



**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2016 - 2036**

**Consultation Statement
September 2018**

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Background to preparation of Neighbourhood Plan	2
3	Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation	4
4	Pre-submission consultation Responses	4
Appendix 1	Poster for Drop-in event and Village Fun on the Green Day July 2015	6
Appendix 2	Invitation (base format adapted or personalised as appropriate) to individuals, groups and organisations contacted for the July 2015 events	7
Appendix 3	Notice giving details of the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation and poster for the launch event.	8
Appendix 4	Statutory and Non-statutory Consultees Consulted at Pre-Submission Consultation Stage together with the email notification sent to all on the list.	10
Appendix 5	Tables of responses to Regulation 14 Pre-submission consultation with Stowupland NP responses including proposals for modification.	14

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Stowupland Neighbourhood Development Plan (SNP).
- 1.2 The legal basis of this Consultation Statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:
- contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - explain how they were consulted;
 - summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- 1.3 The policies contained in the SNP are as a result of extensive engagement and consultation with residents of Stowupland as well as other statutory bodies. Work has involved two household surveys, public meetings and consultation events at appropriate stages during the preparation of the Plan.

2 BACKGROUND TO PREPARATION OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 2.1 The decision to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan emerged from a public meeting organised by the Parish Council in September 2014, followed by pre-application publicity material circulated in the village a few weeks later. There was sufficient interest and volunteers for the Parish Council to submit the Neighbourhood Plan Area to Mid Suffolk District Council for designation on 4th November 2014. The whole of the parish was designated as a Neighbourhood Area on 3rd February 2015.
- 2.2 A Neighbourhood Plan Group was formed and started work straight away. This was later formalised to become an advisory sub-committee of the Parish Council. Preparation of the Plan proceeded through a number of key stages up to the point at which it has been submitted to Mid Suffolk District Council for examination. These can be summarised as follows:
- Stakeholder consultation**
- 2.3 In March 2015 the Group started to contribute articles to the parish Newsletter, Telstar, and has continued to update residents in this way throughout the process.
- 2.4 As the purpose of the Plan was to ensure that people living and working in the parish could have their say about how their community should develop over the next 20 years the group set about organising a drop-in event at the Village Hall (Friday 3rd July) and a “stall” with display material and a “where is this in the village” photograph competition with prizes for adults and children at the Fun Day on the Green on 5th July 2015. Around 20 groups, individuals, and organisations were contacted (including businesses and landowners/farmers) the poster is reproduced as Appendix 1, and Appendix 2 is a copy of the base format of letters sent to individuals, groups and organisations.

2.5 In summary, the Group/Sub-committee has:

- secured grant funding to employ a consultant planner to assist with the first drop-in event and prepare display material, carry out an online questionnaire, commission a Landscape Architect to carry out a Landscape Appraisal of the Parish, print posters, banners and display material, and print display material for the Regulation 14 Pre-submission drop-in event and copies of the Neighbourhood Plan and evidence documents;
- created a page on the Parish Council's website: www.stowupland.com/neighbourhood-plan ;
- organised drop-in sessions for local residents and businesses at the Village Hall;
- taken part in the village Fun Day on the Green, July 2015, and the 100 year celebration of Freeman Primary School in September 2015;
- carried out a 'mini' questionnaire ensuring delivery every household and business in the parish through Telstar;
- sent letters to all landowners inviting "expressions of interest" in future development of land in the parish;
- carried out an online questionnaire using Community Action Suffolk software;
- publicised questionnaire with display, and followed-up with drop-in/display to communicate results;
- carried out a Character Assessment of the parish;
- commissioned a Landscape Appraisal;
- joined the MSDC/Babergh NP Networking group, and attended meetings organised by the councils to learn from other villages creating plans;
- members of the sub-committee have attended meetings and events to publicise and promote the NP, including Book Group, the History Group, and a Ploughmans Lunch;
- met with MSDC officers and Parish Council;
- published news and update items in Telstar throughout the process.

Community engagement – the questionnaires

- 2.7 An initial questionnaire, that became known as the 'Mini' Questionnaire was produced in May 2015 and distributed to every household and business in the parish in the form of a detachable flyer inside the May edition of *Telstar*, the award-winning village magazine. The response rate was over 30%. The results of the 'mini' questionnaire in the September 2015 edition of *Telstar*.
- 2.8 After considering what this initial questionnaire had revealed it was decided to carry out a fuller questionnaire. We used an online format developed and provided by Community Action Suffolk, and encouraged people to complete the questionnaire online. A separate Youth Questionnaire was also devised. Over half the parish completed the questionnaire either online or in paper format. The results were publicised through February and March 2016 at drop-in sessions at the Village Hall, an item in *Telstar* and by making the material available at Parish Council meetings.
- 2.9 A Supporting Document "Engaging the community – the two questionnaires" details the questions and analysis of results.

2.9 Throughout the process, the SNP Working Group/sub-committee worked with Mid Suffolk District Councils as the Parish Council was keen to ensure that the Plan would not draw significant objections from the Council during the formal pre-submission consultation. An early draft of the plan was submitted to Babergh & Mid Suffolk Councils in 2017, and following advice from officers an amended version was submitted followed by a meeting with officers in March 2018.

3 REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

3.1 Residents and businesses in the parish were notified of the pre-submission consultation through a printed notice delivered with Telstar, posters on parish noticeboards, and two banners displayed in two prominent locations in the village. A copy of the notice is attached as Appendix 3. In addition, the consultation was publicised through being featured on the cover of July's edition of Telstar, with an article inside, and a notice on the back cover. (Note: all residents and businesses in the parish receive Telstar as near to the start of the month as volunteer deliverers can achieve).

3.2 The Pre-Submission Consultation commenced on 14th June 2018 at 2.30pm with a drop-in launch event at the Village Hall between 2.30pm and 6.30pm. An exhibition explaining the neighbourhood plan process and the proposals in the Plan was available as were paper copies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

3.3 In accordance with requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, the Parish Council notified statutory consultees based on a list provided by Babergh & Mid Suffolk Councils. A copy of the email text of the notification and the list of consultees is included as Appendix 4.

3.4 Printed copies of the Neighbourhood Plan were placed on "deposit" at the Village Hall, the Sports & Social Club, M & M Butchers, The Retreat P.H. and The Crown P.H. together with a wallet containing paper copies of the response form.

3.5 The Pre-Submission consultation period ran for the statutory six weeks period plus one day from 2.30pm on 14 June to midday on the 27 July 2018.

4 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION RESPONSES

4.1 In total 54 people, groups, authorities and organisations responded to the Pre-Submission Consultation. The tables of comments and the responses of the sub-committee, as endorsed by Stowupland Parish Council on 13 September 2018, are set out in Appendix 5 of this Statement. As a result, the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan (September 2018) has been appropriately amended. The changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan, agreed by Stowupland Parish Council at their meeting on 13 September 2018, are relatively minor in nature and do not warrant a further pre-submission consultation round.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 Poster for Drop-in event and Village Fun on the Green Day July 2015
- Appendix 2 Invitation (base format adapted or personalised as appropriate) to individuals, groups and organisations contacted for the July 2015 events
- Appendix 3 Notice giving details of the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation and poster for the launch event displayed in the parish.
- Appendix 4 Statutory and Non-statutory Consultees Consulted at Pre-Submission Consultation Stage together with the email notification sent to all on the list.
- Appendix 5 Tables of responses to Regulation 14 Pre-submission consultation with Stowupland NP responses including proposals for modification.



Come and tell us what you feel about our village, and what hopes you have for its future.

We can all help to shape the future of Stowupland – but the Neighbourhood Plan Group needs your help.

Friday 3rd July

There will be displays and opportunities to record your views and comments in the Village Hall. Members of the Group will be around from 11.30 to 1pm and from 2pm to 7pm, and there will be free refreshments.

Sunday 5th July

The Neighbourhood Plan Group will be at the Fun-day on The Green on Sunday 5th July from 11.00am to 4pm – free refreshments all day.



Dear Club, Society, or Group Leader/Chairperson,

Invitation to the Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan

Drop-in Day 3rd July

and Fun-day Sunday 5th July

The Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan Group would like to invite you and all your members to a drop-in day at the Village Hall on Friday 3rd July to find out about the Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan and how you can influence the future of our village.

Please urge your members to come along and see how Stowupland used to be, how it has changed, and how it might look in the future.

The Neighbourhood Plan Group would like to find out what people feel about our village, and what hopes they have for its future.

We can all help to shape the future of Stowupland – but the Neighbourhood Plan Group needs your help.

Friday 3rd July

There will be displays and opportunities to record your views and comments in the Village Hall. Members of the Group will be around from 11.30 to 1pm and from 2pm to 7pm, and there will be free refreshments.

Sunday 5th July

The Neighbourhood Plan Group will be at the Fun-day on The Green on Sunday 5th July from 11.00am to 4pm – free refreshments all day.

Please let your group know about these days and encourage members to come along.

We look forward to seeing as many Stowupland residents as possible.

Jackie Ward

Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Chair.

Notice of Regulation 14 Pre-submission consultation

**Notice of details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan
for Stowupland**

**The draft Stowupland Neighbourhood Development Plan will be available
for inspection at
Stowupland Village Hall
from 2.30pm on Thursday 14 June 2018**

Thereafter copies will be available for inspection at:

- M & M Butchers
- The Village Hall
- The Sports and Social Club
- The Crown PH
- The Retreat PH

You can make your comments and representations online on the Parish Council's website: www.stowupland.com using the code numbers provided overleaf, or by completing a paper version of the response form.

If you require a code, or a paper copy of the response form please contact the Parish Clerk, Claire Pizzey parishclerk@stowuplandpc.co.uk 01449 677005.

All responses, whether made online or on the *paper form must be received by 12.00 noon on Friday 27 July.

*completed response forms can be left in boxes at the locations listed above, or can be posted to Claire Pizzey,
2 Broomspath Road, Stowupland IP14 4DB

Poster for launch event on following page



**Stowupland
Neighbourhood
Plan
Pre Consultation Launch**

**14th June
2.30 till 6.30**

**Stowupland
Village Hall**

**To comment go to
www.stowupland.com
fill in the online questionnaire
code numbers listed below**

Appendix 4

Statutory and Non-statutory Consultees Consulted at Pre-Submission consultation stage together with the email notification sent to all on the list.

Ms	Jo Churchill MP	MP for Bury St Edmunds
Cllr M Hicks	County Cllr to Thredling	Suffolk County Council
Cllr G Green	County Cllr to Stowmarket North & Stowupland	Suffolk County Council
Cllr N Gowrley	County Cllr to Stowmarket South	Suffolk County Council
Cllr A Stringer	County Cllr to Upper Gipping	Suffolk County Council
Cllr K Welham	Mid Suffolk Ward Cllr to ...	Stowupland
Cllr A Stringer	Mid Suffolk Ward Cllr to ...	Mendlesham
Cllr S Morely	Mid Suffolk Ward Cllr to ...	The Stonhams
Cllr B Humphries	Mid Suffolk Ward Cllr to ...	Stowmarket (North)
Cllr D Muller	Mid Suffolk Ward Cllr to ...	Stowmarket (North)
Cllr G Green	Mid Suffolk Ward Cllr to ...	Stowmarket (North)
Cllr J Wilshaw	Mid Suffolk Ward Cllr to ...	Bacton & Old Newton
Cllr R Eburne	Mid Suffolk Ward Cllr to ...	Haughley & Wetherden
Mrs S Jones	Parish Clerk to ...	Mendlesham Parish Council
Mrs J Blackburn	Parish Clerk to ...	Earl Stonham Parish Council
Mrs J Blackburn	Parish Clerk to ...	Creting St Peter
Mr D Blackburn	Town Clerk to ...	Stowmarket Town Council
Mr G Brown	Parish Clerk to ...	Haughley Parish Council
Ms K Hall-Price	Parish Clerk to ...	Old Newton with Dagworth & Gipping Parish Councils
	BMSDC Neighbourhood Planning	Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils
	SCC Neighbourhood Planning	Suffolk County Council
Mr D Watson	Transport Policy	Suffolk County Council
Mr N McManus	Planning Obligations Manager	Suffolk County Council
Ms S Docherty	HR Manager - SOR, Children and Young People	Suffolk County Council

Ms N Huynh-Ma	Area Manager, Norfolk & Suffolk Team	Homes & Communities Agency (HCA)
	Land Use Operations	Natural England
	Essex, Norfolk & Suffolk Sustainable Places Team	Environment Agency
		Historic England
Mr S Taylor	Town Planning Team	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
		Highways England
	Stakeholders & Networks Officer	Marine Management Organisation
		Vodafone and O2 - EMF Enquiries
Mr A Jackman	Corporate and Financial Affairs Department	EE
Ms J Evans		Three
K Harding	Estates Advisor	NHS England Midlands & East (East)
		Transco - National Grid
Mr H Green	Infrastructure Planner	UK Power Networks
Mr S Patience	Strategic and Spatial Planning Manager	Anglian Water
Mr P Mercer MBE		National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
Ms K Wright	Service Development Officer	Norfolk & Suffolk Gypsy Roma & Traveller Service
Mr J Dugmore	Chief Executive	Suffolk Chamber of Commerce
		Diocese of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich
Mr J Grayling		Babergh Disability Forum
		Suffolk VASP for Mental Health
Mr P Pearson	Conservation Officer	RSPB
Mr P Raiswell	Senior Planning Manager	Sport England (East)

Mr L G Jenkins		Suffolk Constabulary
Mr J Mayer	Senior Conservation Adviser	Suffolk Wildlife Trust
Mrs F Cairns	Director	Suffolk Preservation Society
Ms L Cockburn		Suffolk Preservation Society
Mrs S Mortimer	Senior Manager Community Engagement	Community Action Suffolk
Ms S Osborne	Community Dev' Officer – Rural Affordable Housing	Community Action Suffolk
	Landowners in the parish previously contacted inviting expressions of interest in putting forward land for development. See * below text of email.	

Text of covering email sent to notify the people, bodies and organisations listed above of the pre-submission consultation on the Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Sir / Madam

Consultation under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended): Stowupland Neighbourhood Development Plan

We are contacting you because you are a Statutory Consultee or because you have previously indicated to us that you have an interest connected with the parish of Stowupland.

Please be advised that the Parish Council will formally commence its Regulation 14 statutory consultation on its Draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) on 14th June 2018. The consultation will run for a minimum period 6 weeks and close at midday on 27th July 2018. Your comments should be sent to the Parish Clerk using the contact details provided further below.

For your convenience, a copy of the Draft Stowupland NP is attached. This, any other supporting documents, and further information about this consultation can be found on our website at:

www.stowupland.com/neighbourhood-plan

Yours faithfully

Claire Pizzey, Clerk to Stowupland Parish Council

*** List of Stowupland Landowners sent letters seeking “expressions of interest” in bringing land forward for development (November 2015)**

<p>Mr R Bloom Walnut Tree Farm Gipping Road Stowupland Stowmarket IP14 4BD</p>	<p>Mr R Carter Green Farm Thorney Green Stowupland Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 4AL</p>
<p>Mr Miller The Old Farm Mill Street Stowupland Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 5BJ</p>	<p>Mr R Porch Town Farm Saxham Street, Stowupland Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 5DA</p>
<p>Mr & Mrs Orves Oak Tree Farm Saxham Street Stowupland Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 5DF</p>	<p>Mr & Mrs Mason Park Farm Church Road Stowupland Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 4BN</p>
<p>Mr Bewley Berick House Thorney Green Road Stowupland Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 4AR</p>	<p>Mr D J Luxford Newton Hall Old Newton Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 4PL</p>
<p>Mrs Elizabeth Mooney Clerk to the Trustees Stowmarket Church Charity 6 Birch Road Onehouse Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 3EZ</p>	

Appendix 5

Tables of responses to Regulation 14 Pre-submission consultation with Stowupland NP responses including proposals for modification

Table 1	Summary of online responses to pre-submission consultation	
Table 2	Comments received from Mid Suffolk District Council to the Reg.14 pre-submission consultation July 2018	1
Table 3	Responses and comments received from statutory and formal consultees	8
Table 4	Summary of Representations including site bids from landowners' agents	23
Table 5	Online and paper form responses in full (format and spacing as transferred from a spreadsheet format)	44
Table 6	Responses to those who disagreed with policies	96

Responses and comments received to the online and paper forms Reg.14 pre-submission consultation July 2018

Table 1 below shows a percentage of those respondents who agreed, disagreed, or where neither was noted. The comments made are noted, and the comment requesting clarity on the number of dwellings proposed in the plan is helpful, and the text will be amended to make this clearer. A table setting out each of the responses as made is included as Table 5. this is followed by Table 6 with responses to comments on those policies to which respondents had expressed 'disagree'.

