

Babergh District Council

# **Tattingstone Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2024 – 2037**

## **Independent Examiner's Report**

By Ann Skippers BSc (Hons) MRTPI FRSA FHEA AoU

9 January 2026

Contents		
	Summary	3
1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	The role of the independent examiner and the examination process	4
3.0	Neighbourhood plan preparation	7
4.0	Compliance with matters other than the basic conditions	8
5.0	The basic conditions	9
	<i>National policy and advice</i>	9
	<i>Sustainable development</i>	11
	<i>The development plan</i>	11
	<i>Retained European Union (EU) obligations</i>	12
	<i>European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)</i>	13
6.0	Detailed comments on the Plan and its policies	13
	1. <i>Introduction</i>	13
	2. <i>About Tattingstone</i>	14
	3. <i>Planning Policy Context</i>	14
	4. <i>Vision and Objectives</i>	14
	5. <i>Planning Strategy (Policy TATT1)</i>	14
	6. <i>Housing (Policies TATT2 and TATT3)</i>	17
	7. <i>Natural Environment (Policies TATT4 – TATT7)</i>	19
	8. <i>Built Environment and Development Design (Policies TATT8 – TATT11)</i>	24
	9. <i>Services and Facilities</i>	28
	10. <i>Highways and Travel (Policies TATT12 and TATT13)</i>	28
	Policies Map	29
	Appendices	29
	Glossary	29
7.0	Conclusions and recommendations	29
	Appendix 1 List of key documents	30

## Summary

I have been appointed by Babergh District Council to carry out the independent examination of the Tattingstone Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

The Plan is very well presented. The Plan is based around five themes and its 13 policies cover a variety of topics including new settlement boundaries, landscape, non-designated heritage assets and parking standards. The Plan has been careful not to duplicate policies at District level, but rather seeks to add a layer of local detail.

It has been necessary to recommend some modifications, many of which are of a fairly minor nature, to ensure the Plan is clear and precise and provides a practical framework for decision-making as required by national policy and guidance.

Subject to those modifications, I have concluded that the Plan does meet the basic conditions and all the other requirements I am obliged to examine. I am therefore pleased to recommend to Babergh District Council that the Tattingstone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan can go forward to a referendum.

In considering whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Neighbourhood Plan area I see no reason to alter or extend this area for the purpose of holding a referendum.

Ann Skippers MRTPI  
Ann Skippers Planning  
January 2026



## 1.0 Introduction

This is the report of the independent examiner into the Tattingstone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan).

The Localism Act 2011 provides a welcome opportunity for communities to shape the future of the places where they live and work and to deliver the sustainable development they need. One way of achieving this is through the production of a neighbourhood plan.

I have been appointed by Babergh District Council (BDC) with the agreement of the Parish Council to undertake this independent examination.

I am independent of the qualifying body and the local authority. I have no interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan. I am a chartered town planner with over thirty years experience in planning and have worked in the public, private and academic sectors and am an experienced examiner of neighbourhood plans. I therefore have the appropriate qualifications and experience to carry out this independent examination.

## 2.0 The role of the independent examiner and the examination process

### *Role of the Examiner*

The examiner must assess whether a neighbourhood plan meets the basic conditions and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The basic conditions<sup>1</sup> are:

- Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan
- The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development
- The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area
- The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, retained European Union (EU) obligations<sup>2</sup>
- Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan.

<sup>1</sup> Set out in paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and paragraph 11(2) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

<sup>2</sup> "EU obligation" was substituted for "Retained EU obligation" by the Environmental Assessments and Miscellaneous Planning (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2018/1232 which came into force on 31 December 2020

Regulations 32 and 33 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) set out two additional basic conditions to those set out in primary legislation and referred to in the paragraph above. Only one is applicable to neighbourhood plans and was brought into effect on 28 December 2018.<sup>3</sup> It states that:

- The making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

The examiner is also required to check<sup>4</sup> whether the neighbourhood plan:

- Has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body
- Has been prepared for an area that has been properly designated for such plan preparation
- Meets the requirements to i) specify the period to which it has effect; ii) not include provision about excluded development; and iii) not relate to more than one neighbourhood area and that
- Its policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I must also consider whether the draft neighbourhood plan is compatible with Convention rights.<sup>5</sup>

The examiner must then make one of the following recommendations:

- The neighbourhood plan can proceed to a referendum on the basis it meets all the necessary legal requirements
- The neighbourhood plan can proceed to a referendum subject to modifications or
- The neighbourhood plan should not proceed to a referendum on the basis it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

If the plan can proceed to a referendum with or without modifications, the examiner must also consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the neighbourhood plan area to which it relates.

If the plan goes forward to referendum and more than 50% of those voting vote in favour of the plan then it is made by the relevant local authority, in this case BDC. The plan then becomes part of the 'development plan' for the area and a statutory consideration in guiding future development and in the determination of planning applications within the plan area.

---

<sup>3</sup> Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018/1307

<sup>4</sup> Set out in sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act and paragraph 11(2) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

<sup>5</sup> The combined effect of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) Schedule 4B para 8(6) and para 10 (3)(b) and the Human Rights Act 1998

## ***Examination Process***

It is useful to bear in mind that the examiner's role is limited to testing whether or not the submitted neighbourhood plan meets the basic conditions and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and paragraph 11 of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).<sup>6</sup>

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that the examiner is not testing the soundness of a neighbourhood plan or examining other material considerations.<sup>7</sup>

The fact that a modification would be of benefit is not a sufficient ground in itself to recommend it. So, for example, the fact that a policy could be added to or strengthened does not justify a modification unless this is necessary for the reasons given above.

