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**Overall Spatial Strategy**

**MM2 - After Paragraph 1.22 / Policy WLP1.1 Scale and Location of Growth**

Norman Castleton

**Comment ID** 43

**Comment** Strategic thinking

---

Waveney plan overall strategic thinking for the area

The problems with this plan are that it is fragmented and based on out of date planning ideas, in this case mainly from the 1960s. The plan lacks holistic and larger overall strategic thinking with piecemeal developments without thought about the consequences concerning the environment and services plus employment. The development concerning roads and transport are dependent upon factors occurring at the time of implementation or the beneficence of speculative builders. As it stands in its disjointed form it is a speculative builders charter without regard to the overall effect in Waveney. What does houses built to the highest architectural standards mean? If the estate housed built in recent times are anything to go by then they are not of any standard at all. The likely environmental consequences or influences of all this development is not considered but it should be. Where is the employment coming from? If part of the answer is tourism then why should holiday makers then what attracts holiday makers and the answer will be not another over developed area full of drab estate houses. What will be the effect of rising seas levels and what efforts will be required to offset this. Why has the Green Spaces strategy largely been ignored despite the claims in this document. The Shoreline Management Plan is not the answer as it has already proven to be inadequate re Hemsby & Suffolk Coastal and the Sizewell Nuclear Reactors will become vulnerable. Where are the medical & educational facilities to treat all these extra people? So little linked up thinking is in this plan and it needs a complete revision.

---

**Attached documents**

Strategic thinking .rtf (4 KB)

---

Somerleyton Estate (Lord Somerleyton) (Evolution Town Planning (David Barker))

**Comment ID** 49

**Comment** We support the proposed change to paragraph 1.24 which states that windfall planning applications under policy WPL1.2 will not need to be considered against the overall housing distribution for the District. To do so would be onerous for multiple small applications, and would create uncertainty that could harm delivery and so would not be “Effective.”

---

Sotterley Estate (Tom Barne) (Evolution Town Planning (David Barker))
Comment ID 51

Comment We support the proposed change to paragraph 1.24 which states that windfall planning applications under policy WPL1.2 will not need to be considered against the overall housing distribution for the District. To do so would be onerous for multiple small applications, and would create uncertainty that could harm delivery and so would not be “Effective.”
MM3 - Policy WLP1.1 Scale and Location of Growth

Home Builders Federation (Mark Behrendt)

Comment ID 68

Comment We do not agree with the modification to WLP1.1 that the 5 year housing land supply will be considered on the basis of the “Liverpool” approach which delivers any backlog across the remainder of the plan period. This approach is contrary with the guidance supporting the 2012 NPPF that seeks to address any backlog within five years of the plan being adopted.

Larkfleet Homes (DLP Planning Ltd (Emma Raine))

Comment ID 79

Comment Main Modification 3 says:

“Policy WLP1.1 – Scale and Location of Growth

In the period 2014 to 2036, the Council will:

- Make provision for the delivery of a minimum **8,223 dwellings** in Waveney (374 per year).
- Maximise opportunities for economic growth, with the aim of achieving a minimum of 5,000 additional jobs in To deliver this, make provision for:
  - 43 hectares of employment land for B1/B2/B8
  - 2,200m² (net) of convenience (food) and 11,000m² (net) of comparison (non-food) retail

Any shortfalls in housing delivery against the above target will be recovered over the entire plan period. As such, when calculating a five year supply requirement the Council will apportion any past shortfall against the target over the remaining plan period.

In order to sustainably deliver the growth targets set out above, new residential development will be distributed across the District approximately as follows:

- Lowestoft Area - **56%** of housing growth
- Beccles and Worlingham - **16%** of housing growth
- Halesworth and Holton - **8%** of housing growth
- Bungay - **6%** of housing growth
- Southwold and Reydon - **4%** of housing growth
- Rural Area - **10%** of housing growth (See Policy 1 for more detail on the distribution across rural villages)

Employment land development will be focused mainly in Lowestoft and Beccles and distributed approximately as follows:

- Lowestoft Area - **60%** of employment land development
- Beccles - **25%** of employment land development
Other Market Towns and Rural Areas - 15% of employment land development

60-70% of retail and leisure development will be focused in Lowestoft Town Centre as the District’s main town centre. Beccles as the next largest town centre should accommodate approximately 15% of retail and leisure development. The remaining proportion of development should come from within District Centres (Oulton Broad and Kirkley), Local Centres (including new Local Centres on large housing allocations) and other Market Towns Town Centres commensurate with the level of housing and employment growth.

Provision has been made in this Local Plan through site allocations and policies to deliver this scale and strategic distribution of growth. Neighbourhood Plans can allocate additional growth to meet local needs at a scale which does not undermine the overall distribution strategy.”

We do not support the proposed modifications to Policy 1 under MM3, with particular reference to using the ‘Liverpool’ approach to address past housing under delivery. This is also evident in AM4.

The submitted Local Plan advocated using the ‘Sedgefield’ approach; which would deal with under delivery in the first five years of the This was supported by us and to our knowledge no representations were put to the Council advocating use of the ‘Liverpool’ approach.

It now seems that to address the past shortfall in housing delivery against the housing requirement, the Liverpool Method is to be It is not at all clear why the Liverpool Method is now being used, particularly when there have been no changes to individual site delivery rates in the housing trajectory. The question is one of soundness, not could something, in retrospect, have been done differently. Therefore, there is no justification for making this change, and no soundness issues have been identified. Main Modifications should not be used to make non-soundness changes to a submitted Plan.

Norman Castleton

Comment ID 46

Comment Environment & Strategic Thinking

Environment Key Issues: The problem with this whole plan is that it is of the 1960s. There was an excuse then when the ‘human effect’ on the environment was not fully appreciated. There is no such excuse now. There is no mention of need to reduce carbon emissions to avoid runaway climate change as per the UN resolution December 2018. It is imperative that the ‘environment’ and the effect of any form of development or activity is assessed in terms of its effect on the environment. I see no such thinking in this plan. “We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them” [Albert Einstein]. Rather, we will forge ahead and carry on as we have done before make some vague noises about sustainability and use up more of the Earth’s scarce resources, expand outwards and for ever more until there is not a piece of green field left. Build more and more road space ignoring the fact that the more roads that are built the more traffic congestion builds. It already apparent that new roads do not bring more jobs or a safer travel environment. The only growth new roads will be more accidents and more ‘crime’. No thoughts here about more environmentally friendly forms of transport or building more within already urbanised areas. The ‘Precautionary Principle’. should be at the fore-front of all planners and decision makers thinking at this time. The people who are responsible for this plan should read the
works of Mayer Hillman.

And consider the quote from Jane Goodall “The most intellectual creature to ever walk Earth is destroying its only home”.

**Waveney plan overall strategic thinking for the area**
The problems with this plan are that it is fragmented and based on out of date planning ideas, in this case mainly from the 1960s. The plan lacks holistic and larger overall strategic thinking with piecemeal developments without thought about the consequences concerning the environment and services plus employment. The development concerning roads and transport are dependent upon factors occurring at the time of implementation or the beneficence of speculative builders. As it stands in its disjointed form it is a speculative builders charter without regard to the overall effect in Waveney. What does houses built to the highest architectural standards mean? If the estate housed built in recent times are anything to go by then they are not of any standard at all. The likely environmental consequences or influences of all this development is not considered but it should be. Where is the employment coming from? If part of the answer is tourism then why should holiday makers then what attracts holiday makers and the answer will be not another over developed area full of drab estate houses. What will be the effect of rising seas levels and what efforts will be required to offset this. Why has the Green Spaces strategy largely been ignored despite the claims in this document. The Shoreline Management Plan is not the answer as it has already proven to be inadequate re Hemsby & Suffolk Coastal and the Sizewell Nuclear Reactors will become vulnerable. Where are the medical & educational facilities to treat all these extra people? So little linked up thinking is in this plan and it needs a complete revision.

**Attached documents**

- Strategic thinking.rtf (4 KB)
- Environment key issues.rtf (4 KB)
MM4 - Policy WLP1.2 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Larkfleet Homes (DLP Planning Ltd (Emma Raine))

Comment ID 75
Comment MM4 proposes to delete policy WLP1.2:

“Delete Policy:

Policy WLP1.2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in Neighbourhood Plans) will be approved wherever possible without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application, or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision, planning permission will be granted unless:

- The proposal would undermine the achievement of the vision and the strategic priorities/objectives set out in this Local Plan;
- The adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against national planning policy; or
- Specific national planning policies indicate that development should be refused.”

We support the deletion of WLP1.2 (MM4) as this policy is unnecessary. There is no need to replicate Paragraph 14 of the Framework (2012) and we agree it should be deleted.

Norman Castleton

Comment ID 40
Comment Sustainable plan?

Waveney plan overall strategic thinking for the area
The problems with this plan are that it is fragmented and based on out of date planning ideas, in this case mainly from the 1960s. The plan lacks holistic and larger overall strategic thinking with piecemeal developments without thought about the consequences concerning the environment and services plus employment. The development concerning roads and transport are dependent upon factors occurring at the time of implementation or the beneficence of speculative builders. As it stands in its disjointed form it is a speculative builders charter without regard to the overall effect in Waveney. What does houses built to the highest architectural standards mean? If the estate housed built in recent times are anything to go by then they are not of any standard at all. The likely environmental consequences or influences of all this development is not considered but it should be. Where is the employment coming from? If part of the answer is tourism then why should holiday makers then what attracts holiday makers and the answer will be not another over developed area full of drab estate houses. What will be the effect of rising seas levels and
what efforts will be required to offset this. Why has the Green Spaces strategy largely been ignored despite the claims in this document. The Shoreline Management Plan is not the answer as it has already proven to be inadequate re Hemsby & Suffolk Coastal and the Sizewell Nuclear Reactors will become vulnerable. Where are the medical & educational facilities to treat all these extra people? So little linked up thinking is in this plan and it needs a complete revision.

Attached documents

Sustainable plan .rtf (3 KB)
MM5 - Every housing allocation policy: WLP2.4 / WLP2.6
/ WLP2.13 / WLP2.14 / WLP2.15 / WLP2.16 / WLP2.20 /
WLP3.1 / WLP3.2 / WLP4.1 / WLP4.2 / WLP4.3 / WLP4.4 /
WLP4.5 / WLP5.1 / WLP5.2 / WLP6.1 / WLP7.2 / WLP7.3 /

Beccles Town Council (C Boyne)

Comment ID 60
Comment 3. That throughout the whole plan, the number of properties per development area should be stated as a maximum number, rather than approximate number of properties. This will ensure that aggressive developers will be unable to cram in more than the indicated number of properties within an area, but would be able to build fewer if appropriate.

Larkfleet Homes (DLP Planning Ltd (Emma Raine))

Comment ID 76
Comment MM5 proposes the following:

“Add the word ‘approximately’ before each reference to dwelling numbers in housing site allocation policies.”

We also support MM5 which proposes to add the word ‘approximately’ before each reference to dwelling numbers in housing site allocation policies. This ensures that an upper limit is not applied to the allocation should the relevant technical reports demonstrate a higher number of homes could be accommodated on site.

Ms crook

Comment ID 61
Comment WLP6.1 Land at Copperwheat Ave, Reydon was agreed to have 'up to 220 houses' when taking into consideration the other housing developments already agreed to be built in the area, by replacing 'up to' with 'approximately' this gives way to a much larger amount of houses being built on this piece of land which the village cannot support and does not need.

Somerleyton Estate (Lord Somerleyton) (Evolution Town Planning (David Barker))

Comment ID 122
These representations have been prepared on behalf of the Somerleyton Estate. The Somerleyton Estate is a major employer and landowner in the village of Somerleyton and the surrounding area. It has a close and long term interest in the vitality of the village and the rural area around it. The Estate provides long term employment, facilities and services in the village and the surrounding area. Evolution Town Planning has worked with the Somerleyton Estate throughout the preparation of the Local Plan, and we attended the Examination on behalf of the Estate.

The Estate is the landowner of the site for two housing allocations which are WPL7.5 – Land North of The Street, Somerleyton which allocates approximately 10 homes. and Policy WPL7.6 – Mill Farm Field, Somerleyton which allocates approximately 35 homes.

We support the amendments to both these planning policies which preface the number of dwellings to be delivered by the policy with the word approximately. This provides important flexibility in the policy. Detailed design is not yet underway on these sites, and flexibility in the housing numbers allows the design process, and the assessment of local housing needs to be taken into account after the plan is adopted. There is a recognition in Somerleyton village and in the Local Plan that smaller homes are required. Delivering this may require flexibility in housing numbers to be delivered.

The Somerleyton Estate remains committed to delivering high quality development on both allocated sites in its ownership. The Estate owners have a long term interest in ensuring that the local area thrives and delivering much needed homes in Somerleyton is part of that aim.

The change to the policies is supported and is necessary to achieve soundness by ensuring that the Local Plan is “Justified” by reason of being the most appropriate strategy and “Effective” by being deliverable.

Sotterley Estate (Tom Barne) (Evolution Town Planning (David Barker))

The Sotterley Estate is a major landowner in the villages of Sotterley and Willingham and the surrounding area. Evolution Town Planning has worked with the Sotterley Estate throughout the preparation of the Local Plan. We attended the Examination on behalf of the Estate.

The Estate is the landowner of the site for the housing allocation reference WPL7.16 – Land East of Woodfield Close, Willingham which allocates approximately 10 homes.

We support the amendment to this planning policy which prefaces the number of dwellings to be delivered by the policy with the word approximately. This provides important flexibility in the policy. Detailed design is not yet underway on this site, and flexibility in the housing numbers allows the design process, and the assessment of local housing needs to be taken into account after the plan is adopted.

The change to the policies is supported and is necessary to achieve soundness by ensuring that the Local Plan is “Justified” by reason of being the most appropriate strategy and “Effective” by being deliverable.
Strategy for the Lowestoft Area

MM6 - Policy WLP2.1 Central and Coastal Lowestoft Regeneration

Environment Agency (Liam Robson)

Comment ID  19

Comment  In previous responses we stressed the importance of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) being a vital document, informing flood risk to allocations and to guide the sequential test. This should still be included.
MM7 - Policy WLP2.2 PowerPark

Associated British Ports  (Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd (P Rowell))

Comment ID  87

Comment  ABP welcomes the changes proposed through this main modification as they address matters relating to the soundness of this policy that were raised by ABP in its evidence to the Local Plan examination.

Norman Castleton

Comment ID  41

Comment  Power park- I would suggest that some of the new buildings within the Hamilton Dock area have already infringed the conditions outlined herein.
MM8 - Policy WLP2.3 Peto Square

Associated British Ports  (Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd (P Rowell))

Comment ID  88

Comment  ABP welcomes the change proposed through this main modification, which in turn results from the redefining of the boundary of this site allocation to remove land that is within the statutory Port of Lowestoft area (see also modifications PM2, PM3 and PM4 to the Policies Map). These changes collectively address matters relating to the soundness of the plan in respect of this matter that were raised by ABP in its evidence to the Local Plan examination.
MM9 - After paragraph 2.27 / WLP2.3 Peto Square

Associated British Ports (Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd (P Rowell))

Comment ID 89

Comment ABP welcomes the proposed additional paragraph of text which ensures that the local plan contains a consistent and sound position in respect of potential development proposals on sites in close proximity to the Port of Lowestoft.
MM11 - After Paragraph 2.36 / WLP2.4 Kirkley Waterfront and Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood

Associated British Ports (Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd (P Rowell))

Comment ID 90

Comment ABP welcomes the proposed additional paragraph of text which ensures that the local plan contains a consistent and sound position in respect of potential development proposals on sites in close proximity to the Port of Lowestoft.
MM12 - Policy WLP2.4 / WLP2.4 Kirkley Waterfront and Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood

Associated British Ports  (Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd (P Rowell))

**Comment ID** 91

**Comment** ABP welcomes – for the reasons set out in its evidence to the examination – the insertion in this policy of the criteria which makes clear that any pedestrian and cycle bridge provided at Brooke Penninsula ‘should be an opening bridge and should not cause an unacceptable adverse impact upon navigation and other harbour operations’. This addresses relevant matters of soundness that were raised by ABP in its evidence to the Local Plan examination.

During the examination process, ABP were asked by the Inspector to provide a view on an earlier aspect of this policy relating to whether this policy should make specific reference to port development. This view – and an explanation of the context behind providing that view - was provided in a note (Examination document reference H14). ABP notes that the Council provided a response to this note (Examination document reference H23). For the avoidance of doubt, ABP do not accept some of the points raised in the Council’s response, but recognise that prolonging a debate on these matters is not of assistance or particular relevance to the current consultation exercise on the proposed modifications. A detailed response to the Council’s H23 note can, however, be provided if either the Council or the Inspector consider this would be of assistance to the local plan examination process.

Environment Agency (Liam Robson)

**Comment ID** 20

**Comment** We are pleased to see that the plan now states that a “full investigation report assessing the risk of ground contamination should be submitted with any planning application”. This modification ensure that contamination would be managed appropriately.