Table 1: summary of online responses to pre-submission consultation

47 responses were made 2 have not been included as no name was provided			
Question	Agree	Disagree	No response
Vision	89%	9%	2%
SNP1	83%	13%	4%
SNP2	100%		
SNP3	91%	7%	2%
SNP4	89%	7%	4%
SNP5	94%	4%	2%
SNP6	93%	7%	
SNP7	82%	18%	
SNP8	85%	15%	
SNP9	85%	13%	2%
SNP10	100%		
SNP11	91%	7%	2%
SNP12	87%	11%	2%

SNP13	98%		2%
SNP14	87%	11%	2%
SNP15	96%	2%	2%
SNP16	91%	9%	
Overall	82%	16%	2%

The following tables set out all other representations and comments received to the pre-submission consultation (Regulation 14), and the response to these (where appropriate) that will inform the submission draft of the plan.

Table 2: Comments received from Mid Suffolk District Council to the Reg.14 pre-submission consultation July 2018

(Note: policies are highlighted by the use of **bold** font)

Mid Suffolk comment number	Paragraph/policy number	Advice and Comments	Response
1	Proposals Map	Not included in the Plan	We will consider how the maps can best be combined, or produce a separate Proposals Map with the notations on.
2	Addendum	We were expecting the Addendum to include a note on the appeals allowed recently and the implications of these for the Neighbourhood Plan	The appeal decisions hadn't been made when the pre-submission consultation draft Plan was printed, loaded on the website ready for the consultation to start, and submitted to Mid Suffolk. The appeal decisions will be added to the text.
3	Addendum – reference to the Draft revised NPPF, March 2018	The final version may be published before the NP is submitted	The final version was published on 24 July. Annex 1: Implementation – makes clear that policies in the previous Framework (2012) will apply to plans

			submitted for examination before 24 January 2019. No need for change – addendum to be omitted, and statement added for clarification.
4	Contents page	Consider reformatting the contents page to include a separate list of policies and a list of Plans and Drawings.	Advice noted
5	Policy SNP1: Strategy for Sustainable Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Says 206 in para. 8.3 ii) Say how this will be achieved - list the sites that are proposed and say what the allowance is for windfall iii) Proposals Map needs to be included in document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Error will be corrected ii) This is explained in other policies – we are not certain how to (or why we need to) quantify an allowance for windfall iii) Noted – response as for 1st comment above
6	Paragraph 8.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Should be "SHELAA" ii) This methodology was not taken forward in the new Draft NPPF - the new NPPF may be published in its final form before the NP is submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Noted - error will be corrected ii) Noted – this paragraph explains how we arrived at our housing numbers and allocations. The NPPF 2018 Annex 1: Implementation – makes clear that policies in the previous Framework (2012) will apply to plans submitted for examination before 24 January 2019 . Guidance on calculation of housing numbers has not been published by the government at the time of submission of the SNP and the local planning authority have not provided guidance.
7	Paragraph 8.2	You could also say that the NP has a longer lifespan than planning permissions and the allocation of sites in the NP provides certainty for both the community and landowners/developers for the longer term	Noted – addition to text at paragraph 8.5.

8	Paragraph 8.3	It would be helpful to say where these are - at least the major sites	This is explained in paragraph 8.4
9	Paragraph 8.4	i) Need to say where these are ii) 1884/18	i) These are set out on Map 3 immediately following this paragraph and in the site allocation policies ii) The application reference number is 1884/16 as stated. The Committee Action Sheet on the Mid Suffolk website for 23 May 2018 states "Approve as Officer Recommendation" but the decision notice hasn't been issued (as at 24 July 2018)
10	Policy SNP3: Land between Church Farm Barn and Brecklands, Church Road	Could say what these are or provide a reference to where they are described (Comment refers to the requirement for materials to be taken from a palette of local traditional building materials)	Noted – the evidence paper will be included as an appendix, and will be signposted in the supporting text for this policy and for Policy SNP14
11	Paragraph 8.6	SHEALA should be SHELAA	Noted - error will be corrected
12	Paragraph 9.1	This ought to be amended to reflect proposed changes to the NPPF definition (annex 2 Glossary). Publication of the revised NPPF is expected before the end of July.	Noted - This section may need to be revised in the light of the revised NPPF published 24/07/18.
13	Paragraph 9.5	i) for Mid-Suffolk ii) It would provide more negotiating room to remove "up to" and insert "of 35%". You can work back from 35% whereas "up to 35%" suggests too much flexibility. It would be prudent to add in something about requiring open book accounts if there is a viability reason for not providing 35%.	i) clarification sought on what is meant by this suggestion ii) Noted – the policy wording is stronger, and the supporting text will be amended accordingly.
14	Policy SNP5: Affordable Housing 1 st paragraph	Although this is taken from the emerging Local Plan it may need to be revised in the light of the new NPPF. The draft revised NPPF includes the following: 64. Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for developments that are not on major sites,	Noted – we are happy to explore this section on Affordable Housing further with Babergh & Mid Suffolk

		<p>other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution should be reduced by a proportionate amount.</p> <p>65. Where major housing development is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups.</p>	
15	<p>Policy SNP5: Affordable Housing</p> <p>2nd paragraph</p>	<p>Need to say what this will be based on - what is the evidence that explains the mix that is needed.</p>	<p>Paragraph 9.2 above the policy sets out the response from Babergh & Mid Suffolk's Housing Enabling Team to two applications (recently granted planning permission on appeal) for 143 dwellings. We consider this the most up-to-date indication of need. We are happy to take advice from Babergh & Mid Suffolk's Housing Enabling Team on the mix, type and tenure of affordable housing that may come forward through this policy.</p>
16	<p>Policy SNP5: Affordable Housing</p> <p>3rd paragraph: Where affordable housing is provided under a Section 106 agreement or similar planning obligation, the maximum proportion possible of the total units provided under Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils' Allocation Scheme shall at every</p>	<p>i) Explain what this is ii) insert "local"? iii) This may need further thought as S106 sites are allocated to people from across the District. If housing is restricted to people with a local connection to the village it will severely compromise the ability of the Council to house those most in need.</p>	<p>Noted – we are happy to explore this section on Affordable Housing further with Babergh & Mid Suffolk</p>

	opportunity be allocated to people meeting the “local lettings” (i) circumstances with a local need or (ii). connections to Stowupland (iii). This obligation will have permanent effect unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer any requirement for the affordable housing.		
17	Paragraph 9.7	Draft NPPF now refers to "a proportion of"	Noted – document updated.
18	Policy SNP6: Rural Exception Sites	(4 th bullet) This would need something like a nominations agreement (*Note 1) This is usually gained through evidence from a local housing needs survey (this is the current process). If this refers to the applicants having a local need then this should refer to a local connection. Local need is ambiguous. It can mean the District as a whole in certain circumstances.	Clarification sought Clarification sought - - we are happy to explore the policy wording further with Babergh & Mid Suffolk
19	Paragraph 10.5	and SNP4? (comment refers to 1 st sentence)	See the response to paragraph 8.4 (ii) above
20	Policy SNP7: Settlement boundaries	Twenty may not be considered to be a small group. If there are sites this large then they can be identified and allocated on the Proposals Map	We consider 20 dwellings a small group relative to the 175 dwellings on SNP2, and the two recent appeal decisions for 143 dwellings.
21	Policy SNP9: Protecting best and most versatile agricultural land	We have previously suggested deleting this policy. It could be argued that this is not compliant with the NPPF and the NP would not therefore meet one of the basic conditions that it should be consistent with national policy.	The NPPF, July 2018, in paragraph 170 states that planning policies should “contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment byb) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land,” The amended policy is in line with NPPF 2018 para 68 and para 117 and 118. Both the large developments

			<p>allowed on appeal include Grade 2 agricultural land, and this policy, whilst allowing smaller developments will ensure the cumulative effect of parcels of good quality land being lost to agriculture is minimised.</p> <p>Changes made: Size increased to 1 hectare in Policy SNP9 and references to NPPF 2018 included in the supporting text.</p>
22	Policy SNP10: Protecting the natural environment and biodiversity – strengthening green/blue infrastructure	Need to say what blue infrastructure is	Noted – footnote added to policy
23	Paragraph 12.2	“itt” should be “it”	Typographical error will be corrected
24	Information box under paragraph 12.4 History of The Meadow (Thradstones Meadow)	Say what this is and why it has a coloured background or put in an Appendix Policy No. missing in 4 th line	Noted – we consider it should remain in the main document This should read SNP2
25	Policy SNP14: Quality of development, resource efficiency and design considerations	This paragraph would benefit from being more specific e.g. say what the Suffolk style of domestic architecture is or provide a reference to where it can be found	Noted – the evidence paper will be included as an appendix, and this will be signposted in the supporting text to Policy SNP14.
26	Policy SNP15: Retention of employment, retail and business premises	This policy has some overlap with SNP 16. It may be better to limit this policy to B Class employment uses only - other types of use are covered by SNP16	Noted – however, limiting this policy to cover B Class employment uses only would be too restrictive, and whilst there is an overlap (with the shops and pubs) there would be a gap in terms of alternative employment opportunities if this policy was restricted to B Class uses.

BMSDC Heritage Team			
1	General comments:	We are pleased to see an emphasis on protecting the natural and historic environment, and the preservation of distinctive local character, as well as consideration for	<p>Noted</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>

		heritage assets and their setting. This is supported by the Landscape Appraisal, which recognises the historic development of Stowupland and the contribution historic properties make to the character of the village. We note that the NP references the NPPF core principles and specific policies regarding landscape, good design, etc., and we would advise that the NP also reflect the language used in Section 12 of the NPPF regarding ‘the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets’.	
2	Policy SNP2:	The development of 175 dwellings which was allowed at appeal stipulated several conditions which are written out in the NP. Several of these pertain to mitigating the impact of the development on the setting of nearby listed buildings, including the Grade II* Columbine Hall. The Heritage Team has commented on the subsequent Discharge of Conditions applications and will continue to do so.	Noted. No change necessary.
3	Policy SNP4:	The site at Church Road is subject to an application (1884/16). The Conservation Officer commented that the development would result in a low level of harm to the significance of the Grade II listed Holy Trinity Church, because it would impact on views of the church and its spire from certain viewpoints. The Officer further commented that revising the layout to preserve a view towards the Church spire between buildings from the public footpath could further mitigate the low level of harm.	Noted. No change necessary.
4	Policy SNP14:	This policy specifies that new development must “respect the character, scale, form, height, proportions, density and massing, materials, context and setting of buildings in the parish”, and specifically “not adversely affect the distinctive character around The Green, and the setting of and context for the listed buildings, heritage assets and their settings in the parish”. This shows an appropriate level of consideration for the heritage assets of Stowupland and their setting.	Noted. No change necessary.

Table 3: Responses and comments received from statutory and formal consultees to the Reg.14 pre-submission consultation July 2018

Item no. and consultee	Comments from consultee	Response
Historic England	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 58) sets out that Neighbourhood Plans should, amongst other things, include clear objectives for the future of the area and a robust evidence base that shows an understanding and evaluation of the area, in this case the Parish of Stowupland. The policies of neighbourhood plans should also ensure that developments in the area establish a strong sense of place, and respond to local character and history by reflecting the local identity of the place - for instance through the use of appropriate materials, and attractive design. We would therefore like to welcome this clearly written and comprehensive neighbourhood plan, which contains reference to the historic environment of the parish throughout.</p>	<p>Noted – no change necessary.</p>
	<p>Policy SNP4 - Land on the South-East Side of Church Road should include a provision requiring any development to ensure that the setting of the Holy Trinity Church (grade II listed) is conserved or if possible enhanced. In addition, we suggest that this policy could, as with SNP3, ensure that development on the site responds to local character and history by including a requirement for high quality design using locally distinctive materials. This will ensure the policy meets the requirements of paragraph 58 of the NPPF, as is referenced in paragraph 13.1 of your plan.</p> <p>We are pleased to note that the Building for Life and Building in Context toolkits are recommended to inform design development. It is suggested that a reference to the Building in Context toolkit is added to Policy SNP4 as a requirement, given the proximity of that site to the listed Holy Trinity Church.</p>	<p>Noted - Amend policy accordingly</p> <p>Footnote added.</p>
	<p>We welcome the production of the Character Area Assessment to provide a robust evidence base for your plan with regard to the scale, form, layout and materials of the historic core of the village. We would recommend that this document is provided as an appendix in the final version of the plan, and that it is linked to in the relevant policies (such as SNP3 and SNP4) in your plan as an evidence base for their requirements.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Appendix and supporting text added</p>
	<p>We welcome policy SNP14: Quality of Development, resource efficiency and design considerations, in particular the robust protection it affords heritage assets, and its focus on the quality of design and construction for new buildings in the parish. We also welcome the robust supporting text for this policy, which clearly sets out your plan’s principles for design quality in more detail. A minor suggested change to Policy SNP14 is to section b). Listed buildings are a type of heritage asset and, as presently worded, section b) appears to separate listed buildings from heritage assets. The insertion of the word “other” before “heritage assets” would remedy this.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Policy amended accordingly</p>

	<p>We note that the plan does not yet include consideration of any locally designated heritage assets - either identified by the local authority or by the neighbourhood plan process. In addition to considering designated heritage assets such as listed buildings, a Neighbourhood Plan is an important opportunity for a community to develop a positive strategy for the area's locally important heritage assets that aren't recognised at a national level through listing, scheduling or other means. This includes identifying any non-statutorily designated historic buildings, other structures, sites of archaeological interest, spaces, views or places of importance to the local community, and setting out what factors make them special against a robust set of criteria.</p> <p>Your plan could, for instance include a list of locally important "neighbourhood heritage assets", and we refer you to our guidance on local heritage listing for further information: HE Advice Note 7 - local listing: https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7. These can then be afforded a level of protection from inappropriate change through an appropriately worded policy in the plan. The plan could also include consideration of any Grade II listed buildings or locally-designated heritage assets which are at risk or in poor condition, and which could then be the focus of specific policies aimed at facilitating their enhancement.</p>	<p>Noted – we see this as a big piece of work, and consider it more appropriate at this stage of the NP and Babergh and Mid Suffolk's new Joint Local Plan for this to be a project that when complete would be incorporated into any review of the NP.</p>
	<p>We note that in several places the plan refers to 'big sky' views and vistas from the Stowupland plateau, and we would suggest that these could be illustrated using photographs and maps - perhaps included as an appendix if necessary. This helps identify the particularly special locations and viewpoints and vistas, which can then be specifically protected through the policies of your plan. We suggest also that the view identified in policy SNP4 is shown on the corresponding map for clarity.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Stowupland Landscape Appraisal contains illustrative photographs and the Character Area Assessment has been added as Appendix 3 which contains some photographs that illustrate this.</p>
	<p>If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staff at Suffolk County Council who look after the Historic Environment Record and give advice on archaeological matters. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also non designated locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may be available to view on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as a local Civic Society, local history groups, building preservation trusts, etc. in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in the early evidence gathering stages.</p>	<p>Noted – no change necessary.</p>
	<p>You can also use the neighbourhood plan process to identify any potential Assets of Community Value in the neighbourhood area. Assets of Community Value (ACV) can include things like local public houses, community facilities such as libraries and museums, or again green open spaces. Often these can be</p>	<p>Noted – no change necessary</p>

	<p>important elements of the local historic environment, and whether or not they are protected in other ways, designating them as an ACV can offer an additional level of control to the community with regard to how they are conserved. There is useful information on this process on Locality's website here: http://mycommunity.org.uk/take-action/land-and-building-assets/assets-of-community-value-right-to-bid/.</p>	
	<p>As you are aware, parishes that have a neighbourhood plan in force are entitled to claim 25% of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds raised from development in their area. The Localism Act 2011 allows this CIL money to be used for the maintenance and on-going costs associated with a range of heritage assets including, for example, transport infrastructure such as historic bridges, green and social infrastructure such as historic parks and gardens, civic spaces, and public places. We are pleased to note the intention to produce a Parish Infrastructure Improvement Plan, and Historic England strongly recommends that the community therefore identifies in this PIIP the ways in which CIL can be used to facilitate the conservation of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, and sets this out in the neighbourhood plan. More information and guidance on this is available from Locality, here: https://mycommunity.org.uk/resources/community-infrastructure-levy-neighbourhood-planning-toolkit/</p>	Noted – no change necessary
	<p>The following general guidance also published by Historic England may also be useful to the plan forum in the further preparation of the neighbourhood plan. It may also be useful to provide links to some of these documents in the plan:</p> <p>HE Advice Note 2 - making changes to heritage assets: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/making-changes-heritage-assets-advice-note-2/ HE Good Practice Advice in Planning 3 - the setting of heritage assets: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/</p> <p>Your plan includes Site Allocations for housing, and we therefore recommend you review the following two guidance documents, which may be of use:</p> <p>HE Advice Note 3 - site allocations in local plans: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans HE Advice Note 8 - Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment : https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainability-appraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/</p>	Noted – no change necessary
	<p>We note that Historic England have not been consulted on any Screening for the potential need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan, and we recommend you speak to the relevant officer at Mid Suffolk Council (Paul Bryant, cc'd) regarding this.</p>	Noted – Screening completed.
	<p>We recommend the inclusion of a glossary containing relevant historic environment terminology contained in the NPPF, in addition to details about the additional legislative and policy protections that heritage assets and the historic environment in general enjoys.</p>	Noted - glossary included.

