



The Parish of Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

Supporting Document SD10
Statement of Consultation

Updated: November 2021

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Statement of Consultation on the Modification draft Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2037 meets the requirements of Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended). A more in depth consultation process has been undertaken than required within the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012), but the process has been proportionate to the size of the population of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Area and the range of policies that the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan has addressed.

The Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan 2016 - 2031

- 1.2. The Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan (the 'MNP') was adopted by Mid Suffolk District Council on 23 March 2017. Prior to adoption, the Plan went through a detailed process including informal and formal public consultation, independent examination by a suitably qualified person and, finally, a local referendum where the majority of those who voted did so in favour of the Plan. The consultation processes undertaken up to the point of submission of the Plan in July 2016 to Mid Suffolk District Council were set out in the Consultation Statement dated June 2016; referred to at that time as Supporting Document SD10.
- 1.3. In 2017 the decision was taken to produce a revised Neighbourhood Plan. The reasoning behind this decision was that the adopted Plan was weakened by the absence of any allocated sites for future development. Since that decision considerable work by both the committee members and external professional consultants has been undertaken to identify preferred sites together with detailed evidence supporting their selection.
- 1.4. In summary, since late 2017, work was undertaken to;
- Identify preferred sites for future development, including consulting with residents
 - Obtain supporting evidence for these sites that include
 - Professional opinion on the suitability of all available sites
 - Flood risk assessments
 - Historic environment review
 - Heritage assessment of potential sites
 - Habitats screening
 - Traffic report

2. The modification draft Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2037

- 2.1. Since the commencement of the project regular, formal, open meetings of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee have taken place. These meetings have been the focal point for discussion and agreement on planning and progressing the project. The dates of the meetings are shown in section 3 and all agendas and minutes are publicly available. Temporary working parties were also occasionally convened to deal with individual areas of review as and when they were required.
- 2.2. It became apparent in mid-2017, following a ministerial statement and policy change, that change would be needed to the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan. The existing Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan made no reference to any specific future development sites around Mendlesham village. A central Government directive received early in 2017 indicated that Neighbourhood Plans should identify specific future development sites particularly if a district council did not have a 5 year development land supply.
- 2.3. The MNP Committee was re-convened to look into how the Plan might best be updated. It concluded that the adopted Plan was weakened by the absence of any allocated sites for future development.
- 2.4. The decision to update the Plan also coincided with a consultation from Mid Suffolk District Council to review potential new development sites in all of the larger villages. That gave Mendlesham Parish Council the opportunity to consult with its residents on the various parcels of land around Mendlesham village identified by Mid Suffolk District Council as possible future development sites. The Mid Suffolk consultation was part of a wider project being carried out by the District Council to update its Local Plan (work that was being done in conjunction with Babergh District Council).
- 2.5. The opportunity proved both beneficial and problematic. It provided the opportunity for the Parish Council to update its Neighbourhood Plan and identify suitable site(s) for future development. However, the Draft Joint Local Plan makes it quite clear that changes would be made to the way villages are classified and the quantity of development that they will be expected to absorb. The precise methodology to be used and the numbers involved was only confirmed (albeit still only in draft) following publication in July 2019 of the Preferred Options version of the Joint Local Plan. This provided guidance on the likely numbers of new dwellings (a minimum of 161 new dwellings for the period 1 April 2018 until April 2037) that will be required and the revised Neighbourhood Plan aims at meeting those figures.
- 2.6. Local residents were consulted in October 2017 and information was sent out using the local monthly newsletter and also through local e-news channels. Two drop-in sessions were arranged, one in the local school and the other in a local meeting room in the heart of the village. At both sessions residents were able to leave short notes on any aspects of the sites that were put forward. All of this information was then collated and it gave the Parish Council clear

guidance on where the residents preferences lay. Supporting Document SD23 contains the report on the consultation and its outcomes.

- 2.7. Following extensive external reviews of the potential development sites a draft MNP was presented for consultation (Regulation 14) in February 2021. The Neighbourhood Planning regulations prescribe a minimum period of six weeks to allow local people and businesses to make representations giving their thoughts and comments on the draft MNP. However due to the Covid situation which allowed only for remote (electronic) consultation it was agreed to extend this period to 8 weeks. Accordingly the consultation period began on 15 February 2021 and ended on 12 April 2021 (eight weeks). At their request, a two-day extension was granted to MSDC to allow them to complete and submit their formal response.
- 2.8. Since 2017 Mendlesham Parish residents have been kept informed of progress through the local e-News system, (with a circulation of over 250 subscribers, the majority local), on local notice boards and the local parish newsletter (published on the Mendlesham Web site and also notified via the local e-News system).
- 2.9. Additionally during the consultation period two vinyl banners (1.5M x 0.5M) advertising the consultation were placed at central positions in Mendlesham Village and Mendlesham Green.
- 2.10. Notifications were also sent through e-mail to all those external (“interested”) parties who may be affected by these proposals. A full list of these parties is included at the end of this report as Appendix 1.
- 2.11. The following table identifies each of the major steps taken in setting up this updating project and consulting with our residents, businesses and organisations that deal with the parish of Mendlesham.

Date	Action
Mid-2017	MNP Committee re-convened.
Jun – Sept 2017	Research into specific development land allocation options.
Oct 2017	Consultation with local residents over additional potential development sites. The details and conclusions arising from this exercise are set out in Supporting Document SD23.
Nov 2017	Formal notification sent to MSDC stating intention to update the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan.
Jan 2018 – Dec 2019	Evidence gathering for development site identification and promotion



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Oct 2019 – Jun 2020	Liaison with external professional consultants to obtain expert opinion on the suitability of local new development sites, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site Assessment by AECOM• Historic Environment report by Place Services• Strategic Flood Risk Assessment report by JBA Consulting• Heritage Assessment of Potential Growth Sites report by Place Services.
Sept 2020	Habitats Screening of the modification draft MNP by Place Services and issuing of a Determination Notice by MSDC
Oct 2020	Independent Health check on v.4.4.1 of the MNP (see Appendix 2 for a summary of the issues raised and response to these) - carried out by Charisma Spatial Planning Ltd.
15 Feb - 12 Apr 2021	Formal pre-submission consultation under Regulation 14 with the statutory bodies, external 'interested parties' and local residents on version 4.7 of the MNP. (A list of those consulted is provided at Appendix 1)
23 Apr 2021	Report (Consultation by Mendlesham Parish Council with interested parties) presented to Mendlesham Parish Council. This detailed the comments received and the responses to them.
June 2021	Version 4.8.1 of the modification draft MNP formally handed over to MSDC

3. Neighbourhood Plan Committee meetings

- 3.1 Since the commencement of the MNP project, regular, formal, open meetings of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee have taken place. These meetings have been the focal point for discussion and agreement on planning and progressing the project.