In addition, PPG is clear that neighbourhood plans are not obliged to include policies on all types of development.<sup>8</sup>

Often representations suggest amendments to policies or additional policies and, as in this case, the allocation of sites. As explained above, where I find that policies do meet the basic conditions, it is not necessary for me to consider if further amendments or additions are required and plans do not have to contain site allocations or address housing supply.

PPG<sup>9</sup> explains that it is expected that the examination will not include a public hearing. Rather the examiner should reach a view by considering written representations. Where an examiner considers it necessary to ensure adequate examination of an issue or to ensure a person has a fair chance to put a case, then a hearing must be held.<sup>10</sup>

I note that some representations at submission stage express concern that the consultation has not been adequate and that comments made have not been properly considered by the qualifying body. From the information before me and taking together the two formal consultations carried out pre-submission and then the submission stage consultation seem to me to have provided adequate opportunity for comments to be made. With regard to process, governance and other such issues, an independent examiner has no authority to consider such allegations. Such matters should be dealt with through the internal complaints handling procedures of the qualifying body or local planning authority.

---

<sup>6</sup> Paragraph 11(3) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and PPG para 055 ref id 41-055-20180222,

<sup>7</sup> PPG para 055 ref id 41-055-20180222

<sup>8</sup> Ibid para 040 ref id 41-040-20160211

<sup>9</sup> Ibid para 056 ref id 41-056-20180222

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

I note that a representation also requests a hearing to be held; this is not uncommon. After consideration of all the documentation and the representations made, I decided that it was not necessary to hold a hearing.

In 2018, the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (NPIERS) published guidance to service users and examiners. Amongst other matters, the guidance indicates that the qualifying body will normally be given an opportunity to comment upon any representations made by other parties at the Regulation 16 consultation stage should they wish to do so. There is no obligation for a qualifying body to make any comments; it is only if they wish to do so. The Parish Council made comments on the Regulation 16 stage representations and I have taken these into account.

I am grateful to everyone for ensuring that the examination has run so smoothly and in particular Paul Bryant at BDC.

I made an unaccompanied site visit to familiarise myself with the Plan area on 15 November 2025.

### ***Modifications and how to read this report***

Where modifications are recommended they appear in a bullet point list of **bold text**. Where I have suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in ***bold italics*** in the bullet point list of recommendations. Modifications will always appear in a bullet point list.

As a result of some modifications consequential amendments may be required. These can include changing policy numbering, section headings, amending the contents page, renumbering paragraphs or pages, ensuring that supporting appendices and other documents align with the final version of the Plan and so on.

I regard these issues as primarily matters of final presentation and do not specifically refer to all such modifications, but have an expectation that a common sense approach will be taken and any such necessary editing will be carried out and the Plan's presentation made consistent.

## **3.0 Neighbourhood plan preparation**

A Consultation Statement has been submitted.

Work began on the Plan in earnest after an information event was held in August 2021. In 2022, two surveys were conducted; one for Residents and one for 9-15 year olds. The Landscape Appraisal and Design Guidelines and Codes were commissioned. In March 2023, a drop-in event was held to update residents and this included feedback on the survey results and the drafts of the two supporting evidence documents.

Pre-submission (Regulation 14) period of consultation was undertaken between 20 January – 8 March 2024. It was publicised by a leaflet distributed to every household and business in the Parish. The period of consultation was launched with a drop-in event at the Village Hall. Both hard copies and online copies were made available.

As a result of this consultation, owners of the proposed Local Green Spaces were given a further opportunity to comment.

Then as a result of the pre-submission consultation, it was decided to hold a further period of focused consultation on the proposed settlement boundary for the Heath. This was held between 14 January – 28 February 2025. A leaflet was distributed to all households and businesses. This also explained the Plan was not going to proceed with the proposed designation of land at the Wheatsheaf public house, behind the White Horse public house and the allotments as Local Green Spaces.

I consider that the consultation and engagement carried out is sufficient.

Submission (Regulation 16) consultation was carried out between 3 September – 17 October 2025.

The Regulation 16 stage resulted in 13 representations. I have considered all of the representations and taken them into account in preparing my report.

I note that a representation from the Defence Infrastructure Organisation explains that the Plan area contains, and is washed over by, a safeguarding zone designated to preserve the operation and capability of the Eastern Wide Area Multilateration Network. New development can impact on the operation or capability of this asset. As a result the Ministry of Defence should be consulted on certain applications within the safeguarding zone. This is primarily a matter for development management at BDC level.

## **4.0 Compliance with matters other than the basic conditions**

### ***Qualifying body***

Tattingstone Parish Council is the qualifying body able to lead preparation of a neighbourhood plan. This requirement is satisfactorily met.

### ***Plan area***

The Plan area is coterminous with the administrative boundary for the Parish. BDC approved the designation of the area on 19 July 2021. The Plan relates to this area and does not relate to more than one neighbourhood area and therefore complies with these requirements. The Plan area is shown on page 5 of the Plan.



### ***Plan period***

The Plan period is 2024 – 2037. This is clearly stated in the Plan itself. The requirement is therefore satisfactorily met.

### ***Excluded development***

The Plan does not include policies that relate to any of the categories of excluded development and therefore meets this requirement. This is also helpfully confirmed in the Basic Conditions Statement.

### ***Development and use of land***

Policies in neighbourhood plans must relate to the development and use of land. Sometimes neighbourhood plans contain aspirational policies or projects that signal the community's priorities for the future of their local area, but are not related to the development and use of land. If I consider a policy or proposal to fall within this category, I will recommend it be clearly differentiated. This is because wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable.<sup>11</sup>

In this case, seven Community Actions are found throughout the Plan. They are clearly distinguishable from the planning policies and accompanied by a good explanation of their status.<sup>12</sup> I therefore consider this approach to be acceptable for this Plan.

