



Bures Neighbourhood Plan 2021-2037

Consultation Statement

January 2025

Contents

Overview of Bures Neighbourhood Plan	3
About this consultation statement	3
Summary of consultation and engagement activity	4
Community and Engagement Log	6
Early engagement - how this was considered in development of the pre- submission plan.	27
Regulation 14 Consultation	28
Overview.....	28
Responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation.....	30
Statutory Stakeholders.....	31
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council.....	31
Braintree District Council.....	41
Suffolk County Council	44
National Gas (Avison Young)	55
National Grid (Avison Young)	55
Historic England	56
Natural England	56
Environment Agency	57
Anglian Water	60
Highways England.....	67
Essex Police	67
Water Management Alliance (WLMA)	73
Marine Management Organisation.....	74
Councillor Ian Woodman (Chair of Mount Bures Parish Council).....	77
James Lawson Planning	79
Residents	85
Ken McAndrew	85
Online Survey.....	86
Appendix A- Statutory Consultees Contacted at Regulation 14.....	108

Introduction

Overview of Bures Neighbourhood Plan

1. Bures Neighbourhood Plan (NP) has been prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Localism Act 2011, the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and Directive 2001/42/EC on Strategic Environmental Assessment.
2. It establishes a vision and objectives for the future of the parish and sets out how this will be realised through non-strategic planning policies.

About this consultation statement

3. This consultation statement has been prepared by Collective Community Planning on behalf of Bures St Mary Parish Council and Bures Hamlet Parish Council to fulfil the legal obligation of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out that a Consultation Statement should contain:
 - a) Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
 - b) Explains how they were consulted;
 - c) Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - d) Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and where relevant addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.
4. It has also been prepared to demonstrate that the process has complied with Section 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This sets out that before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must:
 - a) Publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work, or carry on business in the Neighbourhood Plan area:
 - i. Details of the proposals for a Neighbourhood Plan;
 - ii. Details of where and when the proposals for a Neighbourhood Plan may be inspected;
 - iii. Details of how to make representations; and
 - iv. The date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised;
 - b) Consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a Neighbourhood Plan; and
 - c) Send a copy of the proposals for a Neighbourhood Plan to the local planning authority.
5. Furthermore, the National Planning Practice Guidance requires that the qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its Neighbourhood Plan, and ensure that the wider community:

- Is kept fully informed of what is being proposed;
 - Is able to make their views known throughout the process;
 - Has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging Neighbourhood Plan; and
 - Is made aware of how their views have informed the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
6. This statement provides an overview and description of the consultation that was undertaken by the NP steering group on behalf of Bures St Mary Parish Council and Bures Hamlet Parish Council, in particular the Regulation 14 Consultation on the pre-submission draft. The steering group have endeavoured to ensure that the NP reflects the views and wishes of the local community and the key stakeholders.
 7. The area was designated by Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council and Braintree District Council on 25 November 2021¹.

Summary of consultation and engagement activity

8. This section sets out in chronological order the consultation and engagement events that led to the production of the draft Bures that was consulted upon as part of the Regulation 14 Consultation.
9. A significant amount of work went locally into engaging with the community early in development of the NP, so that it could be informed by the views of local people. Consultation events took place at key points in the development process. The full engagement log with the community is shown in the next section. A range of events and methods were used and at every stage the results were analysed and shared with local people. The group created a neighbourhood plan website in which the public could be kept up to date with the neighbourhood plan² including a log of public engagement, viewing documents and notes from the minutes of meetings which took place between 2021 and 2024³.
10. The village magazine between October 2023 and August 2024 had monthly articles updating the community on the plan and asking if they had views to share on different topics. These have been summarised below and links to the various magazine articles can be found here: [Public Engagement Log — Bures Neighbourhood Plan](#)
 - October 2023 Article- Discussed the concerns the community had raised around transport and accessibility. The NP have an objective to provide a safe and accessible village environment and stated how the plan will identify

¹ [Bures Neighbourhood Plan Notice](#)

² [Bures Neighbourhood Plan](#)

³ [Minutes & Links — Bures Neighbourhood Plan](#)

policies and community projects to address current problems. Residents were given the opportunity to join the group, make suggestions or ask questions.

- November 2023 Article- Asked residents what trees are important to them and what makes them special since the NP steering wanted to identify trees in the NP to preserve.
- December 2023 Article- Focused on flooding and stated the NP group have been considering what should be included in the plan to address increasing risk of flooding in Bures. Residents were given the opportunity to join the group, make suggestions or ask questions.
- January 2024 Article- Thanked residents for their responses to consultations in the magazine, at clubs and the market. Also, the NP group asked for views on the idea of locally listed properties (NDHAS). Residents were given the opportunity to join the group, make suggestions or ask questions.
- February 2024 Article- Focused on the Bures Common Land Trust and an update on trying to apply to the community ownership fund for a grant to help purchase the Water Meadow on Colchester Road for the village.
- March 2024 Article- Update on the fact views which have been contributed at public consultations between 2021-2023 or within the parish survey in 2017 are being looked at carefully. Announced there will be the Bures Annual Public Meeting to share progress on the NP to the community and for people to come along to the Bures Community Centre on Monday 25th March to share any thoughts.
- April 2024 Article- The question was asked if residents have shared their thoughts on their favourite green spaces, key views and valued trees and if they didn't to check out the news tab to find out more. If people wished to find out more or share information an email was provided.
- August 2024 Article- Update to the community that the draft plan was sent to the Local Planning Authorities for their informal comments and after this the consultants CCP will be making amendments. Further information will be shared in due course.

Community and Engagement Log



Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
28.9.21 and 11.10.21	Launch meetings These took place during the COVID-19 pandemic. (Social distancing, masks, ventilation) Two meetings were held	A wide range of residents including councillors, landowners, business owners, experts in particular areas. Across the age range	Aim – to attract those who may be willing to contribute to the creation of the Bures Neighbourhood Plan and play key roles in the work towards its creation.	Large display board in the empty corner shop. Bures market Parish Council meetings Parish Magazine Word of mouth	28.9.21 12 attendees 7 agreed to be part of a working party or steering group 11.10.21 12 attendees 8 agreed to be part of a WP or SG
13.11.21 – 1.12.21	Gathering of views on and aspirations for Bures	Attendees of the launch meetings Residents attending the market Attendees at Boxercise class Attendees at Youth Club	To identify what residents value most about Bures and their hopes for Bures in 2035 to inform 'Vision Statement' Focus on different age groups	Large display board Stickers on a board Sheets to complete Interviews	Team 9 Market 60 adults Boxercise 5 adults Youth Club 15 under 18s

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
		Residents interviewed when out and about in the village	including young adults and teenagers		23 adults 1 under 18 113
14.1.22 7 & 17.1.22	Parish Council meetings	All Parish Councilors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councilors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Terms of Reference and communication and engagement Strategy to be agreed by both councils. All present at the meetings to understand the grant process and spending Councillors approved the minutes of the Steering group meetings and the spend to date	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas	25
25.1.22	Wider group meeting	All those interested in taking an active role in achieving a Neighbourhood Plan for Bures	To agree working groups according to willingness and interests – Housing, Heritage and Landscape, Environment, Economy, Transport	Meeting in the main hall of the community centre – preceded by email and Facebook post	12 (apologies 4)
	Website	Everyone in Bures and connected to Bures	To be a hub for the Bures NP, where all formal documents, meeting minutes etc can be easily accessed by residents. The website also offers a direct communication channel to the NP Steering Group	Bures Neighborhood Plan website created https://www.buresneighbourhoodplan.com	
12-19.2.22	Bures Neighbourhood Plan flyer	All residents	To ensure that all households are aware of the project and know what to expect	Volunteers from Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary Parish Councils to deliver to every	9 volunteers All residents

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
				property in the two parishes	
25.2.22 – 25.3.22	Housing Needs survey Gathering the views and requirements of Bures residents and those people with strong connections to the village	All Bures residents and those people with strong connections to the village. For example owners of business owners not resident, young people whose families are resident in Bures but are unable to find suitable accommodation here	Given our District Councils have no plans for further housing development in Bures the NP Group decided it should engage with Bures residents on their housing needs and to incorporate these into the NP. The recent potential redevelopment of the Bures Bus Depot had also solicited a number of views calling for more social housing.	Pre engagement with different community groups – Young people looking for in Bures – Elderly people looking to downsize within Bures but unable to do so – People currently living in Social Housing Posters promoting the HNS placed in all retail outlets and on parish notice boards. Details about the HNS have also been placed in the Parish Magazine and in the School parents' newsletter. Online links to the survey promoted on Facebook (including the local Beautiful Bures Facebook Group) and on the front page of the Parish / Bures NP websites	800 paper surveys hand delivered to every household On-line survey also available
14.3.22 & 17.3.22	Parish Council meetings	All Parish Councilors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councilors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Councillors approved the minutes of the Steering group meetings and the spend to date	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas	25 plus members of the public

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
12.3.22 17.3.22	Vision Statement	Residents visiting Bures market 12.3.22, Youth Club 17.3.22, all those involved in the project and members of the public in other venues	To be sure that the draft statement reflected the views of residents	Views gathered from residents 11-12/21 were distilled into a statement to be taken back to residents for consultation. Display boards in the vacant shop, display boards at Bures market, clip board and approach by members of the team, Bures Parish Magazine Responses gathered under these headings – Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree Those not in agreement asked reasons in order to ensure that the Vision reflects views accurately	70 at Bures market SA – 54, A – 14, D - 2 12 through display boards – comments only 7 at Youth Club SA – 1, A - 5, D- 1
22.3.22	Wider Group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning plus those who responded to the flyer and wished to join in	New volunteers added to groups and areas of responsibility SWOT analyses for each group shared Vision statement agreed by the meeting	Meeting in the main hall of the community centre – preceded by email and Facebook post Flyer, posts, emails	13 (apologies 5)
9-10.4.22	PROGRESS UP-DATE WEEKEND	All residents	To engage as many residents in face to face contact with the NP team and the progress that had been made at 6mths since launch point. Activities for	Prior to the events - Banners, posters, Facebook posts, displays At the event Large display boards asking for contributions to the SWOT analyses	150 Saturday 30 Sunday

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
			residents to give their views	Early outcomes of the Housing Survey List of businesses – 142 – prizes for those who could add additional ones Board showing environmental priorities – visitors asked to indicate their priorities Early contribution from AECOM involvement with the Heritage and Landscape Group	
19.5.22 23.5.22	Parish Council meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Councillors approved the minutes of the Steering group meetings and noted the Wider Group meeting due 24.5.22. Application for a grant for a further year approved	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas	25 plus members of the public
24.5.22	Wider Group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning	Items to be funded by next grant Feedback from Public engagement – Progress Update 9-10 April Sharing progress made by the groups. Housing needs survey details Landscape character work by Nigel Cowlin	Meeting in the main hall of the community centre – preceded by email and Facebook post Flyer, posts, emails	11
7,9,10.7.22	Bures Music Festival	The Wider Group was keen to engage young people in the village. This event	The young people are the future of the village. It is important to know what they	Stall with large Bures Neighbourhood Plan standing signs and a large	Between 150 and 180

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
		gave the opportunity to reach many who do not attend the market and other venues previously visited by the team.	think and feel about Bures and for them to be more aware of the Neighbourhood Planning process	<p>banner behind on the fence.</p> <p>Theme – ‘Planning is not just about housing’ with a focus on the environment. Maps showing the wildlife corridors identified by the Environment Group together with a competition to estimate most accurately the length of the corridors. Three prizes of Bures vouchers awarded – one for each day. Two of the prizes were won by children.</p> <p>Visitors to the stall were also asked to identify their favourite green space in Bures. This was something which many residents felt strongly.</p> <p>There was an A0 poster displaying the outcome of the Housing Needs survey.</p> <p>In addition, wildflower seeds were given out to people visiting the stall and as an introduction to the work of the plan when going out into the festival.</p> <p>The young people who attended the B-Fest on 7th July were very positive. The wide range of</p>	people over the period of the festival

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
				people over the weekend were, on the whole, similarly interested in the stall and the activities	
18.7.22 and 28.7.22	Parish Council meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Councillors approved the minutes of the Steering group meetings and noted the Wider Group meeting due 26.7.22. Application for a grant for a further year successful. Additional volunteer came forward to join the N Planning team	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas Regular agenda item	25 plus members of the public
19.7.22	Work with Yr 6 pupils at Bures School	Children, parents and staff	Further work focusing on young people as the future of the village. Parents, also previously not well represented in the engagement, were reached through the use of a photo quiz.	Photo quiz showing items in the village showing positive actions to combat Climate Change – where and why? Children were also invited to identify their favourite things about Bures and what they would like to see in Bures in the future. Children all given packets of wildflower seeds	28 children parents – between 28 and 56 staff at least 5 of the 23
22.7.22 21.10.22	Business survey	All those involved in business and commerce in the village	To understand the needs of the business community in order to create policies and community	Survey sent out electronically via RCCE Survey monkey and in hard copy form using members of the team to deliver.	148 sent out (it was agreed that only 135 were operating companies)

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
			objectives that meet those needs Vouchers given as incentive to return surveys. Return rate 36.3%	Questions relating to needs and to size and nature of businesses Business group met and agreed the vouchers should be given to the 11th, 21st and 31st responses recorded. Due to lack of information the 11th 23rd and 31st JB Plumbing, Blake Tree Care and Chris Bright Machinery.	135 hard copies
26.7.22	Wider Group Meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning	Feedback on Bures Music Festival and Bures School engagement – very positive Sharing news on changes to the Steering group and the creation of advisors	Meeting in The Garrad Room at Bures Community Centre. Emails sent and personal invites offered	11 attendees 7 apologies
26.9.22 and 29.9.22	Parish Council meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Councillors approved the minutes of the Steering group and Wider group meetings and noted Business survey responses in and being analysed.	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas Regular agenda item	25 plus members of the public

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
13.10.22	Wider Group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Housing items needed to be discussed Housing Needs Assessment Call for Sites Site Options package Presentations to village organisations	Meeting in The Garrad Room at Bures Community Centre. Emails sent and personal invites offered	11 present 4 apologies
14.11.22 and 24.11.22	Parish Council meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Councillors approved the minutes of the Steering group and Wider group meetings. Issue of Call for Sites explained with, on 24.11.22 the decision not to proceed with a CfS.	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas Regular agenda item	25 plus members of the public
16.11.22	Wider Group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Important Feedback meeting Feedback on meeting with Paul Bryant Babergh, Alan Massow Braintree and Jan Stobart RCCE. Housing Needs Assessment to proceed. Bures NP will not involve a Call for Sites. 1 year in trifold leaflet agreed Visits to meetings of clubs and societies agreed for January	Meeting in The Garrad Room at Bures Community Centre. Emails sent, Parish Councils shared date and personal invites offered	7 present 6 apologies

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
29.11.22	Members of the Bures NP Team visited Bures Scouts Explorers Group to discuss the NP and community projects	Young people aged 14 – 18 who are members of Bures Scouts Explorers Group	The Wider Group meeting on 16.11.22 identified that contact with younger people was needed. The Explorer group leader contacted to ask us to visit.	Presentation on NP – linking back to Youth Club visit and Music Festival engagement. Discussion on Community projects Agreement that the Explorer group will provide ideas and feedback on topics the NP is working on.	22 aged 14-18 3 leaders 4 members of NP team
10.12.22	Bures Neighbourhood Plan 2nd flyer – 1 year in	Visitors to Bures Christmas Market	To alert residents to the new leaflet	Leaflets and board positioned next to the refreshments	2 members of the NP team Many visitors – superficial engagement
14.12.22 – 14.01.23	Bures Neighbourhood Plan 2nd flyer – 1 year in	All residents	To ensure that all households are aware of the progress with the project. Residents will know how they can contribute and what to expect next.	Volunteers from Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary Parish Councils to deliver to every property in the two parishes	All residents
9.1.23	Wider group Meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning – members of the public welcome	Discussion on HNA, site on the Mount Bures/Bures Hamlet boundary Use of consultants	Emails, website	9 attendees 5 apologies

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
10.1.23	History Society	Members of the society	Consultation on the Heritage and Landscape aspects of the draft plan	The H & L survey was trialled. The response was very positive with wholehearted support for the policies identified by the group. Responses to statements included in the draft – strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree	21 responses – all either strongly supportive or supportive of all elements
16.1.23 and 26.1.23	Parish Council meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Councillors approved the minutes of the Steering group and Wider group meetings. Housing Needs Assessment undertaken by AECOM in hand. Consultation leaflets outlining the NHP progress distributed to all households with good feedback. Application for a second grant from Groundwork UK approved. £3,695 received. Budget variation approved.	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas Regular agenda item	25 plus members of the public
23.1.23	Steering Group/Wider Group	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	To meet Ian Poole from Places4People to hear his views on the work to date.	In person meeting in the Dennis Ambrose Barn – open to all. Advertised on the website	9 attendees 6 apologies
31.1.23	Explorer Scouts group	Young people who belong the group	Consultation on the Heritage and Landscape and	Through the Scouts	14 responses