The dates of the meetings relevant to the modification draft plan are shown in the table below and all agendas and minutes are available to view online. Temporary working parties were also convened to deal with individual areas of review as and when they were required.

Activity	Date
NP Committee meeting no. 38	14/08/2017
NP Committee meeting no. 39	14/09/2017
NP Committee meeting no. 40	30/10/2017
NP Committee meeting no. 41	30/11/2017
NP Committee meeting no. 42	03/01/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 43	23/01/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 44	12/02/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 45	17/07/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 46	06/08/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 47	22/01/2019
NP Committee meeting no. 48	09/05/2019
Working party meeting with MSDC	21/05/2019
NP Committee meeting no. 49	17/07/2019
NP Committee meeting no. 50	21/08/2019
NP Committee meeting no. 51	13/01/2020
NP Committee meeting no. 52	17/02/2020
NP Committee meeting no. 53	26 May 2020
NP Committee meeting no. 54	30 July 2020



4. Appendices

APPENDIX 1 - List of organisations consulted by Mendlesham Parish Council for its Regulation 14 process.

APPENDIX 2 - Issues raised by the NPIERS “health check” Examiner re Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan draft version 4.4.1 and responses made - October 2020

APPENDIX 3 - Issues raised by local residents and interested parties on Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan draft version 4.7 and responses provided - April 2021

APPENDIX 1: List of organisations and individuals contacted by Mendlesham Parish Council for its Regulation 14 process.

Title	Given Name	Family Name	Position	Company / Organisation
Dr	Dan	Poulter	MP for Central Suffolk & North Ipswich	Member of Parliament
Cllr	Andrew	Stringer	County Cllr to Upper Gipping Division	Suffolk County Council
Cllr	Gary	Green	County Cllr to Stowmarket North & Stowupland Division	Suffolk County Council
Cllr	Matthew	Hicks	County Cllr to Thredling Division	Suffolk County Council
Cllr	Andrew	Stringer	Ward Cllr to ...	Mendlesham
Cllr	Suzie	Morley	Ward Cllr to ...	The Stonhams
Cllr	Keith	Welham	Ward Cllr to ...	Haughley, Stowupland & Wetherden
Cllr	Rachel	Eburne	Ward Cllr to ...	Haughley, Stowupland & Wetherden
Cllr	Andrew	Mellen	Ward Cllr to ...	Bacton
Cllr	Rowland	Warboys	Ward Cllr to ...	Gislingham
Cllr	David	Burn	Ward Cllr to ...	Palgrave
Mr	H	Roberts	Clerk to ...	Wickham Skeith PC
Mrs	L	Cockerton	Clerk to ...	Stoke Ash & Thwaite PC



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Mrs	L	Cockerton	Clerk to ...	Wetheringsett-cum-Brockford PC
Ms	W	Brame	Clerk to ...	Stonham Parva Civil Parish
Mrs	J	Blackburn	Clerk to ...	Earl Stonham PC
Ms	C	Pizzey	Clerk to ...	Stowupland PC
Mrs	K	Hall-Price	Clerk to ...	Old Newton with Dagworth and Gipping PC
Mr	R	Caird	Clerk to ...	Cotton PC
Mrs	A	Thompson	Clerk to ...	Mickfield PC
			BMSDC Community Planning	Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils
			SCC Neighbourhood Planning	Suffolk County Council
Mr	Graeme	Mateer	Transport Policy	Suffolk County Council
Mr	Neil	McManus	Planning Obligations Manager	Suffolk County Council
Ms	Nhi	Huynh-Ma	Area Manager, Norfolk & Suffolk Team	Homes & Communities Agency (HCA)
			Land Use Operations	Natural England



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			Essex, Norfolk & Suffolk Sustainable Places Team	Environment Agency
			East of England Office	Historic England
			East of England Office	National Trust
Mr	Steve	Taylor	Town Planning Team	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
				Highways England
			Stakeholders & Networks Officer	Marine Management Organisation
				Vodafone and O2 - EMF Enquiries
Mr	Henry	Parker		<i>EE (part of the BT Group)</i>
Ms	Jane	Evans		Three
	Chris	Crisell	Estates Planning Support Officer	Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG & West Suffolk CCG
				Transco - National Grid
			Stakeholder Engagement Team	UK Power Networks
Mr	Stewart	Patience	Strategic and Spatial Planning Manager	Anglian Water



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Mr	Martin	Lunn		Essex & Suffolk Water
Mr	Peter	Mercer MBE		National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
	Jo	Richardson		Norfolk & Suffolk Gypsy Roma & Traveller Service
				Diocese of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich
Mr	John	Dugmore	Chief Executive	Suffolk Chamber of Commerce
Mr	Iain	Dunnett	Senior Growing Places Fund Coordinator	New Anglia LEP
	Marie	Finbow	Strategy Manager	New Anglia LEP
Mr.	Philip	Pearson	Conservation Officer	RSPB
Mr	Mark	Nowers	Conservation Officer (Essex, Beds & Herts)	RSPB
Mr	Philip	Raiswell	Senior Planning Manager	Sport England (East)
Mr	Leigh Gareth	Jenkins		Suffolk Constabulary
Mrs	Fiona	Cairns	Director	Suffolk Preservation Society
Ms	Linda	Cockburn		Suffolk Preservation Society



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Ms	Sunila	Osborne	Community Development Officer – Rural Affordable Housing	Community Action Suffolk
Mrs	Sarah	Mortimer	Senior Manager Community Engagement	Community Action Suffolk
				Dedham Vale Society
Ms	Paula	Booth	AONB Officer (Joint AONBs Team)	Suffolk Coast & Heath AONB
				Theatres Trust
	Jess	Nobbs		East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board



APPENDIX 21 - Issues raised by the NPIERS “health check” Examiner re Mendlesham Neighbourhood plan draft version 4.4.1 and responses made.

The key findings of the “health check” were as follows.

“The review of the NP is timely. There are some areas that warrant further thought and work. The *main* ones are:

1. The Plan takes the right approach in using the evidence and the housing figures in the emerging Draft Joint Local Plan of a minimum of 161 new dwellings between 2018 and 2036, but should deal with completions, commitments, windfalls site allocations and exception sites differently.
2. New Policy MP1 requires amendment in relation to the proposed site allocations, particularly in relation to the site which is under construction and the site in Mendlesham Green.
3. If the settlement boundaries are to be revised, these need to be included in policies in this NP.
4. The views and green spaces could be reconsidered in terms of the evidence base and which policy they sit within.
5. The supporting documents including the Basic Conditions Statement and other key documents would benefit from revision to ensure they are as clear as they can be and up to date. This includes work on the Figures.
6. A check needs to be made to see if the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report has been subject to consultation with Natural England.”

