.uk/ | | 3 | 07/02/2020 19:59 PM | Support a replacement for the 800 P&R route. | | 4 | 08/02/2020 15:30 PM | Community transport would be helpful for elderly and disabled who feel the bustop is too far from their residence. | | 5 | 10/02/2020 16:08 PM | reinstatement of public bus services is so important if at all possible. Some kind of community run transport scheme would be very beneficial to the elderly in outlying villages. | | 6 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | Increasingly needed in view of cuts to local buses | | 7 | 11/02/2020 18:52 PM | I don't have a view as I don't know what the implications are. The survey should include the option ""Don't Know"" for all questions rather than forcing people to answer. | | 8 | 12/02/2020 10:17 AM | Surely an issue for local ESC | | 9 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | St Andrew's place bus stop disappeared | | 10 | 18/02/2020 07:17 AM | Particularly with the closure of spring side, we should endeavour to assist people who are potentially isolated to do their grocery shopping while at the same time improve their social access. | | | | | |

| **2. Village Hall/PavilionThe current policy MEL9 is very specific about plans for a Village Hall only. We propose to change the policy so that it is broader and includes options for rebuilding and possibly re-siting the Pavilion instead. Do you agree with this change?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 74.14% | 43 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 25.86% | 15 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Comments: (18) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 14:56 PM | Very sensible, given the environmental and financial implications of a large, excessively multi-functional village hall as originally planned | | 2 | 05/02/2020 14:59 PM | With a bit of foresight, this might have also have been the Parish Council Offices. | | 3 | 05/02/2020 17:21 PM | A community centre should be built: not a pavilion. Unfortunately Melton has had some miserable and extremely negative parish councillors. Melton should look at what other much smaller villages have achieved: Westleton, Waldringfield, Coddenham and Henley for example. The proposed village hall was rejected because the wrong site was proposed and the architect came up with a really horrible design. A community centre should be placed roughly where tennis courts are currently with a replacement tennis court provided near Jenners Close (insufficient demand for two courts). Emphasis should be on activities for health such a table tennis, carpet bowls and badminton rather than meetings and talks. With the CIL money available, Melton should be very much more positive. | | 4 | 05/02/2020 17:51 PM | I agree that the pavilion is in need of refurbish, however my concern is that it should be replaced with some structure and practical application to that which is currently provided. With the exception of the added benefit of public toilets. This addition would , to be of use and benefit would require the pavilion and Conveniences to be as near as is practically possible to the play area and picnic benches. The pavilion should not be located more than a few meters from its current location . I am further concerned that there should be no " mission creep" on this project that would enlarge the footprint of the current structure ( maybe 25 % extra would be acceptable to accommodate toilets etc. I would not wish to see the pavilions useage require the extension of the hard surface car parking as this would be a negative impact on the available and useable green surface as well as being ecologically negative with regards to carbon emission absorbing landscaping. | | 5 | 05/02/2020 20:41 PM | I think a new Village Hall is profligate and would consume the playing fields | | 6 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | Please proceed with the village hall | | 7 | 06/02/2020 17:33 PM | Re build pavilion but not resisting it to far from its current practical position | | 8 | 07/02/2020 19:59 PM | Yes replace. No don’t move it. Modern vandal resistant building with toilets. | | 9 | 08/02/2020 15:30 PM | Good idea to site village hall in visible area and include public toilets. | | 10 | 09/02/2020 09:32 AM | Demand and usage changes over time. A pavilion was essential for adult team sports during 1960-1980s, but this requirement no longer exists. But there is demand for a building on the playing field. I see it as a building with facilities the various uses of the playing field. To provide toilets and changing facilities for parents and children using the play area, storage for clubs using the field, lockers, electrical hook-up for car boot sales, fete and other events, external seating, the ability for vendors to plug in to facilities and provide coffee & food for which they would rent a pitch. These are current uses, but the building must be adaptable to cope with the demands of the next 30 years. I see it as a facilities building (still called the Pavilion though), which would be on the same location and similar footprint. A relatively modest building, low maintenance, built to great eco standards, highly efficient and low cost to run, vandal proof and attractive design. Minimal loss of green space. Retain maximum usable space for grass pitches, so do not enlarge the car park. This would encourage even more people to use the playing field now (more parents and children, external classes, personal trainers, new clubs, etc) and also set it up for the next 30 years of use | | 11 | 10/02/2020 16:08 PM | A new vandal proof Pavillion with provision of public loos will definitely be necessary at some stage. As far as a Village Hall goes, that is necessary but I don't see it as necessarily having anything to do with the Playing Fields Melton Road. | | 12 | 11/02/2020 08:24 AM | Why not include the option of a private run cafe, like Kingston park. The loss of the cafe there has been significant. | | 13 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | Would be helpful if WC could be provided close to existing play areas. | | 14 | 12/02/2020 10:17 AM | This change removes the original desire the council had to build a village hall. This whole issue should go back to consultation. | | 15 | 13/02/2020 09:53 AM | Would a new village hall/pavilion actually be used much? | | 16 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | Brownfield field if re-site you would use greenfield | | 17 | 18/02/2020 07:17 AM | I think it would depend on the proposals before I could definitively support them. Our green open space is so valuable so would be unlikely to support any new build on the Melton recreation ground. | | 18 | 04/03/2020 12:04 PM | Plans for the new Village Hall on the recreation ground looked promising | | | | | |