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

**Comment ID** 103

**Comment** The County Council welcomes the amendments in relation to:
- Primary School/pre-school size and site size and
- Development which is part of ancillary to the Lake Lothing Third Crossing
The County Council has previously set out its position in relation to the mechanism for securing developer contributions towards new early education/pre school provision. The reference towards on-site provision being funded through Section 106 is welcomed.
MM15 - After paragraph 2.47 / Policy WLP2.7 Former Battery Green Car Park

Associated British Ports  (Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd (P Rowell))

Comment ID  92

Comment  ABP welcomes the proposed additional paragraph of text which ensures that the local plan contains a consistent and sound position in respect of potential development proposals on sites in close proximity to the Port of Lowestoft.
MM16 - Policy WLP2.8 Former Lowestoft Hospital

Norman Castleton

| Comment ID | 44 |
| Comment | It is an absolute disgrace that this hospital site should be used for any other reason than health. |
MM17 - Policy WLP2.9 Historic High Street and Scores Area

Norman Castleton

Comment ID 45

Comment This area has been sadly neglected and allowed to rot. Look at the state of Mariner’s Score & Crown Score. This despite funds being given for the refurbishment of these historic sites. With some of the safeguards removed regarding new development I have little faith that this area will ever be improved.
MM18 - Policy WLP2.10 Inner Harbour Port Area

Associated British Ports  (Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd (P Rowell))

Comment ID  93

Comment  ABP welcomes the changes to policy WLP2.10 which the Council propose to make through Main Modification MM18. The modifications proposed address relevant matters of soundness raised by ABP in its evidence to the Local Plan examination.

In addition to the matters covered by this proposed modification, ABP’s evidence to the examination also questioned whether the policy and supporting text needed to more positively plan for the up-to-date level of growth at the Port which is considered likely to occur over the plan period, primarily that growth associated with the needs of the offshore energy sector for which only limited opportunities remain in the Outer Harbour Port Area (see comments provided on additional modification AM10).

Although ABP considers that further changes, along the lines suggested in its evidence, should be made in this regard to this part of the Plan, it notes the Council’s position (set out in paragraphs 52 to 54 of its Matter 6 Examination Hearing Statement) that it considers policy WLP2.10 does set out a positive and supportive approach to port related development within the Inner Harbour area, and that the policy constitutes a site allocation policy (i.e. a positive promotional policy rather than simply a protective safeguarding policy). Clearly, on this basis, this is how the policy will be interpreted going forward, even if no further changes are made.

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID  104

Comment  The County Council welcomes the amendment relating to the Lake Lothing Third Crossing.
MM21 - Paragraph 2.80, Policy WLP2.13 North Lowestoft Garden Village

Peter Mackay

Comment ID 15

Comment
It is encouraging to see that the word “may” has replaced “will”, but without any further guidance on what might determine such a possibility, this remains a great concern. A far preferable modification would be to simply state that access will not be granted to the development from Corton Long Lane at any time during development and following completion.

Corton Long Lane is completely unsuitable to bear any increase in construction, residential, or through traffic for the following reasons:

The road is narrow and any degree of parking on it causes problems for traffic flow.

The road is something of a local landmark. It is a leafy, tree lined, largely unlit rural lane and should retain its unique identity.

The pavement is narrow and on one side only. I have witnessed people with prams or dogs having to use the roadway. This is unsafe and would be more so if construction and development traffic were added.

The road is part of a cycleway.

Should the development at Gunton Park go ahead (WLP 2.20) there will already be a very considerable increase in traffic on the road to access it.

The plan now states that land to the south of the development (WLP 2.13 North Lowestoft Garden Village) i.e. land that borders Corton Long Lane, should not be developed in order to ensure the identity of the existing village of Corton. It would therefore seem completely incongruous to allow access through this area.

There is already in existence a roundabout junction on the A47, not far north of the Corton Long Lane junction, where access is gained to the Water Treatment Centre. This access would be far more suitable, much safer and more centrally placed to the development.

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID 105

Comment
This amendment is acceptable to the County Council as Highway Authority. Any proposed access from Corton Long Lane will be assessed as part of a planning application and will be subject to any mitigation identified at that time. As noted in the supporting text, the development will necessitate new or improved access from the A47 and, in line with this, there is likely to be a limit on the amount of new development which can be accessed from
Corton Long Lane.
We are encouraged by the inspectors findings and comments but wish to stress the importance of the following as our concern is with so many new developments in close proximity to Corton already taking place over development would end the villages identity. There are some 1400 homes planned so we are struggling to see how this could be anything but a problem for Corton.

- Set out detailed arrangements for access on to the site.

We wish to endorse this as we will need to work closely with existing residents.

We strongly oppose any access to the new site being in Corton Long Lane. This is from a safety and environmental point of view causing the less inconvenience to existing residents including access to Corton. Corton Long Lane is already becoming a very busy cut through so an increase in traffic of this size would be a real problem. Our opinion is access should be from the A47 either by creating a new slip road or access being provided on the roundabout that is in between the Corton and Hopton roundabouts. This is the safest and less intrusive option.

- Set out the distribution of land-uses across the site. The primary school, local shopping centre and retirement community should be located centrally on the site.

We need to be reassured this will not impact on Corton existing primary school.

- Ensure the identity of the existing village of Corton is maintained.

As above crucial to our village and residents and we wish to stress the need to be actively involved in any plans and developments.

- Ensure there is no adverse effect on the operation of the water treatment works.

We need assurance the safety and operation will be unaffected.

The village already suffers from low water pressure so this needs to be addressed with any plans.

- Set out the approach to phasing of development across the site.

We wish to be advised as to when this will/may start and how the development will grow etc. Crucial to keep residents involved.

- Set out detailed urban design guidance and demonstrate how the principles of garden city developments can be met on the site.
Include an assessment of ecology and identify key ecological networks and habitats to be preserved and enhanced through the development.

Planned area is important for existing wildlife and providing greenery to surrounding area. How will the new development be screened, if at all? and how will existing wildlife be catered for.

- Be informed by evidence of archaeology.

Important we are kept informed.

- Set out the approach to infrastructure delivery on the site.

It is crucial we are informed as soon as possible of any/updated detailed developments

- Housing development on the site should help facilitate the delivery of the employment land.

Would be good to see how this statement can be clarified.

**Norman Castleton**

**Comment ID** 42

**Comment** As my original comments I think this plan for a garden village north of Corton is ill conceived and detracts from any future as a holiday or tourist area.

**Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)**

**Comment ID** 106

**Comment** The County Council welcomes the updated reference to the land requirement for the primary school and the requirement that all site-specific infrastructure (on- and off-site) be funded via planning obligations.
MM23 - Policy WLP2.14 Land North of Union Lane, Oulton

David Henwood

Comment ID 2
Comment Dear Sir

I am writing again to submit my concerns regarding the allowance of pedestrian & cycle access to Union Lane in Oulton from the proposed housing development planned { WLP2-14 & WLP-15 } as explained many times the road is too narrow to have any extra cycles or people using it on a daily basis, we have a constant flow of pedestrians walking dogs up and down the lane, Cars, large farm vehicles, and lorries delivering and collecting from many addresses with in the lane, and adding to this would undoubtedly bring accidents that do not need to happen, I would urgently request that you reconsider these access areas and would respectfully ask that someone in authority visits the area to have a look for themselves, and discuss with the people that live here before allowing this to happen,

please reply to these comments

Yours Faithfully

D.B Henwood

Karma McLean

Comment ID 63
Comment This land should not be approved . There is still knotweed growing towards the edge of the land that back against the properties on Parkhill and Lothingland Close and has had a history of knotweed for a number of years.

The path access that is already along Parkhill is access to people's gardens that own the houses on Parkhill. Any lengthening of the pathway to the proposed entrance on pathhill will narrow the road that is already dangerous.

The access that you say would be used from Parkhill is also going to be another dangerous addition to an already hazardrous road. The road is too busy and too narrow for an access to so many dwellings.

Karma McLean

Comment ID 66
Comment

As previously stated the pathway being extended on Parkhill would be dangerous as it would narrow the road further and it is already very narrow. The path already on Parkhill is access to the houses on Parkhill.

The entrance to Union Lane is already very busy and hazardous. There are too many parked cars which make access tricky and the exit from union lane on to Parkhill is a busy junction.

The pedestrian crossing already on Parkhill is dangerous as it is in an area where paths are already too narrow, the road is narrow, the required speed changes several times and there is a busy junction. This makes it dangerous already so adding anything to this would make matters worse.

Oldman Homes (Philip Oldman) (Bidwells (Darren Cogman))

Comment ID 97

Comment

Main Modifications Consultation (MM23)
Bidwells on behalf of Oldman Homes Ltd. in respect of WLP2.14 – Land North of Union Lane, Oulton.

Bidwells are instructed on behalf of Oldman Homes Ltd. to comment on the Main Modifications consultation in respect of Policy WLP2.14 and the proposed additional paragraph within the supporting text, paragraph 2.97.

We note that the Main Modifications propose incorporating “approximately” prior to the quantum of development (150 dwellings).

We also note that the Main Modifications proposes to incorporate an additional bullet point, as follows: “If needed at the time of the planning application, 0.09 hectares of land on the site should be reserved for a new pre-school setting” that is qualified by an additional policy paragraph, as follows: If required, land for the pre-school setting will be transferred to the Council in accordance with the payment in kind provisions of Regulation 73 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended).”

Comments

We support the incorporation of the word ‘approximately’ before the proposed quantum of dwellings, to provide flexibility for the most appropriate number of dwellings to be delivered, and ensure the most efficient use of land based on the most up-to-date evidence at the time of a planning application, in accordance with section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

We acknowledge the potential need (to be determined at the time of the planning application) for 0.09 hectares of land on the site to be reserved for a new pre-school setting, and support the delivery mechanism to secure it, in accordance with the payment in kind provisions of Regulation 73 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations (as amended).

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)
Comment ID 107

Comment The County Council welcomes the provision of land for a new pre-school setting and has previously set out its position in relation to the mechanism for securing said land.
MM24 - Paragraph 2.98 / Policy WLP2.15 Land Between Hall Lane and Union Lane, Oulton

Karma McLean

Comment ID 65

Comment As per my previous comments, union lane is already very narrow. There are too many parked vehicles so access through that road is not suitable for many firms of transport. Adding to the traffic through this road would increase all previously stated dangers.

Lee Mason and Alison Lund

Comment ID 27

Comment The original proposal correctly stated that "Union Lane is a narrow road of rural character and it is not appropriate to provide vehicular access to this site" (ie WLP2.15). The amendment seeks to significantly weaken this by allowing the possibility of "safe and suitable access" for vehicles being allowed onto Union Lane.

Let me be clear, past the junction with Airey Close, Union Lane is essentially a single track road with a dangerous blind bend. To even admit the possibility of thinking of allowing 200 houses (and thus potentially 400 vehicles or more) vehicular access onto this stretch leaves me utterly incredulous. I appreciate that there is caveat regarding whether this can be done safely in the revised proposal but as a long-time resident of Union Lane I can assure you that this is not possible and to even admit the possibility of it being done safely is the height of folly. This ill-thought out and frankly dangerous amendment needs to be removed immediately before it is somehow approved and there is a serious accident on this stretch of road.

Sharon Corbin (Bidwells (Darren Cogman))

Comment ID 95

Comment Main Modifications Consultation (MM24 & MM25)

Bidwells on behalf of Sharon Corbin in respect of WLP2.15 – Land Between Hall Lane and Union Lane, Oulton

Bidwells are instructed on behalf of Sharon Corbin to comment on the Main Modifications consultation in respect of Policy WLP2.15 and the proposed additional paragraph within the supporting text, paragraph 2.104, and the modified text 2.103.

We note that the Main Modifications propose incorporating “approximately” prior to the quantum of development (190 dwellings).

We also note that the Main Modifications proposes to incorporate an additional bullet point, as follows: “If needed at the time of the planning application, 0.09 hectares of land on the site
should be reserved for a new pre-school setting” that is qualified by an additional policy paragraph, as follows: “If required, land for the pre-school setting will be transferred to the Council in accordance with the payment in kind provisions of Regulation 73 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended).”

We also note that the Main Modifications, in respect of access, reads as follows: “Vehicular access should be primarily off Hall Lane. A secondary vehicular access could be provided off Union Lane subject to demonstration that the access is safe and suitable…….” that is qualified by “Vehicular access is possible from Hall Lane. Union Lane, being narrower and less suitable for through traffic, could provide a secondary vehicular access subject to demonstration that safe and suitable access could be provided for all users, including those accessing the Public Rights of Way network to the north and west” (para 2.103).

Comments
We support the incorporation of the word ‘approximately’ before the proposed quantum of dwellings, to provide flexibility for the most appropriate number of dwellings to be delivered, and ensure the most efficient use of land based on the most up-to-date evidence at the time of a planning application, in accordance with section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

We acknowledge the potential need (to be determined at the time of the planning application) for 0.09 hectares of land on the site to be reserved for a new pre-school setting, and support the delivery mechanism to secure it, in accordance with the payment in kind provisions of Regulation 73 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations (as amended).

We acknowledge and support the proposed wording in respect of vehicular access to the site (MM24 and MM25) as it provides flexibility subject to appropriate evidence being provided.

**Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>This wording is useful for clarifying the constraint on potential secondary access from Union Lane, and the need to consider pedestrians and cyclists. The lack of footway on Union Lane, West of Airey Close, is a limiting factor which helps lead to the conclusion that the access should only be secondary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MM25 - Policy WLP2.15 Land Between Hall Lane and Union Lane, Oulton

Karma McLean

Comment ID 64

Comment You also refer to pedestrian and cycle access to Union Lane. This is already a dangerous junction and the pedestrian crossing that is already on the road is very dangerous because of the narrowing of the road. There is too much going on in one small road area for anyone on the road to be able to concentrate on all of them at once.

Lee Mason and Alison Lund

Comment ID 28

Comment See my comment to MM24. Union Lane is utterly unsuited to a vehicular access from WLP2.15 and this amendment should be withdrawn immediately before it is somehow passed and a serious accident (not to mention ongoing congestion on what is a single track road with a blind bend) results.

Sharon Corbin (Bidwells (Darren Cogman))

Comment ID 96

Comment Main Modifications Consultation (MM24 & MM25)

Bidwells on behalf of Sharon Corbin in respect of WLP2.15 – Land Between Hall Lane and Union Lane, Oulton

Bidwells are instructed on behalf of Sharon Corbin to comment on the Main Modifications consultation in respect of Policy WLP2.15 and the proposed additional paragraph within the supporting text, paragraph 2.104, and the modified text 2.103.

We note that the Main Modifications propose incorporating “approximately” prior to the quantum of development (190 dwellings).

We also note that the Main Modifications proposes to incorporate an additional bullet point, as follows: “If needed at the time of the planning application, 0.09 hectares of land on the site should be reserved for a new pre-school setting” that is qualified by an additional policy paragraph, as follows: “If required, land for the pre-school setting will be transferred to the Council in accordance with the payment in kind provisions of Regulation 73 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended).”

We also note that the Main Modifications, in respect of access, reads as follows: “Vehicular access should be primarily off Hall Lane. A secondary vehicular access could be provided off
Union Lane subject to demonstration that the access is safe and suitable….” that is qualified by “Vehicular access is possible from Hall Lane. Union Lane, being narrower and less suitable for through traffic, could provide a secondary vehicular access subject to demonstration that safe and suitable access could be provided for all users, including those accessing the Public Rights of Way network to the north and west” (para 2.103).

Comments

We support the incorporation of the word ‘approximately’ before the proposed quantum of dwellings, to provide flexibility for the most appropriate number of dwellings to be delivered, and ensure the most efficient use of land based on the most up-to-date evidence at the time of a planning application, in accordance with section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

We acknowledge the potential need (to be determined at the time of the planning application) for 0.09 hectares of land on the site to be reserved for a new pre-school setting, and support the delivery mechanism to secure it, in accordance with the payment in kind provisions of Regulation 73 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations (as amended).

We acknowledge and support the proposed wording in respect of vehicular access to the site (MM24 and MM25) as it provides flexibility subject to appropriate evidence being provided.

---

**Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>The County Council welcomes the provision of land for a new pre-school setting and has previously set out its position in relation to the mechanism for securing land and funding for this new provision. The amended wording in respect of access is acceptable; the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be prioritised in determining whether the access is safe and suitable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MM26 - WLP2.16 Land South of The Street, Carlton Colville/Gisleham

Adam Robertson

Comment ID 62

Comment I am concerned that there is no vehicular access directly to the A12, which will lead to more congestion in The Street, Gisleham Road and Hall Road, during the start and end of the day, for Carlton Colville Primary School. This needs to be looked at very closely, before proposing this development.

I am equally concerned about the flooding risk, especially after the Kirkley Stream flooded in July 2015. I can't believe that building 900 homes, on a flood plain is sustainable. Indeed, is it even sensible to do so?