Each of the above points was noted and amendments carried out as suggested.

A new draft version of the NDP was then produced.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Appendix 3 - Responses received to the informal consultation with local residents and other interested parties

Responder	Comments made	MPC response
Marine Management Organisation	12 Feb 2021 Acknowledged receipt of notification of informal consultation. Offered "No Comment"	NFA
Highways England e-Mail	17 Feb 2021 Acknowledged receipt of notification of informal consultation. Offered "No Comment"	NFA
Water Management Alliance	17 Feb 2021 Acknowledged receipt of notification of informal consultation. Offered "No Comment"	NFA
Mr and Mrs AT (residents) e-Mail	19 Feb 2021 I have finally read through the latest plan. It all looks good. Just a few comments to make. I still have concerns regarding traffic and it doesn't seem to be covered in any detail. Are there any road/traffic improvements that can be made when thinking about the increased traffic to and from all the new builds on Engine Meadow, Mason Court, and Chapel Road. At the moment driving to Mendlesham Health Centre is becoming more and more hazardous with cars parked along Chapel Road. This needs some serious thought.	24 Feb 2021 Thank you for your e-Mail (19 Feb 2021) detailing concerns about local traffic, development at Mendlesham Green and the future of the Health Centre. The Neighbourhood Plan Committee (NPC) shares your concern about the "overall developing situation" regarding traffic and over the past few years many discussions have been had about the best way to deal with it. Traffic matters are dealt with by Suffolk County Council Highways Authority and usually come to the fore in assessing the effects of individual developments. One problem is that historically there is a lack of detailed



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>Extra traffic from these new houses plus the 75 houses on Station Road, all trying to get to and from their homes and the Health Centre. Old Market Street and Front Street get narrower from parked cars. This really needs someone to sit down and work out some way of avoiding gridlock. Would it be possible for a feasibility study to be done on a one way system for the future?</p> <p>The other area of concern is the houses being built on Station Road, with access points at Church Road and Station Road. This would mean traffic avoiding coming through the village, which is good, but the danger is it being used by everyone else as a short cut. The safest thing to do would be to put traffic calming measures in place so it would at least mean no one would be speeding through this rat run.</p> <p>With regard to the 10 proposed houses at Mendlesham Green. I don't know if these would be affordable homes, which seems a good idea, however low cost housing could mean a buyer not having a car, and the only way of getting to Mendlesham would be walking on an extremely dangerous road. So maybe the type of housing should be to a higher wage bracket (I hate saying this!)</p> <p>Last comment. Are there any plans for Mendlesham Health Centre and car park to expand for the growing population.</p> <p>Decisions are already made on the houses but our parish has farm traffic, coaches and large lorries all meeting each other on narrow roads so a plan needs to be looked at for traffic flow.</p>	<p>data describing the levels of traffic going through Mendlesham Village. To this end the NPC undertook a detailed review of traffic volumes having purchased roadside measuring equipment to assist the work. Suffolk County Council Highways were also asked to provide data at specific locations detailing the types of traffic on set dates. The result was the production of a report (Supporting Document SD25) that gives a clear statement of where we are today (with monitoring continuing).</p> <p>Whilst there is clear and understandable concern from local residents it seems highly likely that major changes would not be made by the Highways Authority to the passage of traffic through the village as it is not a major thoroughfare nor, according to its criteria, are the levels of traffic significant and there is no existing alternative local route. (The NPC acknowledges the problems of road and kerbside damage caused by HGV's.). We understand different options have been discussed with the Highways Authority, including the possibility of a one way system but the view is that the roads within the conservation area, either due to layout or width, are not able to cope with this. However this does not stop us from addressing the traffic issues from future developments as and when they arise.</p> <p>On a more positive note the development to the West of Glebe Way site (2/13) does offer good traffic diversion opportunities. There has been ongoing dialogue with the owners of the land and the NPC has made it clear that traffic from this development needs to have the option to access the site from both Church Road and Old Station Road. This dual access option is defined in Policy MP1. The dual access to the Glebe Road site is not seen as a</p>
--	--	--



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>Otherwise an excellent plan and thank you for all who worked so hard on it.</p>	<p>“by-pass” but it should enable some traffic to avoid going through the conservation area. Careful design of the access road should include appropriate traffic calming measures. Your concern regarding the possibility of a rat run are shared and have already been discussed. There will need to be careful design of any new road infrastructure to prevent this happening.</p> <p>The possible development of ten houses at Mendlesham Green is currently aimed at social housing with development and operation managed through the recently formed Mendlesham Community Land Trust. This tract of land is owned by the Parish Council. The provision of social housing here needs further research but at the moment it demonstrates Mendlesham’s desire to examine all avenues to provide a suitable environment for all of its residents. Requests for sites for community housing near to Mendlesham village have not been forthcoming so whilst there would be a need for transport, this site is viewed as, at least, a site that could be potentially delivered.</p> <p>Moving to the situation regarding the Health Centre it is understood that the Health Centre recently obtained planning permission to expand the building and associated services at the Mendlesham site. They are now waiting for a decision regarding funding the planned works.</p> <p>I hope this answers your concerns? If you want to discuss the matter further I will be happy to phone you.</p> <p>NFA</p>
Mr and Mrs AT (residents)	25 Feb 2021 Thank you very much for your detailed reply. I appreciate	NFA



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

e-Mail	<p>that some of the decisions regarding the Neighbourhood Plan regarding traffic, are out of your control and are dealt with by Highways, at least I am reassured the subject is always included in any decisions and any concerns would be referred to SCC.</p> <p>Some of the things I talked about will be on a wait and see basis before they can be acted upon.</p> <p>You have all worked hard on this plan which can never be perfect and not suit everyone's wishes for the future of the parish but I feel it is the best you could have come up with so thank you to all involved.</p>	
Natural England	No specific comments. Attached annex covering issues and opportunities to be considered when preparing a NP.	NFA
Anglian Water	<p>Policy MP1: Housing</p> <p>We note that Neighbourhood Plan identifies sites for residential development most of which have the benefit of planning permission together with one site at Glebe Way which is allocated for residential development in the emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk Local Plan.</p> <p>The emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk Local plan includes district wide policies relating to water supply, sewerage infrastructure, water efficiency, managing the risk of flooding and surface water management. As the Development Plan is intended to be read as a whole it is not considered necessary to include similar requirements in Policy MP1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, we have no comments to make</p>	NFA