| **3. Protected Green SpaceThe current policy MEL12 does not include the former Bowling Green and Cricket Ground at St Audry’s. We propose to include these areas and would welcome feedback from residents about other green spaces that may have been missed initially. Do you agree with this inclusion?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 74.14% | 43 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 25.86% | 15 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Any other areas to be included: (13) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 17:21 PM | Forced by this questionaire to answer 'Yes' or 'No' because there's no option for no opinion. | | 2 | 05/02/2020 17:51 PM | We must be careful not to dilute our focus on what is important to the majority. The areas mentioned I would suggest that 90% of the current Melton populous have no idea where they are and are not of benefit to them nor are they likely to be. These areas when Hopkins Hones bought the St. Audrys freehold were included with that, | | 3 | 05/02/2020 19:23 PM | These are on a private estate and this proposal would do nothing for the majority of the parish | | 4 | 06/02/2020 08:52 AM | Cricket ground yes, but unsure why the bowling green has been deemed appropriate as unused for so many years, providing development enhances the area. The field which was subject to a planning appeal adjacent to Upper Melton Terrace on Yarmouth road should be a protected green corridor. | | 5 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | The NIMBY’s on the Asylum Estate have missed the boat on this one. | | 6 | 07/02/2020 19:59 PM | MPC should be involved in saving the St Audrys sports site. It’s too late for the bowls green site. | | 7 | 09/02/2020 09:32 AM | There will continue to be pressure to build in and around the village, so we should try to retain any usable small parcels of green space. But these must be accessible and usable spaces, eg close to footpaths and regular routes around the village. Any larger spaces, which have or had a specific use, such as bowling green and cricket ground must be included, so that their current usage can continue, new usage encouraged or simply used for communal open space | | 8 | 10/02/2020 15:11 PM | Woodland between Saxon Way and Hope Crescent and also Coppice Close and Hope Crescent. | | 9 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | Amenity space opposite car park near Fison House should be protected and if lost/reduced for new parking equivalent should be provided elsewhere. | | 10 | 11/02/2020 14:44 PM | Should include the Leeks Hill Woods if not already included. | | 11 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | Save as much Greenfield as enough have gone in the last 5 years and a disgrace | | 12 | 18/02/2020 07:17 AM | The woods behind the rec, the rejuvenated footpath 22 and I will come up with other areas I hope. We need to protect these areas and prevent any building on them now and in the future. | | 13 | 23/02/2020 17:54 PM | The Green space between St Andrews Close and Station Road needs protecting unless it already is. | | | | | |