Environment Agency (Liam Robson)

Comment ID 21

Comment We previously recommended that the Level 2 SFRA is referenced as it provides further detail on flood risk and provides recommendations for the new development. We would stress the importance of the level 2 SFRA and the need to include reference to it in the policy.

Julian Rogers

Comment ID 26

Comment
1. The current plan is still proposing a new access road to the proposed housing estate to the west of Bell Farm within close, extremely close, proximity of a scheduled monument (25-30 mtrs). This will be significant cultural and heritage vandalism. It will not preserve the setting or context of the moated site contrary to all best practice and advice and will be both highly visible and high impact. It also would be contrary to the view of Historic England in their comments on current road infrastructure.

2. The proposed access road to the west of Bell Farm will also destroy a natural flood defence and conflict with the Kirkley stream flood mitigation plans as well as ancient meadow land. The field should be left untouched and preserved as flood mitigation and part of the country park or, as mentioned, provided as land suitable for the land owners equestrian facilities.

3. The current proposals do not recognise or address the congestion and traffic flow issues that will arise in The Street, Hall Road, Lowestoft Road and other adjoining sub-roads. It does not protect or enhance the historic centre of the old village from the extreme pressure on traffic nor pedestrian movement. It will also mean the destruction of ancient hedging, mature trees as well as ancient meadow land to create access to the east of Bell Farm. This
is a disaster of a development proposal that runs contrary to all common sense given all the options available and will have a negative impact on existing residents..

**Attached documents**
- Scheduled monument proximity to proposed access road.jpg (1.6 MB)
- View from proposed access to new development showing close proximity to scheduled monument on right.jpg (1.5 MB)
- View eastwards along The Street showing existing congestion.jpg (2.7 MB)
- Mature trees and hedging to be destroyed in proposals.jpg (2.4 MB)

**Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)**

**Comment ID** 110

**Comment**
The County Council welcomes the amendments related to the school site and mineral resources.

The County Council welcomes the commitment to funding the Bloodmoor Roundabout improvements through a planning obligation as this helps ensure timely delivery of this piece of infrastructure.

However, the use of a planning condition and a Section 278 Agreement (under the Highways Act 1980) may prove more effective. The County Council as Highway Authority would support consideration of this mechanism at the time of the planning application.
MM28 - Policy WLP2.19 Oakes Farm, Beccles Road, Carlton Colville

Essex and Suffolk Water (Savills (Mr Hodgson))

Comment ID 72

Comment
I write on behalf of my client Essex & Suffolk Water in response to the current Local Plan Modifications consultation. Specifically this letter follows up our representation to Policy WLP2.19 Oakes Farm, Beccles Road, Carlton Colville which sought changes to the enabling development within the policy and the criteria to be considered when an application is submitted.

Following the Examination in Public Policy WLP2.19 is proposed to be modified as follows (MM28):

Policy WLP2.19 – Oakes Farm, Beccles Road, Carlton Colville

Land at Oakes Farm, Beccles Road, Carlton Colville (30.23 hectares) as identified on the Policies Map is allocated for sports and leisure uses.

The site should deliver at least 20.75 hectares of sports pitches, non-pitch sports and other sports and leisure facilities to relevant standards together with changing facilities and car parking.

Up to Approximately 6.23 hectares of the site, to the north of the site, fronting on to Beccles Road is to be developed for complementary commercial development to enable the delivery of the sports development. As part of any mixed-use scheme a limited amount of residential development may also be permitted on this land in order to deliver the sports development. Development on this part of the site should not be commenced until the 20.75 hectares of land has been made available for sports and leisure use.

The site should be developed in accordance with the following site specific criteria:

- Existing rights of way should be retained.
- A cycle route should be provided from Wood Lane to Chapel Road.
- The route of any future A146 Barnby Bypass should be protected.
- The County Wildlife Site, hedgerows, ditches and trees should be conserved and enhanced through development.
- The impact of any floodlighting on wildlife and residential amenity should be mitigated.
- Pitches and other sports facilities should be located in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring properties.
- A landscaping scheme should be prepared to integrate the site within the landscape.
- An ecological assessment undertaken by a suitably qualified person will be required as part of any planning application.
- A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan should be submitted with any planning application.
- Any planning application is to be supported by the results of a programme of archaeological evaluation, including appropriate fieldwork, and should demonstrate the impacts of development on archaeological remains and proposals for managing those impacts.
- The route of the existing clean water pipe serving the wider Lowestoft area should be
On behalf of our client we support the above alterations to Policy WLP2.19 and the equivalent supporting text changes in the Council’s Additional Modifications.

Sport England (Philip Raiswell)

Comment ID 52

Comment Sport England are supportive of this policy which is considered to be sound and will ensure the provision of new facilities for outdoor sport, in line with the recommendation of the Waveney DC Playing Pitch Strategy (2013).
MM29 - Policy WLP2.20 Gunton Park, off Old Lane, Corton

Sport England (Philip Raiswell)

Comment ID 53

Comment Sport England are supportive of the modification to this policy to include the need to also provide a replacement cricket field, as this meets our recommended amendment requested in our response to this policy at final draft stage (May 2018). The policy is now considered to be sound.
Strategy for Beccles and Worlingham

MM33 - Policy WLP3.1 Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood

Beccles Town Council (C Boyne)

Comment ID 56

Comment 1. That any new development proposed within the town should ensure that the charm and character of the town is maintained. This could be provided for under the relevant policies for Beccles.

Beccles Town Council (C Boyne)

Comment ID 59

Comment 2. That under Policy WLP3.1 the proposed Country Park is an important requirement of the proposed garden neighbourhood development and must be included, but the Council agrees that the actual location does not need to be defined at this stage. However the Council is pleased to note that a cycle link along Ellough Road, connecting the proposed and existing employment areas with proposed and existing residential areas, has been specified in the modifications.

Beccles Townlands Trust & Chenerys' Land Partnership (Griffiths) (Wheatman Planning Ltd. (Deirdre Linehan))

Comment ID 102

Comment The Inspector’s conclusion to retain the outline Masterplan and Masterplan report as part of the considerations for the proper planning of this site are to be welcomed. However, the final paragraph of Policy WP3.1 does not, in our opinion, provide explicit guidance on what is required from the detailed Masterplan to be submitted with any planning application. This final paragraph of the Policy has been modified to take account of the Inspector’s comments, requiring the detailed Masterplan to be based on the outline masterplan in Figure 13 and be informed by the Masterplan Report. However, we are of the opinion that as a result of this modification the Policy currently omits an explicit requirement for the detailed Masterplan to be for the whole site and signed-up to by all the relevant landowners. We would, therefore, suggest an appropriate modification should be made to this paragraph of the Policy. To do so would ensure the comprehensive and proper planning...
of the proposed Garden Neighbourhood. It would also be consistent with the Inspector’s acknowledgement of the role of the Masterplan in the development of this allocation. Thereafter, any planning applications submitted on the site would need to demonstrate how the proposal delivered the relevant section of the allocation within the framework established by the detailed Masterplan; if the application were to be for part of the allocated site as opposed to the whole.

The Policy stipulates the relevant on-site infrastructure and facilities will be secured via s106 obligations. We would suggest the Policy is further modified so that the detailed Masterplan requires the identification of appropriate trigger points for these vital parts of the mixed-use development and associated infrastructure. While the modification would require the detailed Masterplan to be based on the outline version contained in Figure 13 and also informed by the Masterplan report, the Policy should provide clear guidance on what should be addressed in the detailed Masterplan, enabling the delivery of the comprehensive Garden Neighbourhood in manner consistent with the objectives of the Local Plan (as noted in paragraph 3.18); thus providing the out-working of the outline Masterplan as informed by the Masterplan Report.

Furthermore, to assist with the comprehensive development of the allocation, the requirement for landowners to enter into a legal agreement with the LPA to make provision for services, vehicular and pedestrian access across land ownership boundaries (paragraph 3.19) should be included within the text of the Policy. Again, these are crucial considerations in bringing forward the detailed Masterplan based on the outline version and ensuring cooperation across different landownerships. This approach would give greater weight to the issue in the determination of any applications for planning permission and avoid undermining a comprehensive approach to delivery or frustrates delivery of any part of the site (para. 3.20).

With these additional modifications, we consider the Policy would deliver the Inspector’s requirements for the detailed Masterplan to be based on the outline version (Figure 13) and informed by the Masterplan Report. It would also be consistent with the guidance of the NPPF for front-loaded engagement.

Larkfleet Homes (DLP Planning Ltd (Emma Raine))

Comment ID 74

Comment Larkfleet have an interest in land west of Ellough Road to the south of Beccles and Worlingham (the greater part of allocated site WLP3.1). It was not challenged at the Examination that there is an expectation that the Larkfleet land will come forward first, will provide for the majority of the facilities that will define the development as a Garden Neighbourhood and in doing so will unlock the development of the remainder of the site.

Although the site proposed by Larkfleet has been allocated in the Local Plan, which we fully support, we consider there are numerous soundness issues with the specific terms of the allocation which we have highlighted during the previous stages of Local Plan consultation and during the Examination hearings. Some of these issues have been addressed by the proposed
modifications, we do however retain some concerns.

**Main Modification 33: Policy WLP3.1 - Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood**

Main Modification 33 proposes to amend the wording of Policy WLP3.1 as follows:

“Land south of the built up areas of Beccles and Worlingham, between Ellough Road and M&H Plastics (89.80 hectares) as identified on the Policies Map is allocated for a comprehensive mixed use development including:

- **Approximately** 1,250 new dwellings;
- Retirement community comprising a care home / nursing home and extra care and/or sheltered dwellings;
- 2 form entry primary school including and a pre-school setting (2.2 hectares);
- Country park, indoor/outdoor sports facilities, allotments, play areas and public open space (at least 25 hectares);
- Community Hub comprising a convenience store, local shops, community centre and pre-school setting;
- Employment development (falling under use classes B1, B2 and B8) (5 hectares). The site should be developed in accordance with the following site specific criteria:
  - The site will be developed at a density of approximately 30 dwellings per hectare.
  - Vehicular access should be from two points along the Beccles Southern Relief Road.
  - **Vehicular access to the employment development should be from Ellough Road.**
- A permeable and legible layout should be prepared. Road layout and access should encourage traffic to travel into Beccles westwards along the Southern Relief Road.
- Pedestrian and cycle links should be provided to Bluebell Way, Cucumber Lane, Darby Road, Nicholson Drive, Oak Lane, Field View Gardens/Foxglove Close and Cedar Drive.
- Development proposals must support the delivery of the community facilities, access and utilities across the entire garden neighbourhood in accordance with informed by the principles set out in the Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood Masterplan Report.
- Development which would undermine comprehensive development of the site will not be permitted.
- The primary school and community hub should be located in a central location within the site which has good accessibility from the new community as well as the existing community of south Beccles and Worlingham.
- Any C2 uses and retirement housing should be provided in a central location on the site, close to the new services and facilities.
- **The country park including a cycle path should be provided along the boundary of the site with Ellough Road.**
- A strategic landscaping scheme should preserve existing and historic field boundaries and aid in the creation of distinct character areas within the
- Public rights of way on the site should be preserved and
- Natural features on the site such as ponds, trees and hedgerows should be retained and incorporated into the layout of the Views towards Beccles Church should be created through the layout of open space.
- A landscaped buffer should separate the employment land from housing.
- A landscaped strip a minimum of 10 metres wide should be provided along the southern edge of the
- The woodland by the western edge of the site should be retained and
- A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan should be submitted with any planning
- Any planning application is to be supported by the results of a programme of archaeological evaluation, including appropriate fieldwork, and should demonstrate the impacts of
development on archaeological remains and proposals for managing those

On-site infrastructure, including the primary school and pre-school provision, community centre, cycle link along Ellough Road, sports fields and open space will be secured and funded through Section 106 planning obligations. More detail is in Appendix 1.

A detailed masterplan based on the outline masterplan in Figure 13, and informed by incorporating the Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood Masterplan Report principles in the accompanying masterplan report and by ongoing engagement with the community, should be prepared in consultation with the community and submitted as part of any planning application.”

Our client supports the addition of the word ‘approximately’ to the number of dwellings the allocation could This ensures that an upper limit is not applied to the allocation should the relevant technical reports demonstrate a higher number of homes could be accommodated on either the land controlled by Larkfleet or on the remainder controlled by others. Our client has previously submitted representations to this effect, confirming that the site in its totality could deliver in the region of 1,475 dwellings whilst still meeting the provision for green space and community facilities necessary to deliver the Plan’s objectives.

The clarification of education requirements confirming both a 2-form entry primary school and a pre-school are supported insofar as the amendment recognises that the provisions may or may not be conjoined on a common site

Whilst specific reference to the provision of vehicular access for the employment area to be taken from Ellough Road is also supported – as there is otherwise no realistic prospect of providing access to meet such provision located in this general area of the site - Larkfleet consider that the amendment risks precluding proper consideration through Masterplanning and consideration of highways issues of the scope to improve connectivity between the site and the existing built up We previously made the case in our Matter 7 Hearing Statement that safe and suitable vehicular access could be taken from Ellough Road which should not solely be limited to serving the employment land so as to ensure an orderly form of development.

The additional clause should be further modified to read:

“Vehicular access may be provided from Ellough Road to serve the employment development and improve connectivity with the existing urban area.”

Our client also supports the replacement of “in accordance with” to “informed by” when reference is made to the Council’s own This ensures the Council’s masterplan, at Figure 13, which appears not to have had full regard to technical evidence and the specific constraints and opportunities presented by the land identified by Policy WLP3.1, does not inhibit the delivery of the site such that the development can come forward in a timely manner and deliver the wider objectives of the Plan.

In this regard we note that this supported amendment is not reflected in the final paragraph of the Policy which should be further modified to state:

“A detailed masterplan based on the outline masterplan in Figure 13, and informed by incorporating the Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood Masterplan Report and masterplan in Figure 13 ...”

Within our Local Plan representations at various stages and as set out at the Examination hearings, our client indicated that it does not support the provision of a ‘Country park’ in the
form or location as depicted on the submission version of the Local Plan. Moreover, we questioned why land adjacent to Ellough Road should be labelled as a Country Park when larger areas of open greenspace in the western part of the site were not so labelled. Following further engagement with Natural England, it is demonstrably not necessary to provide a ‘Country park’ in the form and location depicted on the Figure 13 Masterplan and we consider that to do so is misleading as its inclusion is not soundly based in evidence; there is no evidence which sets out the need for this open space typology, nor evidence that such provision is specifically required at this location or that other open space within the development would not fulfil an equivalent role.

We fully support the provision of formal and informal open space on the site to meet the recreational needs of the community, the provision of cycling and to mitigate potential impacts on sensitive habitats. Therefore, the deletion of reference to ‘Country park’ is supported as it was not justified with appropriate evidence. It is, however noted, that there are still references to a country park in the first section of bullet points in MM33 which we assume to be an error: this reference also needs to be removed and also deleted from the Figure 13 Masterplan.

As we have set out in this response and during the hearings, our client has worked with and engaged with the relevant technical bodies, stakeholders and local community over a number of years. Larkfleet have taken numerous steps to include the community in shaping this new development. However, we object to the additional text which requires a detailed masterplan “to be informed by the Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood Plan Report and by ongoing engagement with the community”. At the hearing sessions, the meaning of ‘ongoing engagement’ was discussed at some length, which produced no clarity on what it is that is intended by the wording as proposed to be modified. If there is to be a policy requirement, which for example, would require the statutory public consultation for a forthcoming planning application to go beyond what is usually required, this should be clearly set out and clearly justified. The policy should clearly identify the nature of consultation that is expected. As noted, our clients have taken steps to consult with a wide range of local stakeholders and as evidenced at the Examination there are inevitably conflicting interests expressed by the community as to the principle and detail of any proposals. Consultation to date has drawn out those conflicting considerations and we are concerned that without prescription within the policy the term ‘ongoing engagement with the community’ is unlikely to achieve any material conclusion save that it may lead to the delayed delivery of the development without ultimately benefitting the community. Therefore, in its current form we do not support the inclusion of the phrase ‘ongoing engagement with the community’ this Main Modification it is not effective, it is not justified, and it should be deleted.

Taking into account the amendment identified at paragraph 2.9 above the final paragraph should be further amended to read, in full:

“A detailed masterplan informed by the Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood Masterplan Report and masterplan in Figure 13 and by the result of community consultations should be prepared and submitted with the application.”

Additional Modifications AM26 amends the supporting text to WLP3.1 to be consistent with MM33. Therefore, our comments above are relevant to AM26.
Comment ID 111

Comment
The County Council welcomes the amendment in respect of the school site size. The commitment to fund site-specific infrastructure through Section 106 is also welcomed.

Please note that this policy will be read alongside Paragraph 1.41, as amended by additional modification 5 (AM5), which states that other site-specific infrastructure, whether on or off-site, such as highway works which are necessary for a grant of planning permission, will be funded via conditions or obligations. This is clarified in Appendix 1.