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	relating to the above policy.	
Mr BS 26.3.21 Resident	Too much to read!	<p>Short overview of NP document sent by email to resident as requested. Offer of verbal discussion declined by resident</p> <p>Response information provided did not tell him where new dwellings would be. Further email response sent.</p> <p>“The two page document (particularly page 2) gives you the page numbers in the draft Neighbourhood Plan itself that contain the most important data (e.g. the policies). So you need to reference those pages to get all the relevant information.</p> <p>Within the draft Neighbourhood Plan there are detailed maps that show exactly where new and existing dwellings are sited.</p> <p>Your query about where new houses will be sited is dealt with within policy MP1 and maps showing the sites are included.</p> <p>If it would help I can provide a printed (colour) copy of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for you to reference?</p> <p>Please let me know if you want a copy and any other information you require” .</p> <p>NFA</p>
Mr DS Email 31.3.21	In response to the consultation I wish to make the following comments	Comments noted



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Resident	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I am against the area of land south of Glebe Way being allocated for 75 homes, because it will spoil the most attractive part of the village2. I think that the Parish Council has significantly underplayed the views from Oak Farm Lane. I consider these views, looking back to the village from a relative height to be the most attractive view in the parish. No mention is made of the view of the church and surrounding properties. I consider this view should be rated high. Also no mention has been made of views from the village looking south. This is one of the most attractive views from the village.3. Whilst I am against more housing south of Glebe Way, I understand the wish to build a bypass connecting Station Road and Church Road. Saying I understand the wish does not mean I support the construction of a bypass.4. Should a bypass be pursued it is vital that it is designed to be in accordance with the Department of Transport's design document CD 123 , where the bypass meets Station Road, Oak Farm Lane and Church Road. Accepting substandard layouts will be dangerous. If the parish council is to continue to promote a bypass it needs to make sure it is safe and include requirements that it meets CD123, as well as other relevant standards.5. I can see no mention in the Plan of the new housing on the south side of Brockford Road. Why is this not specifically included in the number of homes that have been built and will be built.	NFA
----------	--	-----



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>Hopefully the above makes sense. If you have any queries please let me know.</p>	
<p>MR CG Email 4.4.21 Resident</p>	<p>I have scanned through the NP and note on page 35 4.1 that the Post Office is shown as being part of the Public House, rather than noting it as part of the convenience store. Is this an oversight for amendment or is it shown here as the historical situation? Otherwise I thank the team for what they have done on our behalf.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Propose that the NP is amended (P. 35, 4.1) to "...a convenience store (including a Post Office), a fish and chip shop, hairdressers, pub and some houses."</p>
<p>Mr EB and Mr BB Email 11.4.21 Residents</p>	<p>Land North-East of Chapel Road, Mendlesham O.S. 4623 Ref DC/19/00959: 49 dwellings – Refused October 2019 Ref DC/19/05915: 20 dwellings – Granted October 2020 Joint Local Plan Ref LA074 SHELAA report October 2020(page 204) Site Ref: SS0083 Estimated dwellings yield = 50. Draft Neighbourhood Plan quotes twenty. An approach was made to the Parish Council to discuss what might be achieved on this site but any meeting was declined. Strategic Flood Risk Report. Page 5 figs 2 - 3 Chapel Road – outside No's 12 – 14 An underground survey of the pipes by contractors for Suffolk County Council in November 2014 found that flooding was caused by a blocked pipe. Marked in yellow</p>	<p>Acknowledged Comments noted but no amendment necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan NFA</p>

on road. A maintenance problem.



		
<p>MSDC (PB) 9.4.21 email</p>	<p>I have been working with colleagues on our response to this formal consultation request and, while it is near completion, a few matters still require further discussion. I remain hopefully these we can resolve these during the courses of Monday but it might not be possible to meet your end of day deadline. For that reason, I politely ask if the Parish Council could grant us a short extension so we can finalise our response. I think that no more two-</p>	<p>Confirmed extension as requested.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>days (48 hours) should be sufficient, i.e., you should have our final response by no later than close of business on Wed 14 April 2021.</p> <p>With thanks in advance for your consideration of this request and in hope of a positive response.</p>	
<p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust (JD) 12.4.21 email</p>	<p>See pdf letter -summary “ pleased to see the MNP recognises the importance of wildlife within Objective EO1, we are concerned that there is no specific policy for biodiversity within the NP. As stated within the NPPF, (2019) (s174), development should seek to provide biodiversity net gain therefore, we believe that the plan should be expanded to further safeguard species and habitats from fragmentation caused by development....”</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p> <p>Noted that the draft NP already contains a “Habitat Regulations Determination” report (Supporting Document SD28).</p> <p>It may be that a statement could be inserted into policy MP1 requiring all new developments to address the issue of provision of biodiversity net gain and safeguard against developmental fragmentation. Will be dealt with in MP8.</p>
<p>Bowyer Planning on behalf of Vistry Group (JP) 12.4.21 email</p>	<p>Two documents received. Main representations submission; and Appendix 1 comprising the Vision Document.</p> <p>The submission is a suggested detailed outline plan for building circa 200 new homes on land to the North of Brockford Road, a site of 16 hectares of greenfield made up of two arable fields.</p> <p>The Vistry Group wants to discuss this outline proposal with the Parish Council.</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p> <p>The documents provided serve two purposes. Firstly they provide a base for discussion about a possible future planning application. Secondly they provide a response to the draft Neighbourhood Plan. It is the second purpose that we address here.</p> <p>The documents make the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Larger development sites (than circa 20 dwellings) should be considered. ● Disagreement with the SHELAA (2020) assessment that the site is unsuitable for development. ● Such a large development would not affect surrounding important views.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Disagreement with the AECOM report assessment that the site is unsuitable for development.● Disagreement with the SEA Scoping & Environmental report citing inaccuracies.● Querying the achievability of the minimum figure of 161 new dwellings for 2018 - 2037. It appears that no notice has been taken of the Capacity Assessment Table that clearly identifies how the total figure of 229 new home will be achieved.● Querying the meaning of the “**” against the 161 minimum figure (first line MP1) - an error and the “**” will be removed. <p>There is no reason (other than the correction) to make any changes to the draft NP. The various external reports assessing the sites have been accepted and provide the Parish Council with professional guidance. It is not for the Parish Council to enter into discussion about the accuracy of professional opinion.</p>
Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Group 12.4.21 email (CC)	Dear Parish Clerk Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan Thank you for communicating with Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) regarding Mendlesham Parish Council’s proposal to create a Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The CCG recognises that the Parish of Mendlesham does have a primary healthcare facility actually inside the parish and this is very important to the people of Mendlesham and its surrounding community. To maintain a primary care service for the residents of Mendlesham and surroundings, work is currently underway to extend the capacity of Mendlesham Health Centre.	Acknowledged The request for “a simple statement” could be dealt with by inserting suitable wording into para 2.18 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. E.g. “The Parish Council fully supports Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Mendlesham.”