Natural England	<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>For clarification of any points in this letter, please contact Tom Borges on 0300 060 3900. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk. Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p>	Noted – no change necessary
Suffolk Preservation Society	<p>As the draft plan identifies, Stowupland strengths include its historic core with its rural setting. However, we note that despite the high concentration of listed buildings in the village the historic built environment is not specifically dealt with in a stand-alone chapter although references are made throughout the plan. The historic environment is important to the economic and social well-being of the town and is arguably a defining character of the neighbourhood. We consider that references could usefully be included to reflect the statutory weight that local planning authorities must give to the protection of designated heritage assets and their setting when determining planning applications. Local planning authorities are under a statutory duty to pay special regard to the protection of heritage assets (listed building and conservation areas) and their setting (S.16, 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Section 13 has been re-organised to include a sub-heading Historic context, and text has been added (paragraphs 13.6 and 13.7).</p>
	<p>We note that the site allocations section of the document identifies SNP4 opposite the grade II listed Holy Trinity Church which, if developed, may affect the setting of this important listed building. The statutory duty to pay special regard to protecting such buildings and their setting, and protecting is enshrined in law and we recommend that the wording in policy SNP4 reflects this.</p>	Noted – no change necessary
	<p>We also consider that the Plan should make reference to Locally Listed Buildings, otherwise known as Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs). These are unlisted buildings, features and monuments, both within and outside conservation areas, which have a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the protection given to NDHAs (para. 135) when determining planning applications that affect them. Neighbourhood Planning allows for the identification of non-designated heritage assets. Mid Suffolk District Council does not currently maintain a district-wide Local List and therefore the production of a Neighbourhood Plan provides an ideal opportunity to provide one for your parish. Historic England also advocates this approach and provides advice to local groups via its website, in particular its guidance notes <i>Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment</i> and https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7/</p> <p>We would strongly encourage your team to consider compiling such a list which will strengthen protection from demolition or harmful development within the assets' setting which is otherwise limited. The Society</p>	<p>Noted – we see this as a big piece of work, and consider it more appropriate at this stage in the NP and Babergh and Mid Suffolk's new joint Local Plan for this to be a project that when complete would be incorporated into any review of the NP.</p>

	has recently been involved in two instances elsewhere in the county where the assessment of a building as a non-designated heritage asset (outside of a conservation area) has successfully prevented its demolition. We therefore recommend that the Plan requires development that affects non-designated heritage assets to take into account the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Alternatively, in view of the advanced state of the plan, a commitment to the compilation of a local list in the future, in conjunction with Mid Suffolk District Council could, would be worth considering at this stage.	
Environment Agency	<p>We have assessed the draft Neighbourhood Plan as submitted and our letter contains our response and information in relation to environmental issues that should be considered during the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Our principal aims are to protect and improve the environment, and to promote sustainable development, we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Act to reduce climate change and its consequences <input type="checkbox"/> Protect and improve water, land and air <input type="checkbox"/> Work with people and communities to create better places <input type="checkbox"/> Work with businesses and other organisations to use resources wisely <p>You may find the following two documents useful. They explain our role in in the planning process in more detail and describe how we work with others; they provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> An overview of our role in development and when you should contact us. <input type="checkbox"/> Initial advice on how to manage the environmental impact and opportunities of development. <input type="checkbox"/> Signposting to further information which will help you with development. <input type="checkbox"/> Links to the consents and permits you or developers may need from us. <p>Building a better environment: Our role in development and how we can help: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289894/LIT_2745_c8ed3d.pdf Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning: http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/environmental-quality-in-spatial-planning-supplementary-files/</p>	Noted – no change necessary
	<p>Natural Capital</p> <p>Studies have shown that natural capital assets such as green corridors and green amenity spaces are important in climate change adaptation, flood risk management, increasing biodiversity and for human</p>	Noted – no change necessary

	<p>health and well-being. An overarching strategic framework should be followed to ensure that existing amenities are retained and enhanced. We are pleased to see policy SNP10 and SNP12 looks to protect 'Local Green Spaces' from being developed on. Development management will guide the provision of green infrastructure which should be delivered in a collaborative approach between developers, councillors and the local community. SuDS are often part of building green infrastructure into design and should be incorporated in to any proposed development. For more information please visit http://www.susdrain.org/delivering-suds/using-suds/background/sustainable-drainage.html</p>	
	<p>Sustainability Climate change is one of the biggest threats to the economy, environment and society. New development should therefore be designed with a view to improving resilience and adapting to the effects of climate change, particularly with regards to already stretched environmental resources and infrastructure such as water supply and treatment, water quality and waste disposal facilities. We also need to limit the contribution of new development to climate change and minimise the consumption of natural resources. Opportunities should therefore be taken in the planning system, no matter the scale of the development, to contribute to tackling these problems. In particular we recommend the following issues are considered at the determination stage and incorporated into suitable planning conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Overall sustainability: a pre-assessment under the appropriate Code/BREEAM standard should be submitted with the application. We recommend that design Stage and Post-Construction certificates (issued by the Building Research Establishment or equivalent authorising body) are sought through planning conditions. <input type="checkbox"/> Resource efficiency: a reduction in the use of resources (including water, energy, waste and materials) should be encouraged to a level which is sustainable in the long term. As well as helping the environment, Defra have advised that making simple changes resulting in the more efficient use of resources could save UK businesses around £23bn per year. <input type="checkbox"/> Net gains for nature: opportunities should be taken to ensure the development is conserving and enhancing habitats to improve the biodiversity value of the immediate and surrounding area. <input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable energy use: the development should be designed to minimise energy demand and have decentralised and renewable energy technologies (as appropriate) incorporated, while ensuring that adverse impacts are satisfactorily addressed. 	<p>Noted – no change necessary</p>
	<p>Please note that the view expressed in this letter by the Environment Agency is a response to the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan only and does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning or permit applications that may come forward. We reserve the right to change our position in relation to any such application.</p>	<p>Noted – no change necessary</p>

Suffolk County Council	Heritage is highlighted in the Plan as an important asset to the community. As well as historic buildings, referenced in Policy SNP1 the Plan should refer to archaeological heritage. SCC would recommend the inclusion of background information on the archaeology within the parish and a policy. This would provide clarity to developers as to how they should approach archaeological remains, particularly as policies SNP6 and SNP7 allow for the possibility of infill development.	Noted – see next item
	<p>Section 4.14 provides some detail relating the early history of the parish and there is also reference to medieval sites and listed buildings in the document, however there is also evidence of prehistoric and roman sites, particularly towards the Gipping and its tributary. More information can be found using the Suffolk Heritage Explorer</p> <p>It is recommended that the following text is included in the Plan, which encourages developers to engagement with SCC Archaeological Service early, outlines some of the local and national policy related to archaeology and signposts to the Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>“Suffolk County Council manages the Historic Environment Record for the county, which includes approximately 50 entries for Stowupland. Non-designated archaeological heritage assets would be 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 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 NPPF and Local Plan policies are met. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can advise on the level of assessment and appropriate stages to be undertaken.”</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>New text added in Sections 4 and 13.</p>
	<p>The plan could also encourage outreach and public engagement related to archaeological heritage assets as it is an aspiration in the NPPF to increase public understanding of heritage assets.</p> <p>SCC can offer support in drafting suitable archaeology policy.</p>	<p>Noted – we feel this would be an excellent parish project. We have an active History Group, and welcome the suggestion. We are also considering combining this with a heritage trail around the parish</p>
	<p><i>Early Years Education</i></p> <p>The two providers in this ward are the pre-school within the Stowupland associated with the primary school and the pre-school in Cedars Park. While there are expected to be enough spaces to accommodate the demand produced by the Plan, it should be noted that the available places are in Cedars Park, outside of the parish.</p>	Noted
	<p><i>Primary Education</i></p> <p>Freeman Primary School is currently full and this situation will continue according to current primary school forecasts. The forecasts include the sites that are currently permitted, meaning that an additional</p>	Noted

	<p>five primary school children are expected to arise from proposed site allocation SNP4. The forecasts are presented in the table below. Note that SCC treat the 95% capacity as the total capacity when seeking developer contributions, to enable flexibility with school places.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="405 325 1256 459"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total Capacity</th> <th>95% Capacity</th> <th>2018</th> <th>2019</th> <th>2020</th> <th>2020</th> <th>2022</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Freeman Primary School</td> <td>209</td> <td>199</td> <td>219</td> <td>233</td> <td>249</td> <td>256</td> <td>266</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>SCC has been in discussions with the school regarding the potential expansion. The school has made it clear that they do not desire to expand beyond their current size; a significant proportion of the pupils currently attending the school from out of catchment and the school wished to principally serve its local community. There is capacity at other nearby schools, such as Trinity Primary School, to accept additional students.</p> <p>However, Freeman Primary School have agreed for SCC to undertake a feasibility study to expand to 315 places, which could provide a potential education solution to further growth should the schools position on expansion change. This may require more land for additional playing fields, however once feasibility work as been completed the County Council can be more certain about what may be required.</p> <p>Due to the large number of out of catchment pupils attending this school and the capacity at nearby schools it is expected that the Plan growth can be accommodated</p>		Total Capacity	95% Capacity	2018	2019	2020	2020	2022	Freeman Primary School	209	199	219	233	249	256	266	<p>The lack of capacity to cope with future growth seems alarming, although it is understood that this currently includes a high proportion of children from outside the catchment area, and we support the school's wish to serve the local community.</p> <p>We await the outcome of the feasibility study with interest.</p> <p>Noted</p>
	Total Capacity	95% Capacity	2018	2019	2020	2020	2022											
Freeman Primary School	209	199	219	233	249	256	266											
	<p><i>Secondary Education</i></p> <p>Stowupland High School includes 11-16 age range and 6th form. The school is currently over capacity with pupil roles forecast to increase up to 2021, however its capacity can expand to resolve this and accommodate other potential growth within the school catchment, but outside of the parish of Stowmarket. The total school capacity is 1,033, with 11-16 provision having a capacity of 900 places, with the remainder being 6th form capacity.</p> <p>The 11-16 provision is being expanded to 975 in September 2019 and then to 1,050 through a combination of internal modifications and moving offices to allow those in the main school building to be converted into teaching space. There is the potential to expand the 11-16 capacity to 1,200, depending on funding from developer contributions.</p> <p>Overall, it is expected that the growth in the Plan can be accommodated by the secondary school.</p>	<p>Noted – the school is talking to the Parish Council about their plans for modifications, moving offices and potential expansion in the future. This engagement is very welcome and has potential for closer links between the school and local community.</p>																
	<p><i>Fire and Rescue</i></p>	<p>Noted</p>																

	<p>Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service (SFRS) would encourage the provision of automated fire suppression sprinkler systems in any new development as it not only affords enhanced life and property protection but if incorporated into the design/build stage it is extremely cost effective and efficient. SFRS will not have any objection with regard access, as long as access is in accordance with building regulation guidance. We will of course wish to have included adequate water supplies for firefighting, specific information as to the number and location can be obtained from our water officer via the normal consultation process.</p>	<p>First comment incorporated in the supporting text for Policy SNP14. The remaining comments seem more appropriate when considering specific proposals or applications.</p>
	<p><i>Flooding</i> The Plan should have an awareness of flooding issues within the parish and signpost to the appropriate national policy (paragraphs 99 and 100 of the NPPF of the previous NPPF and paragraphs 155 and 161 of the new NPPF) local policy (Policy CS4 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy), and the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy. This will provide wider context to flood risk in the parish. The plan should also describe the potential flood risk and surface water drainage in in the area.</p> <p>Below is some recommended wording that could be included in the plan. A suitable place for this could be section 4.1 “Natural and Physical Environment” or section 11 “Landscape and Environment”, however the Parish Council may find another part of the plan more appropriate.</p> <p>“The majority of the parish is with (fluvial) flood zone 1, a section of the River Gipping runs on the north western boundary from north to south and there some areas of flood zone 2 and 3 along it. There is however a significant number of ordinary watercourses which drain the land and this makes some areas of the parish susceptible to surface water (pluvial) flood risk ranging for low risk to high risk. Infiltration of water into the ground is likely to be poor due to the presence of clay soils throughout the parish, therefore alternative methods to drain sites will have to be utilised in line with National Planning Policy Guidance.</p> <p>The most likely solution will be to discharge surface water into ordinary watercourse at a controlled rate, whilst attenuating water on site. A proportion of the developed area within the northern part of the parish is served by a public surface water sewer. It is recommended that any development coming forward should engage with Suffolk County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority to address these issues at an early stage of the development.”</p> <p>If the Parish Council requires additional support or clarification regarding flood and water management issues SCC can offer this.</p>	<p>Noted Text added in Section 4.</p>

	<p>Maps of flooding from rivers are produced by the Environment Agency and can be found here: https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/confirm-location?easting=606715.22&northing=259663.97&placeOrPostcode=stowupland</p>	
	<p><i>Our Water – Suffolk Community Flood Project</i></p> <p>SCC are trialling a community led project to gather local knowledge on flooding and drainage, which you may wish to consider when further developing the Plan. The project aims to collect data about local ordinary watercourses and other significant water related features, through simply drawing the location on a map and recording issues associated with flooding which affect the community. The information gathered can then be transferred to Suffolk County Council where the data will be recorded, and then the maintenance roles and responsibilities for the watercourses can be ascertained.</p> <p>‘Our Water’ is a tool which enables community groups to improve their understanding of local flood risk and possibly help maintain the local watercourses. The project is achieved by walking around a targeted area and noting the location, condition, and other attributes of a watercourse and its features. Volunteers would be provided with basic training of such features and will be supported by SCC throughout the duration of the project.</p> <p>We would like to involve communities so they fully understand their local flood risk and so they can support in the mitigation process where needed. The volunteers will be given a pack of equipment for the fieldwork which includes a map of the parish, a handbook, a photo guidebook of watercourse structures and conditions, a record sheet, clipboards and other stationery.</p> <p>If Stowupland Parish Council is interested in engaging the community in the project please contact Ben Carter using the following details: 01473 260456 or Ben.Carter@suffolk.gov.uk</p>	<p>Noted – the parish council welcomes this initiative and will consider becoming involved with it. Not necessary to amend plan.</p>
	<p><i>Minerals and Waste</i></p> <p>SCC is the minerals and waste planning authority in Suffolk and will be responding in reference to the current adopted Minerals Core Strategy and Waste Core Strategy, as well as the emerging Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (SMWLP). Minerals and Waste local plans once adopted are a development document. The SMWLP is currently in Submission Draft stage with consultation on this draft ended on 23rd of July, submission will take place between August and September and examination in public is expected in early 2019, with adoption in the summer of 2019.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p><i>Minerals</i></p>	