## **5.0 The basic conditions**

### ***Regard to national policy and advice***

The Government replaced previous versions of the NPPF with a new NPPF which was published in December 2024. This was amended in February 2025 to correct some cross-references to footnotes and to clarify the intent of paragraph 155.

The NPPF is the main document that sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

In particular it explains that the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will mean that neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies in local plans or spatial development strategies and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> PPG para 004 ref id 41-004-20190509

<sup>12</sup> The Plan, page 6

<sup>13</sup> NPPF para 13

Non-strategic policies are more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development.<sup>14</sup> They can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level, establishing design principles, conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment as well as set out other development management policies.<sup>15</sup>

The NPPF also makes it clear that neighbourhood plans gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area.<sup>16</sup> However, neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than that set out in strategic policies or undermine those strategic policies.<sup>17</sup>

The NPPF states that all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence; evidence should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying policies and take into account relevant market signals.<sup>18</sup>

Policies should be clearly written and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. They should serve a clear purpose and avoid unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area including those in the NPPF.<sup>19</sup>

On 6 March 2014, the Government published a suite of planning guidance referred to as Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). This is an online resource available at [www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance) which is regularly updated. The planning guidance contains a wealth of information relating to neighbourhood planning. I have also had regard to PPG in preparing this report.

PPG indicates that a policy should be clear and unambiguous<sup>20</sup> to enable a decision maker to apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. The guidance advises that policies should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence, reflecting and responding to both the planning context and the characteristics of the area.<sup>21</sup>

PPG states there is no 'tick box' list of evidence required, but proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken.<sup>22</sup> It continues that the evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies.<sup>23</sup>

Whilst this has formed part of my own assessment, the Basic Conditions Statement clearly sets out how the Plan's objectives and policies correspond to the NPPF.

---

<sup>14</sup> NPPF para 29

<sup>15</sup> Ibid

<sup>16</sup> Ibid para 30

<sup>17</sup> Ibid

<sup>18</sup> Ibid para 32

<sup>19</sup> Ibid para 16

<sup>20</sup> PPG para 041 ref id 41-041-20140306

<sup>21</sup> Ibid

<sup>22</sup> Ibid para 040 ref id 41-040-20160211

<sup>23</sup> Ibid

### ***Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development***

A qualifying body must demonstrate how the making of a neighbourhood plan would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

The NPPF confirms that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.<sup>24</sup> This means that the planning system has three overarching and interdependent objectives which should be pursued in mutually supportive ways so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives.<sup>25</sup>

The three overarching objectives are:<sup>26</sup>

- a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
- c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

The NPPF confirms that planning policies should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but should take local circumstances into account to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.<sup>27</sup>

Whilst this has formed part of my own assessment, the Basic Conditions Statement sets out how the Plan will help to achieve each of the objectives of sustainable development as outlined in the NPPF.

### ***General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan***

The development plan consists of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan Part 1 (JLP) which was adopted by BDC on 21 November 2023 and some saved policies from the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2 (LP) adopted in June 2006 and the Core Strategy

---

<sup>24</sup> NPPF para 7

<sup>25</sup> Ibid para 8

<sup>26</sup> Ibid

<sup>27</sup> Ibid para 9

(CS) adopted in February 2014. None of the saved policies are relevant to this examination.

The Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2020 and other made neighbourhood plans also form part of the development plan, but are not directly relevant to this examination.

Whilst this has formed part of my own assessment, the Basic Conditions Statement sets out the relationship between the strategic policies of the JLP and the Plan policies.

### ***Retained European Union Obligations Strategic Environmental Assessment***

A Screening Determination dated April 2024 has been prepared by BDC. This in turn refers to a SEA Screening Opinion Final Report prepared by Land Use Consultants Ltd dated March 2024 which concluded that the Plan was unlikely to have significant environmental effects.

Consultation with the statutory bodies was undertaken. The Environment Agency did not make any specific comments. Responses from Historic England and Natural England concurred with the conclusions of the SEA Screening Report.

I have treated the Screening Opinion Final Report and the Screening Determination to be the statement of reasons that the PPG advises must be prepared and submitted with the neighbourhood plan proposal and made available to the independent examiner where it is determined that the plan is unlikely to have significant environmental effects.<sup>28</sup>

Taking account of the characteristics of the Plan, the information put forward and the characteristics of the areas most likely to be affected, I consider that EU obligations in respect of SEA have been satisfied.

Turning now to HRA, a Habitats Regulations Screening Determination dated April 2024 has been prepared by BDC. This in turn refers to a HRA Screening Report of March 2024 prepared by Land Use Consultants.

A number of European sites lie within 20km of the Plan area. These are the Stour and Orwell Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site; the Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site; the Hamford Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC), SPA and Ramsar site; the Essex Estuaries SAC, the Colne Estuary (Mid Essex Coast Phase 2) SPA and Ramsar site, Outer Thames Estuary SPA and the Sandlings SPA.

The Screening Report concludes that no likely significant effects are predicted, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Natural England concurred with the findings of the Screening Report.

---

<sup>28</sup> PPG para 028 ref id 11-028-20150209

The Screening Determination concludes that Appropriate Assessment (AA) is not required.

On 28 December 2018, the basic condition prescribed in Regulation 32 and Schedule 2 (Habitats) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) was substituted by a new basic condition brought into force by the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018 which provides that the making of the plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Habitats Regulations.

Given the distance from, the nature and characteristics of the European sites and the nature and contents of the Plan, I agree with the conclusion of the Screening Determination and consider that the prescribed basic condition relating to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 is complied with.

### ***European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)***

The Basic Conditions Statement contains a comprehensive statement in relation to human rights and equalities. Having regard to the Basic Conditions Statement, there is nothing in the Plan that leads me to conclude there is any breach or incompatibility with Convention rights.