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>It is clear from reading the NP that the health centre is a vital part of the Mendlesham community and that protecting it as an asset is a major priority. I am very happy to inform the parish that the CCG is aware of developments proposed in the area and strategic planning is underway between ourselves and the local LPA. You can be assured that developments will not be taking place without a full assessment taking place of the impact on health care in the area, as part of this work it has been agreed to extend the capacity at the health centre.</p> <p>The CCG and the local LPA have an excellent working relationship (especially with the Infrastructure Team), we work closely on the JLP and is aware of proposed developments in the area. The extension to the health centre will help to accommodate the proposed growing population going forward and the CCG is extremely excited by the possibilities going forward. The extension is being funded through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) collected by Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council and this demonstrates the great working relationship between the CCG and the LPA.</p> <p>We would welcome the addition of a simple statement, to confirm that Mendlesham Parish Council will support Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Mendlesham. Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the Parish Council any concerns it might have and to ensure sustainable Primary Care services for the local community going forward?</p>	
--	--	--



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>If you have any queries or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact m</p>	
<p>Mr BR email 12.4.21 Resident</p>	<p>I wish to make a few observations re the latest incarnation of the Neighborhood Plan.</p> <p>I appreciate the need for more housing, and think Station Fields seems to be a success, but we need to be cautious about location, numbers and quality/appearance. Much has been said about the attractive village centre, but we want the whole of the village to be an asset.</p> <p>2) St Joseph's is an eyesore</p> <p>3) We must go ahead with plans for a link road from Station Road to the far side of the Church thus removing traffic that does not need to use Front St or O M St.</p> <p>4) I don't feel that the parking problems in the village are being taken seriously (and a likely 200+ more cars is going to make parking/congestion a lot worse) I would like to end by thanking all those people involved for all their hard work.</p> <p>Regards</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>NFA</p>
<p>Suffolk County Council email 12.4.21</p>	<p>See separate document</p> <p>The following points were raised</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change in wording relating to archeology in development .	<p>Include the following text around Policy MP5?</p> <p>“Suffolk County Council manages the Historic Environment Record for the county. Non-designated archaeological heritage assets are managed through the National Planning Policy Framework. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service advises that there should be early consultation of the Historic Environment Record and</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

		assessment of the archaeological potential of the area at an appropriate stage in the design of new developments, in order that the requirements of the National Planning policy Framework, and Core Strategy Objective SO 4 of Mid Suffolk District Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) are met.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy MP1 Site 11 refers to SFRA Part 2 should be included in forthcoming proposals applications. For the benefit of doubt, it is suggested that the policy has more detail of this included in it, rather than rely on cross referencing it. 	NFA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy MP1 Site 2/13 has the River Dove along its eastern side and the site is in Flood zone 3 along this side. It is recommended that this is included in the text of the policy and relate this to the buffer zone mentioned in the policy. 	Propose to include "Flood Zone 3" in MP1.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no reference to the provision of SuDS within developments, only a reference to Sustainable Water Management (in Policy MP6 Building Design) which could be strengthened. 	<p>Propose to amend the final para of MP6 as follows</p> <p>"All development should conform to the latest guidance on environmental controls such as vehicle emissions, domestic heating, sustainable water management <i>including prevention of water run-off that would add to or create surface water flooding, which can be mitigated by above ground open Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and the current Suffolk Design Code.</i>"</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCC would suggest that the plan could include the desire for smaller homes that are adaptable and accessible, which meets the requirements for both older residents as well as younger people and families. 	<p>Propose to insert the following text into Policy MP1</p> <p><i>"Support will be given for smaller 2 and 3 bedroomed homes that are adaptable (meaning built to optional M4(2) standards), in order to meet the needs of the aging population, without excluding the needs of the younger</i></p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

