

## Hoxne PC's responses to the substantive comments on the Reg 16 version of the Hoxne NDP:

Comment by:	Comment	Hoxne PC Response
SCC	<p>In paragraph 2.3 on page 10 we would suggest referring to the significant network of PROW in and around Hoxne and part of the landscape and local green infrastructure.</p> <p>We are pleased to see reference to PROW feeding into the village from the surrounding countryside at paragraph 2.6 on page 12, and also the suggestion that PROW should be used to improve links between the village and the surrounding countryside and links between local space on page 32.</p> <p>We support the aim of encouraging walking and cycling by establishing routes on PROW, however, we would have liked to have seen a map showing the local PROW network.</p> <p>The Design Code supporting document should be compatible with existing SCC highways standards to ensure that the design code does not make new development unsuitable for adoption by the Highway Authority.</p> <p>It appears to generally accord with the Suffolk Design: Streets Guide, but this document should state that road and footway layouts should also accord with Local Highways Authority requirements to ensure they are acceptable to the LHA with regard to road adoption.</p> <p>We also note that page 81 of the Design Code indicates a total of 50 dwellings over the two sites (15 at Denham Low Road and 35 at Shreeves Farm), however, Shreeves Farm has been allocated for 38 dwellings according to Policy 13.</p>	HPC has no objection to the Design Code being updated
MSDC	Contents page: The page numbers have been removed in this version of the plan and will need to be added.	HPC agrees that page numbers need to be added and the contents page updated

Comment by:	Comment	Hoxne PC Response
MSDC	<p><b>Joint Local Plan references. Para 2.5 - 2.10</b></p> <p>We note the updates to this section in regard to the progress of the JLP. The JLP Main Modifications consultation has gotten underway since the submission of this plan. While we don't believe this has any direct implications for the content of this plan there are some important distinctions to make.</p> <p>It should be noted that no part of the JLP has been 'withdrawn', some sections are being removed as part of the modification process as per the Inspectors' recommendation. In order to be consistent with other neighbourhood plans, and with the terminology used by the District Council we suggest the follow amendments.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.6:</p> <p>"The Examination found that the policies of the Local Plan that relate to the scale, distribution of housing development, housing allocations and settlement boundaries unsatisfactory. <b>As per the Inspectors' recommendation, in a letter dated December 2021, these policies will now come forward through a Part 2 Joint Local Plan in the future</b>".</p> <p>We suggest the first paragraph of 2.7 be amended as follows:</p> <p><b>"In the November 2020 Draft Joint Local Plan</b>, Hoxne was identified as..."</p> <p>Paragraph 2.8:</p> <p>"The <b>draft Joint</b> Local Plan did provide an allocation..."</p> <p>In order to be consistent with both the NPPF and District level policy we continue to suggest amending Paragraph 2.9 as follows:</p> <p>"the <b>Joint</b> Local Plan requires all sites of <b>10</b> dwellings or more or 0.5ha or more..." <i>This should also be updated in paragraph 5.3</i></p> <p>Para 2.10 should read:</p> <p>"Finally, the <b>Joint</b> Local Plan..."</p>	<p>HPC welcomes the proposed amendments from MSDC that will ensure that our Plan is factually correct where it refers to their Joint Local Plan. We also note that MSDC have indicated that they are satisfied that there are no direct (significant) implications for our Plan following their publication of the JLP Modifications consultation document, and would concur with that assessment</p>

Comment by:	Comment	Hoxne PC Response
MSDC	<p><b>Para 5.5</b> - To be consistent with the current status of the JLP and our suggestions above, we suggest updating paragraph 5.5 to read:</p> <p>“This Plan allocates two sites for development in the Heckfield Green area. One, also identified in the <b>November 2020 Draft</b> Joint Local Plan, is at Shreeves Farm and the other is a site between Denham Low Road and the Playing field.”</p> <p>Para 5.8 should also be amended to read:</p> <p>“The majority of this site <b>was</b> also allocated in the <b>Draft</b> Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan for about 30 homes...”</p>	HPC agrees with this suggested change
	<p><b>Policies HOX12, HOX13 and HOX14</b></p> <p>The partly amended M4(2) Standards references in these policies and supporting text are still contrary to the <a href="#">Written Ministerial Statement</a> dated 25 March 2015 in that it imposes additional technical standards. We recommend that these are amended to ‘support’ M4(2) standards rather than require it. We suggest the following wording:</p> <p>“Some homes suitable for older people should be provided in the form of bungalows or adaptable and accessible homes. <b>Dwellings built to M4(2) standards will be supported.</b>”</p> <p>It may be reassuring to note that modified JLP policy LP24 (as per <a href="#">Main Modification 59</a>) is requiring 50% of dwellings to meet M4(2) standards – <i>subject to consultation</i>.</p>	HPC would like the policy to remain as drafted unless the Inspector considers its contrary to national policy in which case the proposed amendment is supported
	<p><b>HOX13:</b> If the site was unable to achieve 38 new dwellings, it would impact on the number of affordable dwellings able to viably come forward. For this reason, we suggest the third paragraph is amended to read:</p> <p>“<b>35%</b> affordable homes for sale or rent should be provided...”</p>	HPC agrees with this suggested change

Comment by:	Comment	Hoxne PC Response
	<p><b>Biodiversity:</b> We have not commented on this previously. Our Biodiversity Officer has suggested that the plan would benefit from a map showing meadows, woodlands, hedges, veteran trees etc. within the village, as has been done for other features of importance. HOX3 explains that these features should be retained, and a map would strengthen the policy.</p>	<p>HPC would be willing to assist with preparing such a map if the Inspector agrees with this comment.</p>
	<p><b>Figures 8, 9 and 10:</b> There are two maps labelled as Figure 8. Should the map on page 26 be Figure 9, as per the contents page? Figure 10, which is referred to in Policies HOX13-15, does not appear within the plan.</p>	<p>See earlier response</p>
	<p><b>Glossary:</b> We appreciate the addition of a glossary as per our previous recommendation. However, we note some of the terms defined do not appear within the plan. They should be deleted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inquiry</li> <li>• Planning Gain</li> <li>• SHLAA</li> <li>• SHELAA</li> <li>• SHMA</li> <li>• Public Inquiry</li> <li>• Sustainability Appraisal</li> <li>• Statutory Undertaker</li> </ul>	<p>HPC agrees that these terms and definitions should be removed from the HNPD</p>
<p>Shreeves Farm site owners</p>	<p><b>Policy HOX 13:</b></p> <p><b>Delete:</b> <i>"The site should be developed in accord with the Hoxne Design Codes and the indicative Masterplan."</i></p> <p><b>Insert:</b> <i>"Development proposals should demonstrate how they take account of the Hoxne Neighbourhood Design Codes."</i></p>	<p>HPC agrees with this suggested change as it requires a planning applications to positively demonstrate how the Design Code has been taken into account</p>
	<p><b>Insert:</b> <i>"approximately" before "u38" in line 3.</i></p>	<p>HPC does not agree with this suggestion. Allowing to much flexibility on the number of dwellings could lead to over development of</p>

Comment by:	Comment	Hoxne PC Response
	<p>Paragraph 5. 3</p> <p><b>Delete:</b> <i>"Therefore, sites to accommodate 53 dwellings would be required to ensure 19 affordable units are provided."</i></p>	<p>the site which should reflect the village location.</p> <p>HPC does not agree with this suggestion and no justification if provided to support it. The statement is factually correct and explains why HPC has allocated the sites proposed in the plan.</p>
Debenham Low Rd Site owners	No changes requested.	N/A