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
			Natural Environment aspects of the draft plan – some concern regarding possible increase in litter and undesirable visitors. Strong support for 'green' issues	Responses to statements included in the draft – strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree	
1.2.23	Church Coffee morning	Those attending the regular Wednesday event	Consultation on the Heritage and Landscape and Natural Environment aspects of the draft plan	Announced at the coffee morning Responses to statements included in the draft – strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree	17 responses
6.2.23	Steering/Wi der group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Discussion on the draft and on consultations	In person meeting in the Garrad Room. Open to all. Notice on website	7 attendees 5 apologies
13.2.23	Bures WI	Members of the WI	Consultation on the Heritage and Landscape and Natural Environment aspects of the draft plan	Through the WI Responses to statements included in the draft – strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree	11 responses
14.2.23	History Society	Members of the society	Consultation on the Natural Environment aspects of the draft plan. 12 responses – some needing more information regarding 'green' issues.	Through the society Responses to statements included in the draft – strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree	12

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
20.2.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	New sections agreed – in line with the Vision statement	In person meeting in the Garrad Room. Open to all. Notice on website	3 attendees 9 apologies
6.3.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Sharing of the 3rd draft Use of consultants	In person meeting in the Garrad Room. Open to all. Notice on website	4 attendees 6 apologies
20.3.23 and 23.3.23	Parish Council meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Councillors approved the minutes of the Steering group and Wider group meetings. Issue of Call for Sites explained with, on 24.11.22 the decision not to proceed with a CfS.	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas Regular agenda item	25 plus members of the public
11.3.23	Stall at Bures Market	Wide range of residents attending the monthly market	Consultation - To gain feedback on the objectives in the draft plan	Large display boards listing the objectives for each section of the draft plan. Stickers to indicate strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree. Space for other issues to be raised. Members of the team present to discuss issues	22+ people used the stickers to respond. Others discussed
21.3.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	HNA Consultants Photographers	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	5 attendees 4 apologies

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
27.3.23	Annual Parish Meeting	Councillors and residents attending the meeting	Consultation – To gain feedback on the objectives in the draft plan	Large display boards listing the objectives for each section of the draft plan. Stickers to indicate strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree. Space for other issues to be raised. Members of the team present to discuss issues	12+ people used the stickers to respond. Others discussed issues that are important to them
3.4.23	Steering/Wilder group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	End of grant period reporting Use of consultants	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	4 attendees 7 apologies
19.4.23	Steering/Wilder group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Use of consultants Proposal brief Scope of work	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	5 attendees 7 apologies
15.5.23	Steering/Wilder group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	HNA update Use of consultants Changes to the draft	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	7 attendees 4 apologies
16.5.23 23.5.23	Parish Council Meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Minutes of the NP meetings 21st March, 3rd April 19th April were approved 3rd draft shared	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas Regular agenda item	18 + members of the public

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
30.5.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	HNA update Consultants Requests for photographs Public engagement	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	4 attendees 6 apologies
3.7.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Meeting with Newton Green NP reps Funding HNA Changes to the draft	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	8 attendees 2 apologies
17.7.23 27.7.23	Parish Council Meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Minutes of the NP meetings 10th, 15th, 30th May 3rd July were approved Awaiting funding decision	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas Regular agenda item	18 + members of the public
2.8.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Appointment of CCP as consultants Funding Request to Braintree DC that land off Colchester Road could have an Article 4 directive to prevent plotlands Changes to the draft. Article for monthly village magazine	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	8 attendees 2 apologies
5.9.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Louise Cornell CCP in attendance – reviewed the current draft Meeting with Parish RoW officers	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	9 attendees 1 apology

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
12.9.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Allocation of responsibilities for following up on recommendations made by Louise Cornell CCP Transport to be topic for Oct magazine	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	6 attendees 4 apologies
18.9.23 28.9.23	Parish Council Meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District councilors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Minutes of the NP meetings 2nd Aug 5th Sept 12th Sept were approved Consultant appointed 3rd grant of £10,000 allocated	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas Regular agenda item	17 + members of the public
October 2023	Village magazine article	All subscribers	Transport issues, views sought Appeal for volunteers for Community Speedwatch	Monthly village publication appealing for responses	500
November 2023	Village magazine article	All subscribers	Valued Trees in the Bures Landscape Asking that favourite trees be identified	Monthly village publication appealing for responses	500
6.11.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Review of progress on responsibilities taken at meeting on 12.9.23 Parish On-line training	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	7 attendees 4 apologies
20.11.23 23.11.23	Parish Council Meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District Councillors, County Councillors and members of the public attending	Minutes of the NP meeting held on 6th Nov approved Responsibility of the PCs to approve the pre-submission draft discussed	Through the usual parish council methods – website, noticeboards, Facebook, agendas	18+ members of the public

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
		the parish council meetings		Regular agenda item	
18.12.23	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Mark Thompson and Katie Evans CCP in attendance via Zoom Landowner letter for Green Spaces Focus on the river NDHAs, Housing, Getting Around CCP Strategic Environment Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment	In person meeting with consultants via Zoom. Open to all. Notice on website	8 attendees 2 apologies
12.23-2.24	Consultation with landowners regarding Green Spaces	All landowners concerned	To ascertain landowners views on the inclusion of their land as Green Spaces. Letters can be viewed on the Bures NP website ⁴ .	Emails – followed up by telephone discussions as appropriate. One landowner objected to an inclusion but then agreed following discussion. Part of an identified Green Space was removed from the list as it was felt that, in the future this may be developed.	9 landowners
December 2023	Village magazine article	All subscribers	Flooding issues Views sought	Monthly village publication appealing for responses	500
January 2024	Village magazine article	All subscribers	Views sought	Monthly village publication appealing for responses by email	500

⁴ [Public Engagement Log — Bures Neighbourhood Plan](#)

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
15.1.24 18.1.24	Parish Council Meetings	All Parish Councillors – Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary, District Councillors, County Councillors and members of the public attending the parish council meetings	Minutes approved	Agenda item	18+
February 2024	Village magazine article	All subscribers	Informing residents of the consultants appointed Appealing for photos for the cover	Monthly village publication appealing for responses by email	500 copies
Feb/ March 2024	Non-designated Heritage Assets	Owners of properties identified as non-designated heritage assets	To ascertain the views of property owners. Letters can be viewed on the Bures NP website ⁵ .	Trial letter used – letter changed due to feedback. Letters hand delivered to each property concerned. Where owners objected, and were not reassured by members of the team, their properties were removed from the list	38
5.2.24	Steering/Wider group meeting	All those committed to taking an active role in Neighbourhood planning in Bures	Green Spaces Getting Around NDHAs	In person meeting. Open to all. Notice on website	8 attendees 2 apologies
March 2024	Village Magazine article	All subscribers	Advertisement for the Annual Parish Meeting where the Chair, Robin Hamilton was speaking and invitation for photographs for the cover	Full page advert	500

⁵ [Public Engagement Log — Bures Neighbourhood Plan](#)

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
9th March 2024	Bures Market	General members of the public attending the market	Revival of consultation on trees and views	Display showing where valued trees and views are and invitation to submit others	Interested attendees
18th and 21st March 2024	Parish Council meetings	All parish councillors, district and county councillors	Agreement sought for the sending of the draft to Paul Bryant Babergh and Alan Massow – Braintree ahead of Reg 14	Draft plan sent out with the agenda Minuted agreement for draft to be sent following corrections of typos	18
25th March	Annual Public Meeting	All residents	Chair – speaker with opportunity for questions Display showing progress and opportunity to discuss process	Talk Display	19 councillors 41 members of the public
April 2024	Village magazine article	All subscribers	Information about valued trees and key views nominated by residents	Repeat of the March market consultation Invitation to visit website	Interested attendees
13th April	Bures Market	All attendees at the market	Repeat of the APM display	Display, members of the team available	Interested attendees
May 2024	Village magazine article	All subscribers	To inform residents of the progress made	Account of the presentation by the Chair of the Steering Group, Robin Hamilton at the APM	500
11th May	Bures Market	All attendees	To keep the NP process in the public eye	Summary of objectives and policies available to read or take away	Interested attendees

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
20th and 23rd May	Parish Council meetings	All parish councillors, district and county councilors and members of the public present	Draft with Babergh and Braintree officers for advice	No updates	17
8th June	Bures Market	All attendees	To keep the NP process in the public eye	Parish Council table Summary of objectives and policies available to read or take away	Interested attendees
July 2024	Village magazine	All subscribers	To keep the NP process in the public eye	Reminder that the draft plan is with the District Councils for comment. Offer to answer any questions residents may have	500
13th July	Bures Market	All attendees	To discuss next steps with residents	Parish Councils table Members of the team available	Interested attendees
15th and 18th July	Parish Council meetings	All parish councillors, district and county councilors and members of the public present	To be prepared for Reg 14	First feedback from Babergh DC Little change – agreed that draft with minor amendments to go forward to Reg 14	16
July-August	Emails to parish councilors	All councillors	To ensure that all councilors were aware of the minor changes to the draft plan To agree the summary consultation document	Emails used. Draft plan circulated again following amendments Summary consultation at Reg 14 document circulated	14

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
10th August	Bures market	All attendees	To discuss next steps with residents	Parish Councils table Members of the team available	Interested attendees
14th August	Steering group meeting	All actively involved with the preparations for Reg 14 Jan Stobart RCCE	To prepare for Reg 14	Jan Stobart reminded everyone present of the process leading up to Reg 14, the Reg 14 consultation and the next steps Minutes sent to all parish councillors	6 6 apologies
September	Village magazine	All subscribers	To publicise the Public Consultation – surveys and event	Full page article	500
3rd Sept – 28th Oct	Public Consultation on the Pre-submission draft (Regulation 14)	All interested parties	To prepare for submission of the plan	All statutory consultees emailed by Jenny Wright, Parish Clerk Public consultation survey delivered to all households and spares available in public places Online survey launched on smartsurvey Full printed copies of the Pre-submission draft available at key places in the village and on line. Locked chest for completed paper forms in church porch Social media posts to draw attention to the survey and where the full draft plan can be read	88 emails sent 850 copies printed 821 delivered 8 copies available 5.9.24 13.9.24

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
14th Sept	Public consultation Event	All members of the community invited	To answer questions on the draft Encourage residents to respond	Large eye-catching display, multiple copies of the printed draft plan, spare survey forms, members of the team available. Tables and chairs and refreshments available – relaxed welcoming environment at the Bures Market	Members of the public engaged throughout the 3hr period.
19th and 30th Sept	Parish Council meetings	All parish councillors, district and county councilors and members of the public present	Details of the consultation event 14th Sept shared and the further event planned for 12th October agreed.	Agenda item. Good response to the consultation event acknowledged	Parish, district and county councillors
12th October	Public Consultation Event	All members of the community invited	To answer questions on the draft Encourage residents to respond	Calendar featuring valued Trees in Bures from the NP on sale at a bargain price. Bright cheerful display, copies of the printed draft plan, spare survey forms. Members of the NP Steering Group available to discuss issues.	All those attending the market 22 calendars sold a further 13 responses with promises of more

Early engagement - how this was considered in development of the pre-submission plan.

11. Feedback between 2021 and 2024 from residents and the wider community helped shape the objectives and policies within the plan. As well as this community feedback helped shape the conversations had with AECOM when they were developing the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) in early 2022.
12. Feedback in relation to design, the environment and local character was fed into the work on developing Design Codes. This was led by AECOM, but members of the steering group met with AECOM in early 2022 to undertake an initial walk around and identify key priorities such as the lack of parking in the area.

13. Following feedback from residents on the importance of the local environment and preserving existing green spaces, important unlisted buildings, views and trees, the steering group decided to designate local green spaces and identify local important views, locally valued trees and non-designated heritage assets investigating the ideas and comments shared throughout early engagement.

Regulation 14 Consultation

Overview

14. The consultation ran for eight weeks from Monday 2nd September to Monday 28th October 2024. The activities undertaken to bring the consultation to the attention of local people and stakeholders is set out below as shown in the community engagement log on the Bures NP website. This meets the requirements of Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 in Regulation 14.
15. Whilst the Regulation 14 Consultation was taking place, the SEA/HRA Screening Opinion Consultation was led by Babergh and Mid Suffolk Council between September-November 2024. This is where Statutory Environmental Bodies (Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England) were consulted on the draft plan as part of a Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening exercise. It was determined that a full SEA/HRA was not required for the neighbourhood plan. A joint determination notice between Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council and Braintree District Council was sent to the parish councils on the 7th November 2024.

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
3rd Sept – 28th Oct	Public Consultation on the Pre-submission draft (Regulation 14)	All interested parties	To prepare for submission of the plan	All statutory consultees emailed by Jenny Wright, Parish Clerk Public consultation survey delivered to all households and spares available in public places Online survey launched on smart survey Full printed copies of the Pre-submission draft available at key places in the village and on line ⁶ .	88 emails sent 850 copies printed 821 delivered 8 copies available 5.9.24 13.9.24

⁶ [Public Consultation — Bures Neighbourhood Plan](#)

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
				Locked chest for completed paper forms in church porch Social media posts to draw attention to the survey and where the full draft plan can be read	
14th Sept	Public Consultation Event	All members of the community invited	To answer questions on the draft Encourage residents to respond	Large eye-catching display, multiple copies of the printed draft plan, spare survey forms, members of the team available. Tables and chairs and refreshments available – relaxed welcoming environment at the Bures Market	Members of the public engaged throughout the 3hr period.
19th and 30th Sept	Parish Council meetings	All parish councillors, district and county councilors and members of the public present	Details of the consultation event 14th Sept shared and the further event planned for 12th October agreed.	Agenda item. Good response to the consultation event acknowledged	Parish, district and county councillors
12th October	Public Consultation Event	All members of the community invited	To answer questions on the draft Encourage residents to respond	Calendar featuring valued Trees in Bures from the NP on sale at a bargain price. Bright cheerful display, copies of the printed draft plan, spare survey forms. Members of the NP Steering Group available to discuss issues.	All those attending the market 22 calendars sold a further 13 responses with promises of more

Date	Activity	Target audience	Rationale	Methods used	Numbers
5th December 2024	The NP group and CCP to reviewed the representations received and agree amendments to be made to the plan.	CCP Consultation NP Group	The meeting allowed everyone to discuss the views which had been raised by the community and statutory stakeholders. CCP led the meeting going through the summary table and the group agreed amendments to the NP to then share with the parish councils.	In person meeting	4 attendees
Date X	Parish councils went through the amendments of the NP which were agreed by the NP steering group.	Bures St Mary PC Bures Hamlet PC NP Steering Group	In the meeting it was resolved to take forward the suggested amendments to the plan in light of the views by the community and different stakeholders. This plan will then be sent onto the Local Planning Authorities as the submission version.	In person meeting	

Responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation

16. At the end of the consultation period there were 148 completed surveys, either filled in electronically, by hand or online. 16 stakeholders (statutory and non-statutory including one resident) wrote to the Parish Council/steering group with their comments on the draft plan, either in letter or email form. **Appendix A** lists all the statutory consultees contacted at Regulation 14.
17. The next section summarises the main issues and concerns raised and describes how these were considered in finalising the Neighbourhood Plan.

