

Aldham Neighbourhood Plan

Parish Council's response to comments received at Regulation 16 Consultation stage

Body	Parish Council response
1) Natural England	<p>We believe that the draft Neighbourhood Plan adequately addresses the matter of the Suffolk Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS). It is noted that the SPD has yet to be prepared and adopted and therefore cannot be given any weight or reference in the Neighbourhood Plan. The policies do make reference to the need for contributions to mitigate likely significant adverse effects.</p> <p>We note the information contained in Annex 2 of the response, but it is neither a requirement nor the intent of the Neighbourhood Plan to address these matters.</p>
2) Historic England	Nothing further to add
3) Anglian Water	Nothing further to add
4) UK Power Network	Nothing further to add
5) Suffolk Preservation Society	The points raised are noted but it is neither a requirement nor the intent of the Neighbourhood Plan to address these matters.
6) Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG	Nothing further to add
7) Vision Design & Planning Consultants	<p>Bullet Point 1:</p> <p>The dates referred to in the paragraph are wrong. As noted on the cover, the Plan is making provision for the period 2018 to 2036. In terms of housing numbers, the emerging Joint Local Plan (Committee draft July 2019) makes provision for at least 13 dwellings in Aldham in that period. Although the Joint Local Plan is at an early stage, the Neighbourhood Plan is entirely in accordance with that emerging Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan also explains how it is entirely in accordance with the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>Bullet Point 2:</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that there are "plenty of villages that have allowed growth in the form of a mews or cul-de-sac" the development proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan have, rightly, had regard to the environment in Aldham and not "plenty of villages."</p> <p>Bullet Point 3:</p> <p>The policy sets out entirely appropriate guidance and requirements that are conditional for the site to be developed. The appropriate screening of the development within this landscape is considered one such necessary requirement in order to make the development acceptable. No viability information has been provided with the representation and, given that the land is not considered to be contaminated, that there are no requirements to provide affordable housing as part of the development and that the land is in agricultural use, there are not considered to be any burdens on the allocation that would make it inviable.</p> <p>Bullet Point 4:</p> <p>Work in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan did not identify a need or community wish for additional public open space.</p> <p>Insufficient evidence has been provided as to the local need in Aldham for the identified six affordable housing dwellings and whether such a mix of sizes would meet such a local need. Furthermore, nothing is put forward to identify how these would be delivered and managed. Given that the site would effectively extend the Built-Up Area Boundary around the northern edge of the site which, it is noted, also includes a tree belt along the boundary, it is considered that the representation is just seeking to extend to secure the principle of housing on a larger site.</p> <p>Bullet Point 5:</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan identifies why the development of the site in Policy ALD4 is proposed to be deferred to 2026.</p>

	<p>Bullet Point 6: It is considered that opportunities to bring forward dwellings through windfall and infill plots will continue over the remaining 17 years of the Neighbourhood Plan period. An additional two dwellings were built in the village between 2014 and 2017, demonstrating the opportunities are likely to continue into the future.</p> <p>Bullet Point 7: It is noted that the penultimate sentence of the bullet point notes that "It is agreed that the whole of the SHELAA site is not suitable for residential development" but the SHELAA site covers the same area as the plan submitted with the representation and therefore a development of 12 dwellings as proposed in the submission is, de facto, "not suitable".</p>
8) Environment Agency	Nothing further to add