	<p>There are no current minerals sites or proposed minerals sites within the neighbourhood plan area. The NPPF states that minerals policies should safeguard mineral resources (in Suffolk this is mainly sand and gravel) to prevent them being made unusable by development (sterilised). SCC does this through use of the Minerals Consultation Area (MCA). The MCA highlights where there are potentially exploitable sand and gravels resources and Policy 5 of the Minerals Core Strategy requires SCC to be consulted on development greater than one hectare takes place on land within the minerals consultation area. Policy MP10 of the SMWLP will require this for sites larger than five hectares.</p> <p>The current MCA in the Minerals Core Strategy covers a small area of Stowupland, to the north east of the parish. The MCA in the SMWLP, which is more extensive, covers an area along the North East Boundary, related to the River Gipping. The allocated sites in the Neighbourhood Plan are all outside of the MCA in both the Minerals Core Strategy and the SMWLP, meaning the Plan is not expected to cause any minerals safeguarding issues.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
	<p><i>Waste</i></p> <p>Waste facilities are also safeguarded through Policy WDM1 in the Waste Core Strategy and the Policy WP18 in the SMWLP. There are no waste facilities currently operating within the Stowupland Parish, so there should be no waste facility safeguarding issues related to the Plan.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p><i>Landscape</i></p> <p>The landscape policies within the plan are well evidenced, however the wording of policy could be amended to be less restrictive and more positive. Policies should consider where development could provide opportunities to improve landscape. The Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan Landscape Appraisal states in paragraph 6.4.1 that growth should "...improve the setting of existing valued features and or help ameliorate existing adverse effects of current development".</p> <p>To reflect this, the following amendments to Policy SNP8 are proposed. The word "significant" should be inserted into part "i" of the policy to avoid being overly restrictive.</p> <p>"Development proposals will be supported where... They do not have a <i>significant</i> detrimental impact"</p> <p>To encourage development to have a positive effect on the landscape an additional point to policy SNP8 could be added. SCC suggest the following wording:</p> <p>"Development proposals will be supported where... they improve landscape condition, visual amenity, or the setting of valued features, setting where existing development has adverse effects."</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Wording added as suggested.</p>
	<p><i>Public Rights of Way (PRoW)</i></p>	

	<p>Reference to PRow throughout the plan, but particularly in the vision and policy, are most welcome. The following comments suggest amendments to text to help improve the wider policy context of PRow within the plan and policy effectiveness.</p> <p>It is recommended that where the plan refers to PRow in the following way, “footpaths (public rights of way)”, that this is changed to “the public rights of way network”. This is because PRow do not just consist of footpaths, but other types of routes, such as bridleways that can be used by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. By making this change the plan will then cater to a wider range of route types and users.</p> <p>Parts of the Plan where SCC has identified this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final sentence of paragraph 4.2.2 • The third bullet point of the objectives on page 13 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Amendments made as suggested</p>
	<p><i>Policy SNP2</i></p> <p>It is recommended that part “f)” of this policy is amended to the following wording to make the policy more effective and to better protect the existing PRow network: “protect existing public rights of way, and consideration shall be given to enhancing them and increasing and improving links with the wider network. Where changes to the existing network are necessary to accommodate development, mitigating measures shall be taken to ensure that the network is not negatively affected or reduced as a result.”</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Change made as suggested in the first part of this recommendation. A footpath diversion order is currently in place to accommodate development on this site.</p>
	<p><i>Policy SNP3</i></p> <p>This site has a PRow along the western edge of the site connecting to Church Road. The policy should protect and include provisions for enhancement of the PRow network. The following wording is suggested for inclusion: “Any development proposals shall protect existing public rights of way, and consideration shall be given to enhancing them and increasing and improving links with the wider network. Where changes to the existing network are necessary to accommodate development, mitigating measures shall be taken to ensure that the network is not negatively affected or reduced as a result.”</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Change made as suggested</p>
	<p><i>Policy SNP4</i></p> <p>This site has a PRow along the eastern edge of the site connecting to Church Raod. The policy should protect and include provisions for enhancement of the PRow network. The following wording is suggested for inclusion:</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	<p>“Any development proposals shall protect existing public rights of way, and consideration shall be given to enhancing them and increasing and improving links with the wider network. Where changes to the existing network are necessary to accommodate development, mitigating measures shall be taken to ensure that the network is not negatively affected or reduced as a result.”</p>	<p>Change made as suggested</p>
	<p><i>Policy SNP13 and Paragraph 12.5</i></p> <p>A policy dedicated to the protection and enhancement of PRow is welcome, however the first paragraph of the policy is too restrictive. It is suggested that the policy allows for mitigation of impacts, as this allows enables greater scope for improvement to the PRow network as a whole. The following wording is recommended: “... loss of amenity value will be minimised, and mitigation measures will be taken so as not to negatively affect or reduce the overall network.”</p> <p>Change to the explanatory text in paragraph 12.5 would also need to be changed to reflect this policy change. For example the text states hard surfaces are undesirable, but in some cases it may be desirable for a route to be made a sealed (hard) surface to help facilitate cycling. An amendment to paragraph 12.5 is suggested below to reflect the suggested change to Policy SNP13.</p> <p>“...but also to respect them and not wholly change the nature of them. Access to new development should avoid crossing, and effectively severing rural public rights of way, and should avoid incorporating them into urban/suburban layouts, unless mitigation for the loss can be achieved by the creation of new routes in the vicinity. The provision of...”</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Change made as suggested</p>
	<p><i>PRow Maps</i></p> <p>In addition to the map on page 46 it would be beneficial for the Plan to refer to the PRow definitive maps. The definitive maps form part of a legal record defining the PRow routes and they also define the type of routes (footpath, bridleway, etc...). This could be included in the Plan document or referenced as evidence. Definitive maps for parishes, as well as additional information on PRow can be found here: https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/public-rights-of-way-in-suffolk/definitive-maps-of-public-rights-of-way/</p> <p>The definitive map could also be included in the plan provided the Parish Council joined the Public Sector Mapping Agreement (PSMA). SCCs current Ordnance Survey mapping licence prohibits sharing maps for reproducing (such as a neighbourhood plan). However members of the PSMA are able to share maps</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Change made as suggested</p> <p>Noted – this will be considered for future use in the parish.</p>

	<p>more freely. If the parish Council wishes to further investigate this more information can be found here: http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/business-and-government/public-sector/parish-communities/guidance.html</p>	
	<p><i>Transport</i></p> <p>It is welcome that use of sustainable modes, such as walking, cycling and public transport are supported throughout the plan in site specific policies and Plans actions. While site specific policies require development to include pedestrian links to services and public transport, it may also be helpful to have a general policy to require this, should other development come forward.</p> <p><i>Policy SNP15?</i></p> <p>An amendment to this policy is recommended in order to encourage walking and cycling. “All proposals should provide walking and cycling access that connects to existing pedestrian and cycling networks, and to public transport to enable travel by sustainable modes.”</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Text added to Policy SNP14</p>
	<p><i>Actions</i></p> <p>The action on page 22 indicates that a 20mph variable speed limit is desired along Church Road to cover the school entrances. While the desire for this is understandable, it would be against SCC policy to apply a 20mph speed limit to as it is an A class road, which does not meet the criteria for consideration of 20mph schemes. The full criteria can be read here: https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/Roads-and-transport/traffic-management-and-road-safety/20mph-Speed-Limit-Policy-Criteria.pdf</p> <p>SCC suggests that traffic calming measures would be more appropriate for this road than speed restrictions and support the inclusion of this in the action.</p>	<p>Noted – although at first this looks counter intuitive, we understand that traffic calming measures are usually more effective than speed limits as the latter need policing. We welcome the opportunity to work with Suffolk County Council in the future on on appropriate and well-designed traffic calming measures at a number of locations in the village.</p>
Late response (email dated 30 July)		
<p>Anglian Water</p>	<p>Policy SNP2: Land between Church Road and Gipping Road, Policy SNP3: Land between Church Farm Barn and Brecklands, Church Road, Policy SNP4: Land on the south-east side of Church Road.</p> <p>We note that it is proposed to allocate three sites for residential development which currently have the benefit of planning permission or are subject to a current planning application (Mid Suffolk reference 1884/16).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>Anglian Water has no objection to the principle of residential development on the sites identified in the Neighbourhood Plan and has made comments on the current application (Anglian Water reference 00014370).</p> <p>SNP14: Quality of development, resource efficiency and design considerations</p> <p>We note that Policy SNP14 includes reference to new development including measures to provide environmental sustainability including water efficiency which is welcomed.</p> <p>The emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk Local Plan includes a specific water efficiency standard (110 litres/per person/per day) for residential developments within the plan area which is supported by Anglian Water.</p>	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Table 4: Summary of Representations including site bids from landowners' agents – full representations attached

Name	Comment no.	Representation/comment	SNP Response
Boyer obo Taylor Wimpey	1	<p>Our client has an interest in the land south of Stowmarket Road in Stowupland, which is well related to the existing settlement and is within close proximity to local services and bus routes. The site is shown in Appendix One. The total site area is approximately 18ha and we believe is capable of accommodating residential development and community facilities, with it currently being suggested to include dwellings, allotments and public open space.</p> <p>We have previously submitted representations to this effect to the Babergh Mid Suffolk District Council (BMSDC) Joint Local Plan Consultation (Reg. 18) in November 2017.</p> <p>Our representations on the current version of the SNDP are set out below in relation to the site south of Stowmarket Road and the relevant sections and policies of the plan, set out in chronological order.</p>	<p>Noted – the site illustrated includes the parish allotments. We wrote to all landowners in the parish seeking expressions of interest for residential sites we could consider for the NP, and did not receive any response from the owner of this land.</p> <p>Noted BMSDC haven't published responses to the LP consultation.</p> <p>Allocation of this site would be contrary to the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy in terms of the amount of growth proposed in Key Service Centres and it is not required given other planned housing growth in the village.</p> <p>This site is not one of the two sites that may be suitable for development in the SHELAA (August 2017). This site is reference no. SS0769, Land south of Stowmarket Road / West of Mill Street, Stowupland in the Appendix of Discounted sites – the comment states "The site is not well related to</p>

			the existing settlement, and would result in the loss of allotments without adequate replacement space being provided.”
	2.	3. Policy Context - Although this section identifies that the SNDP must comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), there is no specific reference or acknowledgement of the SNDP’s requirement that it must meet certain ‘basic conditions’ and other legal requirements (as set out in Revised NPPF Paragraph 37) before they can come into force. We also consider that it would be useful for this section to give reference to how the SNDP adheres to the basic conditions. The basic conditions are also not drawn upon throughout the rest of the SNDP and we consider that this should be addressed.	Comment noted. The Basic Conditions Statement will be published at submission. The Plan refers to the Local Plan and how our Plan fits with it.
	3.	4. An Introduction to Stowupland - We agree with paragraph 4.1.8 which states that despite significant changes to the character and appearance of the village, the historic pattern of dispersed dwellings around the green and the church and Stowupland Hall are evident. We consider that development to the south and west of Stowupland would not cause any adverse effects to this distinctive character.	Comment noted.
	4.	5. Key issues – Vision and Objectives We consider that the objectives are perhaps too onerous in terms of allowing growth. The majority of the objectives refer to sustainability, and whilst we agree that this is an important aspect of development, the objectives are overly restrictive in terms of preserving open countryside between the village and Stowmarket.	Comment noted. The Vision and Objectives were developed with the community. No change necessary.
	5.	There is also only reference to encouraging small houses and bungalows, with no other direct reference to providing other types of housing. We believe there should be more consideration given for the provision of housing.	Comment noted. No change necessary.
	6.	Paragraph 7.1 makes reference to supporting sustainable growth and positive planning for the future, however, this is not reflected in the vision or objectives.	Comment noted. No change necessary.

	7.	7. A Strategy for Stowupland - Paragraph 7.1 supports sustainable growth and that this needs to take place in the most sustainable locations. We consider that land to the south and west of Stowupland would offer a sustainable location for new housing and that the site would positively contribute to meeting housing needs in the area.	Comment noted. No change necessary.
	8.	Paragraph 7.3 states that responses to the May and December 2015 questionnaires show that the community would prefer housing growth to take place in small sites, with infill developments. However, we would contest that this needs to be balanced with the level of need. There is also a concern that smaller sites that cannot deliver any infrastructure or significantly contribute towards it.	Comment noted. No change necessary. No evidence submitted to support these views.
	9.	We would consider that the questionnaires may also be outdated. It should also be noted that although residents highlighted a need for 1-2 bedroom houses, starter homes and bungalows for residents moving within the village, there is also a need for larger homes which was highlighted for those moving to Stowupland. As a house builder, Taylor Wimpey is aware that market demands can change fairly quickly.	We do not agree that the two questionnaires are out of date. No change necessary.
	10.	Paragraph 7.3 of the SNDP highlights paragraph 6.38 of the 'Urban Fringe' Section of the 'Stowmarket Area Action Plan' (SAAP) (2013). It states ' <i>...The Council will require an acceptable level of separation from the surrounding villages, whose character and appearance should be safeguarded through the application of good design and landscape design principles...</i> '. During the course of the SAAP exhibition, the Inspector referred to a couple of paragraphs in appeals (APP/W3520/W/17/3184908 and APP/W3520/W/17/3184909), stating that ' <i>there is nothing in the SAAP which would preclude the principle of development on the appeal sites...in my opinion, the reduction in the amount of separation would not be significant and the developments would not physically unify the settlement.</i> '	Comment noted. No change necessary. The SAAP exhibition and the two appeals are different events. The appeals referred to were allowed adding a further 143 dwellings to the total with planning permission in Stowupland. Further evidence that the land south of Stowmarket Road is not required for the sustainable growth of Stowupland at this time.
	11.	Paragraph 7.4 highlights paragraph 6.51 under the 'Surrounding Villages' section of the SAAP. It states that ' <i>...villages are an essential part of our rural way of life and their unique character and local distinctiveness needs to be maintained and protected. This is</i>	Comment noted. Three sites are allocated for housing, two of which have planning permission. In

		<p><i>especially the case for the villages surrounding Stowmarket where the future growth of the town may require the use of land</i>’.</p> <p>Although paragraph 7.4 states a need to protect rural character, it also notes that land in the villages surrounding Stowmarket, including Stowupland, will be required for housing.</p>	<p>addition, two appeals have been allowed adding further to the total amount of housing planned in the parish.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	12.	<p>It is noted that paragraph 7.5 states that Stowupland has a limited function as a Key Service Centre. The development of larger sites would enhance the existing services and create new services and facilities in the village.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to support this contention.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	13.	<p>SNP1: Strategy for Sustainable Growth - We consider there to be a degree of ambiguity in the housing need targets and how such figures have been arrived at. The ‘Planning for Housing Growth’ document states that housing need in Stowupland is based on the proposed formula from ‘Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places’. This provides a housing need for Mid Suffolk of 573 per annum. We agree that this should form the starting point for the housing need for the SNDP.</p> <p>Reference is then made to the BMSDC Local Plan ‘Issues and Options Document’ from 2017. This sets out a number of potential options for spatial distribution across the districts, including Core Villages such as Stowupland. Given the early stage of the Local Plan, it is not clear what option the local authorities will actually proceed with. We note that the SNDP document applies these options to the 573dpa over the plan period. However, as the Issues and Options document did not provide a breakdown of growth per village, the Neighbourhood Plan suggests a reasonable approach is to distribute growth based on the current population in the Core Village parishes. There is no further information on how it was determined this was the best approach, or if any alternatives were considered. A similar approach was suggested as part of the ‘Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places’ consultation, however the Government have concluded that this simple formula-based approach will not be taken forward. The revised National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides a standardised methodology on how this should be calculated.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p> <p>The Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in conformity with the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy. The proposed formula in ‘Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places’ has been superseded but the government haven’t provided guidance on NP housing number calculations and MSDC haven’t provided a number for the parish.</p>

	14.	It is considered that further evidence is required to inform a more accurate plan for the future growth of Stowupland, which shall reflect the sustainable location of the village.	Comment noted. No change necessary.
	15.	It is recognised that the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to add an additional 12% growth to reflect the Issues and Options Local Plan reference that there should be more growth in Core Villages within 2km of an 'A' road. However, it is not clear how the additional 12% more growth has been calculated, and these figures may need to be higher.	Comment noted. No change necessary.
	16.	8. Planning for housing growth - The SNDP refers in Paragraph 8.1 and 8.2 to the 'Planning for Housing Growth' evidence paper, and that Stowupland needs to plan for a minimum of 195 new homes, with the expectation that individual and small groups of dwellings will come forward. As above, we question whether this figure should be higher given the sustainability of the village. Furthermore, it does appear that the Neighbourhood Plan relies on existing commitments to plan for its growth, without considering any further areas for development.	Comment noted. No change necessary.
	17.	Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that Neighbourhood Plans are required to provide policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement if it is to be relied on to resist development which conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan. We strongly believe that the SNDP approach should therefore be reviewed and that further sites should be allocated in order to provide for future needs. We therefore question with reliance on existing planning permissions, has the SNDP made enough future allocations?	Comment noted. No change necessary.
	18.	Paragraph 4.1 of the Planning for Housing Growth evidence paper states ' <i>had we been starting with a blank sheet we would have considered site allocations based on assessments of visual and character capacity, and physical and social infrastructure</i> ' for the Neighbourhood Plan. However, it appears that this approach was not taken due to the SNDP identifying existing sites with planning permissions (totalling 185 of the 195 homes). We strongly believe that the suggested site assessments should have been undertaken on <u>all</u> of the sites put forward for potential development in Stowupland, as reliance on existing planning permissions would appear contrary to Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. Whilst the	Comment noted. No change necessary.