Vehicular access to Ellough Road for the employment component of the site is acceptable, subject to the design meeting relevant standards. In addition, the employment should be linked to the residential element of the scheme via pedestrian and cycle links, but without vehicular connectivity through the site.

Worlingham Neighbourhood Planning Team (Wendy Summerfield)

Comment ID 126

Comment
We welcome the modifications as they soften the previous bindings between the eventual Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood and the outline masterplan. Whilst we remain alarmed by the scale of housing, these text changes are positive if they truly enable the identities of the two settlements to be preserved, i.e. in line with the Local Plan’s Vision Statement.

The new emphasis upon “engagement” as opposed to “consultation” with the local communities is a critical feature. Ultimately Waveney D.C. will be the official arbiter of the success and degree of fulfilment of this “engagement with the communities” obligation upon the developer. Nonetheless, we wish to make it absolutely clear from our viewpoint what engagement means and does not mean.

“Engagement with the community of Worlingham” should not mean merely the holding of one or two “pop-up” information and pre-sale marketing sessions in an inconvenient location (i.e. in Beccles) instead of within the village itself.

“Engagement with the community of Worlingham” should mean that a documented evaluation of the requirements and wishes of the community is undertaken by the developer (with oversight from Waveney D.C.) as part of the masterplan development process. Many of these requirements and wishes are captured in detail in the Worlingham Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire (completed by around 1000 residents) and in Section C (Housing Characterisation) of the ‘Housing Needs Assessment for Worlingham at Neighbourhood Plan Level’. Both documents are attached. The aim should be to meet these needs or provide transparent justifications for not meeting them.

The following are indicative (but not exhaustive) expressions of matters we wish to be seriously evaluated:

a) Utilising the twenty-five hectare (minimum) Country Park as a more extensive natural break between the two settlements. The proposed new wording to the Local Plan releases the previous obligation for the Country Park to border the Ellough Road and so makes more
imaginative solutions possible.

b) Disentangling/avoiding unnecessary cross-parish co-mingling of dwellings (in the southwest corner of the site).

c) Placement of the mooted new Community Centre within the boundaries of Beccles Parish or, failing that, on the boundary between the two parishes. The motivation behind this is to avoid undermining identification of nearby Garden Neighbourhood residents with the separately and long-planned Worlingham Community Centre.

d) Early attention to the screening of the new development from the adjoining extant estates. Natural screening is an important feature and should not be implemented as a finishing detail. It takes many years for such screening to mature to an effective condition. The affected residents should be consulted for suggestions as to the type of screening they feel most appropriate.

e) Parking provision for Garden Neighbourhood residents should be fact-based (i.e. using census data for Worlingham Parish, as provided in the attached “Housing Needs Assessment” document) and meet residents’ requirements (as captured in the attached Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire) rather than extensive reliance upon hoped-for emergent nearby job growth.

f) The Country Park is a major feature and merits a community consultation exercise of its own. It would fail if it were merely to be treated as a ‘hole in the sprawl of housing’ and not as a true amenity, one that could capture and build upon the landscape of historical Worlingham. In addition, there will be important park management and maintenance issues to assess and agree.

Attached documents
  - Worthingham Housing Needs Assessment (2.3MB)
  - Feedback from Worthingham NP Questionnaire (732KB)

Worlingham Parish Council (Lesley Beevor)

Comment ID 125

Comment We welcome the modifications as they soften the previous bindings between the eventual Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood and the outline masterplan. Whilst we remain alarmed by the scale of housing, these text changes are positive if they truly enable the identities of the two settlements to be preserved, i.e. in line with the Local Plan’s Vision Statement.

The new emphasis upon “engagement” as opposed to “consultation” with the local communities is a critical feature. Ultimately Waveney D.C. will be the official arbiter of the success and degree of fulfilment of this “engagement with the communities” obligation upon the developer. Nonetheless, we wish to make it absolutely clear from our viewpoint what engagement means and does not mean.

“Engagement with the community of Worlingham” should not mean merely the holding of one or two “pop-up” information and pre-sale marketing sessions in an inconvenient location
(i.e. in Beccles) instead of within the village itself.

“Engagement with the community of Worlingham” should mean that a documented evaluation of the requirements and wishes of the community is undertaken by the developer (with oversight from Waveney D.C.) as part of the masterplan development process. Many of these requirements and wishes are captured in detail in the Worlingham Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire (completed by around 1000 residents) and in Section C (Housing Characterisation) of the ‘Housing Needs Assessment for Worlingham at Neighbourhood Plan Level’. Both documents are attached. The aim should be to meet these needs or provide transparent justifications for not meeting them.

The following are indicative (but not exhaustive) expressions of matters we wish to be seriously evaluated:

a) Utilising the twenty-five hectare (minimum) Country Park as a more extensive natural break between the two settlements. The proposed new wording to the Local Plan releases the previous obligation for the Country Park to border the Ellough Road and so makes more imaginative solutions possible.

b) Disentangling/avoiding unnecessary cross-parish co-mingling of dwellings (in the southwest corner of the site).

c) Placement of the mooted new Community Centre within the boundaries of Beccles Parish or, failing that, on the boundary between the two parishes. The motivation behind this is to avoid undermining identification of nearby Garden Neighbourhood residents with the separately and long-planned Worlingham Community Centre.

d) Early attention to the screening of the new development from the adjoining extant estates. Natural screening is an important feature and should not be implemented as a finishing detail. It takes many years for such screening to mature to an effective condition. The affected residents should be consulted for suggestions as to the type of screening they feel most appropriate.

e) Parking provision for Garden Neighbourhood residents should be fact-based (i.e. using census data for Worlingham Parish, as provided in the attached “Housing Needs Assessment” document) and meet residents’ requirements (as captured in the attached Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire) rather than extensive reliance upon hoped-for emergent nearby job growth.

f) The Country Park is a major feature and merits a community consultation exercise of its own. It would fail if it were merely to be treated as a ‘hole in the sprawl of housing’ and not as a true amenity, one that could capture and build upon the landscape of historical Worlingham. In addition, there will be important park management and maintenance issues to assess and agree.

Attached documents

Worlingham Housing Needs Assessment (2.3MB)
Feedback from Worlingham NP Questionnaire (732KB)
MM34 - Policy WLP3.2 Land West of London Road, Beccles

Beccles Town Council (C Boyne)

Comment ID

Comment 1. That any new development proposed within the town should ensure that the charm and character of the town is maintained. This could be provided for under the relevant policies for Beccles.

Hopkins Homes (Armstrong Rigg Planning (Geoff Armstrong))

Comment ID

Comment I am writing to make representations to the current Waveney Local Plan modifications consultation on behalf of our client, Hopkins Homes, with respect to Policy WLP3.2 – Land West of London Road, Beccles. Hopkins Homes has a controlling interest in the majority of this proposed site allocation and submitted a planning application (Ref: DC/18/4312/FUL) on its land in October 2018 for 228 dwellings.

This letter follows previous representations made on Hopkins Homes’ behalf to the Final Draft Plan (Reg. 19) consultation in May 2018 and to the Inspector’s Matters and Questions ahead of and during the Examination in Public (EIP) between September and November 2018. In particular, it builds upon representations made to the last-minute proposal by Waveney District Council (WDC) to significantly change Policy WLP3.2 to require land for a new pre-school to be reserved on the site, if needed at the time of a planning application. Detailed representations were made objecting to this proposed modification during the EIP and it is disappointing that we have had no response from the Inspector to explain his position. This was promised at the Matter 7 hearing session that was kept deliberately brief to allow time for our client to produce their additional representations. Indeed, such is the brevity of the Inspector’s Post-Hearing Letter dated 21st November 2018 (Ref: H35), in which this significant modification is not even mentioned (save for the fact it is included in WDC’s Note on Infrastructure that is mentioned – Ref: H16), that we are left guessing as to whether the Inspector considers the modification necessary to make the plan sound. If the Inspector does consider the modification to be necessary, we request that he re-open the examination to allow this matter to be appropriately discussed.

This letter provides a summary of the proposed modifications as they relate to Policy WLP3.2, followed by a background to the site allocation and Hopkins Homes’ current planning application on the site. It examines WDC’s lack of evidence concerning pre-school need in Beccles and details our key objections to the proposed modifications which clearly demonstrate that they are unsound and should be deleted. Enclosed with this letter is an updated version of the Early Years Assessment Report prepared by education specialists EPDS Consultants that was submitted with our earlier representations.

Executive Summary
Main Modification MM34 proposes to amend Policy WLP3.2 to require 0.09ha of land to be reserved for a new pre-school setting, if needed at the time of a planning application, and for this setting to be secured and funded through a S106 obligation. Additional Modification AM29 then amends the policy’s supporting text to clarify this requirement. It states that: the level of new development within the town is likely to generate a need for 3 new settings; that Policy WLP3.1 will provide two of these settings (as confirmed by the developer of this site during the EIIP); that the preference is for the third setting to be provided at Beccles Primary Academy or elsewhere in the town, but if it can’t be provided elsewhere for it to be provided at Policy WLP3.2; and that the loss of 0.09ha of land should not impact upon the amount of development achievable on the site (a point that clearly ignores the fact that this is equivalent in size to 3 detached housing plots). Additional Modification AM84 then proposes to modify Appendix 1 - Table A1.2 to require a third pre-school setting to serve Policy WLP3.2 that would be funded through a S106 obligation, contrary to WDC’s adopted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Our client has no in principle objection to contributing towards pre-school provision in Beccles but is shocked that such a large contribution is sought when the evidence base presented by WDC and Suffolk County Council (SCC) is so insufficient and strewn with errors. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF2, July 2018) states at paragraph 35 that for plans to be considered sound, they must be justified which it defines as comprising “an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence”. The evidence presented by WDC and SCC fails to demonstrate that there is either:

- **Current Deficit:** Despite claiming that there is a deficit in pre-school provision in Beccles and despite numerous requests for information, neither WDC nor SCC have presented data on the availability of pre-school places in the town (i.e. how many places are currently free at existing establishments). This is contrary to the Statutory Guidance for Early Education and Childcare (September 2014) that requires local authorities to take into account the state of the local childcare market in securing sufficient childcare.

- **New Demand:** There are clear mistakes in SCC’s calculation of the yield rate for full-time equivalent (FTE) pre-school places per EPDS’s report at Enclosure 1 demonstrates that using SCC’s methodology to calculate the yield rate gives a figure 0.0855 FTE places per dwelling and not the 0.12 claimed by SCC. Furthermore, using EPDS’s more appropriate methodology, which calculates the yield rate based upon the current number of children per dwelling in Beccles and not the number of children per dwelling in new developments across Suffolk (which is likely to vary considerably based on the demographics of each location), gives a yield rate of 0.04 FTE places per dwelling. These more accurate yield rates drastically reduce the requirement for new pre-school places in Beccles from 180.6 to between 61.2 and 130.8 and the requirement generated by Policy WLP3.2 from 33.6 to between 11.2 and 23.9. It is therefore clear that Policy WLP3.2 does not warrant the creation of a new 60 place pre-school and that the forecast demand in Beccles as a whole will be easily met by the two new settings to be provided at Policy WLP3.1.

- **Alternative Options:** SCC has failed to present any information on the capacity of existing providers to provide new places (either through physical expansion, longer opening hours, or by employing more staff) and has also failed to consider the likelihood that new private sector nurseries would open to meet any increased demand (despite the example provided by the new Big Sky Nursery in Beccles that opened in 2016). This raises a significant concern regarding SCC’s approach to pre-school provision as they have completely ignored the fact
that pre-schools are a quasi-public service that is often provided by the private sector (in the same way as other services such as dentists and funeral directors). Seeking financial contributions towards the provision of pre-school places is therefore only justified when there is clear evidence that the private sector cannot expand to meet needs or requires support to be able to.

In addition to the above outlined lack of evidence, which clearly renders the proposed amendments to Policy WLP3.2 unsound, we have significant concerns regarding the requirement for Policy WLP3.2 to fund a new pre-school via S106 obligation. We consider that this requirement would not be consistent with national policy for the following reasons and must therefore be considered unsound against paragraph 35 of NPPF2. Policy WLP3.2 would not create sufficient increased demand to justify a new pre-school and the proposed S106 obligation would therefore fail the tests set by NPPF2 paragraph 56 as it would not be necessary or directly, fairly and reasonably related to the development. Furthermore, SCC’s preferred approach of expanding the existing setting at Beccles Primary Academy would be covered by the Council’s CIL 123 List and no S106 obligation could therefore be sought for this option as it would be contrary to Regulation 123(2) of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

The modified policy wording is also unclear and ambiguous, contrary to NPPF2 paragraph 16, as it makes no attempt to guide the decision maker as to when they should consider demand to be sufficient to justify a new pre-school and in the absence of any detailed evidence of current need, it is unclear to the decision-taker how this need should be assessed.

In conclusion, proposed modifications MM34, AM29 and AM84 are not justified by proportionate evidence, there has been no consideration of reasonable alternatives to increasing pre-school provision and the proposed S106 obligation is contrary to national policy. The proposed modifications therefore fail the tests set by NPPF2 paragraph 35 and should be deleted.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed modifications to Policy WLP3.2 concerning pre-school land are set out in the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (Ref: MM34) and the Schedule of Proposed Additional Modifications (Ref: AM29).

Main Modification MM34 proposes to add the following additional paragraph to the text of Policy WLP3.2:

“If needed at the time of the planning application, 0.09 hectares of land on the site should be reserved for a new pre-school setting. The pre-school setting will be secured by and funded through a Section 106 planning obligation.”

Additional Modification AM29 proposes the following additional paragraph be added to the supporting text for Policy WLP3.2:

“The level of new development within Beccles and Worlingham is likely to generate a need for 3 new pre-school settings. The Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood site (Policy WLP31.) will provide 2 of these settings. The preference for the third is at Beccles Primary Academy or alternatively in a location close to other services and facilities. However, if there is no suitable, available site at the time of a planning application, and there is still a need for a setting, it may be necessary for a new setting to be included on this site. A new setting will require 0.09 hectares of land and therefore should not impact upon the amount of development achievable on the site.”
In addition to the wording contained in WDC’s Note on Infrastructure (Ref: H16), **Additional Modification AM84** proposes the following changes to Appendix 1 - Table A1.2 – Education – Early Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Lead Provider</th>
<th>Approximate Cost</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Potential Funding Amount</th>
<th>Required Developer Contribution</th>
<th>Type of Developer Contribution</th>
<th>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</th>
<th>Time Scale/Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 new preschool setting in Beccles and Worlingham area to serve development on land West of London Road, Beccles (Polir</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>CH Section 106</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Short-medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

Hopkins Homes has a controlling interest in the majority of proposed site allocation Policy WLP3.2 and submitted a planning application (Ref: DC/18/4312/FUL) on its land in October 2018 that is pending determination for:

“Hybrid planning application: (i) Full planning application - Residential development of 217 dwellings (including 30% affordable dwellings) together with public open space, roads, accesses, parking, garages, drainage and associated infrastructure (ii) Outline planning application - 11 No. serviced self build plots with associated access and infrastructure”

This application was prepared in tandem with the development of the Waveney Local Plan and we met with policy and development management officers at WDC during its preparation to agree that the timing of the application was acceptable and the key policy requirements for the development of the site. At no point during these discussions was there any mention of there being a policy requirement to provide land for a pre-school on the site.

To support the proposed allocation of our client’s land by Policy WLP3.2, we prepared detailed representations to the Final Draft Plan (Reg. 19) consultation in May 2018 and a hearing statement for Matter 7 of the Local Plan’s Examination in Public (EIP) in September 2018. These representations were supportive of the proposed allocation, subject to a few minor suggested changes including: the insertion of the word “approximately” before the reference to dwelling numbers to ensure flexibility in the delivery of the site; and the removal of the requirement for a whole site contaminated land investigation due to the split landownership of the site. We are pleased to note that Main Modification MM34 and Additional Modification AM28 propose to make these changes and we have no further comment in this regard.

Following the submission of our hearing statement for Matter 7, we had the opportunity to view the WDC’s Matter 7 hearing statement (September 2018) and the Statement of Common Ground between WDC and SCC on Matters Relating to Early Years (September 2018). These documents were only published following the deadline for third party hearing statements and yet proposed to make a significant change to Policy WLP3.2 to require land on the site to be reserved for a new pre-school setting, if needed at the time of a planning application. In response to this suggested change, we wrote to the Inspector on 10th October 2018 to highlight the fact that SCC hadn’t provided any evidence to demonstrate that such a requirement is necessary and that the timing of the change provided little opportunity for any meaningful investigation into the justification for this requirement ahead of the Matter 7 hearing scheduled for 17th October 2018.