		<p><i>buyers and families.”</i></p> <p>Note that reference is made to this matter in para 3.8 of the existing NDP.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that paragraph 6.3 could include reference to the physical and mental health and wellbeing benefits that can be gained from access to pleasant outdoor areas. 	<p>Propose to insert the following text into para 6.3.</p> <p>“... provide physical and mental health and wellbeing benefits gained from access to appropriate outdoor areas”.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCC would suggest the inclusion of the need to make green spaces and facilities accessible to residents with limited mobility (inclusion of benches and well-maintained paths etc), into Policy MP8. 	<p>Propose to insert the following text into the first para of Policy MP8.</p> <p>“(including those with limited mobility),”</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCC suggests that Policy MP11 could be expanded to include specific measures e.g. bike stands outside new businesses/amenities, and that new housing is linked to community services via cycling and walking routes. 	<p>Propose to insert the following text into para 2 of Policy MP11.</p> <p>“... to promote safe walking, cycling, access to community services and the countryside via Public Rights of Way ”</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> However, the Green Spaces chapter within the plan does not make reference to how each space was designated Local Green Spaces by relating their designation to the relevant criteria in the NPPF. It would be helpful to include this in the Neighbourhood Plan evidence base in order to show how each designation has been fully justified. 	<p>NFA</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important views are protected in Policy MP10 – Open Spaces and explained in SD19. SCC notes that the viewpoints are taken from publicly accessible places (roads), from what can be seen on Figure 6.7. It is not immediately clear why the views are numbered 1-10, 	<p>Figure 6.7 will be relabelled with views “a, b and c” becoming “11,12 and 13”.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	and then “a, b, c” on Figure 6.7 in the plan. This should be explained, or they should be labelled consistently.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that the viewpoints are also displayed on a general Policies Map. 	NFA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The word ‘biodiversity’ does not appear in this plan. EO1 states ‘...protection for important wildlife interests’ however there does not appear to be a policy which specifically addresses wildlife interests. 	<p>Propose to insert the following para into Policy MP8.</p> <p>"Development proposals will be supported where they provide a net gain in biodiversity through wildlife habitat creation, and should help to restore and repair fragmented biodiversity networks."</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy MP11 ‘Paths and Bridleways’ would be better titled “<i>Public Rights of Way and countryside access</i>”, as the word ‘Paths’ is too informal and the word ‘Bridleways’ too limiting when referring to the public rights of way network. The text within the policy should also change accordingly. 	Policy MP11 will be retitled “Public Rights of Way and countryside access”
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There could be reference to other strategies that support this Neighbourhood Plan. This includes Suffolk County Council’s Green Access Strategy (2020-2030)⁵. This strategy sets out the council’s commitment to enhance public rights of way, including new linkages and upgrading routes where there is a need. The strategy also seeks to improve access for all and to support healthy and sustainable access between communities and services through development funding and partnership working. 	NFA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCC welcomes the reference to the Suffolk Guidance for Parking in the plan, however this document was updated in 2019⁶ and therefore paragraph 5.20 should 	Para 5.20 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan will be amended to the following.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	be amended accordingly.	“... Suffolk guidance for parking 2019.”
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that the parish could include support for community facilities and housing developments to include features that encourage sustainable transport for short trips to local destinations, such as safe walking routes and secure cycle parking spaces. 	NFA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The section ‘Traffic Movements’ on page 25 of the plan states the findings of the report, however, does not include the recommendations of the report (Section 8). 	The recommendations are shown in Supporting Document SD25.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy MP1 refers to Site 4 (Fig 2.2) but this is not shown in Fig 2.2, or mentioned anywhere else in the plan. 	Should read “Site 2/13”. MP1 text will be amended
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 2.12 states that there are two proposal maps, however SCC found that this is not very clear. A Policies or Proposals Map should be clearly labelled and referred to throughout the plan and in policies. 	Propose to amend the first sentence of para 2.12 as follows. “There are two proposal maps (figs. 2.2 and 2.3) and two community asset maps (figs.2.4 and 2.5) that show ...”.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures 2.2 and 2.3 are considered to be the “proposals maps”, however it is recommended that a Proposals Map should include all the key elements from the policies within the plan and be clearly labelled. This included important viewpoints showing direction, conservation area, designated local green spaces, allocated housing sites, and should be clearly captioned as the Proposals Maps. 	NFA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The layout order of the images is not very convenient to the reader of the plan. If the reader is not viewing the document online, they have to keep scrolling back and 	Consideration will be given to including all maps into the body of the report.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>forth to the Appendices section refer to any supporting maps and images. It would be helpful if the images were included as part of the supporting text for each policy. This is already the case for Figure 2.1 Map of the Parish, which appears on page 15 following the introduction to the plan area.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Typo on page 54 of the Appendices: "Figure 254" should be "<i>Figure 2.5</i>"	Text (Page 54) will be amended to "Figure 2.5 ...".
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SCC is aware that the parish council has indicated the desire to sell the Community Centre that is currently a part of the primary school, and have a replacement facility built. It is suggested that the plan could be amended to include these wishes.	NFA
National Grid email 12.4.21	See separate document - information provided regarding NG assets ie Overhead and Gas transmission	Acknowledged NFA
M Scott Properties email 12.4.21	<p>See separate document - the document relates to site 1 (SS0063) and its treatment by the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The issues it raises are as follows.</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p> <p>The comments are noted and we see no reason to make any changes to the draft Neighbourhood Plan as proposed.</p> <p>Many of the comments relate to the professional assessments of the various sites. Whilst there is disagreement over conclusions reached we see no reason to seek any changes to those external documents.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• "we do not consider that the proposed allocation of the land adjacent to Old Station Road and Oak Farm Road represents the most suitable site for allocation within the settlement."	



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “The conditional support for the site on this basis is acknowledged in Policy – MP1 [Housing], which states that the most of the support of this site is because of its dual access to Old Station Road and Church Road, which provides an opportunity for local traffic to avoid the village Conservation Area. As such, the policy requires all new dwellings on the site to have direct access to both Old Station Road and Church Road. We question the deliverability of the site in respect of this policy requirement. There are only two potential options to deliver such a link road, and we question the deliverability of both of these. Glebe Way to the north of the site, which connects into Church Road, or alternatively, Oak Farm Lane to the east of the site, which also connects into Church Road.”	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Table 4.1: Site Assessment Summary Table within the AECOM Site Assessment (SD24) provides an assessment and a RAG score in respect of each site considered for inclusion within the NDP. The site proposed for allocation (site ref 2/13 in the AECOM Site Assessment) received an overall ‘Amber’ RAG score, with the AECOM site assessment noting that the east of the site lies within Flood Zone 3, as well as highlighting the impact upon the listed building to the west of the site. The AECOM assessment recommends a reduced site area of c. 1.54ha including land unaffected by flood risk. We dispute that 30dph is an appropriate density for this site, given the planning permission on the northern area of the site achieved a density of approximately 12.2 dwellings per hectare¹, less than half of the indicative density applied by AECOM. The Officer’s Delegated Report confirms the	



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>developable area of the site as 1.4ha, giving a net density of 20dph, still considerably lower than the AECOM density.”</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “The land north of Mill Road and south of Chapel Road (Site ref 1 in the AECOM assessment and SS0063 in the SHELAA) is the only site which does not already benefit from planning consent to have received a ‘Green’ RAG score in Table 4.1: Site Assessment Summary Table. The assessment notes the site’s Grade 3 agricultural land classification as a constraint to be carefully considered. However, despite the other sites included within the assessment in agricultural use also being designated as Grade 3, this is not consistently recognised as a constraint. The Officer’s Delegated Report in respect of the proposed residential development in the north of the land south of Glebe Way (proposed for allocation) confirms at paragraph 6.12 that the site is Grade 3 agricultural land. However, this is not noted in the assessment of this parcel.”	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “The AECOM Site Assessment does confirm, however, that the land north of Mill Road and south of Chapel Road (Site ref 1) is not limited to any significant infrastructure constraints, noting the suitability of Chapel Road for an access and recognising that the site is well-located for village services. <p>The AECOM site assessment states that it is a large site and would have a significant impact on the character of the village. However, despite the Assessment also recommending a reduced area for allocation on the land to the south of Glebe Way, the</p>	



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>area proposed for allocation is not largely dissimilar from the area proposed for allocation, with a difference of approximately 1.4ha.”</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “We question the validity of the planning grounds that led to the site being rejected for further consideration and therefore allocation within the NDP. Firstly, with regards to pedestrian connectivity, it is noted that the land north of Mill Road and south of Chapel Road is no further from the village centre than the site to the south of Glebe Way proposed for allocation. Secondly, we question where the medium impact upon the heritage character assessment was ascertained from. The Heritage Assessment of Potential Growth Sites (SD30) assesses the land north of Mill Road and south of Chapel Road (site ref 2 in the Heritage Assessment) as ‘Green/Amber’ in the RAG scoring in respect of heritage sensitivity. There is no mention of the site having a medium impact on the heritage character of the area.”	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>““The Mendlesham SFRA and Sequential Test has been produced to provide part of the evidence base to support the selection of development sites within the revised Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan.”</i> <p>We do not consider this to be accurate, given it did not assess all of the sites considered suitable within the AECOM Site Assessment, and ruled out a number of sites from the assessment due to other planning grounds. Notwithstanding our comments above which question the accuracy and consistency of the conclusions reached in rejecting sites for allocation, we</p>	