		Neighbourhood Plan refers to existing commitments, this does not consider whether the extant permissions meet the current Local Plan needs, or whether it is sufficient to meet future growth requirements.	
	19.	We also note that paragraph 8.3 refers to Local Plans needing to be reviewed every five years, and that the neighbourhood plan will also be reviewed and additional sites may be allocated at that time. However, we would suggest that every effort should be made now, at this current stage, to plan positively for future growth.	Comment noted. The SNDP does plan positively for an appropriate level of growth, and a commitment has been made to review the NP. No change necessary.
	20.	Proposed Allocations SNP2, SNP3, and SNP4 Whilst we have not sought to review the proposed allocations in detail, we do query their inclusion particularly as each appears to already have the benefit of an existing planning permission. Therefore, the principle and parameters for the developments have already been agreed. It appears the SNDP is not making any 'new' allocations.	Sites SNP2 and SNP3 have planning permission. SNP2 has had reserved matters approved. SNP3 is a full planning permission. SNP4 has a resolution of grant planning permission (in outline) but planning permission has not yet been granted. In addition, a further 143 dwellings have been approved (in outline) on appeal. This results in 328 dwellings with planning permission (on sites of 10 or more), and a further 18 with a resolution to approve. These 346 are in addition to single dwellings and small groups that are coming forward for development: three single dwellings have been granted planning permission recently, and an application for 3 dwellings is awaiting a decision.

			We are satisfied that sites for over 350 dwellings have been allocated or granted planning permission, and this figure will ensure the future sustainable growth of Stowupland for the plan period.
	21.	Due to Stowupland's proximity to Stowmarket, notably the train station, and the nearby facilities, we consider that housing need should be higher and that it should not rely on the current population figures. Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states that a standard method for the local housing need assessment is set out in the NPPG which has only just been released, highlighting that the SNDP is 'ahead' of both local and national policy. As such, we consider a need for more sites to be allocated within the SNDP and consider it unsuitable to rely on 'windfall sites' which are unlikely to provide the necessary infrastructure in line with growth of Stowupland. Larger sites would be expected to have a wider community benefit (to include the provision of affordable housing) and a larger range of housing, reflecting the needs of existing residents as well as those relocating to Stowupland as demonstrated by the questionnaire.	Comment noted. No change necessary.
	22.	Policy SNP5 Affordable Housing - We would query the need for this policy, as it would simply duplicate the Local Plan policy. As part of the emerging Local Plan, any future applications will need to justify the appropriate affordable housing requirements in any instance.	Comment noted. Changes made in response to the NPPF 2018 and comments from Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils
	23.	Policy SNP7 – Settlement Boundaries We consider this policy to be overly restrictive as it applies a presumption in favour of development of up to 20 dwellings, but doesn't provide any evidence, or alternatives considered, to explain how this is appropriate.	Comment noted. No change necessary.
	24.	It is considered that in order to meet future growth, additional sites outside of the existing settlement boundary will be required and that Stowupland does have the capacity to absorb additional development in the settlement boundary.	Comment noted. No change necessary.

	25.	We consider that the allocation of sites to the south and west of Stowupland would allow for a definitive settlement boundary comprising the A14 which separates the village from Stowmarket.	Comment noted. In addition to the A14, a swathe of farmland separates the village of Stowupland from the town of Stowmarket. This agricultural land, and the traditional hedgerows and trees are important characteristics of the landscape and context for the settlement. No change necessary.
	26.	Policy SNP8 – Landscape Character Paragraph 5.4.19 of the SNDP states that LCA 7 is in poor condition and accommodates landscape detractors, reducing its landscape value, suggesting that the site is not of high importance or value. We agree with this and consider that development of land within this landscape would enhance its appearance and value.	Comment noted. No change necessary.
	27.	Paragraph 5.4.20 of the SNDP states that development in this landscape is limited to small scale. We disagree and consider that the site has capacity to accommodate larger scale development whilst having consideration for the landscape and ensuring a buffer between the village and Stowmarket. Appeals (APP/W3520/W/17/3184908 and APP/W3520/W/17/3184909) are also located within LCA 7 and were granted planning permission for development as the Inspector stated that although development would result in harm to the landscape, any damage was not considered significant. Development of the sites was also considered to contribute significantly to the economic and social dimensions of sustainability.	Comment noted. The two appeals referred to granted planning permission for up to a total of 143 dwellings. No change necessary.
	28.	The SNPLA recognises that LCA 7 is ' <i>likely to experience the greatest pressure from development in the future</i> ' as an area which is likely to experience pressure for future growth.	Comment noted.
	29.	Map 9: SNP8 – Landscape Character – important gaps, view and features We recognise that the 'green gap' cuts partially through the area of land that we are promoting, but we consider that careful development	Comment noted. No change necessary.

		<p>of the site would actually strengthen the existing separation between Stowupland and Stowmarket.</p> <p>Appeals (APP/W3520/W/17/3184908 and APP/W3520/W/17/3184909) were also partially located within the 'green gap' allocation, and were concluded by the Inspector to fall largely outside of it. The Inspector also stated that any development to the west, south/west of Stowupland or east, north/east of Stowmarket would cause a reduction in the physical separation between the two areas. However, this was not considered a reason to dismiss the developments. A nature reserve and landscaping in the appeal applications was actually considered to be a method of strengthening the screening along the A14, reinforcing the separation between Stowmarket and Stowupland.</p>	
	30.	<p>In addition, paragraph 4.3 of the 'Planning for Housing Growth Document' states that the A14 separates Stowmarket and Stowupland. We consider that this would prevent coalescence of the village and Stowmarket, and with additional planting would provide a permanent and definitive distinction between town and village.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	31.	<p>Policy SNP9 - Protecting best and most versatile agricultural land</p> <p>Policy SNP9 of the SNDP seeks to retain Grade 2 & 3 land and states that development on sites of 0.5ha or above affecting the best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV) in the Parish will not be supported. This policy is overly restrictive and is not in accordance with the NPPF (Paragraph 170) which does not preclude development on BMV and highlights the importance of taking economic benefits of BMV into account. We consider that this policy should be removed from the SNDP.</p> <p>In relation to this, the decision notice for appeals (APP/W3520/W/17/3184908 and APP/W3520/W/17/3184909) state that '<i>...most recent permissions for large residential developments and allocations of sites in Stowmarket are on similar greenfield sites of Grade 2 and 3 land</i>'. Therefore, the loss of BMV was not considered significant when assessed against national policy.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This policy does not prevent development. It is intended to prevent significant loss of BMV land allowing smaller scale development, but ensuring that the cumulative impact of loss of parcels of BMV land is minimised/ lessened.</p> <p>Policy changed from 0.5ha to one hectare (in line with the NPPF 2018 paragraph 68) to distinguish between small and medium sized sites, and sites of over 1ha.</p>

	32.	<p>Policy SNP10 - Protecting the natural environment and biodiversity</p> <p>The SNDP states the aim of policy SP10 to retain, maintain and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity in the Parish. Whilst we understand this aim, the policy simply reproduces policy already outlined in the emerging Local Plan. Therefore, we consider that this policy should be removed from the SNDP.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	33.	<p>Policy SNP14 - Quality of development, resource efficiency and design considerations</p> <p>Paragraph 13.6 of the SNDP states that since the 1970s, growth in Stowupland has been small scale which must be reflected in future changes that result from development in the Parish. We consider that the needs of the 1970s do not now reflect the needs of 2018 and beyond. Therefore, planning for the future should not seek to reflect policies or development from almost 50 years ago.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	34.	<p>We consider that a high quality development in the south and west of Stowupland could come forward that would respect the character and appearance of the local area and if done properly, reinforce existing hedgerows and trees such that it would provide the potential for ecological enhancements.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	35.	<p>We agree with bullet point (c) that consideration should be taken to preserve night time dark skies when planning for development.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	36.	<p>We support the use of Building for Life 12 to assess developments, however this may not be necessary as it is already sought and implemented at Local Authority level.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	37.	<p>Overall, we consider that this policy is overly restrictive and gives preference to maintaining the environment, restricting development in the Parish.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	40.	<p>Timing of the SNDP</p> <p>The NPPG sets out (Paragraph 005 ref ID 41-005-20140306) that '<i>if policies and proposals are to be implemented as the community intended a Neighbourhood Plan needs to be deliverable</i>'. Although the NPPG also outlines that a draft Neighbourhood Plan is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan, the reasoning and</p>	<p>The evidence published to support the draft Local Plan published in August 2017 has been used in preparing the Stowupland NP.</p>

		evidence informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant. Therefore, any conflicts may result in policies not being deliverable.	We do not anticipate any conflicts that would mean policies in the plan being undeliverable.
	41.	It is understood the timing of the Neighbourhood Plan has been brought forward due to the disagreement on spatial strategy issues, However, section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that any conflict between policies in the neighbourhood plan and the Local Plan must be resolved by the decision maker favouring policy which is contained in the last document to become part of the development plan. Therefore, the Neighbourhood Plan runs the significant risk of policies being overridden by the new emerging Local Plan, leading to abortive work at this time. It is inappropriate to try and pre-empt the Local Plan and any disagreements in relation to the emerging Local Plan should be brought forward through the consultation process towards the Local Plan Examination.	This is inaccurate - It is not known what/who is the source of this misinformation. It has taken the NP Group (of volunteers) three and a half years to get to pre-submission consultation. This includes our own research, commissioning the Landscape Appraisal, two questionnaires, numerous public events, and keeping the Parish Council and residents up to date through attending meetings and publishing items in the parish newsletter. Please see the key stages set out in the document. We are not clear what is meant by “the disagreement on spatial strategy issues”. We submitted a pre-pre-submission draft of the plan at the end of 2017. Following comments we revised the draft and met with Mid Suffolk officers who indicated the direction that the Local Plan may take, but were unable to give more concrete advice as nothing has been issued or made public on the two councils’ preferred option for a spatial strategy. The emerging Local Plan is at a

			<p>very early stage still, and an adopted Local Plan is likely to be at least of couple of years away.</p> <p>***Please see the advice below from the Planning Advice Service (PAS) on the timing of Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
	42.	<p>Land South of Stowmarket Road</p> <p>Overall, we support the SNDP's aim in terms of planning for growth, but we consider that this is not fully reflected in the policies. In addition, we consider there to be a reliance on existing permissions with no future allocations. Therefore, in order to plan for future housing need, we consider that more sites should be allocated within this SNDP.</p>	Noted – no change necessary.
	43.	<p>Land south of Stowmarket road would provide a sustainable location for development due to its access to nearby services and facilities. Development of the site would also offer more opportunity for new community facilities to be provided as well as offering a wider range of housing, identified as a need in the questionnaires, compared to smaller scale sites. We consider that development of the site would enforce the physical separation of Stowmarket and Stowupland through screening. Development of the south and west of Stowupland would also result in a definitive boundary between the two.</p>	<p>The land south of Stowmarket was rejected in the Mid Suffolk SHELAA 2017. It is not necessary to allocated this amount of land in this location in this NP at this time.</p>
	44.	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>The key points from our representations are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We consider that the SNDP should acknowledge the Basic Conditions, identifying how these have been met throughout the document. • The vision and objectives are too restrictive in terms of allowing growth in the Parish to meet 'future' growth and needs. • We also contest the approach to identifying a housing requirement for the village as it has been decided that the formula used by the SNDP will not be taken forward by the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Basic Conditions Statement will be published at submission. The Plan refers to the Local Plan and how our Plan fits with it. • The Vision and Objectives are those of the community developed through questionnaires and a community event.