At the hearing session for Matter 7 on 17th October 2018, the Inspector refused to accept the proposed modification until our client had the time to provide a comprehensive response to it. During the hearing session, SCC’s Planning Strategy Manager, James Cutting, agreed to provide our client’s education consultants, EPDS, with all the information they required to undertake their own assessment as soon as possible and an initial deadline was given for Hopkins Homes to respond by 2nd November 2018. On 31st October 2018, however, we received an email from the programme officer, Annette Feeney, containing WDC’s Note on Infrastructure (Ref: H16) that includes the proposed modification to Policy WLP3.2, with an
extended deadline till the 14th November 2018. We initially accepted this extension, but on consideration decided to submit EPDS’ Early Years Assessment Report (2nd November 2018) on 5th November 2018 as SCC had consistently sought to avoid rather than answer the queries raised with them (as outlined in EPDS’s report at Enclosure 1) and we did not consider that the additional two weeks would enable us to get any further with regards to EPDS’ assessment.

As set out above, in the context of these detailed previous representations, it is disappointing that we have had no direct response from the Inspector to explain his position regarding the proposed change to Policy WLP3.2 and due to the brevity of the Inspector’s Post-Hearing Letter dated 21st November (Ref: H35), we are left guessing as to whether the Inspector actually considers the modification necessary to make the plan sound.

**Evidence Base**

NPPF2 paragraph 35 states that for plans to be considered sound, they must be justified which it defines as comprising “an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence. In addition, paragraph 31 requires that “The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals”. The adequacy of the evidence base for pre-school provision in Beccles is assessed below and found to be sorely lacking.

**Infrastructure Study (March 2018, Ref: C11):**

The only evidence base document containing any information on pre-school needs is the Infrastructure Study (March 2018, Ref: C11). This document contains a very brief assessment of local requirements which simply provides a table that shows: the number of dwellings proposed to be allocated in each area; the number of pre-school children potentially arising from the allocations; the current surplus/deficit in provision (no data is presented to further demonstrate how this has been assessed or the individual pre-school settings that have been included); and a figure for additional places required from the new dwellings (it appears that a multiplier of 0.10 FTE pre-school places per new dwelling has been used in the calculation, but at no point does the document provide an explanation or justification for this). An extract of this table for Beccles is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of dwellings allocated in Local Plan</th>
<th>Pre-school children potentially arising from new development</th>
<th>Current surplus/deficit</th>
<th>Additional Places required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beccles South, Beccles North, Wainford and Worlingham</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-260</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. It should be noted that this table groups together the urban area of Beccles and
Worlingham with Wainford Ward which covers a large rural area to the west, south and east of Beccles – parts of which are much closer to Bungay than to

The Infrastructure Study then outlines where new pre-school settings will be required. For Beccles South, Beccles North, Wainford and Worlingham, it concludes that 1 new setting at Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood (WLP3.1) primary school and 1 at a community hub will be required, with options for a third setting to be considered.

The Infrastructure Study also states at paragraph 8.4 that a:

“notable uncertainty at the current time is the impact of the move to free 30-hour provision [from September 2017]. It is not clear how many additional places will be required as not all parents will take up the additional hours and some children will already be receiving 30-hours childcare. The County Council is keeping this under close review.”

SCC Regulation 19 Consultation Response (May 2018):

It must be assumed from the above that the Infrastructure Study was produced with input from SCC, but despite this just 2 months after its publication, SCC objected to Policy WLP3.2 in their representations to the Final Draft Plan (Reg. 19) consultation in May 2018 stating:

“As set out in Appendix 1, the scale of growth in Beccles is such that three early education settings may be required to mitigate the impacts of growth. As identified in the Infrastructure and Delivery Plan, Site WLP3.1 will provide two settings. The County Council’s intention is to seek provision of a third setting at the existing Beccles Primary School, but this is dependent on the agreement of the academy provider at that school. Should this agreement not be forthcoming, provision will need to be made on this site. As such, the County Council requests that this policy be amended to include reservation of land for a new early education setting:

The site should make provision for a new early education setting

Supporting text, potentially as a new paragraph 3.26, should explain the need:

This site is large enough to justify the provision of a new early years setting. If provision cannot be made at a primary school, provision will need to be made on this site.

Appendix 1 to SCC’s Regulation 19 consultation response contains a similarly brief assessment to that contained in WDC’s Infrastructure Study. It provides a table that shows: the number of dwellings proposed to be allocated in Beccles North, Beccles South and part of Worlingham (no explanation is given as to why Wainford is no longer included or why only part of Worlingham is included); the current surplus/deficit in provision (no data is presented to demonstrate how this has been assessed or the individual pre-school settings that have been included); and the approximate demand for places arising from the allocated dwellings (it appears that a multiplier of 0.12 FTE pre-school places per new dwelling has been used in the calculation, which has increased from the 0.10 multiplier used in WDC’s Infrastructure Study and again no explanation or justification is provided for this). An extract of this table is provided below:

| Area/Wards | Sites | Dwellings | Baseline – existing capacity, Approximate demand for places arising |
|------------|-------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
|            |       |           |                                                               |                                                  |

www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/newwaveneylocalplan
Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between WDC and SCC on Matters Relating to Early Years (September 2018)

In this document, WDC and SCC set out their agreement to amend the policy to require 0.09 hectares of land on the site to be reserved for a new pre-school setting, if needed at the time of the planning application. It does not, however, provide any evidence whatsoever of the need for pre-school places in Beccles other than the vague statement that:

“The level of new development within Beccles and Worlingham is likely to generate a need for 3 new pre-school settings”.

WDC are therefore proposing to amend the policy without presenting any additional evidence to that contained in the Infrastructure Study (March 2018) that there is actually a need for 3 settings in Beccles. Indeed, the Infrastructure Study concluded that there was a requirement for 2 new settings in Beccles and only sets out a potential option for a third setting to be considered in light of the uncertainty at the time regarding the impact of the move to free 30-hour provision (from September 2017). The SoCG was published 1 whole year after the introduction of free 30 hour provision and WDC/SCC should therefore now be in a position to fully assess the impact of this change in government policy and to present adequate and proportionate evidence in order to demonstrate the true need for new pre-school places in Beccles. No attempt whatsoever is made in the SoCG to assess the impact of the new free 30 hour provision.

The SoCG also proposes a change to the table at Appendix 1 to the Local Plan to specifically refer to one of the pre-school settings as serving the need generated by Policy WLP3.2 and for this pre-school setting to be funded by Section 106 as opposed to CIL. As set out below, the need for new pre-school places arising from the site is far too small to justify a new pre-school setting and the preferred approach to meeting additional pre-school demand from Policy WLP3.2 is to expand Beccles Primary Academy which would be covered by WDC’s CIL 123 List. There therefore no justification for a S106 obligation to be sought.

Matter 6/7/8 and 11 – Note on Infrastructure Requirements (October 2018, Ref: H16)

This document was published for informal consultation during the EIP. It details proposed
changes to several policies with respect to infrastructure requirements. For **Policy WLP3.2** it includes the proposed change to the policy wording that is set out in the schedule main modifications, but importantly it does not contain the Council’s proposed additional modifications. It contains no evidence of the need for pre-school provision in Beccles.

**Suffolk County Council Statement on Document H16: Waveney District Council Note on Infrastructure Requirements (November 2018, Ref: H32)**

This document contains SCC’s response to document H16. It sets out that:

“The County Council’s preference is that new early education settings are funded via Section 106 agreements. Given the cost of providing new settings and the need to secure land, this reduces risk to the County Council as a service provider, arising from the significant level and variety of demand likely to be drawn from the District’s CIL income.

Where increased demand can be managed via expansion of existing settings, CIL is an acceptable mechanism for securing funding because risks are lower; child numbers are lower, establishments are already in existence and build costs tend to be lower (provided no abnormal costs such as new accesses or additional car parking). CIL can also be more responsive to changes in programming such infrastructure through monitoring.”

It then sets out that:

“The County Council’s preferred approach is consistent with the current (adopted) Waveney Regulation 123 list and is not unusual in terms of complexity.”

This is clearly not the case for **Policy WLP3.2**, however, as the Council’s adopted Regulation 123 List includes the “Provision of additional pre-school places at existing establishments” which it specifically states funding will not be sought for through S106 planning obligations. **AM29** is clear that the preferred approach is to expand the existing establishment at Beccles Primary Academy and only as a last resort for a new setting to be created at **Policy WLP3.2**. It should therefore be clear that the proposed change to require a S106 contribution towards pre-school provision from the site is not consistent with WDC’s adopted CIL 123 List.

**Objections**

**Insufficient Evidence:**

It should be clear from the above that WDC has entirely failed the test at NPPF2 paragraph 35 to set an appropriate strategy, taking into account reasonable alternative and based on proportionate evidence. Contrary to this test and the requirement of paragraph 31 for all policies to be underpinned by relevant, up-to-date and adequate evidence, the Council has presented so little evidence as to make a mockery of the policy making process.

As set out in EPDS’s report at **Enclosure 1**, neither SCC or WDC have produced any analysis to show that **Policy WLP3.2** would necessitate the provision of an additional new pre-school setting. Indeed, the most in-depth evidence provided is that contained in the Appendices to EPDS’ report, which they directly requested from SCC due to the failure to provide sufficient information in the emerging Local Plan’s evidence base. This evidence is, however, clearly lacking in the following ways:

- **Current Deficit:** No information is presented on the current availability of pre-school places in Beccles. Indeed, it would appear from the responses received to EPDS’ requests that SCC do not
actually know how many of the available pre-school places in Beccles are currently filled. The only information that has been presented by SCC on current capacity is an assessment of the number of registered places available in the town and a figure for what the demand would be if every single child accessed 100% of their statutory entitlement where they live. This approach is clearly contrary to the Department for Education’s Statutory Guidance for Early Education and Childcare (September 2014) that states that to secure sufficient childcare places, local authorities should take into account the state of the local childcare market, including demand for specific types of providers. It is entirely possible, and indeed likely, that not every child will access 100% of their statutory entitlement or that they will go to nursery where they live due to particular family circumstances or the commuting patterns of their parents. Without an assessment of local demand, it is therefore simply not possible for SCC to make such sweeping statements that there is a current shortfall in supply (this is especially true with respect to recent changes in statutory entitlement and the unknown impact this has had on demand locally). Assessing current capacity based on the number of children on school rolls is the approach normally taken by local authorities in assessing the need for education. SCC has presented no justification for deviating from this standard approach.

**New Demand:** There are clear mistakes in SCC’s calculation of the yield rate for full-time equivalent (FTE) pre-school places per dwelling. EPDS’s report at Enclosure 1 demonstrates that using SCC’s methodology to calculate the yield rate gives a figure 0.0855 FTE places per dwelling and not the 0.12 claimed by SCC. Furthermore, using EPDS’s more appropriate methodology, which calculates the yield rate based upon the current number of children per dwelling in Beccles (giving an accurate picture of local demographics) and not SCC’s approach which is to base yield rates on the number of children per dwelling in new developments across Suffolk (which is is likely to vary considerably based on the demographics of each location), gives a yield rate of 0.04 FTE places per dwelling. The table below compares the number of FTE places needed in Beccles to serve the proposed site allocations using the different yield rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yield Rate (FTE Place Per Dwelling)</th>
<th>WLP3.2 (280 dwellings)</th>
<th>WLP3.1 (1,250 dwellings)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC Proposed</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Recalculated</td>
<td>0.0855</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>130.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPDS Calculation</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above clearly demonstrates that even using the SCC’s own methodology (recalculated to remove SCC’s mistake), there is clearly no need for 3no. new 60 place pre-schools in the town as the forecast demand in Beccles as a whole will be easily met by the two new settings to be provided at Policy WLP3.1. It is also clear that Policy WLP3.2 does not warrant the creation of a new 60 place pre-school as it would only generate approximately 1/3 of the required number of places.

**Alternative Options:** EPDS’s report highlights the fact that it is one of the duties of the Local Education Authority to encourage existing providers to expand their provision and yet SCC has failed to present any information on the capacity of existing providers to provide new places (either through physical expansion, longer opening hours, or by employing more staff). SCC has also failed to consider the likelihood that new private sector nurseries would open to meet any increased demand, despite the example provided by the new 63 place Big Sky
Nursery on Station Road that only opened in 2016 and recently earned a good rating during its first Ofsted inspection (https://enjoybeclesmore.co.uk/news/big-sky-nursery-beccles-good-ofsted-1-5743745). This raises a significant concern regarding SCC’s approach to pre-school provision as they have completely ignored the fact that pre-schools are a quasi-public service that is often provided by the private sector (in the same way as other services such as dentists and funeral directors). Seeking financial contributions towards the provision of pre-school places is therefore only justified when there is clear evidence that the private sector cannot expand to meet needs or requires support to be able to expand. In the case of Waveney, SCC has provided no such information and it is also unclear whether SCC intends to run the new pre-schools itself or to support new private sector nurseries which raises further concerns regarding the justification for financial contributions.

S106 Obligation:

The proposed amended wording to Policy WLP3.2 and the amended Table A1.2 at Appendix 1 of the Local Plan, propose that the new pre-school that is claimed to be needed to serve the site would be secured and funded through S106 obligation whether provided on site or not. For the below reasons we consider that the proposed obligation would not be consistent with national policy and must therefore be considered unsound against paragraph 35 of NPPF2.

As set out above, the preferred approach to meeting additional pre-school demand from Policy WLP3.2 is to expand the existing setting at Beccles Primary Academy. This would be covered by the Council’s CIL 123 List (Enclosure 2) which includes the “Provision of additional pre-school places at existing establishments” which it specifically states funding will not be sought for through S106 planning obligations. The proposal to fund the expansion of an existing establishment via S106 is therefore clearly contrary to the WDC’s adopted CIL 123 List and would therefore be contrary to Regulation 123(2) of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

SCC’s justification for requesting a S106 obligation as opposed to a CIL contribution to cover pre-school expansion is that they consider where increased demand can be managed via expansion of existing settings, CIL is an acceptable mechanism for securing funding, but where a new pre-school is required it should be funded via S106 agreements. As set out above, SCC has presented insufficient evidence to demonstrate that Policy WLP3.2 would create sufficient increased demand to justify a new pre-school. In the absence of this evidence, it is clear that the proposed S106 obligation would not meet the relevant tests set by NPPF2 paragraph 56 as it would not be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms nor would it be directly, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. As with Policies 2.14, 2.15 and 4.5, if the Inspector considers that a third pre-school is needed in Beccles, which is in considerable doubt, it should clearly be funded through CIL.

Unclear Policy Wording:

NPPF2 Paragraph 16 requires planning policies to be clearly written and unambiguous, so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. The modified Policy WLP3.2 clearly fails this test as it is not clear to a decision maker how to proceed. The revised wording states that the land for a new pre-school setting should only be reserved if a pre-school if needed at the time of the planning application, but makes no attempt to guide the decision maker as to when they should consider demand to be sufficient to justify a new pre-school. Furthermore, where a site is being brought forward across different land ownerships it is unclear how such a facility would be delivered. There is nothing in the policy to guarantee the timely delivery of a facility for the benefit of the development given that there is no power
to automatically transfer part of a site to the County Council which may not be the provider of the facility in any event. The policy text also invites Decision makers to decide proposals contrary to the legal tests and requirements of Regulations 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations. As set out above, it is far from clear what the current position is on the ground in Beccles, nor that there is any proper monitoring process in place to judge when demand for new pre-school places is likely to outstrip supply. In the absence of this information, it is unclear how the decision maker should make this judgement.

Conclusion

In conclusion, paragraph 35 of NPPF2 states that for plans to be considered sound, they must be justified which it defines as comprising “an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence” and they must be “Consistent with national policy”. The evidence presented by WDC and SCC fails to demonstrate that there is either: a current deficit in pre-school places in Beccles; that Policy WLP3.2 would generate sufficient demand to require a new pre-school; or that other alternative options for providing new pre-school places have been investigated. Proposed modifications MM34, AM29 and AM84 are not therefore justified by proportionate evidence and there has been no consideration of reasonable alternatives for increasing pre-school provision. Furthermore, the proposed S106 obligation is contrary to national policy at NPPF2 paragraph 56 as it would not be necessary or directly, fairly and reasonably related to the development and expanding the existing setting at Beccles Primary Academy is covered by the Council’s CIL 123 List, rendering a S106 obligation contrary to Regulation 123(2) of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The proposed modifications therefore fail the tests set by NPPF2 paragraph 35, they are unsound and should be deleted.

We trust that these comments will be given the due consideration and look forward to participating further as the Local Plan preparation progresses. Should you have any further queries or questions then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID 113

Comment The County Council welcomes the identification of land and the commitment to funding the mitigation and providing the land through Section 106.

Attached documents
- Early Years Assessment Report, EPDS, January 2019.pdf (5.4 MB)
- WDC Regulation 123 List.pdf (611 KB)
MM35 - Policy WLP3.3 Land south of Benacre Road at Ellough Airfield, Ellough

Beccles Town Council (C Boyne)

Comment ID 58

Comment 1. That any new development proposed within the town should ensure that the charm and character of the town is maintained. This could be provided for under the relevant policies for Beccles.