Statutory Stakeholders

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Summary	<p>As a cross county / cross local planning authority boundary plan, the Bures Neighbourhood Plan Team; with help from their consultants, have done a commendable job in delivering a plan that provides the necessary level of background information needed to set out the context for the policies and community actions now presented in this pre-submission draft plan. We also note that you have incorporated many of the suggestions we put forward when invited to comment informally on an earlier working copy of this plan.</p> <p>There are some parts of this plan that we still have concerns over (particularly Policy BP8: River), and we also encourage you to sue this plan to revisit the settlement boundary drawn around Bures St Mary. Our full response on these and other matters is appended to this letter.</p> <p>You will also be aware that the Government are proposing new mandatory housing requirement figures for each local authority area. The proposed draft figure (at July 2024) for Babergh is 763 dwellings per annum. This represents an approximate 83% increase over the figure set out in Joint Local Plan (JLP) Part 1. We are awaiting the Government to publish their final figures and to confirm any potential impacts as we prepare JLP Part 2. While this may not have a direct impact on Bures St Mary from our perspective; or indeed Bures Hamlet from the perspective of Braintree District Council, this is something that you should be aware of.</p>	<p>Welcome the comments and awareness that we have incorporated many of the suggestions.</p> <p>Will review further concerns.</p> <p>Note the awareness of the Government proposing new mandatory housing requirement figures.</p>
General comments	Contents page and page 30. There is a typo in the tile of 'Community Action 1'	Note the comments. Made the amendments to any errors regarding formatting and typos.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Page 15. Paragraph numbering jumps from 53 to 55.</p> <p>At the top of Plan page 78 (PDF page 84) – just before Figure 60 and the Policy BP19 text box, there is a paragraph numbered 204 that has no associated text. This is presumably a formatting error but fixing this will have consequences for the paragraph numbering throughout the rest of the plan.</p> <p>Some NPPF cross-references still require updating. See list below. A cautionary note too that there is expectation that a new NPPF will be published in the forthcoming months. If so, all cross-references to NPPF paragraphs will need to be re-checked prior to submission of this draft plan.</p> <p>Para 219 should now refer to NPPF (Dec 2023) paragraph 195 [not 189 as stated]</p> <p>Para 262 should now refer to NPPF (Dec 2023) paragraphs 108 – 116 [not 108 - 117 as stated]</p> <p>There is still no Glossary. Have the NP Team considered including a short glossary to explain key planning terms such as Rural Exception Site and Community-led Housing?</p>	<p>Amended NPPF cross references and note this may need to be done again in future drafts if a new NPPF is released.</p> <p>Recommend including a glossary and defining particular terms detailed in the plan/policy</p>
Natural Environment	<p>Policy BP4 has been helpfully updated with the inclusion of the footnote to explain that certain types of development are exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements.</p> <p>Given that BNG is now a mandatory part of the planning system, a brief explanation of this within the supporting text would also be helpful. The following is based on text that can be found in other adopted and emerging</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Added the brief explanation in the supporting text that BNG is now mandatory.</p> <p>Added a glossary.</p> <p>Reviewed Para 82, figure 19 and 20. Some are blue and green corridors. The rivers have green</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>neighbourhood plans, and could sensibly be inserted between paragraphs 75 and 76:</p> <p>Paragraph 185 of the NPPF (Dec 2023) states that plans should “<i>promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats.</i>” Furthermore, the requirements of the Environment Act 2021 are now mandatory in terms of achieving Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). In simple terms, BNG is an approach to development which aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand. This gain is to be measured using DEFRA’s biodiversity metric and all net gains will need to be secured and monitored for at least 30 years. Opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design to secure a minimum of 10% net gain firstly onsite or if not locally.</p> <p>Para 82 includes a cross reference to ‘Figure 18’, which shows Priority Habitats. There are two other figures in this Plan which we presume paragraph 82 is meant to refer to - Figure 19 and/or Figure 20 - but given that the text only refers to “<i>the Blue Corridors of flowing water and static water</i>” and that these figures do not differentiate between the two, either para 82 and/or Figures 19 & 20 need to be revisited and amended, as necessary.</p>	corridors next to them which are the banks.
Key Views	The updates to para 66 are welcomed. In the second sentence, inserting the word ‘the’ before ‘Bures Neighbourhood Plan’ would help with the overall grammar.	Welcome the comment. Amended the second sentence.
Our Trees	Para 84: In our informal comments we said that this paragraph should refer to the ‘ <i>Joint Local Plan</i> ’. That of course meant in the	Note the comment regarding Para 84 and amended this.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>context of the Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan, and not the Braintree Local Plan. At the start of this paragraph you need to delete the word 'Joint' so that this simply reads: 'The Braintree Local Plan (2022) Policy LLP67 ... '</p> <p>Some further editing is also necessary to the second sentence to clarify that where we (Babergh DC) refer to trees in JLP Part 1 Policy LP16, this specifically means veteran/ancient trees. So:</p> <p>In the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan, Policy LP16 states that <i>"all development must follow the mitigation hierarchy"</i> and, with particular reference to this chapter, that development that would <i>"result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable biodiversity"</i> ... <i>"such as ancient woodlands and veteran/ancient trees"</i> ... <i>"will not be supported"</i>.</p>	Amended the second sentence of para 84
Improving Water Quality in the River Stour	<p>Policy BP8 (River): We expressed doubts about the workability of this policy in its earlier draft form, but we did not go as far as recommending that it should have been deleted from the plan. We see that the text has been amended but still remain of the view that this policy would be unworkable in practice and do now recommend that it be deleted from this plan. In particular;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy refers to <i>"New built development"</i>. This can only mean development that has already been completed. Not being supporting of something that has happened is therefore a matter of opinion, not land use planning. • Water quality in the River Stour could potentially be affected by development that has come forward in locations beyond the parish boundary. The 	<p>Note the concerns by the LPA.</p> <p>The Environment Agency did not give detailed comments on Policy BP8 to consider. Anglian Water said <i>"Policy BP8 should be confirmed with water companies in terms of capacity where new development proposals are proposed, so that this can be sufficiently sense checked and in a consistent manner"</i>.</p> <p>Do not want to delete the policy. Rephrased this to say development within 30m of the river are required to provide an impact statement.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Bures NP cannot be used to impose restrictions on or otherwise be used in determination planning decisions beyond its designated area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are already mechanisms in place to both identify and to prosecute polluters. <p>It will be interesting to see if Anglian Water and/or the Environment Agency comment on this policy given their respective roles.</p> <p>Policy BP9 is a more helpful policy in that it can be used as part of the planning application decision making process.</p>	
Community facilities	<p>Policy BP12 (Community Assets) remains unchanged from the informal draft plan. We suggested that this policy could be strengthened by also setting out a requirement that suitable alternative provision is or can be made available elsewhere within the designated NP area if an existing community asset is under threat from redevelopment.</p> <p>We also directed you to a good example of a 'Community Facilities & Services' policy in a recently adopted neighbourhood plan (Policy LWL18 of the Lawshall NP Review) and recommend that you reconsider this suggestion.</p>	<p>Note the comments regarding BP12.</p> <p>Amended the current policy text as below:</p> <p><i>Proposals that would result in the loss of valued facilities or services which support the local community (or premises last used for such purposes) will only be permitted where:</i></p> <p><i>a. It can be demonstrated that the current use is not economically viable and is not likely to become viable. Supporting financial evidence should be provided including any efforts to advertise the premises for sale for a minimum of 12 months; and</i></p> <p><i>b. It can be demonstrated, through evidenced research, that there is no local demand for the use and that the building/site is not needed for any alternative social, community or leisure use; or</i></p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
		<i>c. Alternative facilities and services are available, or replacement provision is made, of at least equivalent standard, in a location that is accessible to the community it serves with good access by public transport or by cycling or walking.</i>
Meeting Bures Housing Needs	<p>In the Objective / Context box on page 63, a suggestion that it would be helpful to include the date of the Housing Need Survey, i.e., 'A Housing Need Survey was carried out in 2022 and subsequent public consultations .. [etc] ...'</p> <p>Similar to above, in para 154, suggest it would be helpful to include the date of the published AECOM Housing Needs Assessment (Dec 2022)</p> <p>Policy BP17: Given the cross-boundary nature of this plan, and to ensure that all relevant parties are engaged should a community-led proposal come forward we recommend a small change to the last paragraph of this policy, so that it reads:</p> <p>'As part of any proposal the developer will need to demonstrate that they have proactively engaged with the two relevant community charities (Rural Community Council of Essex, and Community Action Suffolk) and with the relevant departments within the two local authorities.'</p>	<p>Amended the objective box which is on page 62.</p> <p>Amended Para 154</p> <p>Used the proposed wording in BP17.</p>
Housing Growth	<p>Our comments here relate specifically to the settlement boundary around Bures St Mary. In summary, we recommend that you re-think / re-draw this.</p> <p>Policy BP18 states that "<i>New housing development should be located within the defined settlement boundaries for Bures</i></p>	<p>Regarding the points made we did not draw the settlement boundary ourselves around Bures St Mary we used the shape file sent to us from Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p><i>Hamlet and Bures St Mary.</i> " These boundaries are identified in Figure 54, with the same shown on the Policy Inset Map. Figure 54 is a welcomed improvement to the plan. However, it still shows the (default) 2006 Babergh Local Plan boundary around Bures St Mary and, as a consequence, ignores for example the completed housing scheme at Pikes Marsh.</p> <p>You will be aware that we intend to review settlement boundaries through JLP Part 2. Ahead of that, and where they are being brought forward, there is also an expectation that neighbourhood plans will bring forward a new / relevant settlement boundary which we could then take forward without the need to make further potentially confusing changes within a short period of time. The caveat of course is that, at the time of this response, we (Babergh DC) have not made a final decisions on where we might need to make new housing allocations.</p> <p>A separate conversation would be easier but, as a starting point, have a look at the settlement boundary that we put forward in our November 2020 Pre-submission draft JLP (which has no status at this time). This and the R14 Bures NP boundaries are compared in the screengrabs overleaf.</p> <p>Within Policy BP18, a grammatical correction is also needed to remove repetition of the word 'appropriate' within criterion b., i.e., it should read: <i>b. Be of a scale that is appropriate to the site location, and character and setting of its surroundings</i></p>	<p>Changed the map to include recent development as proposed in the draft Reg.19 LP boundary.</p> <p>Amended the grammatical error in Policy BP18</p>
Design	<p>Page 73. At the bottom of this page are two footnotes (#s 36 and 37). Both need correcting.</p>	<p>Amended the footnotes (36 and 37) on page 72</p> <p>Reviewed and amended the figure number to 57.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Footnote 36 cross refers to the start of para 186, specifically, to the Braintree Local Plan (2022). The footnote itself is a repeat of text from our informal comments on your earlier working draft plan. Presumably, the correct footnote link is as follows: https://www.braintree.gov.uk/directory-record/1062214/local-plan-section-1-2-text-adopted-25th-july-2022</p> <p>Footnote 37 cross refers to the end of para 187. While para 187 has been updated to now refer to our adopted JLP Part 1, the footnote still refers to the (Nov 2020) Reg 19 Pre-submission draft version of the JLP. If this link is meant to be to the adopted JLP it would be best if it pointed to the relevant homepage: https://www.babergh.gov.uk/joint-local-plan. If this link was meant to point to the mentioned 'Suffolk Design Guide for Residential Areas' we believe that the correct link for this is: https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/suffolk-design-guide-for-residential-areas</p> <p>Para 190: A question. Do you mean Figure 57? [Figure 56 are photographs of the High Street and Church Square].</p>	
Historic Environment	<p>Para 205 contains two references to footnote 38. Are both necessary?</p> <p>Para 206: Two questions: (1) What has happened to footnote 39? [Nb. There is a footnote 39 on page 88 of the plan but this is relevant to text in para 221.(2) The last sentence refers to Figures 60 and 61. Do you mean Figures 62 and 63?</p>	<p>Note all the comments.</p> <p>Removed one footnote in para 205. Reviewed and amended the paragraph, 39 footnote and figure numbers.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy BP21 (Heritage & NdHAs): Our Heritage Officers have yet to comment on the proposed NdHAs. If those comments become available, we will forward them to you so that they can be taken into consideration prior to this plan being submitted.</p>	
Getting around and sustainable transport	<p>Policy BP24: The paragraph that refers to the Babergh DC LCWIP cannot sit within both this policy and also be a Community Action (#13). You have included it within the latter following our suggestion and this remains the most logical place for it.</p> <p>Looking at the policy again, 'Public Rights of Way' might also be a better and more informative title than 'Walking Routes'.</p> <p>Some other changes to the policy wording are also suggested (see below) to cover the situation where a development proposal may lead to the loss or degradation of an existing route. You may want to work on the final wording of this based on examples of similarly worded policies in other adopted neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Proposed wording:</p> <p><i>POLICY BP24: Public Rights of Way</i></p> <p><i>Where appropriate, new development will be expected to maintain and enhance the existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network. Proposal that might lead to the loss of or the degradation of an existing PRoW will be expected to make suitable alternate provision of at least an equivalent standard.</i></p> <p><i>Development schemes that would also help deliver the proposed new routes listed below</i></p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Made some amendments to the Policy and Community Action 14.</p> <p>Updated policy title.</p> <p>Used the proposed wording.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p><i>and identified in Figure 90 will also be supported in principle:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Riverside Walk</i> 2. <i>Jubilee Grove Link to Mount Bures Level Crossing</i> 3. <i>Millenium Bridge to Bures Mill</i> 4. <i>Yorley Farm to Corn Hall</i> 5. <i>St Edmunds Hill to Lamarsh</i> <p><i>[Nb: Routes 4 & 5 are also being promoted through the adopted Little Cornard NP 2022]</i></p>	
Monitoring, Review, and Implementation	Within para 278 , there appears to be an erroneous '43F' attached to the word 'Locality'. Presumably, a drafting error that simply requires deleting.	Noted. Amended error.
Appendix E-LGS	<p># 8 Jubilee Grove. Suggest amending the fifth sentence to read: 'It is intended to make this an area of biodiversity value with walks and an accessible route to enjoy the views. In the next sentence, , suggest '... a beautiful area of tranquility ...', rather than '... an beautiful area of tranquility ...'</p> <p># 12 St Mary's Churchyard. To repeat our informal comment. Should the text read: '<i>This is now closed to burials.</i>'? [Close implies proximity!]</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Amended the wording where needed.</p>
Appendix F-Listed and NDHAS	On page 167, there appears to be an erroneous '46F46F' attached to the word 'criteria'. Presumably, a drafting error that simply requires deleting.	Noted. Amended the error this happens to some footnotes when converting documents from word to PDF.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Introduction and Councils Position	Braintree District Council welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Regulation 14 Consultation on the Bures Neighbourhood Plan (BNP). We appreciate the work of Bures Parish Council in creating a community-focused plan, and we offer this response to help further align the BNP with district and national policies, particularly those in the current Braintree Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	Noted.
General Observations	<p>Compliance with Local Plan and NPPF The BNP demonstrates a commitment to sustainable development and community-led planning. While generally aligned with our Local Plan, certain policies could benefit from clarification to ensure compliance with district standards on housing, environment, and infrastructure.</p> <p>Strategic Policy Conformity To achieve coherence with district-wide planning, we recommend further aligning BNP policies with Braintree's strategic goals, especially regarding housing supply, infrastructure adequacy, and environmental management. Strengthening these alignments will support Bures' role within Braintree Local Plan Second-Tier Village framework.</p>	Note the comment on compliance and strategic policy conformity. We believe the statement of basic conditions document will meet this requirement and set out how policies have complied with the districts standards/policies.
Specific Comments on Key Sections	<p>Vision and Objectives The BNP's vision, with its focus on protecting Bures' rural character and fostering community spirit, is well-defined and reflects local priorities. To enhance clarity, we recommend explicitly linking these objectives to district policies, particularly on landscape conservation and biodiversity.</p>	This will be done in the statement of basic conditions document.
	<p>Housing and Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location and Scale: We commend the BNP's careful approach to housing location, which reflects Bures' scale and infrastructure. To align with Policy 	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Highlighted any new development to prioritise access to services etc. Added this in Policy 18.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>LPP1, it may be beneficial to highlight that any new housing developments will prioritise access to services and public transport, minimising environmental impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing Mix: The BNP's policies on housing variety (BP14 to BP17) align well with district policies. Setting general goals for affordable and community-led housing could further reinforce support for local housing needs. 	
	<p>Infrastructure and Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure Capacity: We suggest a more detailed strategy for managing infrastructure requirements, particularly healthcare, education, and utilities, to support new developments sustainably. - Sustainable Transport: The BNP's emphasis on cycling and walking routes (BP23 and BP24) is positive and aligns with district policies. Adding specific targets, such as reductions in car dependency, would strengthen the plan's commitment to sustainable mobility 	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that strategic policies should make provision for infrastructure for transport, water, energy, health, education and green infrastructure. A neighbourhood plan has limited ability to influence strategic infrastructure, it would also be difficult at this stage of the plan making to put together a detailed strategy for infrastructure.</p>
	<p>Environmental and Heritage Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape and Conservation: Policies on landscape (BP1 to BP3) align well with the Braintree Local Plan's LPP 67 - Landscape Character and Features, particularly in preserving key views and rural lanes. Adding regular landscape assessments can further support this alignment with evolving district and national standards. 	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Added in the plan emphasis on partnerships with local conservations groups for habitat management in Community Action 1. Groups include Transition Bures, Dedham Vale national landscapes volunteer group, the woodland trust and the RSPB. Wilder together in the Stour Valley which is the national</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity and Natural Environment: BNP's biodiversity policies (BP4 and BP5) on green corridors and habitats reflect best practices. Emphasising partnerships with local conservation groups for ongoing habitat management would further enhance biodiversity outcomes. 	landscapes group the wildlife trusts and the RSPB.
	<p>Community and Local Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community Assets: Policies BP11 and BP12 protect key community assets, which aligns well with district objectives. To ensure these assets remain sustainable, we suggest including funding and management strategies. - Local Employment: The BNP's focus on supporting local businesses (BP22) aligns with district policies, and we recommend adding provisions for flexible employment spaces to strengthen local economic resilience. 	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Agreed that it's important for community buildings to be sustainable, but not sure that setting a requirement for funding and management strategies is planning policy.</p> <p>Recommend the provision of flexible employment spaces in the policy BP22. Reworded community action 10 to emphasise flexible employment spaces.</p>
	<p>Implementation and Monitoring</p> <p>A framework for monitoring the BNP, particularly around biodiversity, housing, and community facilities, would ensure the plan's effectiveness over time. Setting measurable goals and review periods will support adaptive management as needs evolve.</p>	Noted. There is a section on monitoring, review and implementation at the end of the neighbourhood plan.
	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Braintree District Council supports the Bures Neighbourhood Plan and appreciates the effort invested in capturing local priorities. We hope these recommendations help refine the BNP to further align with district and national standards, ensuring its successful integration into the statutory development plan.</p> <p>Please feel free to reach out for further discussion on any of the feedback provided. We look forward to continued collaboration in</p>	Noted. Welcome the comments.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	realising a plan that will benefit both Bures and the wider district.	