		<p>government. In addition, the SNDP calculates housing need targets using the options from the Local Plan. However, due to the early stage of the Local Plan, the preferred option is not yet clear. Therefore, we believe that the SNDP should be looking to allocate new sites for future needs rather than just those with existing permissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There appears to be an over reliance of sites with existing planning permissions. • There are not enough identified sites for future growth, which is contrary to Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. • The SNDP runs the risk of being ahead of both emerging National and Local policy in the near future. • We consider that SNP5 and SNP10 should be removed from the SNDP as replicas of policies from the emerging Local Plan. • We also consider SNP9 and SNP14 to be overly restrictive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will refresh the paper explaining how we reached our housing number. We are not able to anticipate what may be in the next draft of the Local Plan and believe we have allocated sufficient growth to meet the needs of the parish within the context of Babergh and Mid Suffolk's emerging Local Plan and preferred spatial strategy. • Disagree • Disagree • This is not a risk – the NP will be reviewed at an appropriate stage in the future after adoption of the emerging Local Plan. • Disagree • Comment noted.
Gladman	1.	<p>Gladman are promoting land South of Gipping Road, Stowupland for residential development. At a time when future housing needs of the District are uncertain, we suggest that the site presents an excellent opportunity to create a sustainable, high quality residential development in a suitable and sustainable location. We are seeking the allocation of this site in the SNP and are in the early stages of preparing a planning application on this site. We would welcome a meeting with the Parish Council to discuss the potential development of this site and the merits of allocating the site in the neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Meeting with the Parish Council to be arranged.</p>
	2.	<p>In accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, Neighbourhood Plan policies should align with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Stowupland NDP has been prepared following the terms of</p>

		<p>wider strategic policies for the area set out in the Council's adopted Development Plan. Neighbourhood Plans should provide a policy framework that complements and supports the requirements set out in these higher-order documents, setting out further, locally-specific requirements that will be applied to development proposals coming forward.</p> <p>The SNP should only be progressed if it meets the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, supported by a robust and proportionate evidence base.</p> <p>The Framework is clear that Neighbourhood Plans cannot introduce policies and proposals that would prevent sustainable development opportunities from going ahead. They are required to plan positively for new development, enabling sufficient growth to take place to meet the development needs for the area and assist local authorities in delivering full objectively assessed needs (OAN) for housing. Policies that are not clearly worded or intended to place an unjustified constraint on further sustainable development from taking place are not consistent with the requirements of the Framework or the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions.</p> <p>The SNP should not seek to include policies in Neighbourhood Plans that have no planning basis or are inconsistent with national and local policy obligations. Proposals should be appropriately justified by the findings of a supporting evidence base and must be sufficiently clear to be capable of being interpreted by applicants and decision makers. Policies and proposals contained in the SNP should be designed to add value to existing policies and national guidance, as opposed to replicating their requirements.</p>	<p>the Framework and related guidance and in cooperation with Babergh & Mid Suffolk Councils.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	3.	2.1 Legal Requirements, 2.2 National Planning Policy Framework, & Planning Practice Guidance, and 3 Development Plan.	<p>Noted. No change necessary.</p> <p>The Stowupland NDP has been prepared following the terms of the Framework and related guidance and in cooperation</p>

			with Babergh & Mid Suffolk Councils.
	4.	The Vision - Gladman are concerned with the wording of the vision and suggest that this does not set out a positive approach to planning in the neighbourhood area. This is highlighted by the use of the terms 'conserve' and 'tranquil'. Further, whilst growth should consider environmental constraints the social and economic benefits of development should also be a consideration in the planning balance. We suggest that the Vision is revisited to establish a positive approach to planning in the neighbourhood area.	The Vision was developed through community engagement, and captures residents' vision for the future of the parish, planning positively for growth that will enable the parish to conserve its rural village character and identity. No change necessary.
	5.	<p><u>SNP1-Strategy for Sustainable Development</u> Having considered the Planning for Housing Growth document supporting this consultation it is not clear or certain why at least 203 homes is deemed to be the appropriate level of development over the twenty-year plan period.</p> <p>It appears that the SNP is proposing to follow the formula set out in the Planning for the Right Homes for the Right Places consultation however in its response to this consultation the Government stated that it is not proposing to take forward this approach and as such there is no reference to this formula in the revised NPPF. This could not therefore be demonstrated to be a robust approach to establishing the local housing needs of the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>Gladman suggest that the plans housing target will need clarifying stating clearly how it has been derived and we suggest that the Parish Council should contact the District Council requesting that they provide an indicative housing figure to plan for. The Parish Council should also consider the allocation of reserve sites that could come forward should housing needs change when the standardised methodology for establishing local housing needs and the housing requirement of the Joint Local Plan is finalised.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>As preparation of the Joint Local Plan is at an early stage Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Council has not provided an indicative figure. However, the Plan was developed in consultation with the District Councils.</p>

		<p>Whilst welcoming that the SNP is trying to propose a housing figure for the plan period it is unfortunate that this is at a time when national policy is in the process of changing. The SNP could follow the figures set out in the latest SHMA but the plan would need to reference that this will not be the figure used in the emerging Joint Local Plan and the SNP would need reviewing and updating accordingly upon adoption of the emerging Joint Local Plan.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan will be examined against the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. The 2018 NPPF makes clear that the previous Framework will apply to plans submitted before 24th January 2019. The Plan was developed during a period of change and at a very early of the new Joint Local Plan. The SNDP will be monitored and there is a commitment to review in the future.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	6.	<p><u>Policies SNP2, SNP3 and SNP4 – Site Allocations</u></p> <p>To deliver the housing requirement, the plan makes several allocations however each of these allocations already has planning permission or a resolution to grant planning permission, therefore likely to have permission before the SNP is adopted.</p> <p>These planning commitments should therefore not be referenced as allocations within the SNP nor attempt to apply policy requirements to them. Land between Church Road and Gipping Road has Reserved Matters approval and land between Church Farm barn and Brecklands, Church Road is an approved full application. Each of the policies relating to these allocations should therefore be deleted with instead a reference to them as commitments within the neighbourhood area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. However, allocated sites may include sites with planning permission. Site SNP4 does not have planning permission and is an outline application.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	7.	<p><u>Policy SNP5 – Affordable Housing</u></p>	<p>Babergh & Mid Suffolk Councils are at an early stage in preparing a joint Local Plan. The SNDP will become part of</p>

		<p>This policy is a continuation of the Core Strategy affordable housing target. There is no need to repeat policy already set out in another development plan document and Gladman suggest that this policy is removed from the SNP. This is now clearly set out in the revised NPPF Paragraph 16 which states that ‘plans should serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area...’</p>	<p>the development plan before the new Local Plan is adopted, and it was felt necessary to have an up-to-date local policy on affordable housing.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	8.	<p><u>Policy SNP7-Settlement Boundaries</u></p> <p>Gladman object to the use of settlement boundaries if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead without delay. The use of settlement boundaries to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements does not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework and as such Gladman suggest that flexibility is added to this policy to allow demonstrably sustainable development to come forward adjacent to the settlement boundary.</p> <p>As set out above, the development level of Stowupland in the emerging Joint Local Plan is yet to be determined and so to ensure the longevity of this policy more flexibility will need to be drafted into the policy wording. A tightly drawn settlement boundary would not allow the plan to respond to rapid change such as the standardised housing requirement being higher than the latest SHMA figure.</p>	<p>Gladman’s objection to settlement boundaries is noted. However, the Framework does not prevent the use of settlement boundaries to distinguish the built-up area and any allocations from the countryside. Settlement boundaries are used by many local planning authorities, and we understand that Babergh & Mid Suffolk Councils will continue to use settlement boundaries in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>
	9.	<p><u>Policy SNP8 – Landscape Character – Important gaps, views and features</u></p> <p>Gladman are concerned with the intention of this policy to protect numerous key views in the neighbourhood area. Having considered the Landscape Appraisal supporting this consultation we do not consider this evidence to be sufficient to justify the protection of the number of views identified.</p>	<p>Concern noted.</p> <p>We believe the evidence is robust and proportionate.</p> <p>No change necessary.</p>

		<p>We consider that for a view to be identified for protection there should be a demonstrable physical attribute that elevates a views importance out of the ordinary, it is not justified to seek to protect nice views of open countryside. Gladman note the key views identified cover extensive areas of the neighbourhood plan area and this could be seen to be an attempt to impose an almost blanket restriction towards development in much of the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>To support this policy Gladman suggest that the evidence would have to demonstrate the physical attributes of the views identified that elevate them above simply being a nice view of open countryside.</p>	
	10.	<p><u>Policy SNP9 – Protecting best and most versatile agricultural land</u></p> <p>As drafted this policy does not accord with Paragraph 112 of the Framework. This paragraph seeks, where possible, for development to be directed to areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of higher quality.</p> <p>The Judgment in BT&W Vs. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd. [2016] EWHC concludes that Paragraph 112 of the Framework, cannot be characterised as a policy which indicates that ‘development should be restricted’ within the context of Paragraph 14 of the Framework (and the associated footnote 9).</p> <p>Gladman consider that the implications of the Judgment apply equally to the decision-making process and the plan making process. It confirms that there is not a prohibition on the development of BMV agricultural land, nor a restriction on its development in principle. The location of a site on BMV agricultural land should not therefore automatically result in its removal from consideration for development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This policy does not seek to prevent development on BMV land. It seeks to minimise the cumulative impact of parcels of BMV land from being permanently lost to agriculture (particularly at a time of climate change and uncertainty over trading practices following exit from the EU). The Framework (2018 paragraph 170) notes that planning policies should “contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, ...”</p>

			The policy has been amended to be in line with the NPPF paragraph 68.
	11.	<p><u>Policy SNP12 – Local Green Spaces</u></p> <p>This policy seeks to designate two parcels of land as Local Green Space (LGS). The proposed designation of ‘the meadow’ is within the same land ownership as the land which Gladman are promoting through this neighbourhood plan. Acting on behalf of the landowners, Gladman state that the allocation of the wider site for residential development would offer the opportunity to maintain, manage and improve access to an important area of open space for the benefit of the local community.</p> <p>The second paragraph of this policy could be said to extend the area that an LGS designation covers, providing a buffer around the LGS designations. National policy and guidance does not seek to protect the area around a designated LGS, only the area covered by the LGS itself. As the areas around the designated LGS have not been deemed worthy of this protection this element of the policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The meadow is well accessed via the PRow network. The desire in allocating this as LGS is that the character and nature of the area should not change, and that maintenance and management would continue to be as at present (e.g. cutting for hay and managing the hedgerows).</p> <p>The second paragraph does not seek to extend the area of each LGS. This part of the policy is appropriate to the character and nature of both LGSs and proportionate in scope.</p>
	12.	<p><u>Site submission – land south of Gipping Road</u></p> <p>Gladman are promoting land South of Gipping Road, Stowupland for residential development. The site lies adjacent to the approved residential development on the edge of Stowupland.</p> <p>Gladman wish to meet with the Parish Council to discuss the potential development of this site and the merits of including this site within the neighbourhood plan as an allocation. Development of this site could support the management of the adjacent land proposed as Local Green Space ‘the meadow’ offering the opportunity to maintain, manage and improve access to an important</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site is sought as an extension of site allocation SNP2 currently being developed for 175 homes. The public inquiry into the original refusal of planning permission on this site heard that the development would form a new edge to the settlement with appropriate landscape</p>

		<p>area of open space for the benefit of the local community. Development of the site would also offer the opportunity to enhance access to the farm and community shop.</p> <p>A location plan can be found at appendix 1 of this submission.</p>	<p>considerations added to the outline planning permission granted on appeal. It is inappropriate and unnecessary to further extend the settlement into the countryside.</p> <p>The site is not included in Babergh & Mid Suffolk's SHELAA published August 2017 as either an included or rejected site. The site is included as a submission site in the Councils' 'call for sites' March 2018. B&MSDC have not published assessments of these submissions, and the inclusion of this site would be premature in terms of the stage that the emerging Local Plan is at.</p> <p>The development of site SNP2 includes a new, off-road access to the farm shop. There is no community shop in the parish.</p>
	13.	<p><u>Conclusions</u></p> <p>Gladman recognises the Governments ongoing commitment to neighbourhood planning and the role that such Plans have as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that the SNP must be consistent with national planning policy and the need to take account of up-to-date housing needs evidence and the direction contained in the emerging Joint Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

		<p>We have submitted land south of Gipping Road, Stowupland for allocation within the SNP as a site that is in a sustainable and suitable location.</p> <p>The plan is progressing at a time when the full future housing needs of the district are unknown, pending the finalisation of the Government's standardised methodology for assessing local housing needs. Gladman have therefore suggested that flexibility is drafted in to the policies of the SNP and that the Parish Council contact the District Council requesting an indicative housing figure. Failing this the Parish Council should realise that upon adoption of the new Joint Local Plan it is highly likely that the housing policies would be superseded under Section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and therefore the SNP would need an immediate review.</p> <p>We invite the Parish Council to get in touch regarding development proposals on land south of Gipping Road, Stowupland and are happy to discuss to potential options for the delivery of a scheme supported by the local community. We are also willing to discuss management options of the proposed LGS 'the meadow'.</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

PAS Website

Can you do a neighbourhood plan if you don't have a local plan in place?

The Government wants local councils to get plans in place without delay to reflect the development needs of their area, based on up-to-date evidence which can also provide a framework for future neighbourhood plans. However, legally an up-to-date local plan is not a pre-requisite for neighbourhood planning. It is important to remember that for a neighbourhood development plan or order to be successful it needs to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the existing development plan for the local area.

Where neighbourhood planning is undertaken before an up-to-date council plan is in place, collaboration between the community and the council will be critical. The local council should take an active role in advising and supporting the community group, sharing evidence and information and ensuring the neighbourhood plan fits with any relevant up-to-date evidence of strategic needs, the strategic policies of its existing adopted development plans and national policy. It will be for the local council and examiner to determine the weight to be attached to policies in an existing local plan when considering neighbourhood plans.

Table 5: Online (and completed paper forms) responses

(Note: where a respondent has stated **DISAGREE** this has been highlighted as shown here, and reproduced in Table 6 with comments from the SNP team)

Name	RESIDENT	BUSINESS	Question	Agree/Disagree	Comment
HARRIS. L	✓		VISION	AGREE	A full response on question 1 would depend on knowledge of further questions, so it is not possible. The questions should be displayed first.
			SNP1	AGREE	The word sustainable need extreme clarification because the above and other points elay on unsustainable buiding. I need to know all the questions before completing this.
			SNP2	AGREE	The above requires development which would implicitly require facilities which do not exist. This plan is better than others but lacks (so far) comment on the non-existext infra-structure. Shops? Surgeries?
			SNP3	AGREE	Wow, still no acknowledgement of the unsustainable nature of all these dwelling places. No schools, no hospitals, no shops. Do not use the word sustainable.
			SNP4	AGREE	Another 18 dwellings with no comment about the lack of essential facilities. Essential changes include medical facilities, transport - the list is almost endless but has not been addressed - it is therefore unsustainable.
			SNP5	AGREE	This is all totally appalling. I am only ticking 'agree' because it is the slighter lesser of the evils being inficted on this village. The changes that are required are self-evident and are being routinely ignored.
			SNP6	AGREE	The obvious change is that a new town is needed - not the continued destruction of Stowupland.
			SNP7	AGREE	As before. A new town is required for which proper planning can be done.
			SNP8	AGREE	Given that the plan requires the destruction of everything listed, it is difficult to enthuse about this.

		SNP9	AGREE	The first sensible point.
		SNP10	AGREE	
		SNP11	AGREE	
		SNP12	AGREE	
		SNP13	AGREE	
		SNP14	AGREE	A good plan but it will be ignored by the Council
		SNP15	AGREE	
		SNP16	AGREE	
		OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	Anthing that residents can do will be better than 'plans' drawb up by officials who are only concerned about their financial package. It is the best of a very bad job and confirms my desire to leave Stowupland.
HARRIS. M	✓	VISION	AGREE	
		SNP1	AGREE	It is not made clear whether this is 203 in addition to those schemes that already have planning permission.
		SNP2	AGREE	
		SNP3	AGREE	
		SNP4	AGREE	
		SNP5	AGREE	
		SNP6	AGREE	
		SNP7	AGREE	

		SNP8	AGREE	
		SNP9	AGREE	
		SNP10	AGREE	
		SNP11	AGREE	
		SNP12	AGREE	
		SNP13	AGREE	
		SNP14	AGREE	Present street lighting creates light pollution. It needs to be improved and any lighting in new developments needs to be low light pollution.
		SNP15	AGREE	
		SNP16	AGREE	
		OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
BLANCH.H	✓	VISION	AGREE	
		SNP1	AGREE	
		SNP2	AGREE	
		SNP3	AGREE	
		SNP4	AGREE	
		SNP5	AGREE	
		SNP6	AGREE	

		SNP7	AGREE	
		SNP8	AGREE	
		SNP9	AGREE	
		SNP10	AGREE	
		SNP11	AGREE	
		SNP12	AGREE	
		SNP13	AGREE	
		SNP14	AGREE	
		SNP15	AGREE	
		SNP16	AGREE	
		OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
TILLEY	✓	VISION	AGREE	
		SNP1	AGREE	Concern over individuals splying and reapplying
		SNP2	AGREE	
		SNP3		After the first one has started. I think that is enough. Why build more and more. Stowupland will lose itâ€™s feel.
		SNP4		Do we need all these proposals. Disgusted really as they should all be built in places that doesnâ€™t affect residents. Thorney green road a prime example which is totally wrong and will ruin the look and gap between stowupland and the over developed stowmarket.