Environment Agency (Liam Robson)

Comment ID 22

Comment We are pleased to see that the modifications includes reference to potential contamination from the former airfield. We are pleased to see that the plan now states that any planning application on the site should be accompanied by a contamination assessment.
Strategy for Halesworth and Holton

MM36 - Policy WLP4.1 Halesworth/Holton Healthy Neighbourhood

Halesworth Campus Ltd (Eric Wilcock) (Michael Haslam Associates Ltd (Haslam Michael))

Comment ID 14
Comment Halesworth Campus supports the proposed modifications to policy WLP4.1

Halesworth Community Sport & Leisure (David Thomas)

Comment ID 13
Comment It has been brought to my notice that the “Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications”, recently produced by Waveney District Council, contains the statement under Policy WLP4.1 Halesworth/Holton Healthy Neighbourhood – “Existing facilities at Dairy Hill, including the sports pitches, martial arts school, tennis courts, bowling green and children’s play space, will be retained”.

You may not be aware that the Dairy Hill site is owned by Halesworth Community Sport and Leisure, HCSL, which is completely independent of the partners in this project and has absolutely no involvement or role in the development of Policy 4.1.

HCSL has already objected to Waveney District Council’s Planning Policy and Delivery Team by letter and also at a meeting with them at which myself and a fellow Trustee attended. At that meeting it was explained that HCSL had not been asked to contribute to this development nor have HCSL been involved in any of the plans. Unfortunately, the inclusion of the statement about Dairy Hill gives the impression to Halesworth residents that HCSL is involved with this project. This is something HCSL most strenuously wishes to avoid.

This project could well seriously damage Halesworth Tennis Club, which is one of HCSL’s affiliated clubs, due to their plans to build three tennis courts very close to those of HCSL.

Having requested the removal of any reference to HCSL from the section covering Policy 4.1, I am very disappointed to see that reference to HCSL’s Dairy Hill site and its affiliated clubs is still included in this policy’s paragraph. I therefore repeat HCSL’s request to have the statement - “Existing facilities at Dairy Hill, including the sports pitches, martial arts school, tennis courts, bowling green and children’s play space, will be retained” – removed from Policy 4.1
I would be grateful if you would confirm your intention to delete the requested statement.

**Richborough Estates (Steven Louth) (Brown & Co (Paul Clarke))**

| Comment ID | 9 |
| Comment    | The qualification of the proposed allocation housing figure to approximately 215 dwellings is supported as this will provide a suitable degree of flexibility for the development of detailed proposals for the site and should enable a high quality development to be achieved, which makes efficient use of the land. The deletion of the 100-dwelling trigger for the provision of sports facilities is welcomed as this will provide some flexibility for the phasing and delivery of the development and will allow suitable mechanisms to ensure the comprehensive development of the site to be agreed separately with the Council at an appropriate time. |

**Sport England (Philip Raiswell)**

| Comment ID | 54 |
| Comment    | Sport England is supportive of the modification to this policy, as it reflects the representations we made in May 2018 to the final draft of the Waveney Local Plan, and includes a more flexible approach to agreeing the phasing for the delivery of new sports facilities, in terms of delivery mechanisms and triggers. The policy is now considered to be sound. |
MM37 - Policy WLP4.2 Land Adjacent to Chediston Street, Halesworth

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID 114
Comment The amendment relating to use of on-site minerals resources is welcomed.
MM38 - Paragraph 4.33 / Policy WLP4.5 Land at Dairy Farm, Saxons Way, Halesworth

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>The County Council has previously set out its position in relation to the use of CIL for delivering early years provision at this location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategy for Bungay

MM40 - Policy WLP5.1 Land East of St Johns Road, Bungay

Bungay Neighbourhood Development Plan Group

Comment ID 123

Comment: The amendments to the text of the Local Plan do not address any of the concerns we laid out about the overall plan for development in Bungay, in particular in relation to flooding issues and housing density. We also note that the Examiner’s express instruction regarding WLP5.2 to the effect that “modification to require development to be undertaken in accordance with a detailed masterplan, informed by ongoing engagement with the community” does not seem to have been carried out despite the fact that the plot is subject to two related planning applications (i) for 150 dwellings on the site, and (ii) for an attenuation pond, presumably related to the drainage thereof, on site WLP5.1. Neither of these applications has been accompanied by any detailed masterplan for the whole development nor any engagement by WDC planners with Bungay residents, the NDP or Bungay Town Council beyond what it statutorily required.

Bungay Town Council (Jeremy Burton)

Comment ID 34

Comment: The amendments to the text of the Local Plan do not address any of the concerns we laid out about the overall plan for development in Bungay, in particular in relation to flooding issues and housing density. We also note that the Examiner’s express instruction regarding WLP5.2 to the effect that “modification to require development to be undertaken in accordance with a detailed masterplan, informed by ongoing engagement with the community” does not seem to have been carried out despite the fact that the plot is subject to two related planning applications (i) for 150 dwellings on the site, and (ii) for an attenuation pond, presumably related to the drainage thereof, on site WLP5.1. Neither of these applications has been accompanied by any detailed masterplan for the whole development nor any engagement by WDC planners with Bungay residents, the NDP or Bungay Town Council beyond what it statutorily required.

Tim Basey-Fisher (John Long Planning (John Long))

Comment ID 17

Comment: I write to you on behalf of my client, Mr Tim Basey-Fisher, in respect of his land interests at Bungay, specifically proposed site allocation WLP5.1 - Land East of St Johns Road, Bungay.
Please note, Mr Basey Fisher’s other land interests at Bungay: (part of) WLP5.2 - Land West of St Johns Road is the subject of a separate representation.

I can confirm that Mr Basey-Fisher continues to support the allocation of the land East of St Johns Road (Policy WLP5.1) for residential development and that the site remains available for development.

Mr Basey-Fisher has reviewed the main modifications proposed in respect of Policy WLP5.1 (main modification ref: MM40). I am able to confirm that whilst Mr Basey-Fisher is disappointed that not all of his proposed changes to the policy have been accepted, he supports the proposed modifications to the policy as they address some of the concerns previously raised during the pre-submission consultation and discussed with the Inspector and Council at the recent Local Plan Examination Hearing session (Matter 7).

I trust that this support for the main modifications (MM40) will be presented to the Inspector in order that he can complete his examination and issue the Inspector’s Report.

**MM41 - Policy WLP5.2 Land West of St Johns Road, Bungay**

**Bungay Neighbourhood Development Plan Group**

**Comment ID** 124

**Comment** The amendments to the text of the Local Plan do not address any of the concerns we laid out about the overall plan for development in Bungay, in particular in relation to flooding issues and housing density. We also note that the Examiner’s express instruction regarding WLP5.2 to the effect that “modification to require development to be undertaken in accordance with a detailed masterplan, informed by ongoing engagement with the community” does not seem to have been carried out despite the fact that the plot is subject to two related planning applications (i) for 150 dwellings on the site, and (ii) for an attenuation pond, presumably related to the drainage thereof, on site WLP5.1. Neither of these applications has been accompanied by any detailed masterplan for the whole development nor any engagement by WDC planners with Bungay residents, the NDP or Bungay Town Council beyond what it statutorily required.

**Bungay Town Council (Jeremy Burton)**

**Comment ID** 35

**Comment** The amendments to the text of the Local Plan do not address any of the concerns we laid out about the overall plan for development in Bungay, in particular in relation to flooding issues and housing density. We also note that the Examiner’s express instruction regarding WLP5.2 to the effect that “modification to require development to be undertaken in accordance with a detailed masterplan, informed by ongoing engagement with the community” does not seem to have been carried out despite the fact that the plot is subject to two related planning applications (i) for 150 dwellings on the site, and (ii) for an attenuation pond, presumably related to the drainage thereof, on site WLP5.1. Neither of these applications has been accompanied by any detailed masterplan for the whole development nor any engagement by WDC planners with Bungay residents, the NDP or Bungay Town Council beyond what it statutorily required.
have been carried out despite the fact that the plot is subject to two related planning applications (i) for 150 dwellings on the site, and (ii) for an attenuation pond, presumably related to the drainage thereof, on site WLP5.1. Neither of these applications has been accompanied by any detailed masterplan for the whole development nor any engagement by WDC planners with Bungay residents, the NDP or Bungay Town Council beyond what it statutorily required.

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID 116
Comment The County Council welcomes the amendments relating to early years provision, the land for the high school expansion and minerals extraction.

The Slater Family (Bidwells (Iain Hill))

Comment ID 100
Comment On behalf of The Slater Family, we are instructed to make the following comments in respect of Policy WLP5.2 – Land West of St Johns Road, Bungay (Ref: MM41).

- We support the insertion of the word ‘approximately’ into the policy. This will enable the policy to be flexible in the context of the detailed design work that will be undertaken as part of a planning application; helping to ensure the most efficient use of the site.

- Whilst the amendment to the policy to reflect a requirement for 2.75ha to be reserved for the future expansion of Bungay High School is recognised, the policy’s supporting text should make it clear that, if required, the land will be purchased from the landowner using funds from the Community Infrastructure Levy and / or other sources. This would ensure that the policy is consistent with the Statement of Common Ground between Waveney District Council and Suffolk County Council, Matters Relating to Schools (September 2018) (paragraph 6).

- The recognition within the policy of the area of land required to deliver the new pre-school setting is welcomed. However, we continue to object to the requirement that the pre-school setting should be funded through a Section 106 planning obligation. From reviewing the Schedule of Proposed Modifications there is no justification / evidence as to why it is considered appropriate to fund the development of new pre-school settings by way of CIL on some allocated sites, but Section 106 planning obligations on other allocated sites.

Representations seeking clarity on this matter have been submitted at various stages during the preparation of the Waveney Local Plan. However, to date, a robust answer has not been provided to provide certainty that due consideration has been given to this matter.

Therefore, rather than reiterate comments that have previously been made on this matter, a copy of the representations made on ‘Actions Arising from Hearings’ (Matter 6/7/8 and 11 – Note on Infrastructure Requirements) is attached.
● The requirement for a detailed masterplan to be prepared as part of any planning application is, as per previous representations, supported. This will ensure that the development of the site comes forward in a coordinated manner. This is particularly important in relation to infrastructure and accessibility requirements.

Attached documents

Slater Family (Bidwells) - Attachment.pdf (344 KB)

Tim Basey-Fisher (John Long Planning (John Long))

Comment ID 73

Comment
I write to you on behalf of my client, Mr Tim Basey-Fisher, in respect of his land interests at Bungay, specifically the inclusion of his land (subject of planning permission DC/14/4193/OUT) within proposed site allocation WLP5.2 - Land West of St Johns Road, Bungay. Please note, Mr Basey Fisher’s other land interests at Bungay: WLP5.1 - Land West of St Johns Road is the subject of a separate representation.

I can confirm that Mr Basey-Fisher position remains as previously and consistently stated, which is that his support for the inclusion of the consented site (planning permission: DC/14/4193/OUT) within the wider proposed allocation Policy WLP5.2 – Land West of St John’s Road, is on the basis that the emerging policy provisions are in no way used to seek to prejudice the ability of the first reserved matters application (150 housing units) for planning permission DC/14/4193/OUT to be positively determined.

It is important that the determination of the reserved matters application (DC/18/4429/ARM) for the housing element of planning permission DC/14/4193/OUT is not fettered by this emerging local plan policy, due to the time period in which the reserved matters application needs to be submitted, approved and a lawful commencement made to be in accordance with the outline planning permission; and also, the fact that the site is included within the Council’s 5 year housing supply figures.

Mr Basey Fisher accepts the need to ensure that the wider allocation is not compromised by the reserved matters application (DC/18/4429/ARM) and that access to the land to the western part of proposed allocation WLP5.2 can only reasonably be achieved through land within his control. Mr Tim Basey Fisher’s expectation remains that the main/primary access to the ‘wider’ allocation (western part of the proposed allocation WLP5.2), and in particular the new route for buses to serve the High School will be via the new access to be constructed on land within his control to the south of Bungay Swimming Pool. This main/primary access is also a requirement of planning permission: DC/14/4193/OUT. It is a substantial access capable of serving the southern portion of the consented site (including 3.0 hectares of employment land), and additional development land to the west, and including a new access to the High School for buses.

Currently, Mr Basey Fisher is very concerned that the emerging allocation (WLP5.2), including the latest proposed Main Modifications (MM41), particularly the requirement that “a detailed masterplan informed by ongoing engagement with the community should be prepared and submitted as part of any full or outline planning application”, is being cited as a basis upon which to seek to change the planning permission’s (DC/14/4193/OUT) requirements and obligations applicable to the current pending reserved matters application (DC/18/4429/ARM),
and to potentially fetter its positive determination.

Mr Basey Fisher requests that the policy, including the requirement for a detailed masterplan to be prepared, acknowledges that part of the proposed allocation site is subject to an extant planning permission, the provisions of which need to be taken into account in preparing the wider detailed masterplan.

As the Council’s determination of the reserved matters application is not due until the end of February 2019, after the closing date for this Main Modifications consultation, it is not yet possible for Mr Basey Fisher to know whether his concerns will be realised. He hopes that they will not, but if they are Mr Basey Fisher reserves the right to review his support for the wider WLP5.2 allocation.

I trust that these comments on the main modifications (MM41) will be presented to the Inspector in order that he can complete his examination and issue the Inspector’s Report. Should you require any further information please contact me in the first instance.
Strategy for Southwold and Reydon

MM42 - After Paragraph 6.8, Policy WLP6.1 Land West of Copperwheat Avenue, Reydon

James Winterbotham

Comment ID 81

Comment The Council responses to many comments questioning the need for the scale of development do not adequately address objections. It is also not at all clear that building more houses in Reydon will address the problem of second homes in Southwold. Council thinking isn’t sound here.
MM43 - WLP6.1 Land West of Copperwheat Avenue, Reydon

James Winterbotham

Comment ID  83

Comment  Development should provide a mix of new housing in line with Policy WLP8.1 which is tailored to meet local needs.

This isn’t clear. Is this just re-stating WLP 8.1 (in which case why is it needed here when other sites do not?) or is it making a further point about tailoring WLP 8.1 to local needs here in which case these need to be better defined. Many comments on the initial consultation challenged the case for local need for 220 houses (or almost 400 in total in the area) and these have as yet not been properly addressed. Is this amendment giving greater weight to local need than elsewhere or greater weight to local opinion (in which case how is this to be measured)?

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID  117

Comment  The County Council welcomes the amendment related to minerals extraction.
Strategy for the Rural Areas

MM44 - Policy WLP7.5 Land North of The Street, Somerleyton

Somerleyton Estate (Lord Somerleyton) (Evolution Town Planning (David Barker))

Comment ID 48

Comment These representations have been prepared on behalf of the Somerleyton Estate. The Somerleyton Estate is a major employer and landowner in the village of Somerleyton and the surrounding area. It has a close and long term interest in the vitality of the village and the rural area around it. The Estate provides long term employment, facilities and services in the village and the surrounding area. Evolution Town Planning has worked with the Somerleyton Estate throughout the preparation of the Local Plan, and we attended the Examination on behalf of the Estate.

The Estate is the landowner of the site for two housing allocations which are WPL7.5 – Land North of The Street, Somerleyton which allocates approximately 10 homes and Policy WPL7.6 – Mill Farm Field, Somerleyton which allocates approximately 35 homes.

We support the amendments to both these planning policies which preface the number of dwellings to be delivered by the policy with the word approximately. This provides important flexibility in the policy. Detailed design is not yet underway on these sites, and flexibility in the housing numbers allows the design process, and the assessment of local housing needs to be taken into account after the plan is adopted. There is a recognition in Somerleyton village and in the Local Plan that smaller homes are required. Delivering this may require flexibility in housing numbers to be delivered.

The Somerleyton Estate remains committed to delivering high quality development on both allocated sites in its ownership. The Estate owners have a long term interest in ensuring that the local area thrives and delivering much needed homes in Somerleyton is part of that aim.

The change to the policies is supported and is necessary to achieve soundness by ensuring that the Local Plan is “Justified” by reason of being the most appropriate strategy and “Effective” by being deliverable.
MM46 - Policy WLP7.8 Land North of Chapel Road, Wrentham

Benacre Company (Lucinda Hutson) (Savills (UK) Ltd (Rosanna Metcalfe))

Comment ID 47

Comment Savills (UK) Ltd act on behalf of the Benacre Company. Land North of Chapel Road, Wrentham (allocated site WLP7.8) is within the ownership of our client, and its allocation is supported.

Bullet Point 3

Whilst the Benacre supports the inclusion of the site in the plan, it is considered that Bullet Point 3 in the Policy is an unnecessary inclusion.

The policy requires “dwellings in the north part of the site and along the west boundary should be no higher than 1.5 storeys”.

As discussed at Examination, the Council has provided no evidence to justify the above criterion. It is considered premature to restrict the dwelling heights on this site when the appropriate assessments which would normally inform design have not yet been undertaken.

Properties in the village and those close to the site comprise a mix of dwelling heights. It is considered that continuous rows of 1.5 storey dwellings would be out of character with area and is considered a mix of heights across the site would be more appropriate.