| **4. HouseboatsThe current policy MEL15 only covers ‘residential’ moorings. We propose to re-word this policy to include ‘commercial’ boats. The main reason being that the Deben Bar on HMS Vale was given planning permission for a new permanent mooring because it was a commercial enterprise. Do you agree with this change?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 75.86% | 44 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 24.14% | 14 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Comments: (9) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 17:21 PM | Change it to include all moorings. No need to mention ""residential"" or ""commercial"". | | 2 | 05/02/2020 17:51 PM | This is an example of mission creep. I feel the "house boat " original focus is what is required. To much " aspiration and broad horizons" weakens the NP, in my opinion. | | 3 | 05/02/2020 19:23 PM | Keep as House boats only . Commercial boats could be a minefield | | 4 | 08/02/2020 15:30 PM | Residential houseboat should be given priority. | | 5 | 10/02/2020 16:08 PM | The fact that HMS Vale was given Planning Permission could set a precedent and we could be inundated with commercial boats! | | 6 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | But in some cases appropriate small scale commercial enterprises from boats may be positive and welcome. | | 7 | 12/02/2020 10:17 AM | This could get out of control | | 8 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | But limited the amount if commercial moorings | | 9 | 18/02/2020 07:17 AM | We need to preserve the character of the area and the Hm’s Deben, although a great space, is already changing the character of the river wall path, which is going to get yet busier when the England coastal path becomes more established. | | | | | |

| **5. Deben MillWe think that the current policy MEL20 does not give enough protection to the remaining green space in this development. We will look at rewording it to include more protection of any remaining green area so that even if parking is added it can’t be in a permanent structure, but instead open and with appropriate landscaping. Do you agree?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 89.66% | 52 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 10.34% | 6 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Comments: (3) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 09/02/2020 09:32 AM | The lack of car parking for workers on this site is the cause of the heavy parking on Melton Hill. Better public transport would encourage people to leave their cars at home. Green space management is very important, to help drainage of the area, with trees and wild flowers encouraged | | 2 | 10/02/2020 16:08 PM | See what happened to the small green triangle of green at the top of Old Maltings Approach when they were given planning approval for that garaging! | | 3 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | The existing green areas on which past permissions were granted should be protected unless equivalents or better can be provided elsewhere. Loss of green spaces, especially for parking should be resisted. | | | | | |

| **6. Land off Wilford Bridge Road (Carter Warburg site)This site allocation is covered by policy MEL 21. Development has not started yet and we are in discussions with the various landowners to try and get all the community benefits that the NP policy covers. We propose to add a new point about the need for a Net Biodiversity Gain on site, including planting of new trees, protection of hedgerows etc. We will seek advice from Suffolk Wildlife Trust on this. Do you agree?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 84.48% | 49 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 15.52% | 9 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Comments: (11) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | It would seem that MPC are somewhat naive when dealing with developers. There is no commercial benefit of including the community assets and indeed considerable costs for the developer, so highly unlikely they will include them. They will just string the amateur cllrs along. | | 2 | 07/02/2020 08:28 AM | It should be far more demanding in its environmental ambition | | 3 | 07/02/2020 19:59 PM | It’s probably a "nice if" | | 4 | 08/02/2020 15:30 PM | Could all trees and hedgerows old and new in the whole of Melton be plotted on NP to protect them from current and future development. | | 5 | 09/02/2020 09:32 AM | This is a very important site as it manages a vast amount of water draining off the high ground towards Melton/Ufford border. Much of the site must be unsuitable for building without the need for ridiculous piling (remember what was actually required on the GAH site) | | 6 | 10/02/2020 16:08 PM | Developers are often too hasty to rip out years old trees and hedgerows - we don't know what the habitat is - maybe there is an endangered species hiding in a site like this? Without a survey from SWT we will never know! | | 7 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | Environmental gains as per NPPF are welcome and on this site would be consistent with this. | | 8 | 11/02/2020 18:52 PM | Include specific help for pollinators. | | 9 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | But no building to go ahead as it's a disgrace that some of the trees have been taken down without permission... so for that they shouldn't get permission.. if they are under handed before permission what will be like if they get permission | | 10 | 18/02/2020 07:17 AM | If we can build in environmental net gain, rather than just biodiversity net gain I would support this even more. Perhaps we can also consider conservation covenants with the respective parties? Happy to become involved. | | 11 | 23/02/2020 17:54 PM | However a lot of the trees have now been felled and the boundary hedge along Waterhead lane is now almost non existent. Would it therefore be replanted? | | | | | |