Suffolk County Council

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Suffolk County Council is supportive of the vision for the Parish. In this letter we aim to highlight potential issues and opportunities in the plan and are happy to discuss anything that is raised.</p> <p>Where amendments to the plan are suggested added text will be in <i>italics</i> and deleted text will be in strikethrough.</p>	Noted. Consider all the documents attached in the representation too when making changes.
Archaeology	<p>It is welcomed to see that the Historic Background (paragraphs 3.1 to 3.4) includes references to the results of archaeological work undertaken in the area.</p> <p>SCC welcomes that the Historic Environment section from paragraph 205 onwards is thorough and contains a comprehensive summary of archaeological work undertaken in the area, also figures 62 and 63 are welcome additions which plot the designated heritage assets. It is suggested that this could be enhanced by a search of the Suffolk HER⁷, and the inclusion of a HER search in map format would be useful to show all heritage assets (above and below ground) in the area, in addition to the listed buildings and including those referenced in paragraph 205.</p> <p>SCC recommends an addition of the following text to the Historic Environment section to provide clarity to developers for any future development sites:</p> <p><i>"Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) would advise that there should be early consultations of the Historic Environment Record (HER) and assessment of the archaeological potential of any potential development site at an</i></p>	<p>Welcome the comments.</p> <p>Included an Essex and Suffolk HER map to show all the heritage assets. Also include the wording provided in the supporting text.</p> <p>Referenced the Suffolks farmsteads project. Rural farmsteads are also of value to the area as well as barns and agricultural buildings this has been added into the supporting text.</p> <p>Added to the policy preparation of a heritage statement where proposals involve designated and non-designated heritage assets.</p>

⁷ [The Historic Environment Record - Suffolk County Council](#)

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p><i>appropriate stage in the design stage, in order that the requirements of NPPF and Babergh Mid Suffolk Local Plan are met. SCCAS as advisors to Babergh Mid Suffolk Council would be happy to advise on the level of archaeological assessment and appropriate stages to be undertaken."</i></p> <p>Community Action 7 is a welcome addition clearly showing that the Bures neighbourhood plan team have an interest in protecting and enhancing the historic environment. This accords well with NPPF as increased public understanding of heritage sites is an aspiration of the NPPF.</p> <p>SCC welcomes the inclusion of a list of non-designated heritage assets in Policy BP21 and in figure 68. It is suggested to consider the potential impacts of the conversion of historic rural buildings some of which could be considered non-designated heritage assets. SCC Archaeological Service have been reviewing Farmsteads throughout Suffolk, as part of a project funded by Historic England which could be of use regarding historic rural buildings. Neighbourhood Planning groups could consider whether the information from the Suffolk Farmsteads Project⁸ would add any details or information to the Non-Designated Heritage Assets within the area. Entries from the project can be seen via the Suffolk Heritage Explorer⁹.</p> <p>SCC also suggests to consider preparing a Heritage Statement, where proposals involve designated and non-designated heritage assets.</p>	
Education	<p>SCC, as the Education Authority, has the responsibility for ensuring there is sufficient provision of school places for children to be educated in the area local to them. This is achieved by accounting for existing demand and new developments. SCC, therefore, produces and annually updates a five- year forecast on school capacity. The forecast aims to reserve 5% capacity</p>	<p>Note the information does not need to be added to the NP as such but give updates on capacity and the schools.</p>

⁸ [Farmsteads in the Suffolk Countryside - Suffolk Heritage Explorer](#)

⁹ [Home - Suffolk Heritage Explorer](#)

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>for additional demand thus the forecasting below may refer to 95% capacity. The information below is to inform the Neighbourhood Planning Group's understanding of educational provision in the Plan Area and does not need to be included in the Plan.</p> <p><i>Primary Education</i> Bures St Mary Parish is within the primary education catchment area of Bures CEVC Primary School. The school is not currently forecast to exceed 95% capacity during the current forecast period. SCC has a lease from another party for some playing field land on the opposite side of the road to Bures CEVC Primary School. The lease runs for 15 years from September 2015 and allows the school permitted use as a playing field and associated uses.</p> <p><i>Secondary Education</i> Bures St Mary Parish no longer has a catchment area secondary school as some voluntary aided, free schools, and academies do not operate catchment areas to prioritise applications to the school. Historically, Bures St Mary Parish was within the secondary education catchment area of Thomas Gainsborough School. The school is not currently forecast to exceed 95% capacity during the current forecast period.</p>	
Flooding and surface water drainage	<p>SCC, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, has the responsibility for managing flood risk arising from surface water & ground water. The Environment Agency has the responsibility for managing flood risk from main rivers, coastal and reservoir.</p> <p>Please be aware that the Environment Agency National Predicted Flood Maps⁴ are due to be update in 2025 with a new series of predicted flood maps.</p> <p>Historically, there has been issue with surface water drainage in the village where areas of land have flooded as water cannot get away quickly enough. Therefore, SCC highlights that it is imperative that areas at the medium/high risk of flooding are not utilised for development.</p>	<p>Note the update on EA flood maps changing in 2025.</p> <p>Added the following wording after the second paragraph In policy 10:</p> <p><i>When development is proposed, surface water should be drained via infiltration, where the geology is acceptable. If not, then the surface water should be discharged at a controlled rate to a</i></p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	When development is proposed, ideally surface water is to be drained via infiltration, if the geology is acceptable. If not then the surface water is to be discharged at a controlled rate to a watercourse or surface water sewer. For major developments, the use of above ground open Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) shall be used and are designed in accordance with national and local policy/guidance.	<i>watercourse or surface water sewer. For major developments, the use of above ground open Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be used and designed in accordance with national and local policy/guidance.</i>
Health and Wellbeing	<p>SCC notes that paragraph 154 identifies the ageing population of Bures. It is important to ensure the needs of all residents are catered for, recognising the likely increase of co-morbidities as people get older. SCC suggests that there could be provision for homes that are adaptable to M4(2) standards. This can help meet the needs of elderly and frail residents, allowing them to maintain independence for longer, but also allowing for younger occupants and families. SCC recommends including the following wording to Policy BP14, in between the first and second paragraph:</p> <p><u>'Support will be given to the provision of housing that meets local need from within the Neighbourhood Plan area including homes that are adaptable and accessible (meaning built to optional M4(2) standards) in order to meet the needs of the aging population, without excluding the needs of the younger occupants and families.'</u></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Added the following wording into Policy 14 at the end:</p> <p><i>Support will be given to the provision of housing that meets local need from within the Neighbourhood Plan area including homes that are adaptable and accessible (meaning built to optional M4(2) standards) in order to meet the needs of the aging population, without excluding the needs of the younger occupants and families.</i></p>
Minerals and Waste	<p>Suffolk County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority for Suffolk. This means that SCC makes planning policies and decisions in relation to minerals and waste. The relevant policy document is the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan,⁵ adopted in July 2020, which forms part of the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The Bures St Mary settlement identified in this plan in the east is within the administrative area of Suffolk County Council, Suffolk County Council are the Local Minerals Authority for this area. Within the</p>	Note the comments. Added in the supporting text reference to the minerals local plan and that the NP area falls within the minerals safeguarding zone.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>wider planning context there is no mention of the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2020. SCC reminds that it needs to form part of the wider planning context as its policies will apply to any applicable development proposed in this area.</p> <p>It is also noted that there is no mention to the Essex Minerals Local Plan⁶ or the Essex and Southend- on-Sea Waste Local Plan⁷ in the wider planning context, their policies will apply to Bures Hamlet (land situated within the Essex County Council administrative boundary).</p> <p>Located within the Bures Neighbourhood designated area is a water treatment facility (AW26 – Bures-Wissington Rd Stw).</p> <p>In addition to this roughly half of the total designated neighbourhood area (all of the designated area within the Suffolk boundary) is located within a Minerals Safeguarding Zone. Therefore, safeguarding policies from the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2020 will apply. The most relevant policies are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Policy MP9 – Safeguard of Minerals Facilities 2) Policy MP10 – Minerals Safeguarding 3) Policy WP18 – Safeguarding of Waste Facilities 	
Natural Environment	<p><i>Landscape Character and Policy BP1: Landscape, Dedham Vale National Landscape And Stour Valley Project Area</i></p> <p>SCC recommends the following amendments to this policy:</p> <p>'The whole of the NP area either falls within the Dedham Vale National Landscape Area or the proposed Stour Valley Project Area. Therefore, new built development that will result in a change which will cause <u>significant</u> harm to the local character or distinctive features of the built or natural</p>	Do not wish to make the change.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	environment, where Bures nestles in the valley, will not ordinarily be supported.'	
	<p><i>Policy BP2: Bures Rural Lanes</i></p> <p>SCC (Landscape) welcomes the recognition of the rural lanes of Bures and their importance for the local landscape and village character. There is however concern whether the policy, in its current wording (especially the second paragraph) is realistically deliverable. There may be conflicts arising, for example with Policy BP23: Walking And Cycling Network.</p> <p>For specific lanes to remain unchanged, it is suggested to identify them in the policy and on the Policies Map.</p> <p>SCC also recommends considering designations such lanes as Quiet Lanes, under the Transport Act 20008, which appears under consideration (see paragraph 269).</p> <p><i>AONB/NL</i></p> <p>SCC recommends that paragraph 48 must be revised to reflect Section 245 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023, the subsequent changes to the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, and the strengthened duty of the parish council with regards to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>	<p>Lighten the blue that's in the policy boxes so its easier to read. All policies.</p> <p>Removed second para but could we add in something about development proposals should mitigate any impact where adversely affecting the physical appearance etc.</p>
	<p><i>Policy BP3: Key Views</i></p> <p>SCC (Landscape) supports this policy to protect identified key views, which are shown in Figure 14: Key Views Map as well as on the Policies Map (Appendix A), this is based on the justification for the selection of the views that is given in Appendix C: Key Views.</p> <p>In Appendix C, photos of the numbered views and location maps are provided, together with a short headline to explain the importance of the view. All</p>	Welcome the support.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	viewpoints are publicly accessible or on parish owned land. It is welcomed that the views were identified by residents through two consultations.	
Biodiversity	<p>SCC (Landscape) welcomes Policy BP4: Biodiversity, which is worded well. SCC (Landscape) welcomes Policy BP5: Protection Of Wildlife, however the addition of the following phrasing is recommended, as a further condition:</p> <p>'Developments that provide new wildlife corridors and green links will be supported, <u>if otherwise acceptable</u>'.</p> <p>With regards to Figure 19: Existing Blue and Green Corridors: Green/blue corridors is quite an urban concept and may not be best suited to Bures. However, use of clear definitions, with a differentiation of which corridors are green and blue and which are only green, would be welcome.</p> <p>SCC would also query why the River Stour and its river valley and tributaries are not identified, which would appear to be the main blue and green corridor(s) in the parish.</p> <p><i>Figure 20: Wildlife Corridors amongst other habitats and nature designations</i></p> <p>SCC requests clarification if the term Wildlife Corridor is used interchangeably with the term Blue and Green Corridor.</p> <p>The National Landscape is a landscape designation, so SCC would recommend the following amendment for greater accuracy: 'Figure 20: Wildlife Corridors amongst other habitats and nature designations <i>landscape and ecological designations</i>'</p>	<p>Note the support for Policy BP4.</p> <p>Note the support for Policy BP5. Added the additional wording.</p> <p>We disagree that green and blue corridors is more of an urban concept. Many rural and coastal neighbourhood plans implement green corridors to encourage connectivity between existing habitats.</p> <p>Need to use the term green corridors throughout instead of wildlife corridors to avoid confusion. Amended fig 20 so it's just green corridors. The corridors are considered to be both blue/green due to rivers have banks. Extend the green corridors along the River Stour.</p> <p>Amended text regarding Figure 20.</p>
	<i>Policy BP6: Locally Valued Trees</i>	It's a legal requirement to deliver the mitigation hierarchy, so not sure it's

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>SCC welcomes the value attributed to the woodlands and trees within the parish. SCC also welcomes Community Action 2: Tree Preservation Orders for the Locally Important Trees. However, it should be noted that planning permission would allow TPO trees to be removed, once granted. Tree and hedgerow surveys are usually carried out prior to developments. The important aspect here is that this should inform the design and the mitigation hierarchy should be followed (i.e. Avoid – Minimise – Mitigate – Compensate).</p> <p>SCC recommends to reflect this in the policy. The focus for planting schemes should be in public spaces, as it is very difficult to enforce planting in private gardens. Planting in private gardens should not be relied on for BNG or as mitigation/compensation.</p>	<p>necessary to reflect this within the policy. Add reference to mitigation hierarchy in supporting text.</p> <p>Remove reference to private gardens in the Policy. Update the plan where required to reflect national policy on BNG.</p>
	<p><i>Policy BP7 Local Green Spaces</i></p> <p>SCC welcomes the designation of 15 Local Green Spaces in Policy BP7: Local Green Spaces and shown in Figure 27 and Appendix A Policies Map, as this supports the ongoing work to make Suffolk the Greenest County⁹.</p> <p>SCC suggests that the policy is shortened by permitting development on Local Green Spaces only in exceptional circumstances, which could be explained in the main body of the Neighbourhood Plan text.</p> <p>Appendix E, Green Spaces, is presented as supporting document towards the end of the neighbourhood plan and does provide good justification for the Local Green Spaces designations, although for some areas no size is given yet. Site size should be clarified, to ensure the sites are not considered as “extensive tracts of land” as per the NPPF.</p> <p>SCC welcomes Policy BP8: River. SCC welcomes parts i. and j. of Policy BP19: Design</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Regarding the policy text in BP7 recommend shortening the policy.</p> <p>The hectare size is already stated in Appendix E. It has been made clearer why they are not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Welcome the support of Policy BP8 and BP19.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Public Rights of Way PROW	<p>SCC welcomes Policy BP23, however, it is requested that any new PROW's or any proposed works to existing PROW's are designed to current SCC and ECC (Essex County Council) guidance and standards:</p> <p>'New footpaths are designed to <u>current SCC and ECC guidance and standards</u> so that they can be recognised as Public Rights of Way and be adopted by Essex or Suffolk County Council Highway Authority.'</p> <p>Policy BP24 / Community Action 13 states; "The Babergh District Council Local and Cycling Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), and the community consultation carried out to develop it, identified some local desire to open up the footpaths off Clickett Hill and Cuckoo Hill to cyclists, either by a permissive or bridleway designation that permits cycling. The parish council could ascertain whether this might be agreeable with the local landowner(s), and if so, work with the Public Rights of Way team at Suffolk County council to action this."</p> <p>The policy text above reads more as a community action - and is then repeated exactly in the Community Action 13, immediately below the policy. Therefore, the policy is suggested to be amended as follows:</p> <p><u><i>"Proposals to improve and upgrade the footpaths off Clickett Hill and Cuckoo Hill, as identified in the Babergh District Council Local and Cycling Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) would be supported, and the community consultation carried out to develop it, identified some local desire to open up the footpaths off Clickett Hill and Cuckoo Hill to cyclists, either by a permissive or bridleway designation that permits cycling. The parish council could ascertain whether this might be agreeable with the local landowner(s), and if so, work with the Public Rights of Way team at Suffolk County council to action this."</i></u></p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Policy BP23 make clear in the policy or supporting text that any new PROWS need to meet the CC standards. Recommend using their wording.</p> <p>Amended the wording in Policy BP24 and added further wording regarding different users.</p> <p>Reviewed other strategies which could be referenced in the NP. E.g the SCC Green Access Strategy. Added these in the supporting text.</p> <p>Also added wording to community action 13 regarding promotional material.</p> <p>Used some of the wording suggest by the LPA. Happy with the deletion of Cuckoo Hill but retaining the text for Clickett Hill and removed the reference to permissive path, just have bridleway.</p> <p>Accessible paths – Millennium Path already accessible and plans to add an accessible path within jubilee grove. Added this in the supporting text.</p> <p>Added wording to CA13 around publicity for</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>SCC encourages the upgrade of the bridleway to allow cyclists and horse use over a permissive path as permissive path rights can be removed at any time. The route needs to meet current guidance and standards and any upgrade and order making costs will need to be met.</p> <p>SCC informs that to apply for permission to carry out work on a PROW, or seek a temporary closure please refer to the SCC PROW website¹⁰ or telephone 0345 606 6071. Please note that any damage to a PROW resulting from works must be made good by the applicant. Suffolk County Council is not responsible for the maintenance and repair of PROW beyond the wear and tear of normal use for its classification and will seek to recover the costs of any such damage it is required to remedy.</p> <p>SCC suggests that there could be reference to other strategies that support this Neighbourhood Plan. This includes Suffolk County Council's Green Access Strategy (2020-2030)¹¹. This strategy sets out the council's commitment to enhance public rights of way, including new linkages and upgrading routes where there is a need. The strategy also seeks to improve access for all and to support healthy and sustainable access between communities and services through development funding and partnership working.</p> <p>It is also suggested that the rights of way network can be developed for different users. This should include people with limited mobility, people using pushchairs or in wheelchairs, and cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>This plan should be further developed by including the development of promotional material that raises awareness of rights of way and circular walks, the history and heritage of the parish, and biodiversity to raise awareness, understanding and appreciation of these aspects.</p>	<p>inclusion e.g the welcome to bures pack that goes out to new residents.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Transport	<p>SCC, as the Local Highway Authority, has a duty to ensure that roads are maintained and safe as well as providing and managing flood risk for highway drainage and roadside ditches.</p> <p>It is noted and supported that the plan refers to walking, cycling and wheeling in policies BP17 and the section titled 'Getting Around and Sustainable Transport' encourages the use of sustainable transport. This is captured within policy BP23 and is warmly welcomed by SCC as a Local Highway Authority. It is suggested that this section of plan could refer to relevant local and national guidance such as Suffolk Design: Streets Guide¹², Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2023)¹³, Manual for Streets¹⁴, Cycle infrastructure design (LTN1/20)¹⁵ and Inclusive Mobility¹⁶ where appropriate.</p> <p>Similarly, Community Action 11 sets out a number of sustainable transport improvements and SCC, as a Local Highway Authority, supports any feasible measures to improve highway safety and prioritise sustainable travel. Where appropriate, SCC looks to procure such improvements from new developments to mitigate their impact on the local highway network.</p> <p>The section titled Train and Bus Connections and Community Action 12 refer to the need for public transport services to be maintained and enhanced and this will be supported wherever feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that the plan does not include a vehicle parking policy and does not directly reference Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2023) although Policy BP19 refers to a need for EV charging for two vehicles (which exceeds the requirements set out in Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2023) and Building Regulations: Document S¹⁷). SCC recommends that the plan supports and accords with Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2023).</p> <p>It is noted that policy Community Action 13 refers to the Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils</p>	<p>Welcome the support of Policy BP17 and BP23.</p> <p>Referred to relevant guidance such as the Suffolk Design Guide.</p> <p>Amend Policy BP19 to align with the Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2023 and Essex Design Guide Parking.</p> <p>National policy is only to refuse applications on highways grounds if they will have a severe impact on highway safety, to refuse due to impacts on the appearance or functioning of rural lanes would therefore appear out of conformity. One option is to change the policy wording to encourage schemes to be designed to retain the appearance and current function of rural lanes.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>LCWIP¹⁸. SCC as a Local Highway Authority and BMSDC sustainable travel officer continue to work on schemes to encourage cycling and create and enhance local cycling routes.</p> <p>The first paragraph of Policy BP2 would include the formation of new accesses that would require visibility splays resulting in significant hedgerow loss. SCC has no objection to a policy that promotes 'SCC quiet lanes' and highlights traffic concerns regarding narrow rural lanes but the Highway Authority cannot take this policy into account when reviewing development proposals. It is recommended that the wording of this policy is revised, especially to remove its contradiction with Policy BP23 walking & cycling.</p>	
General	Community Action 1: minor typo, as follows: 'COMMUNITY ACT/ON 1: PROTECTING LOCAL BIODIVERSITY'	Amended typo.