## **6.0 Detailed comments on the Plan and its policies**

In this section I consider the Plan and its policies against the basic conditions. Where modifications are recommended they appear in **bold text**. As a reminder, where I suggest specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in ***bold italics***.

The Plan is presented to a high standard and contains 13 policies. There is a helpful contents page at the start of the Plan.

### ***1. Introduction***

This is a very clear, well-written and helpful section that sets out information about the Plan and how it has evolved. There is a clear diagram which shows the different stages of the neighbourhood planning process. Some natural updating will be needed as the Plan progresses towards the next stages.

Paragraph 1.11 refers to an “Appraisal of Views” document giving the impression there is a separate document. In fact views are considered in the Landscape Appraisal. A correction should be made to this paragraph in the interests of accuracy.

- **Delete the reference to an “Appraisal of Views” document in paragraph 1.11 on page 6 of the Plan**

## **2. About Tattingstone**

This is an informative section about the history and present attributes of the Parish.

## **3. Planning Policy context**

This section usefully explains the policy context for the Plan.

## **4. Vision and Objectives**

The vision for the area is:

“That Tattingstone Parish will remain an attractive and desirable place to live, maintaining its historic and environmental assets. It will be a thriving and sustainable community, with the three parts of the Parish retaining their own identities and characteristics but supporting each other through the provision of appropriate services and facilities.”

The vision is underpinned by eight objectives across the six topic areas of planning strategy; housing; natural environment; built environment and design; services and facilities; and highways and travel.

Both the vision and the objectives are clearly articulated and relate to the development and use of land and put sustainable development at the heart of the Plan.

## **5. Planning Strategy**

### **Policy TATT1 – Spatial Strategy**

It is useful to set out the planning context for this Plan area.

JLP Policy SP01 sets out the housing figures for the District; in Babergh District, the JLP will seek to deliver some 7, 904 net dwellings. The policy indicates that the mix of tenure, size and type of housing development should be informed by needs assessments.

JLP Policy SP03 sets out an expectation that housing will come forward through extant permissions, allocations in neighbourhood plans, windfall development and through allocations in the JLP Part 2. It indicates that settlement boundaries will also be reviewed as part of the work on the JLP Part 2. However, BDC has announced its intention to undertake a full Joint Local Plan review and not a Part 2 Plan in the light of various Government announcements about changes to the planning system. It would be reasonable to expect that the review of settlement boundaries and any site allocations would now form part of the work on a full Joint Local Plan review.

JLP Policy SP03 essentially carries forward settlement boundaries from previous development plan documents. The JLP recognises that the existing settlement boundaries have been in place for some time.

**Policy TATT 1 – Spatial Strategy** defines three settlement boundaries for the Plan area reflecting the Parish's three distinct built-up areas. It then sets out how development will be managed within and outside the settlement boundaries.

The opportunity has been taken to review and update the three settlement boundaries to reflect changes on the ground. These are shown on pages 12 and 13 of the Plan and on the Policies Map. I note that a further period on focused consultation was carried out on the settlement boundary proposed for The Heath.

The two settlement boundaries for the Village and the White Horse built-up areas seem to me to have been designated logically. The proposed settlement boundary for the Heath attracted further representations at submission stage and I comment on this below.

One representation would like the settlement boundary to include the entirety of the rear gardens of Yew Tree House, Well Cottage and Laburnum Cottage which all front Church Road and back onto a distinctive area of green space. The currently proposed boundary slices through their rear gardens. This is not an uncommon situation and a tight line is often drawn around the built development element and is used to prevent the development of large gardens or encroachment into the countryside where perhaps the 'line' is not uniform.

However, I saw at my site visit that there is a very distinct and robust boundary consisting of a hedgerow and trees along the rear of these boundaries onto the field which continues along the backs of all the properties in this part of Church Road. There seems to be no specific reason given in the documentation as to why the line has been drawn as it has.

Additionally, during the pre submission amendments to this settlement boundary, a large area of land around Peartree Cottage, the last property in this 'run' along Church Road, has been included. Therefore taking this into account together with the physical features on the ground, I see no reason why the rear gardens of these three properties could not be included to ensure there is logical to the boundary taken as a whole. A modification is therefore made to this effect.

The same representation also puts forward the argument that land north of Homecroft is suitable for development. The site has been assessed as part of BDC's work on the JLP. The most recent Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Draft is dated September 2025. This does indeed identify the site (called land to the west of A137 and south of Station Road, HE23295) as being 'suitable' for development.

However, the status of a SHLAA is clear; the document itself explains that the SHLAA does not have any formal planning status and the sites are produced as a reference only

evidence base document for the JLP. It continues that the SHLAA is not a consultation document or a proposal of sites for development.<sup>29</sup> As I have already set out earlier in this report, there is no obligation for a Plan to allocate sites for development, including small or medium sites, or to include this parcel of land within the settlement boundary.

There is no evidence to support the claim that the Plan promotes less development than is set out in strategic policies. I do not find any conflict with development plan policies.

Policy TATT1 directs new development to those areas within the settlement boundaries. Outside the settlement boundaries, development is only permitted where it would be in accordance with national or district or neighbourhood level policies and where there would be no detrimental impact on any heritage or landscape designations. The policy explicitly refers to the Suffolk Coast and Heaths National Landscape (NL).

At this juncture, it is important to note that the southern part of the Plan area falls within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths NL. The duty amended by the Levelling up and Regeneration Act 2023<sup>30</sup> on relevant authorities in respect of their functions which affect land in NLs must be considered. Relevant authorities must now 'seek to further' the statutory purposes of Protected Landscapes. This replaces the previous duty on relevant authorities to 'have regard to' their statutory purposes. Guidance<sup>31</sup> was issued by the Government which gives further information about how the duty should be applied.