| **7. We propose to add a new policy that requires a Construction Management Plan for all developments and references things such as noise especially in built up areas. Do you agree?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 86.21% | 50 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 13.79% | 8 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Comments: (12) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 14:59 PM | These are not legally binding, so of little use. | | 2 | 05/02/2020 20:41 PM | There was appalling noise and massive vibration for 10 weeks from the development on the old refrigerator works site next to Fayrefield Road. | | 3 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | Again somewhat naive by MPC, noise level restrictions are already in place, how are the amateur cllrs going to manage this? How will you get round the need for pile driving? | | 4 | 07/02/2020 19:59 PM | Not sure MPC can enforce this. | | 5 | 09/02/2020 09:32 AM | See point above relating to GAH site | | 6 | 10/02/2020 15:11 PM | The continuous noise from pile driving over several weeks at the construction site on Melton Hill was a nightmare for residents especially those living nearby. The use of such noisy equipment should be time restricted during daylight hours. | | 7 | 10/02/2020 16:08 PM | I live near the building site on Melton Road and was driven to distraction by the noise from the pile sinking! It started too early in the morning and carried on far too long in the evenings. | | 8 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | Not necessarily. This could be conditioned by the district council where necessary. | | 9 | 11/02/2020 18:52 PM | Dk | | 10 | 12/02/2020 10:17 AM | The proposal is not specific enough. Would small extensions that do not require PP be included? | | 11 | 13/02/2020 09:53 AM | Building is noisy but should be constrained to certain hours and days (i.e. 8-6 and not Sundays) | | 12 | 23/02/2020 17:54 PM | A good idea as building work that takes a long time such as the GAH site and Riduna can blight people's lives. | | | | | |

| **8. We propose to add a new policy which encourages renewable energy – small, local windfarms, solar energy fields. Do you agree?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 75.86% | 44 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 24.14% | 14 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Comments: (11) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 14:56 PM | The Suffolk coast has certainly contributed enough to renewable energy - even given the desirability of renewables, no more in this part of the county, please! | | 2 | 05/02/2020 17:21 PM | Any policy would be totally ineffective. | | 3 | 05/02/2020 18:31 PM | Depends where they are and impact on nearby residents | | 4 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | The local NIMBY’s will still moan about this | | 5 | 10/02/2020 15:11 PM | Solar panels on all new residential properties should be included in all developments at the planning stage as standard. | | 6 | 10/02/2020 16:08 PM | I am all for solar energy fields but wind turbines are a blot on the countryside - a bit like the Sizewell Pylons!!!!! | | 7 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | Particularly if the community can benefit and not just the landowner | | 8 | 11/02/2020 18:52 PM | Subject to other considerations eg visual interference, noise, effects on ecosystems, etc | | 9 | 12/02/2020 10:17 AM | Small solar maybe but local wind farms no. | | 10 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | As this would probably go on Greenfield land | | 11 | 18/02/2020 07:17 AM | Perhaps consider community chp as well. The impact on the environment will need to be carefully managed as solar fields can impact on the nature and character of the locality. | | | | | |