Amended wording to Bullet Point 5

Bullet Point 5 of Policy WLP7.8 (as amended by MM46) currently states:

“Low density development is to be supported with a landscaping scheme to provide openness on site and provide screening along the west boundary of the site. This landscaping scheme should be informed by the Waveney District Landscape Character Assessment (2008), Great Yarmouth and Waveney Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Study (2016) and the completed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.”

Following the publication of the Main Modifications, Waveney District Council has suggested a further minor modification to bullet point 5 of Policy WLP7.8 as follows:

Low density development is to be supported with a landscaping scheme to provide openness on site and provide screening along the north and west boundaries of the site. This landscaping scheme should be informed by the Waveney District Landscape Character Assessment (2008), Great Yarmouth and Waveney Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Study (2016) and the completed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

I can confirm that the Benacre Company agrees to the revised wording of the policy to include “screening along the north and west boundaries of the site”.

David Rogers
Comment ID 82

Comment
1. I welcome reference to the need for a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

2. Pedestrian footways must be protected. Existing boundaries to houses on Chatten Close must also be guaranteed to include the ransom strip; this was a condition of the Chatten Close development. Will Benacre continue to be responsible for the maintenance of the ransom strip?

Fiona Anderson

Comment ID 80

Comment
Comment for Wrentham WLP7.8

1. School - There is no primary school in the village and families who come to live in the area would rely on having children bused into other villages or transported by private car. This would add to traffic in Chapel Road, a narrow road with no provision for vehicles to stop off the road making sure children can board or alight with safety.

2. Impact on the wider landscape - At present open views are enjoyed by walkers in this area across open fields up to the Church. This is a unique part of the village and this special environment should be protected.

3. Informal pedestrian footways - It is very important that these are protected and incorporated into any planning. The implication that this will be carried out "as much as possible" is not strong enough. In my view it is essential that local villagers will continue to be able to enjoy access to this land for regular exercise in order to keep fit. We must encourage residents to walk around their village as much as possible.

4. Hedgerows and trees located along the site boundaries - It is essential that hedges and trees are both protected and reinforced. The existing tree screen provides homes (nesting and feeding areas) for the many species of birds in the village. Local residents need to know who will be responsible for maintaining and further enhancing the trees and hedges on the site.

5. Play area - there is no provision for extra parking or bike racks for families visiting the play area. Ideally users should walk to the site but for younger users accompanied by elderly carers it is a slow process (up to 30 minutes) for those who live on the edges of the visit and some users might need to drive to the play area.

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID 118

Comment
The County Council welcomes the amendments related to walkways and archaeological assessment requirements.
MM47 - WLP7.9 Land south of Southwold Road, Brampton

John Kidner (Durrant's (Christopher Hobson))

Comment ID

Comment

Paragraph 7.87 of the Local Plan states that “the intention of the policy allocation is for the residential development to facilitate delivery of a replacement village hall, an equipped play area and a playing pitch” Underlined is our emphasis.

The land owner fully envisages the development of the site facilitating the various elements within the masterplan and these would be secured through a legal agreement attached to any planning permission, along with financial contributions received through the payment of CIL. However, we remain concerned regarding the ambiguity in the policy criteria and the potential implications this may have.

The creation of uncertainty to a developer will have implications on how quickly the site can come forward; for instance caused by delays in finding a willing developer. All other policy allocations providing for infrastructure refer to the land /setting for the infrastructure being secured and/ or funded through a Section 106 planning obligation. In this regard see policies WLP3.2, WLP4.5, WLP5.2. There is no such clarity of this manner currently in the modified wording of our clients site (policy WLP7.9).

Secondly, it is not made clear what is expected by the facilitating development, which could potentially place an unreasonable financial burden on any future development of our clients site. Without clarity there is the potential for financial contributions to be double counted by being sought both through the section 106 agreement and through the payment of CIL. For example, as noted above the legal agreement will secure the land (setting) for village hall and car park along with the public open space at no cost. A CIL payment will be borne by the development which already covers the need to provide for community facilities to meet the need resulting from the development (CIL Regulation 123 List, May 2013). Therefore, there is no need and it unreasonable to secure further financial contributions through the legal agreement towards the provision of a village hall/community building.

With particular regard to the provision of community centres, the Council’s Infrastructure Study confirms in paragraph 12.11 that Brampton is in need “of replacing older facilities which are coming to the end of their usable lives”. Paragraph 12.11 also identifies that “an area for the new centre for Brampton has been included in the Local Plan allocation WLP7.9 (underlining our emphasis). Given that there is already a need for a replacement village hall /community building within the village it is unreasonable to rely on the development coming forward on site WLP7.9 to deliver the new village hall in its entirety or indeed beyond the provision of the land (setting) and the financial contributions made through CIL.

Furthermore, as recognised by paragraph 12.12 of the Councils Infrastructure Study in reference to the Woods Meadow development in Oulton, any new housing development accompanying a new community centre would have to be of sufficient size to justify the building of a community centre. A residential development of approximately 50 homes as identified in policy WLP7.9 is clearly not of sufficient size to justify a new village hall/community building in its own right.
The infrastructure being facilitated through this site allocation (WLP7.9) is also not only addressing an existing need but helping to meet the need resulting from planned growth elsewhere in the surrounding area, notably at Station Road, Brampton (policy WLP7.10). The delivery of site allocation WLP7.10 will also provide CIL payment towards the community facilities (village hall) to be provided on the site. Accordingly it is only reasonable that such infrastructure and contributions are funded in a fair and reasonable manner.

In addition, as currently worded policy WLP7.9 unlike other policy allocations, including the significantly larger allocations, including WLP3.1 (Garden Neighbourhood of 1,250 dwellings), WLP3.2 (280 dwellings) and WLP5.2 (400 dwellings), introduces a further requirement in the final bullet point “Timescales and a phasing plan for the delivery of the various components of the masterplan should be agreed with the Council and secured by way of a legal agreement.” It is not clear why this site is being treated differently from other allocated sites and there is no justification in the supporting text to explain why an additional requirement is placed on our clients site when other larger and more complex scheme do not have such requirements.

For clarity the landowner envisages the legal agreement will secure the transfer of the setting (land) for, 1) the village hall/community building; 2) the car park; 3) the public open space; at no cost to the appropriate named organisation in each respect; along with the provision of the footpath and financial contribution towards equipping the play area. In addition to this CIL will be payable, and we consider a CIL payment of £430,844 could be reasonably expected for the development based on the rate of £87.57 per square metre (assuming market development of 120 sqm including garages of 36 sqm on 20 of the units).

We would also highlight that any development would have to provide; affordable housing at 30% of the new homes to be delivered; the construction of a footpath along the site frontage; along with other significant costs including the relocation of the overhead powerlines and sewerage infrastructure improvements.

Therefore, it is imperative that this site allocation is not hindered by unreasonable expectations and clarity is provided as to what is being sought through the policy allocation and subsequently required to be sought through the legal agreement. In the interests of reasonableness and consistency through the plan we therefore respectfully suggest the following modifications to the policy wording.

Revised paragraph:

- A comprehensive masterplan based on the indicative masterplan in Figure 27, including the various components of the site allocations, should be submitted as part of any planning application.

Additional bullet point:

- The public open space land comprising of, an equipped play area, playing field and amenity green space; the village hall setting; and car park land shall be secured through a Section 106 planning obligation. The equipped play area shall be funded through a Section 106 planning obligation and the footpath along the south side of Southwold Road shall be secured by and funded through a Section 106 planning obligation and/or Section 278 Agreement.
MM49 - Policy WLP7.10 Land at Toodley Farm, Station Road, Brampton

Jill Williams

Comment ID 18

Comment: Dear Sirs,
Re: Policy WLP7.10 Land at Toodley Farm, Station Road, Brampton

I live at 2 Rose Villas, Station Road, Brampton, directly opposite Toodley Farm and I wish to respond to the modifications to the Waveney Local Plan:

Regarding the sustainability
Objective 1. “To improve the health and well-being of the population.”
I fail to see how anyone could say there will be no effect if the plan goes ahead. My neighbours and I have voiced our objections at every opportunity as the houses will be directly in front of us invading our privacy. Whilst we are not against the building of the eight houses in principle, there is plenty of space to the left and right of us, or even in the next field along the lane (also owned by the landowner in question).

Objective 13. “To conserve and enhance the historic environment”. I also note that there is mention of the need to landscape to mitigate the impact on a nearby (farm owner/Parish Councillor’s) listed building. The proposed site cannot even be seen from the said listed building!!!! This whole affair is causing us health problems and will certainly do nothing towards our well-being with all the subsequent noise and traffic problems it will cause.

Furthermore:
I can see no mention of the Ecology survey of the field. Please can we be informed of when this will take place? I am particularly interested in this due to my property being registered as a sanctuary for great crested newts.

If the houses were to be built on the south and or west side of the field this would have less impact on our properties.

There has been no mention anywhere of the need for extra car parking for the train station. We have a problem here of cars being left all day on the roadside. Station Road is far too narrow for this to continue especially with the extra traffic this plan will create. This would seem a good opportunity to add some extra parking spaces along the east side of the field.

It has come to my attention recently that the initial adverts for land to be considered for this building plan were placed in local newspapers which are not delivered to our village. Had the adverts been placed around the village I am quite sure other landowners would have welcomed the chance to be considered. Please can you look into this matter and make your findings known.

Yours faithfully,
Jill Williams (Mrs)
Roy Harris

Comment ID 1

Comment
Proposed development has gone from 8 terraced houses along road front to 8 self build and now 8 dwellings. These houses are not required at this end of a very spread out village whose center is 2 miles away. If the proposed 8 dwellings were sited at the southern end of proposed site I wonder whether the land owner would like to see them from his house. I don’t think so but it is alright to put them where it does not affect him at the detriment to his neighbours.

Steven Dashwood

Comment ID 4

Comment
Is it the case that a prior consent form has to be submitted to the local planning office with a 5 year time span before you can apply for planning.

Is there also going to be a report from highway engineers regards to the small country lanes that will have more traffic, effect access, and speed limits.

Also an environmental health report, in the impact that added houses would have in the area.

A report from the local police department regarding the impact on human and animal life as regards to extra activity in regards to speed limits added vehicles.
MM53 - Policy WLP7.15 Land East of Mill Road, Rumburgh

Janet Holden

Comment ID 3
Comment I object to the insertion of the phrase 'where possible'. Why has this been included here and not for example in WLP 7.14. Where possible is too subjective.

Tim Basey-Fisher (John Long Planning (John Long))

Comment ID 16
Comment I write to you on behalf of my client, the Basey-Fisher family, in respect of their land interests at Rumburgh: proposed site allocation WLP7.15 Land East of Mill Road, Rumburgh.

I can confirm that the Basey-Fisher family continues to support the allocation of the land for residential development and that the site remains available for development.

The Basey-Fisher family has reviewed the main modifications proposed in respect of Policy WLP7.15 (main modification ref: MM53). I am able to confirm that the family supports the proposed modifications to the policy as they address the concerns previously raised during the pre-submission consultation and discussed with the Inspector and Council during the recent Local Plan Examination Hearing session (Matter 8).

I trust that this support for the main modifications will be presented to the Inspector in order that he can complete his examination and issue the Inspector’s Report.
District-Wide Strategic Planning Policies

MM54 - Policy WLP8.1 Housing Mix

Larkfleet Homes (DLP Planning Ltd (Emma Raine))

Comment ID 77

Comment

MM54 proposes the following

“Policy WLP8.1 – Housing Mix

The mix of sizes and types of units on any particular site should be based on evidence of local needs including the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and in consultation with the local planning authority.

Proposals for new residential developments will only be permitted where at least 35% of new dwellings on the site are 1 or 2 bedroom properties, unless this can be satisfactorily demonstrated to be unfeasible.

Neighbourhood Plans can set out a more detailed approach to housing type and mix which reflects local circumstances and is supported by evidence.”

Our client supports the proposed modifications to this policy; however, we suggest that the modification is further amended to read as follows:

“Policy WLP8.1 – Housing Mix

The mix of sizes and types of units on any particular site should be based on evidence of local needs including the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and in consultation with the local planning authority.

Proposals for new residential developments will only be permitted where at least 35% of new dwellings on the site are 1 or 2 bedroom properties, unless this can be satisfactorily demonstrated to be unfeasible or unviable.

Neighbourhood Plans can set out a more detailed approach to housing type and mix which reflects local circumstances and is supported by evidence.”

Our comments also stand for Additional Modification 56.

We also consider AM57 and AM58 should be changed in line with our comments above.

Richborough Estates (Steven Louth) (Brown & Co (Paul Clarke))
Comment ID 10

Comment The proposed qualification of the requirement for 35% of new housing schemes to comprise 1 and 2 bedroom properties is supported, as it explicitly allows the feasibility of such provision to be taken into account. This is important as the rigid application of such a requirement could, in some circumstances, stymie otherwise acceptable development and frustrate the delivery of housing.
MM55 - Policy WLP8.2 Affordable Housing

Home Builders Federation (Mark Behrendt)

Comment ID 69
Comment We support the removal of the word minimum from WLP8.2

Richborough Estates (Steven Louth) (Brown & Co (Paul Clarke))

Comment ID 11
Comment The requirement for housing developments outside specified locations to provide 30% affordable housing is supported. The deletion of the requirement to provide 50% of the affordable housing for intermediate tenures (in addition to 50% for affordable rent) is also supported as this will provide greater flexibility and allow for the provision of a wider range of affordable housing products. This approach is consistent with the broader definition of affordable housing set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, which includes starter homes and other affordable routes to home ownership.
MM56 - Policy WLP8.3 Self Build and Custom Build

Home Builders Federation (Mark Behrendt)

Comment ID 70

Comment
We support the proposed modification to WLP8.3 but consider that the amendment to this policy should go further and remove the word “minimum” in the first sentence of the second paragraph to ensure consistency with approach taken in the modification to WLP8.2.

Larkfleet Homes (DLP Planning Ltd (Emma Raine))

Comment ID 78

Comment
MM56 proposes to amend Policy WLP8.3 as follows:

“Policy WLP8.3 – Self Build and Custom Build

Proposals that would make a proportion of serviced dwelling plots available for sale to self builders or custom builders will be supported where in compliance with all other relevant policies of this Local Plan.

Developments of 100 or more dwellings will be expected to provide a minimum of 5% self or custom build properties on site through the provision of serviced plots unless this can be satisfactorily demonstrated to be unfeasible. Once completed and available for development, the serviced plots should be marketed for a period of not less than 12 months. Marketing should be in accordance with the principles set out in Appendix.

If, following this period, any of the serviced plots remain unsold, they may be built out by the developer.

Proposals for 5 or more self build or custom build dwellings in a single site location should be developed in accordance with a set of design principles to be submitted with any application and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.”

We support this modification, but would also include the word ‘unviable’ to the policy as identified below:

“Policy WLP8.3 – Self Build and Custom Build

Proposals that would make a proportion of serviced dwelling plots available for sale to self builders or custom builders will be supported where in compliance with all other relevant policies of this Local Plan.

Developments of 100 or more dwellings will be expected to provide a minimum of 5% self or custom build properties on site through the provision of serviced plots unless this can be satisfactorily demonstrated to be unfeasible or unviable. Once completed and available for development, the serviced plots should be marketed for a period of not less than 12 months. Marketing should be in accordance with the principles set out in Appendix 4. If, following this
period, any of the serviced plots remain unsold, they may be built out by the developer.

Proposals for 5 or more self build or custom build dwellings in a single site location should be developed in accordance with a set of design principles to be submitted with any application and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.”

Richborough Estates (Steven Louth) (Brown & Co (Paul Clarke))

Comment ID 12

Comment The proposed qualification of the requirement for 5% of new housing schemes of 100 dwellings or more to comprise plots for self or custom build properties is supported, as it explicitly allows the feasibility of such provision to be taken into account. This is important as the rigid application of such a requirements could, in some circumstances, stymie otherwise acceptable development and frustrate the delivery of housing.
MM58 - Policy WLP8.15 New Self Catering Tourist Accommodation

Bourne Leisure (Lichfields)

Comment ID 98

Comment Bourne Leisure continually reviews its business plan to ensure that the facilities provided at Corton and Gunton Hall Coastal Villages respond to the evolving demands of the tourism market and increasing expectations from guests regarding the quality of accommodation and facilities. In terms of the overall policy, Bourne Leisure welcomes the new reference to proposals for the expansion or intensification of existing self-catering tourist accommodation as a general principle. This will ensure the policy is in line with NPPF paragraph 83 and draft Strategic Objective 6 of the Draft Local Plan which seek to support growth of the tourism industry.