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>consider the evidence base should have considered each site deemed suitable within the AECOM Site Assessment, in order to demonstrate a thorough and robust site selection process, which we do not consider has been demonstrated.”</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “In addition to our concerns as to the robustness of the site selection process and the evidence that exists support the allocation of the land to the south of Glebe Way, we also question the ability for the NDP to rely upon windfall development in meeting the minimum housing requirement as proposed within the JLP, as suggested in the Windfall Developments Report (SD29).”	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “We do not consider it appropriate for the NDP to include a windfall allowance and submit that this represents double counting with the JLP. The latter includes a windfall allowance across the JLP period towards meeting the identified housing requirement, calculated with reference to the two Districts. This forms a separate part of the expected housing supply within Babergh and Mid Suffolk Districts across the JLP period, separate from the housing requirement for Mendlesham and other settlements. An allowance in the NDP would effectively be double counting a provision that has already been accounted for, and therefore inconsistent with the JLP.”	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Whilst we support the identification of a housing supply which exceeds the identified requirement in the event of non-delivery, we have concerns as to sources of the expected housing delivery. Notwithstanding our concerns the windfall development should not be	



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>included within the housing trajectory, we do not consider that the land south of Glebe Way represents the most suitable site to deliver the housing requirement within the Parish, not least due to a lack of evidence in respect of its suitability for allocation.”</p> <p>“Further, we have estimated the site area under permission DC/18/03147 on land south of Glebe Way to be c. 2.3ha in total, as the actual figure is not confirmed within the planning application documents or the Officer’s Delegated Report. Based on the total site area allocated of 5.3ha, as confirmed within the AECOM Site Assessment, this would leave a remainder of c. 3ha to be developed. Applying the approximate density achieved on the consented scheme of c .12.2dph, this would achieve a total of 37 dwellings, which falls well short of the expectation for 47 dwellings from this site.</p>	
Historic England email 12.4.21	<p>Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment on the revised Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Draft of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We welcome the production of this revised neighbourhood plan and welcome the emphasis it places on the conservation of Mendlesham’s historic environment. We welcome the revised Policy MP5, but would like to make the following minor suggestions:</p> <p>It appears to repeat its requirements regarding the need for assessing the impact of any traffic on the historic environment and within the conservation area. These two paragraphs could be amalgamated. We would also suggest</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p> <p>NFA</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>that the plan identify any local non-designated heritage assets in the Parish that have not been identified by the Local Planning Authority, and incorporate their protection into this policy. Advice on local heritage listing can be found on our website, in our Advice Note 7: Local Heritage Listing. We would recommend that any heritage assets identified in this way are incorporated into an Appendix, with information such as architectural interest and attachment to any significant historical individuals or events identified. This will ensure their reason for identification is robust, and their protection made as strong as it can be.</p>	
<p>Mid Suffolk District Council Email 13.4.21 (time extension previously provided) .</p>	<p>See separate document (sent by PB 13 April 2021). The document identifies the following issues.</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">On 31st March 2021, the Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (JLP) was formally submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government for independent examination. While references to the JLP are limited it would be advisable to keep the progress of the JLP in mind and, as necessary, update the NP text to reflect any developments. <p>Following on from the above, some references to district level planning guidance within the NP may also quickly become out-of-date (e.g., para 3.57). These too should be kept under review as both NP and JLP progresses through their respective plan making</p>	<p>Paras 2.11 and 2.16 formatting issues will be corrected.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>stages.</p> <p>Finally, some formatting issues are present (e.g., para 2.11 and 2.16). Other opportunities may also exist to merge related text (e.g., para 3.26 and 3.27).</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Para 3.58 requires modification as the SHELAA was updated in October 2020 [See link further below]. <p>Note that the updated report still identifies (on pg 402 - 403) the 86 net outstanding dwellings at the 1st April 2018 base date which, together with the 75 dwellings expected to be delivered across site LA073 (Land South of Glebe Way) make up the 161 dwellings minimum requirement figure for this NP area.</p> <p>https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Current-Evidence-Base/SHELAA2020/BMSDC-Joint-SHELAA-Report-Oct-2020.pdf</p>	<p>The hyperlink to the latest SHELAA report will be changed. Also noted that the pages 458 and 459 reference will need to be changed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We note that policy MP1 makes provision to accommodate the minimum level of housing need consistent with JLP policy SP04 & Table 4. You may want to be more explicit and setting out how the figure has been met. There are examples of this in other NPs which we can direct you to if needed. <p>In the first paragraph, the purpose is of the ‘***’ is unclear, although we believe this is meant to be a cross-refer to the final paragraph. It could be deleted.</p> <p>We have previously suggested that each allocation be set out in an individual policy. MP1 need only refer to those, resulting in a more succinctly worded policy. To minimise renumbering elsewhere, we suggested that</p>	<p>The use of ‘***’ is an error and the marker will be removed.</p> <p>The use of a single policy to cover all new development sites will continue.</p> <p>Third para; reference of exceptional circumstances - we will consider changing the wording as follows.</p> <p>“the settlement boundaries have been created as defined in the NP maps in order to demonstrate the extent of land that is required to meet the development needs of the parish. Outside of the boundaries in isolated locations development will only be permitted in exceptional</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>the allocation policies be labelled ‘MP1a’, ‘MP1b’ etc. However, we note that the parish council have expressed a clear preference to retain just the one policy. While understandable, it is important that each of its distinct components can be referenced clearly. This will not only aid general reading but will be necessary for planning application determination. This could be achieved by, for example, use of subheadings and some form of numbering for each allocation, e.g., MP1a (criterion i., ii., etc.), MP1b (criterion i., ii., etc).</p> <p>The third para refers to exceptional circumstances. Please note that the exceptional tests on green belt (NPPF, para 135-7) & AoNB (NPPF, para 172) are not of relevance to Mendlesham. Exceptions for isolated development (NPPF, para 79) would only be of relevance in such circumstances. It may be more appropriate to amend the policy wording and state that: <i>“the settlement boundaries have been created as defined in the NP maps in order to demonstrate the extent of land that is required to meet the development needs of the parish. Outside of the boundaries in isolated locations development will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances (NPPF, para 79).”</i> This policy approach and wording would be consistent with the JLP, policy SP01. Please note that in addition to this proposed text amendment, the settlement boundary maps would need to include the allocated sites (see also our comments below re Appendix 3).</p> <p>Regarding the Ropers Farm allocation, heritage impacts on Elm’s Farmhouse will be an important consideration. We note that the policy includes criterion that requires a Heritage Impact Assessment and that</p>	<p>circumstances (NPPF, para 79).”</p>
--	--	--