I note that JLP Policy SP03 explicitly states that outside the settlement boundaries, development is only permitted where a site is allocated for development, it is in accordance with a made neighbourhood plan, it is in accordance with JLP policies or it is in accordance with the NPPF.

JLP Policy SP09 requires development to support and contribute to the conservation, enhancement and management of the natural and local environment and networks of green infrastructure.

Therefore the policy reflects the relevant District policies and will help to achieve sustainable development.

The policy also refers to "important gaps" and two are identified on the Policies Maps. The first one is in White Horse and is between the gateway into the settlement from the south identified in the Landscape Appraisal and 1960s housing beyond. The second is in the Village to the west of the built-up area and seeks to separate development along Church Road with the Heath.

Both are relatively short gaps along rural roads. I note that the vision specifically mentions the desire for the three distinctive built up areas of the Parish to retain their

---

<sup>29</sup> Draft SHLAA September 2025, para 1.1, page 8

<sup>30</sup> Levelling up and Regeneration Act 2023 s245

<sup>31</sup> Guidance issued 16 December 2024



own identities and characteristics. The identification of both important gaps is supported by the evidence in the Landscape Appraisal dated March 2023 prepared by Alison Farmer Associates. The important gaps will help to retain separation and ensure elongation of the built development is restricted.

Paragraph 5.5 refers to the existing settlement boundaries being shown in black dashed lines, but this is not the case for this version of the Plan. This supporting text should be amended accordingly.

With the modification to the settlement boundary at the Heath, **Policy TATT1** will meet the basic conditions by having regard to national policy, being in general conformity with the JLP given it supports the strategy within that document and the strategic policies referred to above and will help to achieve sustainable development.

- **Include the rear gardens of Yew Tree House, Well Cottage and Laburnum Cottage, Church Road in the settlement boundary for The Heath**
- **Delete the last sentence of paragraph 5.5 on page 12 of the Plan that begins: “The adopted Local Plan boundaries...” to end**

## **6. Housing**

### **Policies TATT2 – Housing Development and TATT3 - Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites**

The NPPF states that to help support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land comes forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.<sup>32</sup> It continues that the overall aim should be to meet as much of an area’s identified housing need as possible, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community.<sup>33</sup>

Within this context, it is clear that size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in policy.<sup>34</sup> These groups include affordable housing, families with children, older people and those with disabilities.<sup>35</sup>

To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> NPPF para 61

<sup>33</sup> Ibid

<sup>34</sup> Ibid para 63

<sup>35</sup> Ibid

<sup>36</sup> Ibid para 83

In rural areas, the NPPF explains that policies should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs.<sup>37</sup> This includes proposals for community-led housing.<sup>38</sup>

The NPPF offers support to rural exception sites that provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs and indicates that some market housing on these sites may help to facilitate this.<sup>39</sup> However, the NPPF differentiates between rural exception sites and sites suitable for community-led housing whereas non-strategic JLP Policy LP07 treats the two types of development in largely the same way except for ensuring that community-led housing schemes are initiated and led by a legitimate local community group and that the scheme has general community support.

The NPPF is clear that support for community-led housing (defined in the NPPF's glossary) is for exception sites which would not otherwise be suitable as rural exception sites.<sup>40</sup> These sites must be adjacent to existing settlements and proportionate in size to them, not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance in the NPPF which includes NLs, and comply with any local design policies and standards.<sup>41</sup> The criteria set out in the NPPF is largely mirrored in non-strategic JLP Policy LP07 which states that a rural exception site must be well-connected to an existing settlement and proportionate to it.

BDC point out that some context appears to have been inadvertently lost as a result of amendments at the draft stage. I agree and a modification is made to paragraph 6.9 of the supporting text in the interests of clarity.

There are two policies in this section.

**Policy TATT2 – Housing Development** refers to housing development and supports windfall and infill sites subject to acceptable impacts.

**Policy TATT3 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites** sets out support for small-scale affordable housing schemes including community-led housing, on sites outside the settlement boundary, but well related to the existing settlements. It sets out clearly the expectations attached to such development.

To ensure there is clarity between rural exception sites and exception sites for community-led housing in line with the NPPF, a modification is made to Policy TATT3.

It is also important that the policy recognises the protection given by footnote 7 of the NPPF. A modification is made to reflect this point.

---

<sup>37</sup> NPPF para 82

<sup>38</sup> Ibid

<sup>39</sup> Ibid

<sup>40</sup> Ibid para 76

<sup>41</sup> Ibid

With the modifications to Policy TATT3, **Policies TATT2 and TATT3** will meet the basic conditions by having regard to national policy and guidance, be in general conformity with, and add a layer of local detail to, JLP Policies SP01, SP02 which sets out local expectations for affordable housing and SP03 in particular, and help to achieve sustainable development.