National Gas (Avison Young)

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	Generic Letter. National Gas Transmission has identified that it has no record of such assts within the NP area.	Noted.

National Grid (Avison Young)

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets:</p> <p>4YL ROUTE TWR (001 - 073): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: BRAMFORD – PELHAM</p>	Note the comments. NP is not allocating any sites. No particular changes.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	Please remember to consult NGET on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets.	

Historic England

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, but do not consider it necessary for Historic England to be involved in the detailed development of your strategy at this time. We are, however, pleased to see the plan present a positive approach for the area's rich historic environment, not only in Chapter 10 but also within the vision, and context sections.</p> <p>We suggest one minor amendment to ensure consistency with terminology contained within the NPPF and recommend using 'Scheduled Monuments' as opposed to 'Scheduled Ancient' or 'Ancient Scheduled'.</p>	Note the comments. Amended wording in the plan which states Scheduled Ancient or Ancient Scheduled. Then changed this to Scheduled Monuments.

Natural England

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	No specific comments on the draft plan.	Noted.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>For the purposes of neighbourhood planning, we have assessed those authorities who have “up to date” local plans (plans adopted within the previous 5 years) as being of lower risk, and those authorities who have older plans (adopted more than 5 years ago) as being at greater risk. We aim to reduce flood risk and protect and enhance the water environment, and with consideration to the key environmental constraints within our remit, we have then tailored our approach to reviewing each neighbourhood plan accordingly.</p> <p>A key principle of the planning system is to promote sustainable development. Sustainable development meets our needs for housing, employment and recreation while protecting the environment. It ensures that the right development, is built in the right place at the right time. To assist in the preparation of any document towards achieving sustainable development we have identified the key environmental issues within our remit that are relevant to this area and provide guidance on any actions you need to undertake.</p>	Noted.
Environmental Constraints	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>Based on a review of environmental constraints for which we are a statutory consultee, we find that there are areas of fluvial flood risk and watercourses within the neighbourhood plan area along the River Stour.</p> <p>On the basis that future development is steered away from the sensitive aspects of the environment highlighted, we do not consider there to be potential significant environmental effects relating to these environmental constraints. Nevertheless, we recommend the inclusion of relevant policies to cover the management of flood risk. Allocation of any sites and any windfall development delivered through the Plan period should follow the sequential approach. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 167 sets this out.</p>	Noted. Added in reference to NPPF and sequential approach.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Water Resources</p> <p>Being in one of the driest areas of the country, our environment has come under significant pressure from potable water demand. New developments should make a significant contribution towards reducing water demand and mitigate against the risk of deterioration to our rivers, groundwater and habitats from groundwater abstraction. We recommend you check the capacity of available water supplies with the water company, in line with the emerging 2024 Water Resources Management Plan which is due to be published in 2023. The Local Planning Authorities Water Cycle Study and Local Plan may indicate constraints in water supply and provide recommendations for phasing of development to tie in with new alternative strategic supplies.</p> <p>New development should as a minimum meet the highest levels of water efficiency standards, as per the policies in the adopted Local Plan. In most cases development will be expected to achieve 110 litres per person per day as set out in the Building Regulations &c. (Amendment) Regulations 2015. However, a higher standard of water efficiency (e.g. 85 l/p/d) should be considered, looking at all options including rainwater harvesting and greywater systems. Using the water efficiency calculator in Part G of the Building Regulations enables you to calculate the devices and fittings required to ensure a home is built to the right specifications to meet the 110 l/p/d requirement. We recommend all new non-residential development of 1000sqm gross floor area or more should meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption.</p> <p>Developments that require their own abstraction where it will exceed 20 cubic metres per day from a surface water source (river, stream) or from underground strata (via borehole or well) will require an abstraction licence under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991. There is no guarantee that a licence will be granted as this is dependent on available water resources and existing</p>	<p>Note the general information.</p> <p>The Local Plans will set water efficiency standards in which the NP and any development in the area should abide by. The NP does not wish to repeat such wording.</p> <p>Added some of the detail in the supporting text.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	protected rights. The relevant abstraction licencing strategy for your area provides information on water availability and licencing policy at Abstraction licensing strategies (CAMS process) - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk).	
	Water Quality We note that the Bures Water Recycling Centre operated by Anglian Water Services has capacity to treat foul water from fewer than 250 additional homes equivalent. Any applicant wishing to develop land in this catchment should liaise with the Anglian Water to ensure that sufficient capacity to treat new foul water flows will be available at the time of development.	Noted. Added detail into supporting text before Policy BP9.
	Contaminated Land For land that may have been affected by contamination as a result of its previous use or that of the surrounding land, sufficient information should be provided with any planning application to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF for dealing with land contamination. This should take the form of a Preliminary Risk Assessment (including a desk study, conceptual model and initial assessment of risk), and provide assurance that the risk to the water environment is fully understood and can be addressed through appropriate measures. This is because Bures Neighbourhood Plan Area is a source protection zone 2 and 3 as well as on a principal Aquifer. For any planning application the prior use should be checked to ensure there is no risk of contamination.	This is necessary already, it's a standard question on the planning application and if you tick yes then you're required to provide contamination reports.
	Source Protection Zones Your plan includes areas which are located on Source Protection Zones 2 and 3. These should be considered within your plan if growth or development is proposed here. The relevance of the designation and the potential implication upon development proposals should be considered with reference to our Groundwater Protection guidance:	No change.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/ground-water-protection	
	Biodiversity Net Gain We encourage you to seek ways in which your neighbourhood plan can improve the local environment. Identifying sites for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain could lead to habitat improvements in your area. Biodiversity Net Gain is a system that delivers habitat improvements on any local sites including Local Wildlife Sites to ensure that there is no loss of habitats from new development. Identifying areas that could benefit from management for conservation within your area could enable habitat to be created closer to development sites in your plan area, providing local ecological enhancement.	Added into community action 1 that the PCs will liaise with landowners and relevant stakeholders to have offsite credits here for habitat improvements and BNG. Explore this for Jubilee Grove.
	Informative We encourage you to seek ways in which your neighbourhood plan can improve the local environment. For your information, together with Natural England, Historic England and Forestry Commission, we have published joint guidance on neighbourhood planning, which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: How to consider the environment in Neighbourhood Plans - Locality Neighbourhood Planning	Note and welcome the comments.

Anglian Water

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Anglian Water is the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for the neighbourhood plan area and is identified as a consultation body under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Overall, Anglian Water is the water supply and water recycling provider for over 6 million</p>	Note the comments. No change.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>customers. Our operational area spans between the Humber and Thames estuaries and includes around a fifth of the English coastline. The region is the driest in the UK and the lowest lying, with a quarter of our area below sea level. This makes it particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change including heightened risks of both drought and flooding, including inundation by the sea. Additionally, parts of the area have the highest rate of housing growth in England.</p> <p>Anglian Water has amended its Articles of Association to legally enshrine public interest within the constitutional make up of our business – this is our pledge to deliver wider benefits to society, beyond the provision of clean, fresh drinking water and effective treatment of used water. Our Purpose is to bring environmental and social prosperity to the region we serve through our commitment to Love Every Drop.</p> <p>Anglian Water wants to proactively engage with the neighbourhood plan process to ensure the plan delivers benefits for residents and visitors to the area, and in doing so protect the environment and water resources. Anglian Water has produced a specific guidance note on the preparation of NPs found using this link under our Strategic Growth and Infrastructure webpage - Strategic Growth and Infrastructure (anglianwater.co.uk). The guidance also has sign posting/ links to obtaining information on relevant assets and infrastructure in map form, where relevant.</p> <p>It is noted that the neighbourhood plan does not allocate any new sites for housing or other commercial etc. development. The comments set out below are made, ensuring the making of the plan contributes to sustainable development and has regard to assets owned and managed by Anglian Water.</p> <p>Overall, we are supportive of the policy ambitions within the neighbourhood plan, subject to any requested amendments.</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Policy BP4	<p>Anglian Water supports the policy and prioritising the delivery of biodiversity net gains within the neighbourhood planning area to support habitat recovery and enhancements within existing and new areas of green and blue infrastructure. We would also support opportunities to maximise green infrastructure connectivity including through opportunities to minimise surface water run-off from existing urban areas through the creation of rain gardens for example.</p> <p>Anglian Water has made a corporate commitment to deliver a biodiversity net gain of 10% against the measured losses of habitats on all AW-owned land.</p> <p>As the neighbourhood plan progresses, there may also be benefit in referencing the emerging Suffolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy (Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) - Suffolk County Council) which will identify priority actions for nature and map specific areas for improving habitats for nature recovery.</p>	Note the comments. Referenced the emerging Suffolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy (Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS)).
Policy BP7	<p>The policy designates a number of areas of Local Green Spaces (LGS) within the neighbourhood plan area. Anglian Water does have assets forming part of our water and water recycling network (e.g., rising mains and sewers) located in or in the vicinity of these designated areas of local green space.</p> <p>Given the policy states that managing development within a LGS is to be consistent with national policy for Green Belts, we do not consider that the policy will prevent any operational development that may be needed to manage, maintain or repair our assets.</p> <p>For information, maps of Anglian Water's assets detailing the location of our water and water recycling infrastructure are available at: www.utilities.digdat.co.uk</p>	Noted.
Policy BP8	Page 39 - The objective under the 'Improving Water Quality in the River Stour' mentions ensuring the river meets or exceeds bathing standards which in turn assures protection for flora and fauna. This	Changed the wording in the objective to good.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>objective does not stipulate what standards are wanting to be achieved – is this Good or Excellent but could equally mean Poor or Sufficient based on the wording? Typically, the bacteria also would not be protecting flora or fauna, the guidelines within the Bathing Water Directive are based on human health impacts, not ecological. If there is concern on this objective being for ecology it's more relevant to be meeting the standards of the Water Framework Directive or similar.</p> <p>Para. 103 - Essex and Suffolk do undertake Catchment Management across the area and support the Stour Valley Farm Cluster.</p> <p>Para. 108 – This suggests that only nature-based solutions will be used by Water companies to reduce pollutions from wastewater. Whilst it is definitely the preferred option, some other solutions may still be required.</p> <p>Para. 104 - The bacteria monitoring mentioned will only be for the bathing water season (May-end of September) and therefore will not be undertaken during the winter months, this isn't included in the paragraph and may suggest year-round monitoring.</p> <p>Para. 104 - For information regarding abstraction from the River Stour, Anglian Water does not carry out this. It is understood Essex and Suffolk Water abstract downstream at Stratford St. Mary and they should be consulted further on the Neighbourhood Plan, if not already.</p> <p>Policies BP8 and 9 – both should be confirmed with water companies in terms of capacity where new development proposals are proposed, so that this can be sufficiently sense checked and in a consistent manner. See comments also below under policy BP9.</p>	<p>Added in the detail to the referenced Para 103, 104 and revising the wording on Page 108</p> <p>Reviewed the policy wording.</p>
Policy BP9	<p>Anglian Water welcomes the neighbourhood plan requiring new development to be served by sustainable infrastructure provision and that does not result in a detrimental impact on water infrastructure, including sewers and surface water</p>	<p>Noted. Added relevant text to supporting paragraph.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>and other flooding and that this should take account of climate change.</p> <p>Anglian Water, therefore, encourages developers to engage in early discussions with our pre-development team Developing (anglianwater.co.uk) so that connections to a sustainable point of connection (SPOC) or any upgrades to our network are addressed when planning applications are submitted to the local planning authority.</p>	
BP10	<p>Anglian Water is supportive of measures to address surface water run-off, including the preference for this to be managed using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and requiring permeable surfaces for new areas of hardstanding within developments to comply with the drainage hierarchy. Such measures help to avoid surface water run-off from entering our foul drainage network, and connections to a surface water sewer should only be considered where all other options are demonstrated to be impracticable. Any requirements for a surface water connection to our surface water sewer network will require the developer to fund the cost of modelling and any upgrades required to accept the flows from the development.</p> <p>Anglian Water encourages the use of nature-based solutions for SuDS wherever possible, including retrofitting SuDS to existing urban areas to enhance amenity and biodiversity within the neighbourhood plan area and contribute to green and blue infrastructure.</p> <p>It has been the intention of Government to implement Schedule Three of The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to make SuDS mandatory in all new developments in England. However, we welcome the policy approach to ensure SuDS measures are incorporated within new developments, until such time these measures are in place.</p>	Noted.
BP19	Criterion H	AECOM were commissioned to produce

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>The requirement for 50% of the frontage to be landscaped is not covered in the design guide and it would be beneficial to make this cross reference in the checklist (Section 04.4) on page 89.</p> <p>Guidelines EE 04.Flood Mitigation It is welcomed that the design guide includes addressing surface water run-off from the introduction of hard-standing areas (pavements and areas of hard standing such as vehicle parking areas). Reference is made in the guidelines to include permeable surfacing for parking areas and driveways). This would also be useful to specify in the checklist on p.89 for building material and surface treatment/ car parking.</p> <p>Water efficiency Anglian Water's water resources management plan (WRMP) for 2025-2050 identifies key challenges of population growth, climate change, and the need to protect sensitive environments by reducing abstraction. Managing the demand for water is therefore an important aspect of maintaining future supplies. See Water resources management plan (anglianwater.co.uk)</p> <p>As a region identified as seriously water stressed, we encourage measures to improve water efficiency in new developments*. This can be achieved by a fixtures and fittings approach, including through rainwater/storm water harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling. Such measures to improve water efficiency standards and opportunities for water reuse and recycling also reduces the volume of wastewater needed to be treated by our water recycling centres. This will help to reduce customer bills (including for other energy bills) as well as reduce carbon emissions in the supply and recycling of water.</p> <p>For information, the Defra Plan for Water: our integrated plan for delivering clean and plentiful water - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) supports the need to improve water efficiency and the Government's Environment Improvement Plan sets ten actions in</p>	<p>the design guide. There is not a mention to frontage in section 04.4 on page 89. Also, not a mention of 50% in the design guide. The group wish to keep this.</p> <p>Cannot change the checklist as it comes from the published AECOM document.</p> <p>Made it clearer in BP19 that the innovative approaches supported would include water and reference design code EE.01 and water efficiency measures.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>the Roadmap to Water Efficiency in new developments including consideration of a new standard for new homes in England of 100 litres per person per day (l/p/d) where there is a clear local need, such as in areas of serious water stress.</p> <p>It has recently been announced by Government that a review of the Water Efficiency Standard(s) within the Building Regulations 2010 (Part G2 of the Approved Documents) will be consulted on in the next few months.</p> <p>Given the proposed national focus on water efficiency, Anglian Water encourages Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans to cover this issue through a policy-based approach. Anglian Water has produced a Water Efficiency Protocol with other partners (the Environment Agency, Natural England and Cambridge Water) on the imperative for development plan policies to achieve tighter water efficiency standards than the optional standard of 110 litres per person per day (l/p/d) for new homes.</p> <p>The guidelines EE01.Features in Dwellings refers to water efficiency (Figure 106), but water efficiency measures are not specifically referred to in the main part of the neighbourhood plan document. For instance, under Policy BP19 'New developments are encouraged to use innovative approaches to design and opportunities to deliver decentralised energy systems powered by a renewable or low carbon source and associated infrastructure including community-led initiatives. Examples of such design features are set out in Design Code- EE01 to EE07.' this could be made clearer this also includes water with appropriate cross referencing.</p> <p>For information, Braintree Local Plan Policy LPP 72 'Resource Efficiency. Energy Generation and Energy Efficiency' covers water efficiency measures required as part of new development proposals.</p> <p>* For water supply for non-household use, Anglian Water now has a threshold of 20m3 a day for</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	consideration of whether meeting that commercial/ industrial request could jeopardise domestic supplies for households. Water supply for toilets and welfare facilities, as well as firefighting fall with the domestic definition. This is due to pressure on water supplies because of abstraction reduction, climate change and a fast-growing population. As a result, the gap between the demand for water and our supply (headroom) has shrunk. Prospective applicants are advised to contact Anglian Water to avoid situations where water intensive demand projects progress to site acquisition, design or planning applications without establishing that a water supply and wastewater solution is feasible.	