Environment Agency (Liam Robson)

Comment ID 23

Comment Previously we highlighted the vulnerability of some types of self-catering accommodation to flood risk. In order to manage the risk we would reiterate the need for owners/site managers to sign up to flood alerts/warnings as well as undertaking site specific FRAs.
MM60 - WLP8.21 Sustainable Transport

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID 119

Comment The County Council welcomes the amendments to policy WLP8.21.
MM61 - Policy WLP8.27 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

Bourne Leisure (Lichfields)

Comment ID
99

Comment
Bourne Leisure endorses the rewording of Policy WLP8.27 which establishes the importance of considering the amenity of nearby businesses, residents and visiting guests in assessing proposals for renewable and low carbon schemes. This will help to ensure that tourism businesses and holiday makers visiting the area are not adversely impacted by renewable and low carbon energy development which would have a detrimental impact upon the local economy.

However, to ensure consistency with paragraph 170 of the NPPF, we suggest that the word “significant” is removed from Policy WLP8.27 to read:

“there are no significant adverse effects on the amenities of nearby properties or businesses”

This will ensure that both new and existing development does not contribute to or is put at risk of any adverse environmental impacts.
MM63 - Policy WLP8.31 Lifetime Design

Home Builders Federation (Mark Behrendt)

Comment ID 71

Comment Whilst we welcome the modifications made to improve the clarity of this policy, we continue to disagree with the requirement for 40% of homes to be delivered to Part M4(2). As we stated in our representations and hearing statements, we do not consider the Council to have adequately justified this level of provision.

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID 120

Comment The County Council welcomes the change to policy WLP8.31 which extends the scope of the policy to include all forms of development.

However, the inclusion of the qualifying words ‘where practical’ risks rendering the policy ineffective, given that ‘im practicability’ has a very wide definition and may be conflated with inconvenience. It is inconsistent with national policy, given the importance which the NPPF (2012) gives to design. For example, paragraph 57 emphasises the need to plan positively for inclusive design, without qualification. Discounting inclusive design on the grounds of impracticality is not consistent with this approach.

If qualification to the requirement is required, the dementia friendly design requirement is already qualified in the policy to the extent that development ‘should’ be demonstrated, rather than ‘must’.

The ‘where practical’ statement in MM63 is also inconsistent with additional modification 68 (AM68), which refers to dementia friendly design being incorporated ‘where appropriate’. This is much more effective, and in suggesting relevance is probably closer to the true intent of the modification.

As such, the words ‘where practical’ should be deleted. But if specific qualification is required in MM63, the words ‘where relevant’ or ‘where appropriate’ would be more effective and consistent with national policy.
MM65 - Policy WLP8.37 Historic Environment

Kieran McDonald

Comment ID 84

Comment  WDC policy highlights the objective of the Council is to positively protect and enhance all heritage assets – I see no evidence of compliance with the spirit or the letter of this policy. The plan fails to acknowledge a currently non-designated heritage asset at WLP7.16 (C17 Suffolk Long House) and proposes development adjacent to all four boundaries, despite Heritage England stating that this property is of “local historic importance” [23rd May 2018]. The hearing should have acknowledged this and obliged WDC to make consideration of this in its plan.
MM68 - Policy WLP8.40 Archaeology

Norfolk County Council (Naomi C Chamberlain)

Comment ID 38

Comment Historic Environment support and approve of the sentiments and wording of Policy WLP8.40 – Archaeology. A sentence could be added encouraging any potential developers who have concerns regarding the archaeological implications of a proposed development to directly contact their local planning authorities archaeological advisors at either Norfolk County Council or Suffolk County Council.

Suffolk County Council (Robert Feakes)

Comment ID 121

Comment MM68 is supported.
Appendices

MM70 - Appendix 1 - Table A1.1 - Infrastructure and Delivery Framework

Anglian Water Services Ltd (Stewart Patience)

Comment ID 39

Comment We note that it is proposed to remove the column entitled 'Infrastructure Requirements' from Table A1.1 of Appendix 1 of the Submission Local Plan. This column includes reference to localised sewerage network improvements as referenced in the Local Plan.

Policy WLP1.3 (formerly WLP1.4) - Infrastructure includes a requirement for applicants to demonstrate that there is capacity within the foul sewerage network and at receiving Water Recycling Centre in time to serve the development. There is also reference made elsewhere to localised sewerage improvements being required to accommodate additional development at specific settlements identified in the local plan.

As the local plan is intended to be read as whole we have objection to the proposed removal of the text relating to sewerage network improvements which is relevant to Anglian Water from this table.
General Comment

Beccles Town Council (C Boyne)

Comment ID 55

Comment Beccles Town Council is generally in agreement with Waveney District Council’s proposed modifications to the draft Waveney Local Plan.

However, Beccles Town Council considers that the following aspects require addressing or emphasising.

Broads Authority (Natalie Beal)

Comment ID 30

Comment The Broads Authority is disappointed that the following straightforward amendments have not been made. The Authority is not aware of the reason for not making these fairly simple changes which can only serve to improve the Local Plan and ensure the protection and enhancement of the Broads, which has a status equivalent to a National Park. The following comments were made at the pre-submission consultation and are made again.

8.86 – we asked that this mentions the Broads. It is not clear why this simple change has not been made. The Broads is equivalent to a National Park and is an asset to Waveney and therefore should be included in this paragraph.

WLP8.27 – we asked that this policy mentioned impact on areas like the Broads. We suggested this text: ‘There are no adverse impacts on important landscapes of the Broads and AONB’. The Broads Landscape Sensitivity Study is of relevance to this policy as it refers to sensitivity from solar farms and wind turbines not just within the Broads, but nearby. As written it is not consistent with National Policy and is not effective as the Broads is a cross boundary strategic priority.

5.206 – we pointed out that this is a statement rather than an instruction and it has not been changed. It needs to end saying ‘...and these documents may be of relevance to scheme proposals near to the boundary with the Broads and developers/promoters should refer to them’

WLP8.35 – whilst the sentiment of protecting dark skies is very much welcomed, the use of the word ‘should’ is weak and could be seen as guidance rather than a requirement. It is not clear why this requirement is so weak and we seek stronger wording such as ‘is required to’.

Environment Agency (Liam Robson)
Comment ID 24
Comment Policy WLP 6.2 – Southwold Harbour

We are pleased to see that paragraph 6.19 has now been updated to include the most recent advice relating to flood risk activity permitting.

Policy 8.11 – Conversion of Rural Buildings to Residential Use

We have previously recommended that this policy should ensure any sites within Flood Zone 2 or 3 undertake a site specific FRA. This has not been included in the policy itself but is detailed in paragraph 8.56. We would like to see this added to the policy as it is a requirement set out in paragraph 163 footnote 50 of the NPPF.

Policy WLP 8.14 – Conversion and Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment Use

As stated in policy 8.11 we have previously recommended that this policy should ensure any sites within Flood Zone 2 or 3 undertake a site specific FRA as set out in paragraph 163 of the NPPF.

Comments not included in modifications but previously requested

In our response referenced AE/2015/11539 and dated 24 May 2018 we provided comments on:

- Policy WLP 3.1 – Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood
- Policy WLP 2.3 – Peto Square
- Policy WLP 7.5 – Land North of The Street, Somerleyton

It would appear that these comments have not been included and therefore our previous comments remain valid.

Forestry Commission (Steve Scott)
Comment ID 5
Comment Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission on the Local Plan. The information below is provided to assist you in assessing the appropriateness of sites for future development with regard to any which may be near to Ancient Woodland.

Ancient woodlands are irreplaceable. They have great value because they have a long history of woodland cover, with many features remaining undisturbed. This applies both to Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS).

There are three ancient woodland clusters in the Waveney District that are significant in the landscape and are of the highest priority for biodiversity. The three ancient woodland clusters are at Redisham, Sotterley and Wrentham. The individual ancient woodlands are listed below.

As a non-statutory consultee, the Forestry Commission is pleased to provide you with the inserted links, information that may be helpful when you consider site allocations or policies
within your draft plans.

Please note it is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland, unless "there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists" (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 175 amended July 2018).

We also particularly refer you to further technical information set out in Natural England and Forestry Commission’s Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland - plus supporting Assessment Guide and Case Decisions.

As a Non Ministerial Government Department, we provide no opinion supporting or objecting to a policy, an application or site allocation. Rather we are including information on the potential impact that the proposed development would have on the ancient woodland.

This response provides factual information on related policy which the planning authority may take account of when preparing plans and when making its decision on applications.

If the planning authority takes the decision- to approve an application which may impact on Ancient Woodland sites we may be able to give further, support in developing appropriate conditions in relation to woodland management mitigation or compensation measures. Please note however that the Standing Advice states that "Ancient woodland or veteran trees are irreplaceable, so you should not consider proposed compensation measures as part of your assessment of the benefits of the development proposal".

We suggest that you take regard of any points provided by Natural England about the biodiversity of any such woodland.

The resilience of existing and new woodland is a key theme of the Forestry Commission’s work to Protect, Improve and Expand woodland in England we will continue to work with Forestry/Woodland owners, agents, contractors and other Stakeholders to highlight and identify, pests and diseases and to work in partnership to enable Woodlands and Forests are resilient to the impacts of Climate Change.

The ancient woodlands in Waveney District include:

**Redisham cluster**
- Briery Wood
- Great Wood
- Gorse Thick
- Sparrow's Thick

**Sotterley cluster**
- Likeley Wood
- Willingham Wood
- Sotterley Wood
- Ashley Wood

**Wrentham cluster**
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Wrentham Great Wood
Savage Wood
Holly Grove

Please note the list above is intended as a guide, there may be other ancient woodlands in the Waveney District.

We hope these comments are helpful to you. If you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

-----------------------------------

A summary of Government policy on ancient woodland

Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (published October 2006).

Section 40 - "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity".

Paragraph 175 - "development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists".

This Guidance supports the implementation and interpretation of the National Planning Policy Framework. This section outlines the Forestry Commission’s role as a non statutory consultee on "development proposals that contain or are likely to affect Ancient Semi-Natural woodlands or Plantations on Ancient Woodlands Sites (PAWS) (as defined and recorded in Natural England’s Ancient Woodland Inventory), including proposals where any part of the development site is within 500 metres of an ancient semi-natural woodland or ancient replanted woodland, and where the development would involve erecting new buildings, or extending the footprint of existing buildings"

It also notes that ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat, and that, in planning decisions, Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) should be treated equally in terms of the protection afforded to ancient woodland in the National Planning Policy Framework. It highlights the Ancient Woodland Inventory as a way to find out if a woodland is ancient.

Page 23: "Areas of woodland are material considerations in the planning process and may be protected in local authority Area Plans. These plans pay particular attention to woods listed on the Ancient Woodland Inventory and areas identified as Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance SLNCIs)".

Page 10 "The existing area of ancient woodland should be maintained and there should be a net increase in the area of native woodland".

Natural Environment White Paper "The Natural Choice" (published June 2011)
Paragraph 2.53 - This has a "renewed commitment to conserving and restoring ancient
woodlands”.

**Paragraph 2.56** - "The Government is committed to providing appropriate protection to ancient woodlands and to more restoration of plantations on ancient woodland sites”.

**Standing Advice for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees** (first published October 2014, revised November 2017)

This advice, issued jointly by Natural England and the Forestry Commission, is a material consideration for planning decisions across England. It explains the definition of ancient woodland, its importance, ways to identify it and the policies that are relevant to it.

The Standing Advice refers to an **Assessment Guide**. This guide sets out a series of questions to help planners assess the impact of the proposed development on the ancient woodland. Summaries of some **Case Decisions** are also available that demonstrate how certain previous planning decisions have taken planning policy into account when considering the impact of proposed developments on ancient woodland.


**Paragraph 2.16** - Further commitments to protect ancient woodland and to continue restoration of Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS).

**Importance and Designation of Ancient and Native Woodland**

**Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW)**

Woodland composed of mainly native trees and shrubs derived from natural seedfall or coppice rather than from planting, and known to be continuously present on the site since at least AD 1600. Ancient Woodland sites are shown on Natural England’s Inventory of Ancient Woodland.

**Plantations on Ancient Woodland Site (PAWS)**

Woodlands derived from past planting, but on sites known to be continuously wooded in one form or another since at least AD 1600. They can be replanted with conifer and broadleaved trees and can retain ancient woodland features, such as undisturbed soil, ground flora and fungi. Very old PAWS composed of native species can have characteristics of ASNW. Ancient Woodland sites (including PAWS) are on Natural England’s Inventory of Ancient Woodland.

**Other Semi-Natural Woodland (OSNW)**

Woodland which has arisen since AD 1600, is derived from natural seedfall or planting and consists of at least 80% locally native trees and shrubs (i.e., species historically found in England that would arise naturally on the site). Sometimes known as ‘recent semi-natural woodland’.

Other woodlands may have developed considerable ecological value, especially if they have been established on cultivated land or been present for many decades.

**Information Tools - The Ancient Woodland Inventory**

This is described as provisional because new information may become available that shows that woods not on the inventory are likely to be ancient or, occasionally, vice versa. In addition ancient woods less than two hectares or open woodland such as ancient wood-pasture sites were generally not included on the inventories. For more technical detail see Natural England’s **Ancient Woodland Inventory**. Inspection may determine that other areas qualify.
As an example of further information becoming available, Wealden District Council, in partnership with the Forestry Commission, Countryside Agency, the Woodland Trust and the High Weald AONB revised the inventory in their district, including areas under 2ha. Some other local authorities have taken this approach.

**Further Guidance**

**Felling Licences** - Under the Forestry Act (1967) a Felling Licence is required for felling more than 5 cubic metres per calendar quarter. Failure to obtain a licence may lead to prosecution and the issue of a restocking notice.

**Environmental Impact Assessment** - Under the Environmental Impact Assessment (Forestry) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999, as amended, deforestation which is likely to have a significant impact on the environment may also require formal consent from the Forestry Commission.

**Highways England (Mark Norman)**

**Comment ID** 67

**Comment** Thank you for consulting us on the proposed modifications to your local plan following the Examination in Public.

We have no comments to make at this stage.

**Historic England**

**Comment ID** 36

**Comment** Thank you for consulting Historic England on the main modifications, the additional modifications and the addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal report for the Waveney Local Plan.

We welcome the inclusion of the changes agreed through our Statement of Common Ground and our further correspondence on sustainable construction.

**Kieran McDonald**

**Comment ID** 85

**Comment** The plan fails to comply with the NPPF with respect to WLP7.16. WDC October 2015 'call for sites' was published in a newspaper not distributed within the parish affected by the proposed development of WLP7.16. The sole respondent, to the 'call for sites', was the developer.
proposing to develop WLP7.16, unsurprisingly positive with respect to the development. There were no other respondents because...

The steps taken by WDC to make the local community aware and informed, either directly or indirectly, were inadequate. Further to this WDC failed to invite representations from people resident in the directly affected area, including the landowners directly adjacent to WLP7.16, and as a result didn't follow the guidelines outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or the regulations outlined in the 2012 Town and Country Planning Regulations [para 159 to 173; Regulations 18(1) and 2(C.) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012]. WDC denied concerned parties the opportunity to object to the proposed site or to propose alternatives.

Kieran McDonald

Comment ID 86

Comment The modifications don't address the issue of access to WLP7.16. The proposed access to WLP7.16 is clearly inadequate.

Lowestoft Town Council (SARAH FOOTE)

Comment ID 94

Comment Lowestoft Town Council does not have any additional comments to submit and looks forward to an update on the adoption of the Local Plan.

National Grid (Spencer Jefferies) (National Grid (Wood PLC) (Lucy Bartley))

Comment ID 7

Comment National Grid has appointed Wood to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf.

We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.

Further Advice

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Norfolk County Council (Naomi C Chamberlain)

Comment ID 37

Comment Paragraph 1.40 (previously 1.36) should be amended to reflect the aspirations of the A47 Alliance, which Norfolk County Council is a member of, so that the proposals have regard to the strategic function of the A47 and support the long term ambition to dual the route with appropriate grade separation.

Richborough Estates (Steven Louth) (Brown & Co (Paul Clarke))

Comment ID 8

Comment 1. Brown & Co act for Richborough Estates in relation to the promotion for housing of land to the south of Harrisons Lane, Halesworth (the site).

2. Representations to the emerging Local Plan have been made previously in relation to this land, and the site and other adjacent land is currently proposed for allocation for housing, a retirement community and health, sports and education facilities (draft Policy WLP4.1).

3. An outline planning application for the development of up to 190 dwellings on the site was submitted in November 2018. Richborough Estates expect to appoint a development partner for the scheme in the first half of 2019.

4. The purpose of this document is to set out Richborough Estate’s representations on the Proposed Main Modifications to the Waveney Local Plan, which were issued for consultation in December 2018.

5. Richborough Estates is a responsible and reputable strategic land promotion business, founded with the aim of working in partnership with landowners. Richborough Estates projects are located throughout the country and range from urban extensions to smaller scale sites in sustainable towns and villages.

6. Richborough is currently promoting over 20,000 dwellings through various stages of the planning process across the UK. Its aim is to leave a lasting legacy for the communities within which it works.

Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service (Angela Kempen)

Comment ID 6

Comment Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service has considered the plan and are of the opinion that, given the level of growth proposed, we do not envisage additional service provision will need to be made in order to mitigate the impact. However, this will be reconsidered if service conditions change. As always, 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.