| **9. We propose to add a new policy which encourages Energy Efficient development – building materials used, eco energy generating devices installed etc? Do you agree?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 86.21% | 50 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 13.79% | 8 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Comments: (12) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 14:59 PM | Surely the East Suffolk District Council overrides a Parish Council policy | | 2 | 05/02/2020 17:21 PM | Any policy would be totally ineffective. | | 3 | 05/02/2020 17:51 PM | With one provision, any wind generating facility must not be positioned so that it is to the detriment of neighbours properties ,because of :- noise / sound generation , visual impact , general appearance , and finally not at a blot on the scenery / backdrop of its location within the parish . | | 4 | 05/02/2020 18:31 PM | Beware of unintended consequences. Some of these green schemes are not what they seem. | | 5 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | What is an eco generating device ? Don’t let the eco warriors with there quack ideas take control. | | 6 | 07/02/2020 08:28 AM | It should not be ""encouraging"" but a demand. | | 7 | 09/02/2020 09:32 AM | Force ESC to up the minimum standards | | 8 | 10/02/2020 15:11 PM | Provided that there is no substantial fire risk from combustible materials. | | 9 | 10/02/2020 16:08 PM | I propose that every housing development/apartment block over x number of houses (30/50?) whatever might be cost effective, should by law have an eco energy device installed for the whole development. New build houses should definitely be encouraged. | | 10 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | All new commercial developments should be required to include solar panels on roofs, and why not houses too. Would make them more sustainable. Riduna Park? | | 11 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | Something Norfolk housing award | | 12 | 18/02/2020 07:17 AM | Definitely, I would be happy to become involved with this. | | | | | |

| **10. We propose a new policy on Green Infrastructure - Development proposals should seek to maintain and enhance the connectivity of all green corridors where possible. Identify opportunities for new tree and woodland planting in the parish and protection of hedges etc. Do you think this is a good idea?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 89.66% | 52 |
| 2 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 10.34% | 6 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Comments: (8) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 18:31 PM | See above | | 2 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | As long as it is properly thought out | | 3 | 07/02/2020 08:28 AM | Absolutely crucial with commitment to replace any trees etc which die due to lack of care. | | 4 | 08/02/2020 15:30 PM | It is very important to carry out this proposal as developers seem to taking down trees and hedgerows without any thought for wildlife. | | 5 | 10/02/2020 16:08 PM | An excellent idea which would help protect green spaces and wildlife for the next generation. Maybe a link up with our neighbouring Parishes? | | 6 | 11/02/2020 18:52 PM | Not just trees. Careful thought about all plantings to enhance biodiversity and healthy ecosystems. | | 7 | 13/02/2020 09:53 AM | Should also reduce the number of trees cut down for developments | | 8 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | And Warburg has all of this already | | | | | |

2. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Funded Projects

| **11. Which of these projects do you think should be considered in the medium-long term? (select all that apply)** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | New Pavilion – replacement of current building | |  | | --- | |  | | 32.76% | 19 |
| 2 | New Pavilion – with public toilets, meeting facilities, café etc | |  | | --- | |  | | 44.83% | 26 |
| 3 | Road safety measures on Melton Road – refuges, pedestrian crossing, cycling and pedestrian improvements etc | |  | | --- | |  | | 72.41% | 42 |
| 4 | Security barrier at entrance to Melton Playing Fields to close car park at night | |  | | --- | |  | | 32.76% | 19 |
| 5 | Adult exercise equipment | |  | | --- | |  | | 24.14% | 14 |
| 6 | Improved play equipment at Melton Playing Fields | |  | | --- | |  | | 31.03% | 18 |
| 7 | Skatepark/scooter area | |  | | --- | |  | | 22.41% | 13 |
| 8 | Running track at Melton Playing Fields | |  | | --- | |  | | 32.76% | 19 |
| 9 | Full sized goal at Melton Playing Fields or Hall Farm Road | |  | | --- | |  | | 22.41% | 13 |
| 10 | Improved Multi Use Games area in Melton Playing Fields for netball, basketball and football | |  | | --- | |  | | 34.48% | 20 |
| 11 | Improvements to play area at Hall Farm Road | |  | | --- | |  | | 24.14% | 14 |
| 12 | Community Garden at Hall Farm Road | |  | | --- | |  | | 25.86% | 15 |
| 13 | Allotments | |  | | --- | |  | | 37.93% | 22 |
| 14 | Parkour equipment | |  | | --- | |  | | 10.34% | 6 |
| 15 | Other (please specify): | |  | | --- | |  | | 39.66% | 23 |
|  | | | answered | 58 |
| skipped | 0 |
| Other (please specify): (23) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 14:59 PM | They could all be considered, but the priority should be given to schemes which benefits the most residents, rather than area specific. ie improving and maintaining footpaths and pavements where they are heavily used, rather than just those in the village centre. For instance, Bredfield Road, Pytches Road, and Melton Road. | | 2 | 05/02/2020 17:21 PM | Community centre with emphasis on healthy activities such as table tennis, carpet bowls and badmminton. | | 3 | 05/02/2020 17:51 PM | New Pavillion with public toilets . There is no need for meeting rooms as there are a number within the parish and nearby. The idea of a cafe is not needed , the village is well catered for by various commercial facilities in the village and nearby. I would reiterate , the car parking area within the playing field area should not be increased because of ecological reasons . Many of the suggestions would make the enlarging of the car park a pre requisite | | 4 | 05/02/2020 18:31 PM | Village Hall | | 5 | 05/02/2020 19:23 PM | New Pavillion with toilets only and shelter for parents with children on the play area as well as spectators for sports field . Pavillion needs to be near play area with toilets . The area has enough cafe& coffee and rooms for hire . Use the CIL wisely ! | | 6 | 05/02/2020 20:41 PM | I think you should have asked people to rank these items rather than giving the opportunity to just select everything | | 7 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | Village Hall | | 8 | 06/02/2020 17:33 PM | Please include public toilets on the new pavilion , may I suggest these are electrically time locked to coincide with any electrical barrier that is installed. Pavillion needs to be very close to its current position for the conveniences to be of use to families etc using the play equipment . Cafe and meeting room not required , waste of resources and maintenance costs would not be recovered thereby creating a drain on parish funds . | | 9 | 06/02/2020 18:04 PM | Fishing pontoons on the Deben | | 10 | 06/02/2020 18:08 PM | Buy the Springside Store | | 11 | 08/02/2020 14:32 PM | Consideration given to provision of cycle lanes - Melton Road | | 12 | 09/02/2020 09:32 AM | Skatepark - Woodbridge already has a great facility in a perfect location. It is well lit, easily accessed and does not create a negative impact on any homes | | 13 | 09/02/2020 12:01 PM | A statue of Alan Porter randomly sitting in an aircraft with a lifejacket on and headphones. | | 14 | 10/02/2020 07:33 AM | Road safety on Woods Lane, more 30mph signs & painted ones on ground, electronic 30mph reminder. | | 15 | 10/02/2020 15:11 PM | Any new pavilion in Melton playing field either should be on the existing site or near the car park rather than on any other 'green' part of the playing field. | | 16 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | Acquisition of facilities at S. tAudry's sports & social club. Investigate possibility of HLF funding for this community benefit. | | 17 | 11/02/2020 11:17 AM | New pavillion with public toilets is a priority. | | 18 | 11/02/2020 18:52 PM | Use of additional spaces transferred from East Suffolk.  Safe walking and cycling routes to and from schools. | | 19 | 13/02/2020 09:53 AM | Something to make the village ""look nicer"" - perhaps new street furniture.  Also sort out the pavements along Melton Road. | | 20 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | I cant comment on hall farm road as I don't live there. As improving pavillion. It could be toilets on the outside. Don't need a cafe etc as this will take a lot more of the grass area. I park in there sometimes through the day and the car park is sometimes full. So if the cafe goes ahead this will also mean an extended car park | | 21 | 18/02/2020 07:17 AM | Nature conservation | | 22 | 20/02/2020 11:31 AM | I do not agree with a security barrier. This is expensive and not in keeping with the location and environment. | | 23 | 04/03/2020 12:04 PM | Development of former factory site on Melton road has highlighted parking issues: currently it's site workmen. In future it will be over spill from the development. Parking arrangement on Park side of the road is safer for all road users and parking restriction lines along the residential side should be implemented. | | | | | |