- **Add the following sentence at the start of paragraph 6.9 on page 15 of the Plan:**

***“JLP1 Policy LP07 Community-led and rural exception housing, provides guidance on community led schemes which must be initiated by a legitimate community group and have general community support, in addition to the more traditional rural exception sites.”***

- **Change the title of Policy TATT3 to “Affordable Housing on Exception Sites”**
- **Delete the word “rural” from the first sentence of Policy TATT3 so that it reads:**

***“Proposals for the development of small-scale affordable housing schemes, including community-led housing (as defined by paragraph 76 of the NPPF) on exception sites outside...”***

- **Add a new paragraph at the end of Policy TATT3 that reads:**

***“Any proposed sites in, or within the setting of, the Suffolk Coast and Heaths National Landscape should ensure that the special qualities of the National Landscape are protected.”***

## **7. Natural Environment**

**Policies TATT4 – Protection of the Landscape Setting of Tattingstone; TATT5 – Protection of Important Views; TATT6 – Biodiversity and Habitats; TATT7 – Local Green Spaces**

The NPPF states that policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment including through the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services including of trees and woodland and minimising impacts on, and providing net gains for, biodiversity.<sup>42</sup>

To protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF encourages plans to identify and map and safeguard local wildlife rich habitats and ecological networks, wildlife corridors and promote priority habitats as well as pursuing net gains for biodiversity.<sup>43</sup> It continues that plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority

---

<sup>42</sup> NPPF para 187

<sup>43</sup> Ibid para 192

habitats, ecological networks and the recovery of priority species and pursue opportunities for measurable net gain.<sup>44</sup>

In relation to NLs, the NPPF states that these areas have the highest status of protection and that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty.<sup>45</sup>

JLP Policy SP09 requires development to support and contribute to the conservation, enhancement and management of the natural and local environment and networks of green infrastructure including landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and the historic environment and historic landscapes. It also expects all development, through biodiversity net gain, to protect and enhance biodiversity ensuring measures are resilient to climate change.

Non-strategic JLP Policy LP16 refers to biodiversity and geodiversity including the loss of irreplaceable habitats and ancient woodland and biodiversity net gain. Non-strategic JLP Policy LP17 seeks to conserve and enhance landscape character including through the reinforcement of local distinctiveness and the identity of individual settlements, consideration of topographical impact and dark skies. Non-strategic JLP Policy LP18 refers to National Landscapes.

The Plan is supported by a Landscape Appraisal.

BDC point out that the figure on page 21 showing the mitigation hierarchy requires amendment. Furthermore there will be a minor editing task in renumbering the figures and updating any references as a consequence.

**Policy TATT4 – Protection of the Landscape Setting of Tattingstone** seeks to ensure that any development conserves the landscape, heritage and rural character of the Parish.

Policy TATT4 refers to visually sensitive landscape and the NL. Outside the settlement boundaries, any proposals are required to have a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment.

Three areas of visually sensitive landscape are identified on the Policies Maps. All are supported by evidence in the Landscape Appraisal. In the case of the visually sensitive landscape to the north and east of the Village, the Landscape Appraisal recognises the importance of retaining the open setting to the village and the rural setting of Alton Water. With regard to the two areas of visually sensitive landscape of open pastoral slopes in White Horse, the Landscape Appraisal identifies these as visually sensitive from the wide valley landscape and of importance to conserve.

The policy has regard to the NPPF as it seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character and history including the surrounding built environment and

---

<sup>44</sup> NPPF para 192

<sup>45</sup> Ibid para 189

landscape setting and will maintain a strong sense of place.<sup>46</sup> It is in general conformity with JLP Policy SP09 in particular and will help to achieve sustainable development.

**Policy TATT5 – Protection of Important Views** identifies a number of important views in the Parish. The views are identified on Map 7 on page 19 of the Plan and on the Policies Maps. Some views are shown on one map or the other, but obviously the maps should tie up. A modification is therefore made to ensure that all the maps are accurate.

I note that the Parish Council have also confirmed that a view eastwards from the A137 and shown as “4” in their response to the representations should be deleted.

The identification of the views is supported by the Landscape Appraisal. I saw at my site visit that all the views are important to the setting of the villages or demonstrate the intrinsic character of the natural and built environment. All but one has been identified appropriately. I note the comment made by Suffolk County Council during the focused consultation period regarding a view in the Heath that has, in effect, been harmed due to a consent for an extension to the Tattingstone quarry. I consider this view should be deleted in the interests of practicality.

The policy seeks to ensure that the key features of the views are conserved. It requires a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal or similarly appropriate document for new buildings outside the settlement boundaries to, amongst other things, demonstrate any impact on the views. The policy does not prevent any development per se.

I consider that it would be helpful for future reference for the important views to be numbered.

I consider the policy recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and seeks to protect a strong sense of place in line with the NPPF and JLP Policy SP09.

**Policy TATT6 – Biodiversity and Habitats** seeks to protect and enhance the biodiversity in the Plan area. The policy sets out principles for determining planning applications which reflect those set out in the NPPF.

Biodiversity is also referred to in the Design Guidelines and Codes document dated July 2023 and produced by AECOM.<sup>47</sup>

BDC request a modification to the policy which I agree with in the interests of accuracy and clarity.

With the modification of, and correction of the maps in relation to, Policy TATT5 and the modification to Policy TATT6, **Policies TATT4, TATT5 and TATT6** will meet the basic conditions by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and seeking to protect a strong sense of place in line with the NPPF and adding a local layer

---

<sup>46</sup> NPPF para 135

<sup>47</sup> Design Guidelines and Codes, page 28

to strategic policies and especially JLP Policy SP09. They will help to achieve sustainable development.

- **Correct the Biodiversity Mitigation Hierarchy diagram on page 21 of the Plan**
- **Delete the view west on the A137 and described by SCC as “View A” in the representation on the focused consultation from the Policies Maps**
- **Delete the view east from the A137 over the field and described by the Parish Council as “view 4” in the comments on the representations response**
- **Ensure that all the [retained] views on Map 7 subject of Policy TATT5 are correctly transcribed onto the Inset Maps and vice versa and number each retained view**
- **Amend criterion c. of Policy TATT6 to read: “Restoring and repairing fragmented biodiversity networks.”**
- **Create a new paragraph at the end of Policy TATT6 that reads: “*In addition to the statutory requirements, development will be supported where it incorporates provision within dwellings for measures including swift bricks, bat boxes and holes in fences which allow access for hedgehog.*”**

**Policy TATT7 – Local Green Spaces** seeks to designate five areas of Local Green Space (LGS). They are shown and numbered on the Policies Maps to align with the policy and supported by the Landscape Appraisal. More detailed information is contained in a Local Green Spaces Assessment document.