		SNP5		If we cut back immigration we couldn't need to be doing any of these. It's councils and government that want to build not the residents
		SNP6	AGREE	
		SNP7	DISAGREE	
		SNP8	AGREE	
		SNP9		I'm not in favour of any agricultural land being used
		SNP10	AGREE	
		SNP11		Shouldn't be used full stop.
		SNP12		Again shouldn't be touched.
		SNP13		They should remain
		SNP14		After the building of the first agreed area. Do we need any more... it's a village why not increase stowmarket even more and leave Stowupland alone
		SNP15		Why not ask residents to decide?
		SNP16	AGREE	
		OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN		Good idea so long as we can have an overall say as many of the proposals now agreed despite being declined. Some of these should be reconsidered
HINTON	✓	VISION	AGREE	
		SNP1	AGREE	It is not made clear whether this is 203 in addition to those schemes that already have planning permission.
		SNP2	AGREE	

		SNP3	AGREE	
		SNP4	AGREE	
		SNP5	AGREE	
		SNP6	AGREE	
		SNP7	AGREE	
		SNP8	AGREE	
		SNP9	AGREE	
		SNP10	AGREE	
		SNP11	DISAGREE	I do not wish any building to take place in these areas, regardless of whether the criteria in paragraph 74 have been met
		SNP12	AGREE	
		SNP13	AGREE	
		SNP14	AGREE	
		SNP15	AGREE	
		SNP16	AGREE	
		OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
FREEMAN.G	✓	VISION	AGREE	
		SNP1	AGREE	

SNP2	AGREE	
SNP3	DISAGREE	i AGREE WITH THE 10 PLOTS BUT NOT THE OPENING AT REAR OF SITE ONTO REMAINING FIELD AS IT LOOKS LIKE ITS READY FOR PHASE TWO .AND PLEASE DONT SAY THIS IS FOR THE FARMERS ENTRY TO HIS FIELD
SNP4	AGREE	
SNP5	AGREE	
SNP6	AGREE	
SNP7	AGREE	
SNP8	AGREE	
SNP9	AGREE	
SNP10	AGREE	
SNP11	AGREE	
SNP12	AGREE	
SNP13	AGREE	
SNP14	AGREE	
SNP15	AGREE	
SNP16	AGREE	
OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	

FREEMAN.L	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	DISAGREE	the rear area of this development seems to allow for other dwellings to be added at a later date. It needs to be made clear by a substantial boundary at the rear that no access is left to enable this to happen
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
	OVERALL FEELLING	AGREE			

			ABOUT THE PLAN		
WELHAM.K	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
OVERALL FEELLING	AGREE				

		ABOUT THE PLAN		
HOWLETT.T	✓	VISION	AGREE	
		SNP1	AGREE	
		SNP2	AGREE	
		SNP3	AGREE	It would be good to see some timber framed/ plaster rendered dwellings to compilment the nearby historic structures in Chapel Lane.
		SNP4	AGREE	
		SNP5	AGREE	
		SNP6	AGREE	
		SNP7	AGREE	
		SNP8	AGREE	It would appear that the Stowmarket end of that village is already threatened beyond the above.
		SNP9	AGREE	
		SNP10	AGREE	
		SNP11	AGREE	
		SNP12	AGREE	
		SNP13	AGREE	
		SNP14	AGREE	Very doubtful that a Suffolk style of building will be incorporated into the new developments, as evidenced by the homogenous and anonymous buildings taking shape in the large development being constructed off Church Road.

			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	Fairly hopeful, but I am concerned that there is too much development going on in too short a time. Concerns over building styles and very concerned that the local highways will not be able to cope with the influx as they currently are.
WILDING.S	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	

			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
WILDING.D	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	I agree with the proposal but my obvious concern is that the large developments that have been apporved during and subsequently have already exceeded these numbers and disregarded many of the conditions.
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	Whilst the proposal to restrict car park use is necessary consideration must be taken of the congestion created dropping and picking up children
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	

			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
MASKERY.A	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	

			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
MASKERY.C	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	DISAGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	

			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	Need a bigger shop to go with petrol station. Ideal to walk to instead of having to drive to Tesco etc
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
WILKINS.S	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	

			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
WILKINS.A	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	

			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
HOCKTON.R	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	The two major developments which have been approved In rhe Village go against this proposal. The parish council is a useless force against further major developments in the village, there seems little point in objecting to any developments within Stowupland

			SNP9	AGREE	Any farmer approached by a developer will be inclined to accept money over using the land for cereal crops or food production and the current district council will approve agricultural land for housing development
			SNP10	AGREE	You cannot replace established areas of biodiversity with new planting and expect the same levels of plant, insect or animal activity. New for old just doesn't work in the short term
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	I am sure that if it suits the district council, then this land will be built upon
			SNP13	AGREE	Rights of way through a new development will not be the same as walking through open countryside
			SNP14	AGREE	There were many objections to the style of housing in the new church road development, again, the parish council views were overruled by district councillors who have no connection to the area or who have never visited Stowupland
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	If this is related to play parks then why has nothing been done to improve the play Park at the village hall, my daughter is 12 now and there have been proposals to upgrade for the past 10yrs
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	Just a way for the village to glean more money from developers rather than to put in place anything to stop further development in the future. Shame on you parish council and more to the point, shame on you district councillors who don't listen or care about Stowupland villager's points of view
PRING.D	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	

			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
CARCUS	✓		VISION	AGREE	How can we have the vision when 143 houses are to be built on "green space" at junction of Thorney Green Road and Stowmarket Road
			SNP1	DISAGREE	How can we protect our green belt?

			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	As long as traffic conditions stipulated are enforced
			SNP5	AGREE	As long as the village character is maintained and people respect the area
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	Notice that proposed housing area at Thorney Green Road is not on settlement boundaries, is that why they are going to build there?
			SNP8	DISAGREE	Thorney Green Road 143 houses will be built on green open space
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	

MENDELSHAM PC	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
	OVERALL FEELLING	AGREE			

			ABOUT THE PLAN		
HODGKINS.P	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
		OVERALL FEELLING	AGREE		

		ABOUT THE PLAN		
SEABORN.J	✓	VISION	AGREE	
		SNP1	AGREE	I believe that any further requirements to meet the target number of new houses built should use the land between the Bloor housing development and Allards Farm and then no other medium to large developments within the plan period.
		SNP2	AGREE	See comment to Q2.
		SNP3	AGREE	
		SNP4	AGREE	
		SNP5	AGREE	
		SNP6	AGREE	
		SNP7	AGREE	
		SNP8	AGREE	
		SNP9	AGREE	
		SNP10	AGREE	Construction of any new ponds should take account of young children playing in the vicinity.
		SNP11	AGREE	
		SNP12	AGREE	
		SNP13	AGREE	
		SNP14	AGREE	
		SNP15	AGREE	Amenity should also not be adversely affected by significant new generation of noise.
		SNP16	AGREE	

			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	Well thought out.
VICKRIDGE.C	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	DISAGREE	If up to 18 dwellings were to be built on this site, it would represent a considerable over development of this area. A pedestrian crossing in this situation to serve this development would be somewhat of a hindrance and a gross nuisance, what with all sort of vehicles accelerating away up the hill. So not only an over-development of the site, but a plain daft idea for a road crossing.
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	

			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	I feel that a great deal of work has gone into the preparation of the document, and I do sincerely hope that it will not be ignored, ridden roughshod over by the relevant authorities when decisions are to be made concerning its contents.
BOARD . C	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	

			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
PIZZEY.C	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
	SNP13	AGREE			

			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
EASTER.K	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	I feel there is a need for overflow car parking at school times particularly and some of this land may be suitable. The amount of traffic that comes into the village at school times is a serious issue and i feel there should be some safe parking available (not on the roads in the village). Also this could be appropriate at such times when extra parking is requested to the

					Parish Council for events like the 5-a-side football, funerals etc. I feel that land between the school playing field and the cricket pitch, at the rear of the play park might make a very good position for an overflow car park.
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
PACKER.A	✓		VISION	AGREE	We do not mind in fill for small areas of housing but large areas over 15 houses are not welcome
			SNP1	AGREE	If any more development is allowed we will loose all we hold dear the village peacefull living
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	There is ample unused areas within the school grounds that could be used for parking for collection of puples to releivr the village of the 50 cars that park on the green
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	Nothing should be built outside the settlement boundrys
			SNP7	DISAGREE	

			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	DISAGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	They should never be built upon There can be no special circumstances to allow it
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	We are getting overrun by development and it should be stopped
MILLER.B	✓	✓	VISION	AGREE	Little provision for sheltered accommodation & rented accommodation. needs of larger village insufficiet stimulas for additional within village, employment. settlement boundary too tight for these objectives.
			SNP1	DISAGREE	70% of yourSNP survey favoured 14 for sustainable development. site does not appear in plan. stowupland has excellent road and rail links.
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	improved range of housing types
			SNP4	AGREE	

			SNP5	AGREE	low subsidised prices have allowed buyers to make large profits in a market of rising house prices. prefer local scheme (including farmer)to build affordable housing. for permanent renta
			SNP6	AGREE	interesting if viable
			SNP7	DISAGREE	gap between saxham st and stowupland should be maintained
			SNP8	DISAGREE	historically boundary between stowupland and stowmarket was at the pickerel pub near gipping river. subsequently, it was half way up stowupland hill but coalescence has occurred at mill st and now the 143 house development in thorney gree rd stowupland
			SNP9	DISAGREE	fields of this size difficult to manage with best husbandry practices
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	future development shoul have playing fields and environmental features within that area
			SNP12	DISAGREE	village green should never be developed
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	DISAGREE	future sustainable development must be an asset to the village
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	DISAGREE	professional advce mght be different
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	DISAGREE	Could be improved

MILLER.R	✓	✓	VISION	DISAGREE	More provision of sheltered housing and rented accommodation to cater for the needs of larger population More employment opportunities in village. Residents commute to work.Enlarge settlement boundary and provision for greater sports areas
			SNP1	DISAGREE	This cannot be achieved in proposed settlement boundary, 70% of village survey favored site 14 this has not been included. Stowupland has excellent road and rail links, Please ensure that future development has open space environmental and sports features adjacent to housing to minimise transport costs
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	Perhaps could have more open space and greater range of types
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	Problem has always been people buying at low subsidised prices and selling at a large profit so that houses are no longer affordable. Preferable to encourage Stowupland farmers/land owners to build affordable housing for permanent rental. Choice of Stowupland tenants can be prioritised
			SNP6	AGREE	Interesting points if project proved to be viable
			SNP7	DISAGREE	It is important to maintain gap between Stowupland and Saxham street otherwise development (sustainable) to west and south west should be encouraged provided environmentally acceptable (ie open space,sports,landscape belts)
			SNP8	DISAGREE	Historically the river Gipping has been the boundary then half way up Stowupland hill now A14 but coalesce at Mill street now at 143 houses development on Thornry Green road
			SNP9	DISAGREE	Such fields are difficult to manage within beat agricultural husbandry practices
SNP10	AGREE				

			SNP11	AGREE	Housing developments of certain size should be self contained having sports fields and envirimental features
			SNP12	DISAGREE	Village green must never be developed as with all local green spaces they should remain green spaces
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	DISAGREE	They should be enviromentally sustainable be well landscaped and provided with open space parking ,be visually pleasant with the development area so Stowupland is improved by such well designed projects
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	DISAGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	DISAGREE	Could be improved
HODGKINS. W	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	

			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
HYLAND.K	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	

			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
HYLAND.J	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	

			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
HAYWARD.J	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	

			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
KERRY.P	✓		VISION	AGREE	With the increase in traffic along Church Road with the new developement the road surface needs to be of the low noise type for the whole road not just in front of the church.
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	This has to remain as only 10 homes as per current plan but this is obviosly in doubt due to an access road on to the field from the developement.
			SNP4	AGREE	I question as to how they will prevent this being a drop off/pick up point and there must be a zebra crossing.
			SNP5	AGREE	

			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
VODEN.J	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	

			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
MILLER.B.E	✓	✓	VISION	DISAGREE	Greater provision of sheltered & rental accomodation to accomodate needs of larger village.Develop more employment opportunities within the village.
			SNP1	DISAGREE	70 percent of village SNP survey choose site 14 as most suitable site for future housing. Stowupland has excellent road & rail links.Future developments must demonstrate improved environmental standards as well as being sustainable. Better design features to minimise car journeys.
			SNP2	AGREE	

			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	DISAGREE	In order to prevent buying at subsidised prices,so that following first time buyers cannot purchase, suggest more affordable housing should be for permanent rental. Stowupland residents would be prioritised.
			SNP6	AGREE	Interesting suggestion if viable, but not adjacent to commercial areas
			SNP7	DISAGREE	Maintain gap between Stowupland & Saxham Street. Development to west of Thorney Green Road & future devopment should be environmentally sustainable
			SNP8	DISAGREE	Boundary between Stowmarket & Stowupland, historically at the Pikerel Bridge, then at prestons hill & now the A14 has meant there has always been coalescence ,to some degree between both parishes. Mill Street & the 143 house Thorney green road are examples
			SNP9	DISAGREE	Fields below 1ha are difficult to manage by best husbandry practices of our times
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	Should be part of an environmentally sustainable hhousing development.
			SNP12	DISAGREE	Village green must never be used for development.
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	DISAGREE	Successive Stowupland housing developments should be better than those before, better design, sustainable, imprived landscape & visually pleasant,
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	DISAGREE	This must be in line with professional advice
			OVERALL FEELLING	DISAGREE	Overall,it is considered that the vision & aims of the Stowupland Neighbourhood Development Plan (SNDP) are overly restrictivein terms of allowing for future growth in

			ABOUT THE PLAN		Stowupland, as thje document predominately refers to sustainability and the provision of small houses & bungalows. These do provide for the future needs & growth of the village. The SNDP is also, overly protective of maintaining the visual gap between Stowupland & Stowmarket when the natural existing barrier of the A14 supported by additional strengthened planting could achieve the same result. We consider that careful development of the souith & west of Stowupland could help to achieve such a definitive boundary between town & village. Additionally there appears to be an over reliance on sites that benefit from existing planning permissions rather than new allocations. Therefore, it is considered that the SNDP is not currently in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the revised NPPF, and it should look to allocate further sites in order to positively plan for the future needs of Stowuland, We believe thar that land south of Stowmarket Road would provide a good option for the future growth of the village whilst providing opportunities new community services & facilities. It is considered that the proposed smaller scale sites & the existing planning permissions lack a wider community benefit to give a holistic view for the fure growth of Stowupland,
TANNER.B	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	Its a bit late for this , as it seems to have already been concluded
			SNP3	AGREE	Again a bit late as pp has already been grante3d it se
			SNP4	AGREE	Albeit a bgit late as pp has already been granted has it not
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	DISAGREE	Strongly disagree as this as drafted could lead to a plethora of applications on any land adjacent to msettlement boundaries. This clause should be deletedf in its entirety!
			SNP7	AGREE	Needs revising as as far as I can see, there is no site within the settlement boundaries capable of accomodating 20 houses that at present has not got pp

			SNP8	AGREE	Its a pity that some dcs did not take this inti account when considering the application opposite the chapel on the 1120
			SNP9	AGREE	who defines what is the best agricultural land and what criteria do they use
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	DISAGREE	I am extremely concerned at the inclusion of a rural exceptions policy and regard this with due concern. Also what is the defined reason for suddenly deciding that saxham street needs a settlement boundary when so far it has not had one. No explanation for this has yet been provided
TANNER.C	✓		VISION		There is sufficient development allowed at this time, no more should be allowed
			SNP1		If there is any more planning allowed what needs to be protected i.e. the natural and historic environment, the distinctive village character and maintence of the visual gap etc., will be a memory. No more planning should be allowed
			SNP2	AGREE	b) The inclusion of a pedestrian link to ~Gipping Road, etc., What bus stops and other services and facilities in the village . c) There is an equipped play area behind the Village Hall all ready..
			SNP3	AGREE	This is a fait accompli. But it means the loss of a beautiful view for the village as a whole

