

***BABERGH AND MID SUFFOLK JOINT LOCAL
PLAN EXAMINATION***

***Further hearing sessions following the Main Modifications
Consultation***

AGENDAS

Issue A – Modification of Plan from a Full Local Plan to a Part 1 Plan and change to settlement boundaries

(MMs 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 93)

Monday 26 June 2023 – 10:00

AGENDA

1. Is the plan so fundamentally flawed that it cannot be modified to make it sound?

2. Content and Timing of the Part 2 Plan

- Should the Part 1 plan set out clear timescales and content for the Part 2 plan?
- Should/can the Part 1 plan include “consequences” if the Part 2 plan isn’t submitted for examination in line with expectations?

3. Is it necessary/feasible for the Part 1 Plan to set out a spatial strategy?

4. Is the allocation of housing sites in the Part 1 plan, over and above the existing commitments summarised in proposed Table 3 - Residual Housing Need over the Plan Period (MM4) necessary for the plan to be sound, having particular regard to:

- Meeting affordable housing needs? –
- The fact that some existing commitments may not actually be developed?

Note: information about existing commitments, on which Table 3 (Residual Housing Need over the Plan Period) is based has been published by the Councils on the Examination Website (document H43). However, as the plan as proposed to be modified does not allocate sites for housing, we do not intend to examine whether or not a five-year supply of deliverable housing land is likely to exist in the districts. Consequently, we do not envisage discussing this information in detail.

5. Policy SP03 as proposed to be modified

- Is it too restrictive of housing development outside settlement boundaries?
- Is the word “normally” in part 2 of the policy appropriate?
- Should part 2 of the policy be altered to “.....or in accordance with a made Neighbourhood Plan” to account for Neighbourhood Plan policies which permit development outside settlement boundaries?
- Is it necessary for part 2 of the policy to list the specific other policies of the plan which may permit development outside settlement boundaries?
- Is it appropriate for part 3 of the policy to state that settlements boundaries “will be reviewed and if necessary revised”

6. MM9 (proposed new paragraph 0.8.01)

- Is this paragraph accurate and effective? Should the last sentence of the paragraph be revised to: “The settlement boundaries will be reviewed as part of the Part 2 Plan but for **at least the short-medium term** it is considered that the existing boundaries will **be likely to** enable the Districts’ development needs to be met, whilst also recognising the intrinsic character of the countryside.”? [key revisions to the sentence are highlighted in **bold**]

7. Table 3

- Should this be amended to make clear that housing allocations in the Part 2 plan will need to reflect the housing requirement figure and the desirability of there being some flexibility in supply having regard to extant commitments at the time?

8. Settlement Boundaries

- Is it necessary and feasible to amend the settlement boundaries to include (a) completed housing developments and (b) all commitments?

9. Policies Map

- Are there errors in the policies map with respect to Neighbourhood Plans?

**Issue B – Intensive Livestock and Poultry Farming Policy
(MMs 47 and 48)**

Tuesday 27 June at 10.00

AGENDA

1. Potential overlap between the policy and other regulatory regimes. Is the policy consistent with national policy?

2. Consistency of part 1g) with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 111.

3. Clarity of policy wording.

- Does the wording need amending to provide greater clarity that it applies to new developments as well as to the expansion of existing businesses?
- Should the last part of 1c) be removed to reflect wider water resource issues?
- should paragraph 14.14 say 'must' rather than 'should' to accord with part 3 of the policy

**Issue C – Protection of Open Spaces
(MMs 63, 64, 65 (part), 66 and 67 (part))**

Tuesday 27 June at 14.00

AGENDA

1. Clarity and effectiveness of wording of part 1d) of the policy.

- How much provision will be required?
- Off-site provision as opposed to on-site provision
- Is there an overlap with CIL?

2. Clarity and sufficiency of the proposed explanatory text (paragraphs 16.04 – 16.08).

- Should other types of open space be included in paragraph 16.04?
- Is a definition of enabling development necessary in paragraph 16.07?

Issue D – Natural England comments on the Main Modifications and the Habitats Regulations Assessment

Wednesday 28 June at 10.00

AGENDA

1. Is the Habitats Regulations Assessment robust and does the plan include all the recommendations identified in the assessment as necessary to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations? [this is MIQ 1.8, from the Matter 1b hearing session which was not held as planned in October 2021]
2. Update on HRA (June 2023 Update) and SoCG with Natural England (June 2023 Addendum)