The NPPF explains that LGSs are green areas of particular importance to local communities.<sup>48</sup> The designation of LGSs should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services.<sup>49</sup> It is only possible to designate LGSs when a plan is prepared or updated and LGSs should be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.<sup>50</sup>

The NPPF sets out three criteria for green spaces.<sup>51</sup> These are that the green space should be in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves, be demonstrably special to the local community and hold a particular local significance and be local in character and not be an extensive tract of land. Further guidance about LGSs is given in PPG.

1. *South of Chedworth Place.* Chedworth Place is a listed building now converted into a private estate of dwellings. The proposed LGS is in two areas either side of the

---

<sup>48</sup> NPPF para 106

<sup>49</sup> Ibid

<sup>50</sup> Ibid

<sup>51</sup> Ibid para 107

central entrance to the building. The area is essentially opposite the Church and at the heart of Tattingstone village. The Local Green Space Assessment indicates that the area is valued for its openness, visual and amenity benefits and as an environment for wildlife.

2. *Land to the west of Chedworth Place* is an irregularly shaped area of rough grassland and shrubs to the rear of properties fronting Church Road and to the west of a car parking area serving Chedworth Place. The Local Green Space Assessment indicates that the area provides an important natural setting to Chedworth Place and that the space is valued for its amenity, as an open and peaceful area and as an important habitat for wildlife.

A representation on behalf of the owner of this land objects to the proposed designation. The representation indicates that the owner was not consulted. Information to the contrary has been put forward by the Parish Council. Whatever the situation, a representation has been made now and I take account of it. I agree with the comment in the representation that the Landscape Appraisal does not refer to this area specifically as an open space or as a potential LGS. The LGS Assessment sets out the reasons for its proposed designation and I discuss this below.

3. *Land north and west of Samford Court* is an irregularly shaped area of land that serves Samford Court. The Local Green Space Assessment indicates this area is valued as part of the setting of the listed building. It is valued for its amenity and as an open and peaceful area and as an important habitat for wildlife.
4. *Tattingstone Church Cemetery, Church Road* is valued for many reasons including as part of the setting of the Church, its open feel and tranquility and historic importance as well as for the community. The Landscape Appraisal identified this space and the Recreation Ground as key open spaces in the village which together forms a central space in the village and a setting to the Church.
5. *Tattingstone Recreation Ground, Green Lane* is a public open and recreational area. It has tennis courts, cricket green, goal posts for football and a play area. The hard tennis courts and a pavilion are also included in the proposed designation; this should be removed.

Based on the information in the Assessment and my site visit, in my view, all of the proposed LGSs meet the criteria in the NPPF satisfactorily bar two.

Insufficient detailed evidence has been provided at this time to support the proposed designations at land to the west of Chedworth Place and land north and west of Samford Court. I do not find the evidence put forward compelling; both areas are clearly important in the context of their respective listed buildings, but this in itself is not necessarily a reason for LGS designation. Otherwise relatively few details have been provided to explain why the areas are demonstrably special to the local community.

In addition, whilst public access is not an issue or a prerequisite to designation, it does seem to me from the information that the land at Samford Court only effectively serves the residents of that property.

I have therefore concluded that both of these spaces should be deleted from the policy. This is not to indicate the proposed areas would not be suitable for designation, it is to say that the information submitted is, on balance, insufficient to support the designations at this time.

The proposed LGSs proposed for retention are demonstrably important to the local community, are capable of enduring beyond the Plan period, meet the criteria in paragraph 107 of the NPPF and their designation is consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services given other policies in the development plan and this Plan.

Turning now to the wording of the policy, it simply designates the LGSs. The NPPF is clear that policies for managing development in LGSs should be consistent with national policy for Green Belts.<sup>52</sup> This then is acceptable.

With the modifications to the proposed designations and to the extent of retained LGS 5, **Policy TATT7** will meet the basic conditions.

- **Delete proposed LGSs 2 Land to the west of Chedworth Place and 3 Land north and west of Samford Court from the Plan**
- **Remove the hard tennis courts, pavilion building from LGS 5 Tattingstone Recreation Ground, Green Lane**
- **Consequential amendments to the maps and so on will be needed**

## ***8. Built Environment and Development Design***

**Policy TATT8 - Design Considerations** covers varied criteria. It seeks to deliver locally distinctive development of a high quality that protects, reflects and enhances local character taking account of the NPPF's stance on design.

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.<sup>53</sup> Being clear about design expectations is essential for achieving this.<sup>54</sup>

It continues that neighbourhood planning groups can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of an area and explaining how this should be reflected in development.<sup>55</sup> It refers to design guides and codes to help provide a local framework

---

<sup>52</sup> NPPF para 108

<sup>53</sup> Ibid para 131

<sup>54</sup> Ibid

<sup>55</sup> Ibid para 132



for creating beautiful and distinctive places with a consistent and high quality standard of design.<sup>56</sup>

It continues that planning policies should ensure developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive, are sympathetic to local character and history whilst not preventing change or innovation, establish or maintain a strong sense of place, optimise site potential and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.<sup>57</sup>

JLP Policy SP10 in addressing climate change, seeks, amongst other things, to support sustainable design and construction.

Non-strategic JLP Policy LP23 refers to sustainable design and construction. Non-strategic JLP Policy LP24 refers to design and residential amenity.

Policy TATT8 refers to the Landscape Appraisal and the Design Guidelines and Codes. The Design Guidelines and Codes document identifies four character areas across the Parish.