			SNP4		Where is the money coming from to pay the Traffic Warden who will have to be employed full time to ensure all these provisions
			SNP5	AGREE	The price of the affordable housing should be just that and not inflated for profit. Is the price known? Need further information on this aspect.
			SNP6	DISAGREE	No more planning should be granted. The village will be swamped as the position stands.
			SNP7	DISAGREE	No more residential development should take place
			SNP8	DISAGREE	No more development proposals should be supported. - enough is enough
			SNP9	DISAGREE	Question 10, well this is a bit late to throw into the melting pot considering the Bloor Site is on "green land". 0.5ha is quite a large area of land, not even a large garden should be lost now, in view of the amount all ready covered in concrete.
			SNP10	AGREE	It is a pity little attention was paid to this before the village began to sink under the weight of concrete.
			SNP11	AGREE	We are lucky to have the school and parish playing fields. We are unlucky in that parking is so insufficient for the needs to use these spaces.
			SNP12	AGREE	All local GreenSpaces must be saved at all costs,
			SNP13	AGREE	Glad to see that something will be protected.
			SNP14	DISAGREE	Well, so all new development must meet the highest standards of design etc., well the plot has been lost with regard to all these criteria all ready. The Bloor Site looks like a load of beach huts and is out of keeping with this item. Stating clearly the change which would help resolve my concerns would be to STOP any more development entirely.
			SNP15	AGREE	It is a pity that the car parking considerations are only just coming to the surface. With the change from a 3 tier school system to that of a 2 tier, there was no extra provision for "parking" for 4 extra years of childdren at the two local schools. I have all ready mentioned

					that a full time traffic warden will be needed. it is quite appropriate to have local businesses but this should have been thought of before planning permission is given
			SNP16	AGREE	Good
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	DISAGREE	The village has been let down by the Planners and greedy land owners and the plan is a catch up document closing the stable door after the horse has bolted.
STUDD. R	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	

			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
STUDD .K	✓		VISION	AGREE	A lot of this is too bloody late
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	

			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
HUNT . A	✓		VISION	AGREE	I would like to see a weight limit introduced on the A1120 as the lorries which use it are far to big for the village and adjoining villages.With all the extra traffic generated by new housing, it will be even more dangerous. Could we not join forces with Earl Stonham to push for this?
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	I have spoken to the vendor of the land confirming that we wouldn't object to just 10 houses although the loss of view to occupants opposite is a pity
			SNP4	DISAGREE	18 is enough but I am concerned about a proposal to narrow the road as there's barely enough room for two lorries to pass now. I fear for the safety of children
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	DISAGREE	Enough farmland has been taken already, it should be used for growing food not making loads of money for the owners who are supposed to be custodians of the land. Once it's gone, it's gone
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	

			SNP9	AGREE	Strongly agree.Food should come first over greed
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	DISAGREE	I think they should never be built on, full stop
			SNP12	DISAGREE	Should NEVER be built on, no exceptional circumstances
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	It's been very thoroughly prepared by a lot of people and is clear and concise. Well done
POPULAR RENWABLE ENERGY	✓	VISION	DISAGREE	Increase sheltered housing & rental housing provision to accomodate the needs of a larger village Develop more opportunities within village Enlarge settlement boundry to achive this	
		SNP1	DISAGREE	70% of SNP village survey favoured site 14 for housing but site not included, Stowupland has excellent road and rail links so all village development in feture must have improving enviornmental standards constantly better design and features to minimise car journeys	
		SNP2	AGREE		
		SNP3	AGREE	Greater range of housing types	
		SNP4	AGREE		
		SNP5	DISAGREE	In the past purchasers of subsidised housing have later sold at much higher prices depriving other first time buyers of opportunity SNP should encourage land owners to build	

				affordable housing for permanent rental Choice of Stowupland tenants can be prioritised by local land owner and local advice
		SNP6	AGREE	
		SNP7	DISAGREE	Important to maintain gap between Stowupland and Saxham street any development to west and southwest should be environmentally sustainable and acceptable
		SNP8	DISAGREE	The boundary between Stowmarket and Stowupland was coalesced historically (Gipping River) and half way up Prestons Hill the boundary then became the A14, Points of coalescence being Mill Street and the proposed development (Thorney Green Road - 143 houses)
		SNP9	AGREE	
		SNP10	AGREE	Should be near to any sizeable development
		SNP11	DISAGREE	Village green must never be used for housing development green spaces are green for all time
		SNP12	AGREE	
		SNP13	AGREE	
		SNP14	AGREE	The aim should be that successive housing developments are an improvement to Stowupland because not only are they environmentally sustainable and well landscaped but a well designed project should be visually pleasant
		SNP15	DISAGREE	
		SNP16	AGREE	
		OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	DISAGREE	Improvement required

MILLER . D	✓	✓	VISION	DISAGREE	Little provision for sheltered accomodation and rented accomodation for needs of larger village, Insufficient stimulus for additional within village employment Settlement boundry too tight for these objectives
			SNP1	DISAGREE	70% of SNP survey favoured site 14 for sustainable development, But site does not appear in plan. Stowupland should be sustainably developed in an environmentally sensitive manor so becoming a more attractive village with additional sports fields. It has excellent road and rail links
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	Perhaps could have been more open space and improved range of housing types
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	Low sibsided prices have allowed byers to make large profits in a market of rising house prices.Preferable to nhave a scheme controlled locally (including farmer) to build affordable housing for permanent rental. Choice of Stowupland tenants can then be prioritised
			SNP6	AGREE	If viable this would be interesting
			SNP7	DISAGREE	Gap between Saxham street and Stowupland should be maintained
			SNP8	DISAGREE	Historically boundry between Stowupland and Stowmarket was river Gipping,Subsequently it was half way up Prestons Hill, But coalescence has ocured at Mill street Nd now the 143 house development in Thorney Green road Stowupland
			SNP9	DISAGREE	Fields of this size are difficult to manage using best agricultural husbandry practices
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	Agreed any future development should have provision for playing fields or environmental features within that area
			SNP12	DISAGREE	Our village green must never be developed this also applies to the meadow

			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	DISAGREE	Any future sustainable development must be an asset to the village i.e. an improvement by virtue of superior design knowledge such as renewable energy insulation
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	DISAGREE	Professional advice might be different
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	DISAGREE	Could be improved
HOLLIS . F	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	

			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	
HAYWARD.T	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	I think the already agreed development on Thorny Green Rd will test this strategy as it will meet with Stowmarket, however a distinct boarder could be achieved through trees, hedging on the site which meets the A14.
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	I agree with all of the above but this development could easily spread further into the field towards open countryside, this should be prevented and the of the village preserved.
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	Although there may be a need for this in the future then it needs to be considered the amount of housing already agreed while this plan has been in the process.
			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	

			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	I feel it is a good plan, made during a very difficult period for Stowupland where planning permissions have been granted on appeal against village wishes. However, they will happen and we need to make the village roads, paths etc work for the village - in particular a change near the garage with a crossing or at least an island in the middle of the road. The volume of traffic trying to come up from Stowmarket at certain times of day causes big delays and a roundabout should be considered close to the garage also.
BLANCH .C	✓		VISION	AGREE	
			SNP1	AGREE	
			SNP2	AGREE	
			SNP3	AGREE	
			SNP4	AGREE	
			SNP5	AGREE	
			SNP6	AGREE	

			SNP7	AGREE	
			SNP8	AGREE	
			SNP9	AGREE	
			SNP10	AGREE	
			SNP11	AGREE	
			SNP12	AGREE	
			SNP13	AGREE	
			SNP14	AGREE	
			SNP15	AGREE	
			SNP16	AGREE	
			OVERALL FEELLING ABOUT THE PLAN	AGREE	

Table 6: SNP Responses to those who indicated **DISAGREE in responding to the Reg 14 pre-submission consultation**

Name	Policy	SNP response to representation
Tilley	SNP7	No reasons stated for disagreement
Hinton	SNP11	Criteria in paragraph 74 referred to are as set out in the NPPF 2012. Neighbourhood Plans have to be in conformity with national and local policy.
Freeman G	SNP3	Full planning permission has been granted on this site, and the NP can only influence any future proposals.
Freeman L	SNP3	Full planning permission has been granted on this site, and the NP can only influence any future proposals.
Maskery C	SNP4	No reasons stated for disagreement
Carcus	SNP1	There is no green belt around the village, but SNP1 seeks to maintain the countryside gap that clearly separates the rural village of Stowupland from the town.
	SNP8	Planning permission was granted on appeals to two adjoining proposals for development of up to 143 dwellings on land west of Thorney Green Road. The Inspector was of the view that sufficient land was left undeveloped to maintain a gap between the village and the town.
Vickridge C	SNP4	A resolution to grant outline planning permission subject to a S106 agreement has been passed by the Mid Suffolk Planning Committee for a scheme for 18 dwellings on this site.
Packer A	SNP7	No reasons stated for disagreement
	SNP9	No reasons stated for disagreement
Miller B	SNP1	Site 14 was rejected by MSDC in the August 2017 SHELAA. It clearly has problems with access, both on to the A1120 and for pedestrians to access village services and facilities. Nevertheless the site is considered to have potential benefits including improving the junction with the B1115 and extending the 30mph limit. It is likely that this site will be considered at any future review of the NP.
	SNP7	The settlement boundaries and Policy SNP8 iii aims to prevent coalescence.
	SNP8	Planning permission was granted on appeals to two adjoining proposals for development of up to 143 dwellings on land west of Thorney Green Road. The Inspector was of the view that sufficient land was left undeveloped to maintain a gap between the village and the town.
	SNP9	Noted – policy changed (increased to 1ha) in line with NPPF 2018.
	SNP12	Criteria referred to in the policy are as set out in the NPPF 2012. Neighbourhood Plans have to be in conformity with national and local policy.
	SNP14	Agree with comment – not clear why SNP14 is felt to discourage sustainable development
	SNP16	Comment not understood.
Overall	Noted.	
Miller R	Vision	Vision is as developed through public engagement at events in the village.
	SNP1	Site 14 was rejected by MSDC in the August 2017 SHELAA. It clearly has problems with access, both on to the A1120 and for pedestrians to access village services and facilities. Nevertheless the site is considered to have

		potential benefits including improving the junction with the B1115 and extending the 30mph limit. It is likely that this site will be considered at any future review of the NP.
	SNP7	The settlement boundaries and Policy SNP8 iii aims to prevent coalescence
	SNP8	Planning permission was granted on appeals to two adjoining proposals for development of up to 143 dwellings on land west of Thorney Green Road. The Inspector was of the view that sufficient land was left undeveloped to maintain a gap between the village and the town.
	SNP9	Noted – policy changed (increased to 1ha) in line with NPPF 2018.
	SNP12	Criteria referred to in the policy are as set out in the NPPF 2012. Neighbourhood Plans have to be in conformity with national and local policy.
	SNP14	We believe that the policy aims to achieve all these things.
	SNP16	No reasons stated for disagreement
	Overall	Noted. The NP Group has been open to all to attend and help develop the plan, and taken on board comments made at events in the village. It is to be hoped that when the plan is reviewed people will step forward to help improve the plan.
Miller B E	Vision	Vision is as developed through public engagement at events in the village.
	SNP1	Site 14 was rejected by MSDC in the August 2017 SHELAA. It clearly has problems with access, both on to the A1120 and for pedestrians to access village services and facilities. Nevertheless the site is considered to have potential benefits including improving the junction with the B1115 and extending the 30mph limit. It is likely that this site will be considered at any future review of the NP.
	SNP5	The government have extended the definition of Affordable Housing to include Affordable Private Rent (NPPF 2018, Annex 2: Glossary), and such schemes may well be an attractive option for developers to include within the Affordable Housing % of their schemes.
	SNP7	The settlement boundaries and Policy SNP8 iii aims to prevent coalescence
	SNP8	Planning permission was granted on appeals to two adjoining proposals for development of up to 143 dwellings on land west of Thorney Green Road. The Inspector was of the view that sufficient land was left undeveloped to maintain a gap between the village and the town.
	SNP9	Noted – policy changed (increased to 1ha) in line with NPPF 2018.
	SNP12	Criteria referred to in the policy are as set out in the NPPF 2012. Neighbourhood Plans have to be in conformity with national and local policy.
	SNP14	We believe that the policy aims to achieve precisely this.
	SNP16	Noted.
	Overall	We feel the plan is positively prepared, and plans for growth in sustainable locations. The land referred to in this representation (south of Stowmarket Road) has not been identified on a map. We are uncertain as to whether this was a land bid to either the Mid Suffolk SHELAA (2017) or in response to a request for expressions of interest exercise undertaken by the NP Group. In any event there is a clear commitment to review the NP once the B&MSLP has been adopted.

Tanner B	SNP6	The NPPF 2018 encourages rural exception sites (paragraph 77).
	Overall	Concern over RES policy SNP6 noted. Saxham Street is an identifiable linear settlement that is part of the character of Stowupland. The NP Group worked with B&MSDC officers to identify a settlement boundary for Saxham Street to distinguish clearly between the “built-up” area of cottages and bungalows, and the countryside around it.
Tanner C	SNP6	The purpose of the NP is to plan positively for the growth of the parish. Babergh & Mid Suffolk Councils are preparing a joint Local Plan that will allocate growth to villages in the area. Having a NP in place means that we can allocate sites and set parameters and criteria to ensure growth brings with it benefits to the community, and is well-designed.
	SNP7	
	SNP8	
	SNP9	Noted. The policy has been changed (increased to 1ha) in line with government policy for small and medium size developments (NPPF 2018).
	SNP14	Noted. The purpose of the NP is to plan positively for the growth of the parish. Babergh & Mid Suffolk Councils are preparing a joint Local Plan that will allocate growth to villages in the area. Having a NP in place means that we can allocate sites and set parameters and criteria to ensure growth brings with it benefits to the community, and is well-designed.
	Overall	Noted
Hunt A	SNP4	A resolution to grant outline planning permission subject to a S106 agreement has been passed by the Mid Suffolk Planning Committee for a scheme for 18 dwellings on this site. We understand that the scheme that proposed narrowing the road will not go ahead.
	SNP6	Government policy, as set out in the NPPF 2018 encourages rural exception sites (paragraph 77).
	SNP11	Criteria referred to in the policy are as set out in the NPPF 2012. Neighbourhood Plans have to be in conformity with national and local policy.
	SNP12	
Popular Renewable Energy	Vision	Vision is as developed through public engagement at events in the village
	SNP1	Site 14 was rejected by MSDC in the August 2017 SHELAA. It clearly has problems with access, both on to the A1120 and for pedestrians to access village services and facilities. Nevertheless the site is considered to have potential benefits including improving the junction with the B1115 and extending the 30mph limit. It is likely that this site will be considered at any future review of the NP.
	SNP5	The government have extended the definition of Affordable Housing to include Affordable Private Rent (NPPF 2018, Annex 2: Glossary), and such schemes may well be an attractive option for developers to include within the Affordable Housing % of their schemes.
	SNP7	The settlement boundaries and Policy SNP8 iii aims to prevent coalescence
	SNP8	Planning permission was granted on appeals to two adjoining proposals for development of up to 143 dwellings on land west of Thorney Green Road. The Inspector was of the view that sufficient land was left undeveloped to maintain a gap between the village and the town.
	SNP11	Criteria referred to in the policy are as set out in the NPPF 2012. Neighbourhood Plans have to be in conformity with national and local policy.

	SNP15	No reasons stated for disagreement
	Overall	Noted. The NP Group has been open to all to attend and help develop the plan, and taken on board comments made at events in the village. It is to be hoped that when the plan is reviewed people will step forward to help improve the plan.
Miller D	Vision	Vision is as developed through public engagement at events in the village
	SNP1	Site 14 was rejected by MSDC in the August 2017 SHELAA. It clearly has problems with access, both on to the A1120 and for pedestrians to access village services and facilities. Nevertheless the site is considered to have potential benefits including improving the junction with the B1115 and extending the 30mph limit. It is likely that this site will be considered at any future review of the NP.
	SNP7	The settlement boundaries and Policy SNP8 iii aims to prevent coalescence
	SNP8	Planning permission was granted on appeals to two adjoining proposals for development of up to 143 dwellings on land west of Thorney Green Road. The Inspector was of the view that sufficient land was left undeveloped to maintain a gap between the village and the town.
	SNP9	Noted – policy changed (increased to 1ha) in line with NPPF 2018
	SNP12	Criteria referred to in the policy are as set out in the NPPF 2012. Neighbourhood Plans have to be in conformity with national and local policy.
	SNP14	We believe that the policy aims to achieve precisely this.
	SNP16	Noted
	Overall	Noted. The NP Group has been open to all to attend and help develop the plan, and taken on board comments made at events in the village. It is to be hoped that when the plan is reviewed people will step forward to help improve the plan.