

Woolpit Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Response to amendments proposed by Regulation 16 consultees

[MSDC Note: These further comments from WNPSG on representations made at the Submission draft stage were received on 3 Mar 2020. A copy was forwarded to the NP Examiner that same day.]

Consultee	Proposed amendment	WNP response
Suffolk County Council	<p>WPT3 Reference to the Suffolk Guidance for Parking should be updated to reflect that the guidance was updated in 2019</p> <p>WPT4 Reference to the Suffolk Guidance for Parking should be updated to reflect that the guidance was updated in 2019</p> <p>WPT5 For clarity for developers and decision makers, the policy should state that at least 0.7ha of land is needed in order to expand the school</p> <p>Reference to the Suffolk Guidance for Parking should be updated to reflect that the guidance was updated in 2019</p> <p>WPT6 Reference to the Suffolk Guidance for Parking should be updated to reflect that the guidance was updated in 2019</p>	<p>Accepted. The policy will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Accepted. The policy will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Accepted. Bullet point 6 to be amended to read: <i>As required by Suffolk County Council, at least 0.7 ha of land to enable the expansion of Woolpit Primary school to 420 pupils, with access for pedestrians and deliveries direct through the development.</i></p> <p>Accepted. The policy will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Accepted. The policy will be amended accordingly.</p>
Mid Suffolk District Council	<p>Contends that WNP does not meet the housing allocation published in the Joint Local Plan in July 2019 (NB after WNP's Reg 14 consultation had been completed and the plan finalised).</p>	<p>Rejected. The Joint Local Plan is still in draft and has no status. In the face of 3 direct refusals by MSDC to provide a housing target, WNP mad its own calculation of housing need based on known MSDC spatial distribution strategy and the overall district housing requirement.</p>
Drinkstone Parish Council	<p>WPT9 Settlement gaps should be extended to include the gap between Windmill Avenue business park and Drinkstone Mills.</p> <p>WPT16 Footpath/cycle access between Woolpit and Drinkstone should be improved as for the path to Elmswell.</p>	<p>Rejected. Not within the scope of WNP – the land referred to is mainly in Drinkstone parish.</p> <p>WNP welcomes this, and looks forward to a proposal appearing in Drinkstone NP (such footpath/cycle access will be mostly in Drinkstone parish). To be dealt with under the relevant Community Action.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>WPT14 The policy should state that development proposals will only be</p>	<p>Accepted. A bullet point to be inserted after the first two, to read:</p>

	<p>permitted where they will not result in any loss of floodplain.</p> <p>WPT18 Recommends that reference to the use of SuDS in the design of new development is included, making reference to Appendix F of the Mid Suffolk Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>	<p><i>will not result in any loss of floodplain.</i></p> <p>Accepted. A new section to be inserted, to read: <i>Major developments should use a SuDS scheme as set out in Mid Suffolk's SFRA currently in force, having attention to guidance in Appendix F regarding appropriate infiltration and attenuation systems.</i></p>
Mr & Mrs Scott	The Rags Lane site should not be designated Local Green Space.	Rejected. The site meets the criteria required in the NPPF.
Evolution Town Planning	WNP does not meet the Basic Conditions.	Rejected. Evolution's arguments are spurious, and while the JLP remains in draft the legal advice they have obtained is hypothetical.
Turley	<p>WPT2 Recommends an amendment to the wording of the first sentence.</p> <p>WPT18 Recommends the following amendment to the section 'Green space and landscaping': <i>All developments including the site allocations in this Plan should follow the best practice guidance set out in much following the Management and Development Guidelines in the Landscape Appraisal (reproduced in Appendix).</i> The bullet points to be struck out.</p>	<p>Rejected as unnecessary.</p> <p>Rejected. This would weaken the initial requirement; and it is proper for major developments to a biodiversity assessment, appraisal of the impact on the landscape, and plans for the retention and management of areas of open space and woodland.</p>
Clarke & Simpson	<p>WPT1 The first sentence of the Policy should be re-worded to refer to the Plan providing for a minimum of 250 dwellings to be developed in Woolpit to ensure it is compliant with the NPPF. The penultimate [sentence] should also be amended to refer to a minimum of 40 dwellings being delivered through windfall development and sites which comply with Policy WPT2. Text should be added to the final paragraph to make reference to proposals complying with the requirements of Policy WPT2.</p>	<p>Accepted. The opening sentence is amended to read: <i>It is estimated that this Plan can provide 255 dwellings to be developed in Woolpit between 2017 and 2036, in line with calculated housing need.</i></p> <p>Rejected. WPT2 meets the case.</p> <p>Rejected. WPT2 meets the case.</p>

<p>Clarke & Simpson</p>	<p>WPT2 Second bullet point should be amended to read: <i>maintaining suitable gaps between the main village of Woolpit and one or more of the outlying settlements which maintains their distinct identity and is consistent with the recommendations of the Landscape Appraisal.</i></p> <p>WPT6 <i>The landowners suggest that the policy is modified to include an additional sentence supporting self-build/custom build development proposals where they are well related to the existing pattern of development and encouraging the inclusion of self-build plots as part of larger developments which include 10 or more homes or are on sites of 0.5 hectares or more in size.</i></p> <p>WPT9 Modify the second bullet point as in the recommendation for WPT2. Remove the final paragraph of the policy.</p> <p>WPT10 Change the title to more closely reflect the substance and objectives of the Policy. Add text to refer to any community benefits being sought being subject to compliance with the CIL Regulations and paragraph 56 of the NPPF.</p> <p>WPT15 Objects to the scale of protection given to the settlement gap between Brickfields business park and Woolpit Heath, as it sets a higher policy threshold than that for WPT14 Areas of Special Landscape Quality.</p> <p>WPT18 Recommends the following amendment to the section 'Green space and landscaping': <i>All developments including the site allocations in this Plan should follow the best practice guidance set out in much following the Management and Development Guidelines in the Landscape Appraisal (reproduced in Appendix).</i> The bullet points to be struck out.</p>	<p>Qualification of the condition is not accepted, but the bullet point will be amended to add after the word 'settlements': <i>which maintains their distinct identity and is consistent with the recommendations of the Landscape Appraisal.</i></p> <p>Accepted. The following to be added to the final paragraph (changing the full stop to a comma): <i>and in this context we welcome proposals which include self-build/custom build plots.</i></p> <p>Partial agreement; bullet point to be amended as in WPT2 above. Rejected.</p> <p>Accepted. Title to be altered to: <i>Policy WPT10 Sustainability</i></p> <p>Rejected – redundant.</p> <p>Rejected. Settlement gaps and ASLQs are not the same. The settlement gaps require different treatment.</p> <p>Rejected. This would weaken the initial requirement; and it is proper for major developments to a biodiversity assessment, appraisal of the impact on the landscape, and plans for the retention and management of areas of open space and woodland.</p>
-----------------------------	---	--