Highways England

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>We welcome the fact that the promotion of sustainable development and transport is promoted in your plan despite the challenges thrown up by the rural nature of the area.</p> <p>The focusing of development adjacent to the existing settlement is possibly the option which would have the least impact upon the SRN. The impact of these proposals should have been picked up in the evidence base for the District Local plan. Although we note no such allocations are promoted in this or the District Local Plan.</p>	Note the comments. No changes.

Essex Police

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	The 'Essex Police – Designing out Crime Office' (DOCO), welcomes the opportunity to comment	Noted.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	on 'The Bures Neighbourhood Plan' and would wish to raise the below points for consideration.	
Policy BP7 Local Green Spaces	<p>The DOCO acknowledges that figure 27 are designated green spaces; therefore, in accordance with the NPPF, these will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Green Belt Policy, except for the deviations reference with Policy BP7.</p> <p>It is important that if any of the public realm and protected spaces are enhanced or adapted, then it is crucial that these areas are designed with safety and crime in mind. The protected areas should be safe and inclusive for all and not promote crime and Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) to occur.</p> <p>The DOCO would like to bring to your attention, the Home Office strategy of reducing 'Violence Against Women and Girls' (VAWG).</p> <p>The strategy aims to improve wellbeing and perception of crime for women and girls, thus ensuring their safety within their community. Therefore, it is recommended when designing new and adapting public realm and green spaces (inclusive of cycling, walking and play areas,) that consideration should be given to environmental design so that women and girls feel included and comfortable using the spaces.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Important point on any enhancements being designed with safety and crime in mind. Included in the policy reference to safety when it comes to enhancement and footnote the strategy.</p> <p>Reference working with both Essex and Suffolk Police around this.</p> <p>Bures hamlet does have a neighbourhood plan watch group and Bures St Mary is currently looking for a leader.</p>
Policy BP11 Community Buildings	<p>The DOCO acknowledges consultation with residents which have shown how important community facilities are (<i>page 54</i>). Community facilities can help support community cohesion as well as being vital to residents' health and wellbeing.</p> <p>It is advised that if there are enhancements or new development of community facilities that designing out crime principles are considered at the very earliest stages of planning and design.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Added in the policy the importance of ensuring any enhancements design out crime principles.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	Living in a safe and secure home and community can support towards a well-designed place as well as enhance sustainability and health and wellbeing.	
Policy BP13 Recreational Areas	<p>The DOCO acknowledges the objective to ensure that open areas for sport, recreation and relaxation are well maintained and developed according to need.</p> <p>Public facilities play an important role within the community, however, proposals to build new facilities or refurbishment should be designed with crime in mind. Safe, secure, and inclusive facilities will have a positive effect on resident's health and wellbeing and encourages a sense of ownership.</p> <p>It is essential community facilities are used for their intended purpose and have a management and maintenance plan in place to ensure they do not encourage crime and anti-social behaviour. Please refer to previous comments in relation to perception of safety for Women and Girls. The DOCO would also like to bring the applicants attention to www.makespaceforgirls.co.uk/about-us. This initiative aims to incorporate the observations and opinions of teenage girls into the design and development of new and old play spaces. This is to ensure that spaces are inclusive and safe for female users.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Added in the policy the importance of ensuring any proposals to build recreational facilities designs out crime principles with crime and safety in mind.</p>
Community Action 6: Cultural Activities	<p>The DOCO acknowledge the need to maintain the community spirit and finds it encouraging that 98% of residents feel safe living in the community. Whilst this is a positive, it is crucial that all current and future residents continue to feel safe and secure within their community and the applicant makes crime a material consideration when designing new building and community spaces within the Bures.</p> <p>The DOCO would encourage residents to either establish or contact their local Neighbourhood</p>	Added reference to a neighbourhood watch group in community action 6.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	Watch Group; this is to ensure that the local community recognise potential crime risks and promote resiliency to prevent crime, whilst supporting each other enhancing community cohesion.	
Policy BP14 Housing Mix	<p>The DOCO acknowledges the need for affordable housing, however, it is also essential that all new housing is designed with safety and security in mind.</p> <p>The DOCO recommends all new development achieves Secured by Design (SBD) award / accreditation, which aligns with the SBD Policed Preferred Security Products (such as doors, windows, locks, and cycle storage). Member companies / products have not only been tested to the relevant security standards but are also fully certified by an independent third-party certification, therefore proven to deter criminal activity and reduce crime.</p>	Noted. This was recommended in Policy BP18 and BB19 too. It is recommended to be added into the design policy instead, so policies do not repeat.
Policy BP17 Community Led Development	We acknowledge the proposals to strengthening and enhance the existing village centre and the Essex Police DOCO would welcome the opportunity to work in partnership regarding future infrastructure or refurbishment plan at the earliest stages to ensure principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and designing out crime are incorporated.	Added a NEW community action point under Policy BP17 with regards to any refurbishments or new infrastructure coming forward in the village centre.
Policy BP18 New Housing Development	<p>To support the concepts of a 'Well Designed place', Essex Police would encourage all new housing, and commercial development should seek to achieve a Secure By Design Award, this will ensure all development is built with safety and security in mind.</p> <p>Having a safe place to live with good community cohesion will have a positive effect on health whilst also building sustainable communities.</p>	Noted. This was recommended in Policy BP14 and BB19 too. It is recommended to be added into the design policy instead, so policies do not repeat themselves.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	Incorporating the principles of CPTED will enable for safer homes which residents will feel secure living in which aligns to carbon reduction requirements.	
BP19 Design	<p>As previously alluded to, the DOCO recommends the use of SBD Policed Preferred Security Products as academic research suggests that they support sustainability agendas as they are proven to last longer (due to the robustness of the product), and therefore reduce the developments carbon footprint.</p> <p>Products will have a longer life span and minimal maintenance whilst supporting the Bures Design Code and Policy BP19 Embedding 'Designing out Crime' principles can evidence Sustainability Objectives and Health Impact Assessment requirements, as developments that have mitigated against potential crime can see increased community engagement.</p>	Noted. Added in the policy reference to all new developments achieving the Secured By Design accreditation.
Policy BP22 Businesses in Bures	<p>The DOCO appreciates the community aspirations to build new community facilities and in particular setting up a business and commerce hub and Class E business premises.</p> <p>It is recommended CPTED principles are considered at the earliest stages of planning and design and that any new proposals are discussed with the local DOCO to mitigate any opportunities for crime and ASB.</p>	Noted. Added the wording.
Policy BP23 Walking and Cycling Network	It is encouraging that residential grants can be applied for to improve cycling routes and installation of cycle racks (<i>reference E</i>). If a grant was successful and improvements are to be made, its advised that pathways, new cycle and walking routes are designed to be well lit, straight, and as wide as possible maximising the opportunities for natural surveillance.	Note the comments.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	Well-designed spaces will allow users to feel safe and secure while using the space throughout different times of day. Applying the methods of CPTED will support this policy.	
Sustainable Transport Improvements	<p>Consideration is requested to adopt the "Safe system approach" when designing local roads in and around the community. This will take into consideration the various road user groups who wish to access these roads.</p> <p>Essex Police would request that thought is given for the provision of Emergency Service Access throughout the village. It is essential that emergency vehicles can gain rapid access to any incident occurring within the village and surrounding neighbourhoods.</p> <p><i>Reference B Community Actions 11</i> seeks to apply for a 20mph speed limit to the historic core of the village. Essex Police would recommend liaison with our Roads Policing colleagues regarding this matter as it is vital that any enforcement strategies (such as parking enforcement and low speed limits) are self-policing and enforceable. Emergency Services should not be overburdened to overcome inadequacies in safety management, access control or enforcement.</p> <p>Sustainable transport should be efficient, safe and have a low impact on the environment, however, new technology surrounding this agenda brings new types of criminal activity, for example, theft of core cabling. Especially in relation to providing EV charging capability, it is advised that crime prevention measures for such provision are implemented at the earliest stages to mitigate opportunities for crime.</p> <p><i>Reference F of Community action 10</i> advise that the Bures Hamlet and Bures St Mary Parish Councils are to access grant aid to provide public electric car charging points. It is strongly advised</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Recommend adding into community action 11 (now 12) that the parish council will liaise with Essex Police and the Road Policing colleagues in regard to any changes on the roads to ensure that the safe system approach is considered, and appropriate enforcement is agreed which would not burden the emergency services.</p> <p>Recommend the parish councils engage and look into accessing grant aid in regard to reference F. Maybe discuss with the police further.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	that if funding is obtained that crime prevention methods are implemented prior to construction. The local DOCO can be contacted to discuss crime mitigating measures.	
Policy BP24 Walking Route and Community Action 13	<p>It is important to ensure the design of all public realm areas balance appropriate levels of connectivity with permeability, and do not encourage crime and ASB.</p> <p>Essex Police acknowledges the importance placed upon protecting The Bures heritage and design characteristics, however it is essential that the areas such as '<i>quite lanes</i>' are not hampered by early design and are safe to use while not promoting the fear of crime.</p> <p>The Essex Police Designing out Crime Team would welcome further consultation as part of the process, and if there are any further queries around embedding designing out crime, please do not hesitate to contact designingoutcrime@essex.police.uk.</p>	Note the comments. Added wording in community action 13 to liaise with the police on their secured by design and crime principles in any early planning for walking routes.

Water Management Alliance (WLMA)

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	Thank you for your consultation on the above neighbourhood plan. Having screened the consultation, Bures lies outside the Internal Drainage District of the East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board as well as the Board's wider watershed catchment, therefore the Board has no comments to make.	Noted. No changes needed.

Marine Management Organisation

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Thank you for including the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) in your recent consultation submission. The MMO will review your document and respond to you directly should a bespoke response be required. If you do not receive a bespoke response from us within your deadline, please consider the following information as the MMO's formal response.</p> <p><u>Marine Management Organisation Functions</u></p> <p>The MMO is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are: marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing grants.</p> <p><u>Marine Planning and Local Plan development</u></p> <p>Under delegation from the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (the marine planning authority), the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of MHWS, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans, which generally extend to the Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) mark. To work together in this overlap, the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) created the Coastal Concordat. This is a framework enabling decision-makers to co-ordinate processes for coastal development consents. It is designed to streamline the process where multiple consents are required from numerous decision-makers, thereby saving time and resources. Defra encourage coastal authorities to sign up as it provides a road map to simplify the process of consenting a development, which may require both a terrestrial planning consent and a marine licence. Furthermore, marine plans inform and guide decision-makers on development in marine and coastal areas. Under Section 58(3) of Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009 all public authorities making decisions</p>	<p>Note the generic information sent over by MMO. No bespoke response was sent for the BNP.</p> <p>No particular changes to make.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>capable of affecting the UK marine area (but which are not for authorisation or enforcement) <u>must have regard to</u> the relevant marine plan and the UK Marine Policy Statement. This includes local authorities developing planning documents for areas with a coastal influence. We advise that all marine plan objectives and policies are taken into consideration by local planning authorities when plan-making. It is important to note that individual marine plan policies do not work in isolation, and decision-makers should consider a whole-plan approach. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service: soundness self-assessment checklist. We have also produced a guidance note aimed at local authorities who wish to consider how local plans could have regard to marine plans. For any other information please contact your local marine planning officer. You can find their details on our gov.uk page.</p> <p>See this map on our website to locate the marine plan areas in England. For further information on how to apply the marine plans and the subsequent policies, please visit our Explore Marine Plans online digital service.</p> <p>The adoption of the North East, North West, South East, and South West Marine Plans in 2021 follows the adoption of the East Marine Plans in 2014 and the South Marine Plans in 2018. All marine plans for English waters are a material consideration for public authorities with decision-making functions and provide a framework for integrated plan-led management.</p> <p><u>Marine Licensing and consultation requests below MHWS</u></p> <p>Activities taking place below MHWS (which includes the tidal influence/limit of any river or estuary) may require a marine licence in accordance with the MCAA. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object. Activities between MHWS and MLWS may also require a local authority planning permission. Such permissions would need to be in accordance with the relevant marine plan under</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>section 58(1) of the MCAA. Local authorities may wish to refer to our marine licensing guide for local planning authorities for more detailed information. We have produced a guidance note (worked example) on the decision-making process under S58(1) of MCAA, which decision-makers may find useful. The licensing team can be contacted at: marine.consents@marinemangement.org.uk.</p> <p><u>Consultation requests for development above MHWS</u></p> <p>If you are requesting a consultee response from the MMO on a planning application, which your authority considers will affect the UK marine area, please consider the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UK Marine Policy Statement and relevant marine plan are material considerations for decision-making, but Local Plans may be a more relevant consideration in certain circumstances. This is because a marine plan is not a 'development plan' under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local planning authorities will wish to consider this when determining whether a planning application above MHWS should be referred to the MMO for a consultee response. • It is for the relevant decision-maker to ensure s58 of MCAA has been considered as part of the decision-making process. If a public authority takes a decision under s58(1) of MCAA that is not in accordance with a marine plan, then the authority must state its reasons under s58(2) of the same Act. • If the MMO does not respond to specific consultation requests then please use the above guidance to assist in making a determination on any planning application. <p><u>Minerals and Waste Local Plans and Local Aggregate Assessments</u></p> <p>If you are consulting on a minerals and waste local plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommends</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>reference to marine aggregates, and to the documents below, to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), Section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK's) construction industry. • The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which sets out policies for national (England) construction mineral supply. • The minerals planning practice guidance which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply. • The national and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period, including marine supply. <p>The minerals planning practice guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments. These assessments must consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine sources. This means that even land-locked counties may have to consider the role that marine-sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) have – particularly where land-based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.</p> <p>If you wish to contact the MMO regarding our response, please email us at consultations@marinemanagement.org.uk or telephone us on 0208 0265 325.</p>	

Councillor Ian Woodman (Chair of Mount Bures Parish Council)

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Mount Bures Village	As part of the ongoing Colchester City Council Local Plan Review, Mount Bures Parish	Note the comments.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Green - designation of part of green in Bures Hamlet as Local Green Space	<p>Council is seeking to designate a small area of land that has been used as a village green for nearly 50 years as <i>Local Green Space</i>. With the agreement of the Colchester City Planning Policy team, the Council is expecting the green to be shown as Local Green Space on the Colchester District policies map during consultation on the Colchester City Local Plan Review Preferred Options.</p> <p>A small element of the land that is being used as village green lies, however, just over the parish boundary in Bures Hamlet. Mount Bures Parish Council would very much like to see this element of our village green also designated as <i>Local Green Space</i>.</p> <p>The Parish Council initially approached Braintree Planning to see if this designation could be made as part of the Braintree District Local Plan Review process. It has been suggested however that it might be more appropriate to include it within the developing Bures Neighbourhood Plan. I understand that this was discussed at the 30 September Bures Hamlet Parish Council meeting and that it was agreed there that Mount Bures would be welcome to submit the proposal for consideration as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Accordingly, I attach a copy of the justification we provided to Colchester City Council for Local Green Space designation for our village green. This sets out how the designation would meet the criteria for Local Green Space in the NPPF. This document also includes maps and photographs which show the element of the village green that lies just within Bures Hamlet.</p> <p>The Parish Council would be grateful if you could consider this justification and include the element of the village green within Bures</p>	Not going to include the LGS on the basis that it's not local to the community the NP relates to. This site is approximately 1800m from the village centre.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	Hamlet as Local Green Space in your continuing Neighbourhood Plan process.	



Land used as village green, Mount Bures.