| **12. If you think a new Pavilion should be built, which of these facilities would you like included?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Public toilets | |  | | --- | |  | | 82.61% | 38 |
| 2 | Cafe | |  | | --- | |  | | 39.13% | 18 |
| 3 | Meeting area that can be hired out | |  | | --- | |  | | 39.13% | 18 |
| 4 | Other (please specify): | |  | | --- | |  | | 36.96% | 17 |
|  | | | answered | 46 |
| skipped | 12 |
| Other (please specify): (17) | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 14:56 PM | The on-going financial implications of a meeting area would be excessively costly and the desirability of such a space is not proven. | | 2 | 05/02/2020 17:51 PM | Sheltered area by design for spectators of sporting events and for persons using the play area. Why do we need to hire out a meeting room when we have Riduna Park generating income , St. Andrews church hall, St Audrys club , Burness rooms and as yet possibly facilities on The Development opposite the playing field and the former council offices site. Melton Road is becoming a major route and anything that encourages etc extra movements onto this road should be discouraged. | | 3 | 05/02/2020 18:31 PM | Village Hall | | 4 | 05/02/2020 19:23 PM | Shelter for parents and spectators from wind and rain ( Pergoda Pergola type ) Same location as current building to be useful for play areas and pitches . | | 5 | 05/02/2020 20:41 PM | I think if there is a new pavilion it should be a modest, green development that doesn't destroy green space | | 6 | 05/02/2020 21:33 PM | Two meeting areas | | 7 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | Village Hall | | 8 | 06/02/2020 17:33 PM | Shelter from the elements for users and spectators on the field . Adequate security and anti damage planning to be considered . | | 9 | 06/02/2020 18:08 PM | Hopscotch area | | 10 | 07/02/2020 19:59 PM | Plug in facility for pop up cafe | | 11 | 09/02/2020 09:32 AM | Yes, to toilets at the pavilion, but no to meeting room and cafe. Do not over-complicate the building on the playing field. It's not the location for a meeting room. Encourage small local businesses to hook-up and provide food and drink, eg coffee cart, street food, etc, etc | | 12 | 09/02/2020 12:01 PM | Another statue of Alan Porter | | 13 | 10/02/2020 15:11 PM | Security cameras should be considered to protect the buildings and deter antisocial behaviour. | | 14 | 13/02/2020 09:53 AM | Outside covered space with seating | | 15 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | As above | | 16 | 20/02/2020 11:31 AM | Public toilets would be a useful amenity but would need to be maintained and regularly monitored and this should be factored into any plans for future development/investment | | 17 | 04/03/2020 12:04 PM | Public toilets only if funds available to maintain them | | | | | |