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	landscaping on the eastern edge is also addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">MP5 Historic Environment - We suggest that 'Conservation Area' should have initial capitals. The requirement for any proposal which would generate additional traffic needing to access the conservation area to provide a transport assessment is not considered proportionate for minor developments. This requirement could be made for major developments (i.e., 10 or more dwellings). Alternatively, a '<i>where relevant</i>' caveat could be inserted. We also suggest that the policy requirement for Transport Assessments and Highways mitigation measures may be best placed in a standalone highways policy, rather than being included with the Historic Environment Policy. This would enable further issues to be addressed through policy such as encouragement of safe, sustainable, and active transport.	<p>Para 4, Conservation Area will be amended as suggested.</p> <p>We will consider the insertion of a caveat as suggested.</p> <p>We have no plans to introduce a separate Highways policy.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">MP6 Building Design - In the second bullet point, 'Mendlesham' is spelt incorrectly. With regards the third bullet point (the proposed requirement of controls with regards vehicle emissions) it is not considered appropriate or enforceable to control this through Planning. A mechanism which can be utilised in planning is to set out a requirement for EV charging points on all new development in policy. [See also our comment on policy MP5 re safe, sustainable, and active transport].	<p>The misspelling of Mendlesham will be corrected.</p> <p>Comment on EV charging points noted and will be discussed</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• MP9 Local Green Spaces - We make two comments here. The first refers to how Local Green Space (LGS) policies are currently being assessed by NP Examiners and the second refers to your Community Land Trust (CLT) aspirations. <p><u>LGS policies in Neighbourhood Plans:</u></p> <p>In October 2020, the Court of Appeal issued a ruling which has had consequences for how the Examiners we work with are assessing LGS policy wording. You can see this discussion played out in the examination reports we published in October 2020 on the Laxfield and Wilby NPs and, more recently, in those for Assington and Little Waldingfield. Essentially, while it remains OK for LGS to be allocated (where these are evidence / justified) it is no longer appropriate to simply refer to development on such spaces as only being allowed in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>As currently worded, policy MP9 already goes a long way to addressing recent guidance but we suggest further changes as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Re-word the first sentence to read: “<i>The following Local Green Spaces are designated in this Plan and are identified on the proposals map ... (etc.)</i>”2. Move the second sentence to below the bulleted list and re-word as follows: Delete the last paragraph and the footnote (***) reference to this against the bulleted ‘<i>Allotments at Mendlesham Green</i>’ entry. [See below for further explanation]	<p>Wording to policy MP9 will be amended as follows.</p> <p>First sentence “<i>The following Local Green Spaces are designated in this Plan and are identified on the proposals map ... (etc.)</i>”</p> <p>Second sentence will not be moved.</p> <p>Last para will not be deleted - this was amended to the existing following discussion with the Health Check Inspector. (also see comment in next row below)</p>
--	---	--



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p><u>CLT aspirations:</u></p> <p>The District Council is supportive of the Parish's efforts to deliver affordable housing via a Community Land Trust scheme. However, the way this is expressed through policy MP9 is open to misinterpretation hence we recommend deletion of the last paragraph (3) above.</p> <p>The footnote in the policy directs readers to Figure 2.3 which shows the potential CLT site (Site 12) and other parcels of land either side of Old Station Road in the same shade of green. On a casual glance, it would be easy to interpret these all the green shaded areas as 'local green spaces' when, in fact, only the allotment land on the west side of Old Station Road (Figure 6.5) and the Childrens Playing Field (part of Figure 6.6) are designated for this purpose. The confusion is further implied because para 6.4 also refers to the '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>' case where development might come forward on a LGS.</p> <p>NOTE: We will need to give further thought as to how your CLT aspirations can best be expressed through the NP and to do so in a way that would not compromise any application that may come forward in the future. We will contact you again as soon as possible after this consultation has closed to discuss the matter further. In the meantime, our advice is not to allocate Site 12 as this approach could result in obstacles which could be problematic. Subject to having a discussion to clarify a few issues the District Council would like to propose alternative policy approaches to achieve the delivery of the CLT proposal.</p> <p>In the meantime, you may find the following guide helpful:</p>	<p>The treatment of the Mendlesham Green site as an exception site came about from discussions with the Inspector who conducted the Health Check. It was at her suggestion that we reworded the policy. We would be wary of further revision.</p>
--	--	---



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>https://communityfirstyorkshire.org.uk/plannersguide/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/190709-Planners-Guide-to-CLH-FINAL.pdf</p>	
	<p>Appendix 3 - Given the modifications made, it is appropriate that the Plan contains new and updated maps. We also suggest that further changes are needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Figures 2.7a and 2.7b appear superfluous and can be deleted. The settlement boundaries are already shown in Figures 2.2 and 2.3 (although these require amending ... see below)• In Figure 2.2, the settlement boundary line should be re-drawn to include the sites allocated in policy MP1 [Site 2/13 and Site 11] and the former GR Warehousing site [Site 10]. Although not allocated, given the NP also recognises the Chapel Road permission [Site 3] and includes it within the housing calculation table, it would seem sensible to also include this within the new settlement boundary.• In Figure 2.3 further changes will be dependent upon our subsequent CLT discussion (see comments on policy MP9 above).• You may now want to re-think the colour used to identify the Local Green Spaces on Fig's 6.1 to 6.6 and 6.8 to 6.10. Typically, areas marked / shaded in red are recognised as development sites. A more appropriate shade of green might be better - but not one that could be confused with any other open area designations. <p>There is another alternative, which would be to simplify the number of maps needed and rearrange them as appropriate. For example, Figure 2.6 could easily be</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to the removal of maps 2.7a and 2.7b</p> <p>Fig. 2.2 - are you saying the settlement boundary shown is incorrect? If so we will amend it.</p> <p>Fig. 2.3 will not be amended at this point in time. We will consider moving all maps into the body of the report.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>moved to sit directly under para 3.19. Separate 'Policy' or 'Proposal Maps could also be created for Mendlesham Village and Mendlesham Green and at a sufficient scale that would allow the site allocations – both housing and local green spaces to be shown on the one map. Again, there are many good examples of how other NP Groups has visually represented their Plan policies.</p>	
--	--	--

END OF DOCUMENT