James Lawson Planning

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	We write on behalf of the landowner of a site at Old Barn Road, Mount Bures, and are SUPPORTIVE of the Neighbourhood Plan vision, objectives and	Note the support.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	policies, subject to minor revisions to assist in the delivery of affordable housing during the Plan Period.	
	<p>The site is being promoted for affordable housing in response to the pressing local housing need identified in the evidence base to the draft Bures Neighbourhood Plan (BNP) as follows;</p> <p>Housing Needs Survey – carried out by the Rural Community Council for Essex (RCCE) in May 2022 which demonstrates;</p> <p>80% respondent support for a small-scale affordable housing led scheme of 4-8 dwellings, with a preference for 2 – 3 bedroom units;</p> <p>Strong support for the communities needs being met by an appropriate mix of affordable housing tenures;</p> <p>Housing Needs Assessment – carried out by AECOM in December 2022 which demonstrates;</p> <p>Acute issues of affordability in Bures with the median house price requiring an income of £90,000 to purchase a home – almost double current average local incomes;</p> <p>An income of £48,000 to afford an entry level rental property – which is above current average local incomes;</p> <p>Demand for 50 x new affordable home ownership properties over the plan period;</p> <p>The BNP has a key role to play in helping to deliver affordable housing within the Neighbourhood Plan Area through its vision, objective and policies for meeting Bures Housing Needs.</p>	Note the evidence being provided to support an application coming forward for affordable housing.
Meeting Bures Housing Needs	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Area has a pressing need for affordable housing delivery which is only likely to be met if housing comes forward via a number of separate supply sources, as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Allocated sites within the Braintree DC & Joint Babergh & Mid Suffolk Local Plans; 5) Rural Exception Sites; 6) Land acquired & developed by a Community Land Trust (CLT) – this is reliant on a willing 	Note the case being made to bring forward the rural exception site on Old Barn Road. However, the NP does not want to allocate any land at this stage of the process.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>landowner selling the land to a CLT at agricultural use value;</p> <p>7) Windfall sites within the Bures urban area;</p> <p>Concerning sources 1) and 2) above, it is noted that 2 x residential sites have come forward in response to the Braintree DC Call for Sites exercise in April – May 2024. These are located at Woolpit Downs, Parsonage Hill (market housing led) and Old Barn Road (affordable housing led), both within Bures Hamlet Parish.</p> <p>The Braintree Local Plan Review is at an early stage with a Regulation 18 (Issues & Options) consultation expected in January – February 2025, with Plan Adoption envisaged in December 2026.</p> <p>At the current time it is not known whether the site at Woolpit Downs may be allocated, and if allocated, what scale of development is envisaged and whether it can deliver ‘policy compliant’ affordable housing @ 40%.</p> <p>The site at Old Barn Road (source 2) is being promoted as a ‘Rural Exceptions Site’ and would not need to await the outcome of the local plan review. Discussions are ongoing with a Registered Provider concerning the promotion, funding and delivery of the scheme, and subject to ongoing support from Bures Hamlet Parish Council, and a favourable planning application process, the first affordable homes could be built and ready for occupation in 2026.</p> <p>No land has come forward for housing within Bures St Mary Parish in response to the Babergh & Mid Suffolk Call for Sites exercise in January – February 2024.</p> <p>There is currently no information available in respect of a Community Land Trust being set up, and evidence outlined above indicates that there is no agricultural land available via the Call for Sites process for CLT purposes (source 3).</p> <p>Any windfall sites which may emerge during the Plan Period are likely to comprise previously developed</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>land, wherein affordable housing is unlikely to be delivered on financial viability grounds. This is evidenced by a review of previously completed, consented and pipeline windfall sites within Bures, which have not delivered any affordable housing to date (source 4).</p> <p>With the above in mind, it is evident that any delivery of affordable homes within the first 5 years of the BNP (2022-2027) is only likely to come forward via the Rural Exception Site at Old Barn Road (source 2).</p>	
BNP Rural Area Context	<p>The landscape study commissioned by the National Landscape Team and previous parish surveys referenced in the BNP, indicate that the Plan Area is clearly 'rural' rather than 'urban' in context and character, with limited infrastructure and facilities provision. This context ought to be acknowledged in the Plan's approach to the supply of housing, to ensure that realistic policy objectives are set which don't overly constrain the land market for affordable housing delivery.</p> <p>With this in mind, it is considered that Bures local housing needs could be more readily met if the Plan adopts a 'proportionate approach' to site accessibility by 'active travel' modes (walking/ cycling) to reflect the likely reliance on a range of other environmentally sustainable travel modes, and for the partially ambulant and elderly in particular, some reliance on powered transit for short journeys.</p> <p>This could incorporate E-Scooters, Powered Two Wheelers, Electric/ Plug in cars and car sharing, to complement the continued priority for walking, cycling and wheeling, and where user groups are able to utilise such modes, particularly during the inclement winter months.</p> <p>Increased consistency with relevant policies of the Adopted Braintree Local Plan is also advocated, concerning the approach to Rural Exception Sites and sites potentially brought forward by a Community Land Trust.</p>	Note the comments. Review the requested changes.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>As noted above, we are SUPPORTIVE of the vision, objectives and policies for the delivery of affordable housing, endorse the walking route objectives in the draft Plan, and welcome the proactive approach being taken through the 'Community Actions'.</p> <p>A number of changes are requested to the draft Plan to assist both clarity and the delivery of local needs housing policy objectives, and these are outlined overleaf.</p>	
Changes Requested to Policies and text of the draft NP	<p>Requested Change 1 - Meeting the Bures Housing Needs Paragraph 161, Line 2</p> <p>Typographical Error after . . 'Housing Group or a' . . add "Housing Association (Registered Provider)"</p> <p>Requested Change 2 - Meeting the Bures Housing Needs Paragraph 163, Line 4</p> <p>Typographical Error – after . . 'local need exists, and market' . . omit . . "that"</p> <p>Requested Change 3 - Meeting the Bures Housing Needs Paragraph 167, line 4 (requested changes in <i>italics</i>)</p> <p>After . . 'exception sites' . . insert "This is in recognition <i>that certain landowners are able to bring forward affordable housing to contribute to meeting local housing needs</i>, and that community groups may be unable to purchase sites within the defined settlement boundary"</p> <p>Requested Change 4 - Meeting the Bures Housing Needs Paragraph 168, lines 2-4 (requested changes in <i>italics</i>)</p> <p>'Community-led housing schemes <i>outside of defined settlement boundaries</i> should be adjacent to existing settlements and proportionate in size to them <i>with reasonable access to services and facilities. The provision of electric charging facilities for each</i></p>	<p>Noted the requested changes. Made changes to typological errors.</p> <p>Do not wish to make the changes.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p><i>dwelling would be required, and access by walking and cycling modes is encouraged to ensure good levels of accessibility and quality of life, as well as reducing reliance on fossil fuel-based car travel. Applicants will need to demonstrate that sites are suitable in this respect . . .</i></p>	



Residents

Ken McAndrew

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>I have been through the NHP and found the following points that need correcting.</p> <p>Page 21 Fysh Farm House not Frysh. Fig 25 page 35. Red dots in key but not on map. Fig 41 Village Hall in wrong position. Page 69 178 planning for 3 detached Page 83 Malthouse and premises occupied by WA church should be C. Page 88 Fig 67 Building on left is Station House and building on right is School House. Fig 78 red dots in key but not on map. Page 119 Why only Suffolk County Council to action ? Appendix F Fig 67 School House right, Station Houses left !! Page 171to 182 in key at top of page Architectural and!!!</p>	<p>Note the comments. Amend the necessary errors.</p> <p>Amended Fig 25 key</p> <p>Note additional change. 3 detached.</p> <p>Amended Fig 41- renamed village hall community centre and changed the position</p> <p>The red dots can be seen in the bottom corner of Figure 78 just above the key.</p> <p>Cannot fit all the words in Appendix F column for the NDHA list that's why it only says "architectural and". The full criteria is on page 175.</p> <p>Community action 13 only refers to Suffolk County Council since this LCWIP falls in their responsibility</p>

Online Survey

There was a total of 148 responses on the online survey. These have been summarised below. Overall, the majority of respondents agreed with the vision, policies and adopting the plan with amendments.

Q1- Do you agree with the vision statement? The majority of respondents (147 people or 99.3%) agreed with the vision statement out of 148 people. There were 22 comments left on this question which have been summarised below. Many had comments around the idea of safe streets as well as walking and cycling.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with the vision statement it is positive and worthy statement of intent.• Don't build on greenfield• Improved walking and cycling routes should not be at the expense of cars• Not all contents are established currently e.g. safe streets or protection of historic natural setting• People would like to see more pavements and a safe cycle lane between Bures and Sudbury• People asked in what way will Bures be "well connected" since there are issues with broadband infrastructure.• People asked who determines the interpretation of the word "safe" in reference to "provide safe streets" since there are streets which are unlit in the area and there is not a present police patrol.• Recommend adding words about welcoming new residents, businesses and developments• Recommended more notices for the safety of pedestrians.• Recommend adding wording to provide more parking spaces for people visiting the village for events/facilities.• Recommended that the first sentence includes the word "maintained" and the last sentence should include the word "secure" as well as safe since there is a difference and can align with the Secured by Design policy security initiative.	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Don't want to change the vision statement.</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respondent feels there is little attention being paid to limiting the speed of vehicles near Cuckoo Hill. Need to consider speed calming measures such as gate style barriers. Safe streets are important to users of St Mary's Church and the lack of suitable car parking spaces in the centre of the village is the greatest hinderance to the community. Safe would include a 20mph speed limit Should be using more green technology/innovative ideas which are cost effective Vision lacks specificity in regard to "safe streets" on the problems people face such as speeding traffic, insufficient pavements and dangerous areas in the parish where there are no safe crossing places. Vision is quite long and hard to digest how can we distinguish it from other villages Walking and cycling routes should be improved but not extended 	

Q6- Do you agree with policy BP1? The majority of respondents (145 people or 98.6%) agreed with Policy BP1 out of 147 people. There were 19 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not wish to see more development Increasing baseline data of the vast array of varied habitats area is important and should be used to challenge inappropriate ecological surveys Need to be realistic and not have negative viewpoints to all new development especially on brownfield sites or for affordable housing National landscape must be a priority Need to do more on protecting the electricity generation of the whole area e,g routes from the sea 	<p>Note the mix of comments shared.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plan policies cannot be negatively written or be against sustainable development, so it is inappropriate to incorporate some of the suggestions.</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some are in favour of infill development on sites such as the Petrol Station and Bus Garage. Recommended to remove the word “ordinarily” and any developments which will cause harm should not be supported. Respondent didn’t like the houses built on the former petrol station site due to concerns of congestion parking Under new government rules may be difficult We should reflect on how villages have evolved and need to ensure development suits a wide spectrum of society and not focus on just those to suit one class type Wish for further clarification on what new development examples could be supported that would cause harm to the local character and the rationale behind this We shouldn’t just not support but actively oppose Wording allows too much leeway for developers 	<p>Note people dislike recent development in the area but the neighbourhood plan cannot change decisions made in regard to this.</p> <p>Aware that the neighbourhood plan should support housing for a wide variety of people in the parish.</p>

Q7- Do you agree with policy BP2? The majority of respondents (145 people or 98.6%) agreed with Policy BP2 out of 147 people. There were 11 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connecting habitats are vital to species protection and recovery. Especially traffic using the quiet lane or St Edmunds Hill areas How are “rural lanes” interpreted? Concern this may prevent most development. Does it mean all the lanes in and outside the village or just the surrounding lanes? Land inside the tight core of the village is limited so development can only be on the edges. Who decides what is acceptable? 	<p>Note the mix of comments.</p> <p>Recommend making clearer in the supporting text what rural lanes means in relation to this policy. Do not want it to be so negative that it is considered to prevent most development.</p> <p>Group do not have a specific interpretation of rural lanes.</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowners should maintain hedges/ditches to reduce flooding risk Should actively oppose this. What is classified as a lane? 	

Q8- Do you agree with policy BP3? The majority of respondents (142 people or 99.3%) agreed with Policy BP3 out of 143 people. There were 18 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with the policy but no evidence of this being upheld. Apple Tree Mews a prime example of this where Babergh DC a non-compliant development. Agree in principle. View 9 should be protected from all development. Biodiversity net gain should be at the forefront of all development In general, all development should be resisted. All new development will have an adverse effect on scenery. Do not build on flood plains. Policy isn't strong enough needs to actively oppose development adversely key views This does not take into consideration, new developments in the surrounding area Respondents said they need to see figure 13 and do not have a link or web address? Respondent said that "should be" may give less leeway for harm to key views Using a blue background makes this difficult to read Very important to meet the visions statement. All the views are important. Additionally add: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> view of Dragon from St Stephen's chapel, 	<p>Note the various comments.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plan policies cannot be negatively written or be against sustainable development, so it is inappropriate to follow some suggestions where the policy should resist all development or oppose all developments for having an adverse impact on scenery.</p> <p>Note people dislike recent development in the area but the neighbourhood plan cannot change decisions made in regard to this.</p> <p>It is possible that those who didn't see figure 13 did not read the full neighbourhood plan, but just the survey. To avoid printing a very long survey</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2) river views from Bures to Lamarsh footpath, 3) view from top of hill near Over Hall farm back towards Bures and the Dragon 4) the view of Small bridge entry both from Smallbridge itself and from down the hill towards Smallbridge Hall 	<p>maps were left out and people were requested to read the NP documents on the parish council website.</p> <p>Have changed the policy boxes to a light blue so easier to read.</p> <p>Some suggestions are of views already included as a view or another protection, such as valued trees. Agree to include the view from the path to Lamarsh</p>

Q9- Do you agree with policy BP4? The majority of respondents (145 people or 98.6%) agreed with Policy BP4 out of 147 people. There were 14 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents said the biodiversity net gain (BNG) should be a higher % because biodiversity cannot replace the existing beauty of the area, Suffolk County Council has declared a climate crisis. • Respondents questioned BNG and why an increase % and not a no net loss. Some said how can there be an increase in BNG when developing on greenfield land. • Respondents asked where the BNG % was on recently planning applications. • What is the plan for export monitoring and enforcement? 	<p>Note the comments. The BNG % cannot be higher than 10% which is set nationally unless the NP has robust evidence to suggest otherwise to deviate from this. The NP does not have the evidence to expect developers to go above the national percentage.</p> <p>This neighbourhood plan cannot comment or influence applications in the area which have been built out or granted ahead of this plan being written and adopted</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
		<p>which will happen in due course (if it passes a successful referendum).</p> <p>BNG can possibly achieve a 10% gain on greenfield sites depending on what the current habitat is of the site and how it may be enhanced.</p>

Q10- Do you agree with policy BP5? The majority of respondents (142 people or 98.6%) agreed with Policy BP5 out of 144 people. There were 11 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments within or adjacent to existing green or blue corridors should not be allowed at all in my opinion • Development must protect wildlife in these corridors • In general, all development should be resisted • Insufficient retaining of existing features • Need more wildling and targeted wildlife friendly features • Need demonstration of successful projects and features • Remove the words "where possible" • Change the word "supported" to "actively encouraged" 	<p>Note the various comments.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plan policies cannot be negatively written or be against sustainable development, so it is inappropriate to follow some suggestions where the policy should resist all development or oppose all developments for having an adverse impact on scenery.</p> <p>I believe those who didn't see figure 18 did not read the neighbourhood plan and must have just read the survey. To avoid a long survey for printing maps were left out of the survey itself and people were informed to read the NP documents on the parish council website.</p> <p>Removed the words where possible from the start of the policy. Put</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
		actively encouraged rather than supported.

Q11- Do you agree with policy BP6? The majority of respondents (143 people or 98.6%) agreed with Policy BP6 out of 145 people. There were 18 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the wording "where appropriate" to "in all cases" • Change the wording "should" to "must" • Currently too many trees such as Sycamore have been allowed to grow unrestricted and give little back to the environment • In particular the rare Maiden Hair Tree (Ginkgo biloba) on Bures Common Land • Need more nature resistant planting, suggestion to promote evergreens • Residents with trees and hedgerows on private property should be allowed to maintain and trim back their trees with permission from the local authority without locals getting involved. • Trees that are occupied for private gardens should be assessed for the appropriateness of their being and conducive to the surrounding properties and environment • Strongly agree with the policy and need to protect trees with existing preservation orders on • Respondents stated new homes are not built with large gardens, so they are not suitable for large trees. 	<p>Note the various comments.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plan policies cannot be negatively written, overly restrictive or be against sustainable development, so it is inappropriate to follow some suggestions. Policy needs to allow some flexibility. Trees were identified through consultation. Agree to include additional trees as you come down Parsonage Hill and cuckoo hill.</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respondent stated they assume the requirement for promotion of use of new trees would also ensure these were native Respondent agreed with the policy but thought it didn't include sufficient trees and suggested other trees such as two roads that lead into Bures; the first from the Colnes down Parsonage Hill where the mature trees on the edge of the field harbour huge amounts of wildlife as well as provide a grand entrance to the village under the enveloping canopy. The second in a similar fashion as one enters from the Assington direction down Cuckoo Hill the trees there do likewise. Use native species Who decides appropriate both as to use and trees selected? 	