| **13. Is there anything else you would like to bring to the Council's attention relating to the Neighbourhood Plan Refresh or the CIL Projects?** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Open-Ended Question | 100.00% | 17 |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | 05/02/2020 13:17 PM | no | | 2 | 05/02/2020 14:56 PM | Thank you for your thoughtful proposals and all your work on the NP Refresh. | | 3 | 05/02/2020 17:51 PM | No | | 4 | 05/02/2020 18:31 PM | Build a Village Hall. Don’t put Alan Porter in charge of anything. Keep him away from sharp objects. | | 5 | 05/02/2020 18:45 PM | To stop parking in station road | | 6 | 05/02/2020 19:23 PM | If there is money available please could you consider some surface clippings or similar from Wilford Bridge to the First level crossing at Lime Kiln Quay rd.Thank you | | 7 | 05/02/2020 20:41 PM | I thinkits hugely disappointing that Suffolk County council gave up on the yellow lines on Melton Road and I'd like to see the Council taking a bit mor action on this. | | 8 | 06/02/2020 08:55 AM | Do not take on the additional land packets that the District Council are trying to off load on to MPC, you don’t have the expertise or resources to cope. As long as your Chair,Norman Wisdom is in charge. | | 9 | 06/02/2020 14:14 PM | The Saving of St Audrys Sports and Social Club from building Development | | 10 | 08/02/2020 15:30 PM | The volume of traffic has increased greatly in the last ten years | | 11 | 09/02/2020 09:32 AM | Keep our footpaths usable all year. Work with Highways (or whoever has ownership and responsibility) to manage areas which suffer from flooding, poor drainage and mud. Could MPC pay to simply re-surface some areas with hardcore, or provide funding for sections of timber walkways (locally as in Bury Hill, and the marsh along the Deben off Wilford Bridge on the Bromswell bank of the river. Further afield, look at the access provided through the woods and marshes off Foxall Road around Nuffield Hospital). WTC have mentioned the possibility of cycle access along the river wall from Wilford Bridge to Martlesham Creek and I would encourage MPC to work with them to make this happen, using CIL. I understand issues with footpath rights of way and do not see this as a tarmac surfaced route, but simply cycle access to the current path. | | 12 | 09/02/2020 12:01 PM | Don’t let Alan Porter anywhere near it. | | 13 | 10/02/2020 15:11 PM | Protection of wildlife habitat and its timing must be a priority when planning green space management.. | | 14 | 11/02/2020 08:24 AM | Traffic and the use of yellow lines to restrict parking in safety critical areas. | | 15 | 11/02/2020 10:30 AM | Options for the acquisition of St Audry's sports & social club would seem the most worthwhile project for CIL monies. But access issues would need addressing. On going maintenance costs for all ideas to be considered. | | 16 | 13/02/2020 19:31 PM | Some people round the area gets notice of things happening but others don't | | 17 | 18/02/2020 07:17 AM | I welcome the energy behind the plan, and perhaps an up to date notice board on Melton playing fields | | | | |
|  | | answered | 17 |
| skipped | 41 |

3. Your information - this section is optional

| **14. Age** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | under 18 |  | 0.00% | 0 |
| 2 | 18-24 | |  | | --- | |  | | 3.57% | 2 |
| 3 | 25-34 | |  | | --- | |  | | 5.36% | 3 |
| 4 | 35-54 | |  | | --- | |  | | 28.57% | 16 |
| 5 | 55-70 | |  | | --- | |  | | 35.71% | 20 |
| 6 | 70+ | |  | | --- | |  | | 19.64% | 11 |
| 7 | Prefer not to say | |  | | --- | |  | | 7.14% | 4 |
|  | | | answered | 56 |
| skipped | 2 |

| **15. Are you a Melton resident?** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | |  | | --- | |  | | 100.00% | 56 |
| 2 | No |  | 0.00% | 0 |
|  | | | answered | 56 |
| skipped | 2 |

| **16. Do you have any children? (select all that apply)** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes - pre-school age | |  | | --- | |  | | 5.56% | 3 |
| 2 | Yes - primary school age | |  | | --- | |  | | 7.41% | 4 |
| 3 | Yes - primary and secondary school age | |  | | --- | |  | | 9.26% | 5 |
| 4 | Yes - post education | |  | | --- | |  | | 55.56% | 30 |
| 5 | No | |  | | --- | |  | | 25.93% | 14 |
|  | | | answered | 54 |
| skipped | 4 |

|  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
|  | |  |  |
|  |  |

| **18. I agree that I have read and understand Melton Parish Council’s Privacy Notice. By selecting Agree I give consent that the Council may process my personal information for providing information and corresponding with me. I have the right to request modification on the information that you keep on record. I have the right to withdraw my consent and request that I am removed from your database.** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Agree | |  | | --- | |  | | 89.29% | 50 |
| 2 | Do not agree | |  | | --- | |  | | 10.71% | 6 |
|  | | | answered | 56 |
| skipped | 2 |