

Needham Market Neighbourhood Plan – REG16 Consultation

Comments by Needham Market Town Council on REG16 representations

Serial	Respondent	Needham Market Town Council comment
1	Suffolk County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted
2	Mid Suffolk District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Omission from REG14 representation is noted in relation to Policy NM1. The suggested amendment would be consistent with national guidance and therefore no objection to its inclusion. The references timing of the submission of the NMNP and the publication of the BMSJLP (REG19) are correct. The suggested amendments to the NMNP text to refer to the most up to date version of the BMSJLP are factual changes and therefore there is no objection to these being included.
3	Cllr Mike Norris	Noted
4	Natural England	Noted
5	Historic England	Noted
6	Anglian Water	The change in the wording of Policy NM2 which relates to the inclusion of a reference to 10 dwellings was as a result of a representation made by Mid Suffolk District Council at REG 14 stage (page 26 of the consultation statement). It is also consistent with NPPF para 165 which refers to major development. However, there would be no objection if the original wording was reinstated.
7	Water Management Alliance	Noted
8	Highways England	Noted
9	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	Noted.
10	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suffolk Wildlife Trust did not submit a representation during the REG14 consultation and therefore the content of the representation raises largely new issues. There are 5 criteria in Policy NM2 that relate specifically to wildlife and landscaping. This policy was amended following the REG14 consultation to accommodate comments made by Suffolk County Council. Criterion i) refers to creating net gains, creating new habitats and extending wildlife corridors. The introduction of a new policy at REG14 stage would have meant a repeat of that consultation exercise. The preference would have been to expand the Wildlife and Landscaping Section of Policy NM2 rather than insert an additional policy.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the requested policy content could be viewed as repeating the guidance in the NPPF Paragraphs 174-177 and Policies SPO9 (Enhancement and Management of the Environment), SP10 (Climate Change) and LP18 (Biodiversity & Geodiversity) of the emerging BMSJLP – Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Version 2020. These policies were previously SP09, SP10 and LP17 in the 2019 Preferred Options of the BMSJLP). • Paragraph 15.14 (previously 15.19) of the BMSJLP (Regulation 19 Version) refers to County Wildlife Sites as local designations which are protected in the subsequent Policy LP18 (formerly LP17). • The Environment Act is still the Environment Bill and the Government has recently announced a delay to its progress. It is unlikely to be passed until Autumn 2021. • The NMTC would not object to appropriate modifications to Policy NM2.
11	James Bailey Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site referred to as a potential ‘reserve site’ lies outside of the Designated Neighbourhood Area. Therefore, it cannot be included within the current NMNP. • The issue of the housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Area is a Local Plan matter. • The reasons for the Town Council deciding not to make specific allocations in the NMNP are set out in the plan at (paragraph 6.1.7). • The fact that the plan period for the Local Plan has been extended to 2037 has not changed the housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Area (aside from the minor adjustments made to the numbers in the three Local Plan allocations). Therefore, the Neighbourhood Plan does not have a housing shortfall that it needs to address. • It is likely that the NMNP will be reviewed before the end of the plan period in 2036. • NMTC have already begun to think ahead and have commissioned consultants AECOM to undertake feasibility work and Design Guidelines that will be used to inform the next Neighbourhood Plan.
12	Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group	NMTC is pleased to hear that the situation has improved and would not object to the wording in paragraph 6.3.9 being updated to reflect this.