Q12- Do you agree with policy BP7? The majority of respondents (144 people or 99.3%) agreed with Policy BP7 out of 145 people. There were 8 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree Protect all existing flood plains One said parking should be provided on common land in centre of village like village hall/community centre which should exclude school run parking Suggestion of Water meadows alongside Colchester Road Some said they had no link and haven't read the plan. 	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Some people said they didn't read the plan, but residents and businesses were informed to read the NP documents on the parish council website.</p> <p>Water meadows already included as a green space.</p>

Q13- Do you agree with policy BP8? The majority of respondents (145 people or 99.3%) agreed with Policy BP8 out of 146 people. There were 12 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more support from the Environment Agency • No further public use of the river for canoeing etc. should be allowed, and if possible existing usage should be significantly curtailed. Any usage adversely affects wildlife. • No new developments should be supported along the river, since much more needs to be done to monitor and dissuade raw sewage and agricultural chemical runoff. • Recent developments haven't adhered to this • Stop anti-social behaviour from people who jump into the water from millennium bridge • The policy should be redundant no development should have an adverse impact on water quality near the river • The policy wording is weak and should say actively opposed rather than not be supported • Water treatment is not in developers control • Wording should be "material" not "significant" 	<p>Note the comments. Some were not related to the policy or neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Revised the wording of the policy now.</p>

Q14- Do you agree with policy BP9? All the respondents (147 people or 100%) agreed with Policy BP9. There were 12 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree with the policy and it needs to be enforced Developers have a right to connect to public sewers but have no control over the treatment of wastewater Developers need to stop connecting to the sewers It is just as important that existing developments meet their responsibilities to not affect watercourses as much as new developments Increased volume is a concern, the pumping station in Nayland Road, regularly cannot cope Should be no overflow into the river The policy intentions need to be made clearer. Currently the capacity only needs to be confirmed, not that the capacity is sufficient for any proposed development. Policy should be stronger change "should" to "must" Additional wording should say "to the satisfaction of the relevant water authorities" 	<p>Note the differing comments.</p> <p>Added in wording AW used regarding confirming with water companies capacity and upgrades.</p>

Q15- Do you agree with policy BP10? The majority of respondents (143 people or 99.3%) agreed with Policy BP10 out of 144 people. There were 14 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly agree or agree with the policy Change the wording from "should" to "must" 	<p>Note the differing comments.</p> <p>Add water meadows are an essential part of flood</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration needs to be given to the limitations of tributaries that feed the river. • Flood plains should be permitted, they fulfil a critical purpose, flood plains are beneficial to wildlife and mitigate the risk of downstream flooding • Discourage development and building on flood plains is nonsensical • More needs to be done in clearing tributaries to the Stour • Needs enforcement 	management in the supporting text. Did this in Para 116 mentioning the area forms a natural flood plain.

Q16- Do you agree with policy BP11? The majority of respondents (143 people or 99.3%) agreed with Policy BP11 out of 144 people. There were 11 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attention needs to be given to the provision of adequate parking in the area • Concern about parking being removed ear claypits avenue • Concern the post office will soon close • Only existing buildings not new ones • Respondent asked how statement 1 fits with paragraph 2 and what happens when housing is proposed without particular regard • Respondent feels St Mary's Church as a community building could be emphasised better on page 51 since it is a major venue used for large scale community events, community café etc • School should be moved to a new site 	<p>Note the differing comments.</p> <p>Recommend adding more detail about the church on page 51</p> <p>Added St Marys Church to the list of important community buildings.</p> <p>Added actively supported rather than just supported.</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wording should be actively supported not supported 	

Q17- Do you agree with policy BP12? All the respondents (146 people or 100%) agreed with Policy BP12. There were 13 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Action 4 is important Community facilities must be supported and essential to keep societies Doctors surgery is important If there is further residential development, then community infrastructure needs to be improved to meet the demands Is this enforceable or a hope? Need more cash points Presumably would not proceed justification is inadequate Wording should be "must" 	Note the comments. No changes.

Q18- Do you agree with policy BP13? The majority of respondents (143 people or 99.3%) agreed with Policy BP13 out of 144 people. There were 11 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern raised around pedestrian safety from the speeding and traffic on the road towards Sudbury and the need to reduce the speed limit (20mph) 	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>The paragraph about the church does say it is thriving and have</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not extend the recreational areas. Recreational areas are being disrupted from anti-social behaviour. Do not build on greenfield sites. Development should be opposed to prevent the need for alternative provision. Needs to be consideration given on managing the all-day parking at the sports field car park and in Church Square Page 55 Section 131 there is not enough significance given to the St Marys Church congregations The popularity of the river for recreation has tested the capacity of the parking provision in the area Wording should say "encouraged" rather than "supported" 	<p>added they hold a number of community meetings/events.</p> <p>Changed to encouraged rather than supported.</p>

Q18- Do you agree with policy BP14? The majority of respondents (132 people or 92.3%) agreed with Policy BP14 out of 143 people. There were 29 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any future development should have more than the minimum requirement for parking Area cannot cope having new houses with bedroom sizes 3+. Concern of the capacity and strain on services Bures is in need of housing and care home facilities Current new developments are not providing this mix in the area with a focus being on 4+ bedrooms 	Note the mix of comments. No further changes.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more affordable homes and ensure new developments provide these • Need more housing for young people and families to ensure the area doesn't deteriorate in different ways such as the school shutting. Want the area to remain a living village. • Need a higher proportion of larger homes to accommodate families • No more development wanted in general • One-bedroom properties do not encourage families • Risk of highly mobile occupants from 2-bedroom properties • Smaller and affordable housing should be prioritised to help older people downsize and encourage young people to stay in the area • The housing mix should be max 70% too much restriction could have the effect of deterring house builders especially for small developments. Some said this would be a better option. • The number of bedrooms is only one indicator. Need to ensure development is accessible and affordable to all people with different wealth/earnings 	

Q20- Do you agree with policy BP15? The majority of respondents (126 people or 88.7%) agreed with Policy BP15 out of 142 people.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any rented housing that is owned by the Council/Registered Housing Provider should not be able to be purchased under any 'right to buy' or 'right to acquire' legislation, otherwise there will be insufficient rental housing. Some do not agree with affordable housing being sold off. 	<p>Note the comments and voiced concerns.</p> <p>The current percentage % has been set in line with the Bures Housing Needs Assessment</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locals shouldn't be priced out of the area Need to consider the need for starter homes for younger people. Need to ensure checks are made on links to the local area Not in favour of affordable home ownership No view Policy is too restrictive for developers who need to make some profit on their investments after buying land and building One Suggested changing the split to 65%/35% in favour of rented housing. Another said 40/60% This policy content is currently not adhered too. There is a lack of affordable homes in Bures. This exacerbates house prices. Subsidising rents and mortgages push house prices up further. The solution to the economic problem is plainly to get supply and demand back in balance i.e. build sufficient housing. Wording should read "where it is at all practicable.." 	<p>commissioned by AECOM.</p> <p>No changes</p>

Q21- Do you agree with policy BP16? The majority of respondents (132 people or 93%) agreed with Policy BP16 out of 142 people. There were 12 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree only when any development would be limited to the construction of low-cost housing and exclude housing of other types that may be required for profit to fund the low-cost housing or land. Affordable housing should not be sold off How will a survey of current residents accurately reflect need? Infrastructure is not available to support this 	<p>Note the comments and voiced concerns.</p> <p>No changes</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to solve the supply and demand issue for prices to come back in line not market manipulation. • Not sure of the impact of this policy 	

Q22- The majority of respondents (136 people or 94.4%) agreed with Policy BP17 out of 144 people. There were 11 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that 'renewable energy generation' could include wind farms or solar farms and their associated infrastructure which would have a devastating effect on the local landscape. Some comment this wouldn't be acceptable for Bures. • Do not support since there will be infrastructure pressure on the village. Builders should do a full review on the capacity. • Just because something is "community led" does not entail it has the support of 50% of the community • People are unsure about reducing rules for those labelled as local groups or charities • Small businesses not supported when there are empty unused properties available • Support if its for low scale only • Suggest the Almshouses are factored into the NP and be included as a community asset 	<p>Note the comments and voiced concerns.</p> <p>No changes.</p> <p>All the other policies of the NP still need to be met.</p>

Q23- The majority of respondents (135 people or 94.4%) agreed with Policy BP18 out of 143 people. There were 21 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further new development in the area should only come forward if there is provision and capacity available of community services and infrastructure. If not then new development should provide further community services. Do not wish for more housing in the area. No sites available in the development boundary. Do not build on flood plains. Do not want the area to get bigger. Infrastructure is already under strain Plans must mitigate the impact on designations rather than a blanket ban Should be no exceptions except affordable to local families. Strongly agree. Or support in principle Suggest adding the wording " where they do not exceed twenty five units and ..." 	<p>Note the comments and voiced concerns.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to expect small scale development to bring forward community provision of a large scale this would most likely be unviable.</p>

Q24- Do you agree with policy BP19? The majority of respondents (136 people or 97.1%) agreed with Policy BP19 out of 140 people. There were 8 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respondent noted that within the Design Codes section - Housing Growth P.174 a number of locations are mentioned and identified outside Bures St Mary as the Core Village as previously mentioned in the adopted Babergh Local Plan (2014). Suggested the NP should also include and name the hamlet of Smallbridge specifically as and when appropriate, so it is both recognised and remembered as being part of the plan but also of differing character and requirements or consideration as necessary. Respondents made comments that design was ignored in recent developments which have been approved 	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Made reference to Smallbridge in Para 180 when listing other areas.</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest to change wording from “should” to “must” 	

Q25- Do you agree with policy BP20? The majority of respondents (140 people or 96.6%) agreed with Policy BP20 out of 145 people. There were 12 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not agree some expansion of existing dwellings and businesses can easily be accommodated in Bures Hamlet without any detrimental impact New builds should also be encouraged/directed to ensure they comply with most recent Secured by Design (SBD) advice to ensure safety and security of the housing and village is enhanced. Not allowing any new buildings in the Conservation areas could be detrimental to the viability of the village, however, strict controls are required Outline applications for new builds in the Conservation Area have been accepted and should continue to be accepted for consideration. Respondent asked is there nowhere within the conservation area where a new building could not be located and enhanced Should not use conservation areas as an excuse to refuse development Should extend the conservation area and protect the landscape Should make it easier to build housing in the area for young working people 	<p>Note the mix of comments and concerns on the policy being restrictive in the conservation area.</p> <p>No changes.</p> <p>This is not a requirement for householder applications, just where the proposal is for a new dwelling to ensure that design is a key consideration.</p>

Q26- Do you agree with policy BP21? The majority of respondents (144 people or 98.6%) agreed with Policy BP21 out of 146 people. There were 7 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the importance of conserving heritage • Appropriateness to current living standards needs to be considered • The NP does not mention the Smallbridge Hall in this section • Community Action is commendable and hope to see professional input and funding put into aspiration • Recommended BP21 be modified to uphold the necessity to develop the continued usefulness of heritage assets alongside the aim of conserving the heritage in a manner appropriate to their significance. This is in line with comments made about St Marys Church and the need to keep buildings in a state which are useful for meeting the current needs of residents and the congregation. • Wish to see more of a push for national landscapes 	<p>Note the comments and welcome the agreement of the importance.</p> <p>Add small bridge hall info into the supporting text Para 218 and added the sentence about farmsteads in the countryside in Para 232/233 in the supporting text.</p>

Q27- Do you agree with policy BP22? The majority of respondents (125 people or 87.4%) agreed with Policy BP22 out of 143 people. There were 18 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any new businesses development which could threaten the continuance of an existing business in Bures should be fully considered in planning applications • Concern the parish councils do not support local businesses. • Development proposals for new businesses have shown the popularity of extending commercial enterprises in Bures • Do not wish to see full fibre broadband installations leading to more telegraph poles in the area • Do not wish for further business expansion in Bures 	<p>Note the mix of comments.</p> <p>From the comments there was a sense that a number of people felt the policy was not supportive of local businesses.</p> <p>Included reference to existing and new businesses. Amended</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not agree with the statement since there should be healthy competition among businesses even though existing ones may have a certain amount of protection Need for flexibility in businesses. There are a number of valuable local businesses in the area however these could be limited in scope. Nice to have a choice of businesses in the area. It can be attractive to have similar businesses in one place. Policy currently reads as if it is not supportive of any further shops or could lead to a refusal. Wish to support seeing more businesses in the area not less. Policy is unclear, second half of the statement does not accord with the first, is the plan wishing to prevent change if use from commercial to residential Respondents state the replacement of Chambers Site to the Co Op providing a supermarket for locals has not materialised. The commercial viability of a business comes down to market demand, not planning policy. 	<p>typo in this policy should be shown.</p> <p>Made the policy supportive of new businesses too. Non-commercial proposals that threaten the presence of businesses in Bures should not be accepted. Welcome new businesses.</p>

Q28- Do you agree with policy BP23? The majority of respondents (143 people or 97.9%) agreed with Policy BP23 out of 146 people. There were 18 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration should be given to all members of society including children and disabled Current roads are in disrepair with poor drainage Must not compromise/restrict unduly the free use of internal combustion engine vehicles Need to ensure that walking and cycling routes are safe, maintained and well lit 	<p>Note the mix of comments.</p> <p>Some of these concerns cannot be dealt with in the neighbourhood plan itself and is the responsibility of</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should drop the speed limit and introduce traffic calming measures Policy to have due regard and comply 	<p>Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>No changes</p>

Q29- Do you agree with policy BP24? The majority of respondents (136 people or 94.4%) agreed with Policy BP24 out of 144 people. There were 19- comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with route 2 and 5 Agree as long as there are sufficient bins Disagree with the proposed riverside walk since it is unjustified when an existing PRoW already is used which takes one to and from the same locations. Not worth the impact on wildlife to create this. Disagree the routes are viable Disagree with making any existing footpaths into bridleways to accommodate cyclists and horse riders since these become impassable to pedestrians like other areas in Bures. One example a few respondents oppose is along Cuckoo Hill which has to be maintained by volunteers currently. Others have stated there concern of cyclists not respecting safety of others on this path, speeding, and that field margin paths are damaged. The path is narrow, hazardous in winter months, people experience anti-social behaviour. Urged the Parish Council to reconsider the conversion of this footpath into a cycle path, as it poses significant safety hazard to pedestrians. Do not think the policy should be so specific, first paragraph is a catch all statement which should suffice Do not extend footpaths New developments must maintain and enhance the PRoW 	<p>Note the mix of comments. Agreed take out Cuckoo Hill permissive path.</p> <p>Added to Community action 12 wording around signposting bus shelters sympathetic to a conservation area.</p>

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation 14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 28 and Section 251 St Marys Church highlights the need for additional public car parking in Bures as a high priority to reduce congestion and cars parked on Church Square and Bridge Street. Suggest the creation of Bay Parking along the roadside edge of Bures Common. Need overspill car park. Sign post the bus stops and present timetables These would be good steps forward These areas are currently used by people recreationally and we should oppose developments Unsure what the impact would be for landowners and their rights 	

Q30- Do you agree the plan should be adopted? The majority of respondents (140 people or 96.6%) agreed out of 145 people. There were 25 comments left on this question which have been summarised below.

	Summary of comments from the community survey for Regulation14 consultation	NP Response
Item	Comment	
Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Action 11 G - to seek for opportunities to provide additional off-street parking- is a hugely pressing matter Many commented they would support if suggested amendments were made No links to the plan to comment on People applauded the effort of those who got the plan to this stage Public transport is important Respondent stated there needed to be mention of parking in the village and this becoming an increasing issue. Request for the area to have signs at the bus stops Request the removal of HGV in the area 	<p>Note the different comments.</p> <p>Amendments will be made to the plan where appropriate.</p> <p>No changes</p>

Appendix A- Statutory Consultees Contacted at Regulation 14

- MPs for: Braintree, Harwich & North Essex, *and* South Suffolk
- County Councillors for: Constable Electoral Division (Essex), Halstead Electoral Division (Essex), Hedingham Electoral Division (Essex), *and* Stour Valley Electoral Division (Suffolk)
- District Councillors for: Assington (Babergh DC), Bures St Mary & Nayland (Babergh DC), Stour Valley South (Braintree DC), *and* The Colnes (Braintree DC)
- Neighbouring Parish Councils: Althamstone, Assington, Lamarsh, Little Cornard, Mount Bures, Nayland-with-Wissington, Pebmarsh, Wakes Colne, White Colne, *and* Wormingford
- Essex County Council, Suffolk County Council
- Babergh District Council, Braintree District Council, *and* Colchester Borough Council
- Anglian Water, *and* Essex & Suffolk Water
- The Water Management Alliance
- The Environment Agency (Essex, Norfolk & Suffolk Sustainable Places Team)
- Historic England (East of England Office)
- Natural England
- The Forestry Commission
- The National Trust (East of England Office)
- The Crown Estate Office
- Highways England
- Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd (Town Planning Team)
- Marine Management Organisation
- MOD (Defence Infrastructure Organisation)
- British Telecom, EE, Three, *and* Vodafone & O2
- National Gas Transmission, National Grid Transmission, *and* UK Power Networks
- Essex Chamber of Commerce, *and* Suffolk Chamber of Commerce
- Freeport East, *and the* South East Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)
- The Essex, *and the* Norfolk & Suffolk Gypsy, Roma & Traveller Services Teams
- The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
- Community Action Suffolk, *and the* Rural Communities Council of Essex
- Essex Wildlife Trust, *and* Suffolk Wildlife Trust
- The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (Conservation Officer for Suffolk *and* Essex)
- Diocese Offices for Chelmsford, *and for* St Edmundsbury & Ipswich

- Dedham Vale & Stour Valley National Landscape Office, *and* The Suffolk Coast & Heaths National Landscape Office
- Essex Constabulary, *and* Suffolk Constabulary
- Suffolk Fire & Rescue
- Sport England (East)
- NHS Integrated Care Boards for Suffolk & North Essex, *and for* Mid & South Essex ICB
- Suffolk Preservation Society
- The Theatres Trust