Wetheringsett cum Brockford Neighbourhood Plan – REG16 Consultation

Comments by Wetheringsett cum Brockford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (WCBNPSG) on REG16 representations – 20^h March 2023

| Serial | Respondent | Wetheringsett cum Brockford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group comment |
|--------|---------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Suffolk County Council | Design Code – No objection to this being amended to refer to Public rights of way in the areas suggested by SCC. AECOM can be asked to amend the document post examination. |
| 2 | Mid Suffolk District Council | JLP References: Appreciate that the position has changed since the Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted and no objection to the suggested update. Policy WCB1: The WCBNPSG view is that it prefers the use of enhance which asks for a higher bar to be met in terms of the quality of development. A key objective of the WCBNP is to 'champion, sustainable, high, quality design'. The use of the word maintain could lead to new development mirroring existing poor, quality development in some cases, if it were used without the word enhance. Used together 'enhance and maintain' creates uncertainty as they ask for two different things. Arguably development that simply maintains is likely to be of a lesser quality than that which enhances. Planning policy should be striving for the highest quality. The NPPF in para 126 makes it clear that the 'creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve'. The use of 'maintain' does not do that. Policy WCB2: No objections to amending the footnote as requested. Policy WCB3: Agree that the plural of settlement boundaries should be used. Policy WCB6: Same point as WCB1 above. Para 7.18 Trees – No objection to suggested terminology. WCB10 – Noted. The title for Figure 20 can be amended accordingly Environmental Projects – Welcome the opportunity to discuss further with MSDC. |
| | | Other observations: These can be corrected when the Plan is amended after the Examination. |
| 3 | Mendlesham Parish Council | Support noted |
| 4 | Natural England | Noted |

| 5 | Historic England | Noted. |
|---|--|---|
| 6 | Anglian Water | Support noted. |
| 7 | National Highways | Noted. |
| 8 | Mr Livall | Mr Livall did not comment at the Regulation 14 consultation stage. |
| | | It should be noted that the submission version of the Plan is accompanied by an Environmental Assets Report prepared by the Steering Group which is relevant to the objections below. https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Neighbourhood-Planning/Wetheringsett-NP-Environmental-Assets-Report.pdf |
| | | Objection 1: The Parish Council is not required to provide up-to- date biodiversity information as part of its Neighbourhood Plan. |
| | | Objection 2: The Parish Council is not required to provide evidence that it is accurately assessing and promoting "the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species." |
| | | Objection 3: There are no mandatory requirements for the thematic content of Neighbourhood Plans. They should however not seek to duplicate policy in Local Plans. It is not necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to seek to address the challenge of climate change. There is no prescription as to what neighbourhood plans should or should not cover. Further, the Written Ministerial Statement made by the Rt Hon Eric Pickles in 2015 (UK Parliament Ref HCWS488) specifically limits the ability of neighbourhood plans to set local standards in relation to energy efficiency and climate change. |
| | | It should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan (on page 78) identifies a number of environmental projects that could undertaken in the future. This will be dependent upon community willingness and finance available (where required). |
| 9 | Defence Infrastructure Organisation obo MOD | Noted. |