A Development Design Checklist based on the work by AECOM is included as Appendix 1 of the Plan and the policy requires demonstration of how those requirements have been satisfied.

Policy TATT8 then supports proposals where key features and character have been addressed, a sense of place is maintained, there is no loss of garden or important open, green or landscaped areas that contribute to the character of the village and no adverse impact on heritage assets. Reference is also made to flooding and broadband provision.

The policy provides appropriate criteria for the consideration of development proposals with a view to ensuring that the distinctiveness, character and sense of place across the three villages are conserved.

**Policy TATT9 – Non-designated Heritage Assets** seeks to designate 10 assets.

The NPPF is clear that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.<sup>58</sup> It continues that plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.<sup>59</sup>

JLP Policy SP09 expects development to contribute to the conservation, enhancement and management of the natural and local environment including the historic environment and historic landscape. Non-strategic JLP Policy LP19 sets out detail relating to the historic environment.

---

<sup>56</sup> NPPF para 133

<sup>57</sup> Ibid para 135

<sup>58</sup> Ibid para 202

<sup>59</sup> Ibid para 203

The Plan area has a rich history including a number of listed buildings and the Grade II\* Church of St Mary and the Tattingstone Wonder. Recognising the importance of heritage to the local area, work on the Plan has included the identification of 10 non-designated heritage assets.

Non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes which have heritage significance, but do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets. PPG advises there are various ways that such assets can be identified including through neighbourhood planning.<sup>60</sup>

However where assets are identified, PPG advises that it is important decisions to identify them are based on sound evidence.<sup>61</sup> There should be clear and up to date information accessible to the public which includes information on the criteria used to select assets and information about their location.<sup>62</sup>

A Non-designated Heritage Assets Assessment sets out details about each asset and assesses them against Historic England advice. I was able to see the assets or understand their context at my site visit. I consider they have all been appropriately designated except for one. This is Asset No 9, the Gateway Arch, The Close. The Assessment contains very limited information about this asset and includes a question mark in that document. I also had trouble identifying it at my visit. This is not to say, such a gateway is not suitable for designation, but there is insufficient evidence to support it at the current time. A modification is therefore made to delete Asset No 9 from the Plan.

In relation to non-designated heritage assets, the NPPF explains that a balanced judgment will be needed having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.<sup>63</sup>

The policy identifies the assets which are also shown on the Policies Map in a general location. I consider it would be useful to incorporate the Assessment or at the least the maps from the Assessment into the Plan document itself so that it is clear within the Plan itself which buildings and structures are identified.

The wording of Policy TATT9 reflects the NPPF's stance on such assets.

**Policy TATT10 – Flooding and Sustainable Drainage** sets out a requirement for all new development to ensure that surface water drainage and water resources is managed appropriately and encourages the appropriate use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDs).

---

<sup>60</sup> PPG para 040 ref id 18a-040-20190723

<sup>61</sup> Ibid

<sup>62</sup> Ibid para 040 ref id 18a-040-20190723

<sup>63</sup> NPPF para 216

The NPPF is clear that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future).<sup>64</sup>

The latter element of Policy TATT10 is in line with the NPPF which encourages new development to incorporate SuDs where appropriate.<sup>65</sup> SuDs are also referred to in the Design Guidelines and Codes document.<sup>66</sup>

JLP Policy SP10 sets out a requirement to mitigate and adapt to climate change including through approaches to the impacts of flooding. Non-strategic JLP Policy LP26 refers to water resources and infrastructure including the use of water efficiency measures. Non-strategic JLP Policy LP27 deals with flood risk and vulnerability and also refers to SuDs.

The supporting text explains that some parts of the Plan area have been adversely affected by surface water flooding. The immediate area around Alton Water falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3 as shown on Map 10 on page 26 of the Plan. As a result, the policy seeks to ensure that new development addresses flood risk.

The last policy in this section is **Policy TATT11 - Dark Skies and Street Lighting**.

The NPPF indicates that policies should ensure new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.<sup>67</sup> In so doing, the NPPF refers to limiting the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.<sup>68</sup> This policy seeks to ensure that this aim of the NPPF is realised.

The Design Guidelines and Codes also refers to dark skies.<sup>69</sup>

With the modification to Policy TATT9, **Policies TATT8, TATT9, TATT10 and TATT11** will meet the basic conditions particularly having regard to the NPPF, being in general conformity with the JLP and especially those strategic policies referred to above and helping to achieve sustainable development.

- **Delete Asset No 9 from Policy TATT9**
- **Consequential amendments to the maps and so on will be needed**

---

<sup>64</sup> NPPF para 170

<sup>65</sup> Ibid paras 181, 182

<sup>66</sup> Design Guidelines and Codes, pages 27 and 29

<sup>67</sup> NPPF para 198

<sup>68</sup> Ibid

<sup>69</sup> Design Guidelines and Codes, page 47

## **9. Services and Facilities**

This section of the Plan does not contain any planning policies but does have a Community Action.

## **10. Highways and Travel**

There are two policies in this last section of the Plan.

**Policy TATT12 - Public Rights of Way** which seeks enhancement of the existing network, particularly where biodiversity value is also recognised. The Plan explains how important these non-vehicular routes are for the Plan area.

The NPPF is clear that planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way (PROW) and access taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users.<sup>70</sup> The NPPF seeks to enable and support healthy lifestyles including through the provision of pedestrian and cycle routes.<sup>71</sup>

Such networks can also help with providing opportunities and options for sustainable transport modes.<sup>72</sup>

Non-strategic Policy LP29 supports active travel and the protection and enhancement of PROW networks.

This policy sets out to achieve the ambitions of the NPPF. It reflects the importance of such connections referred to in the Design Guidelines and Codes document.<sup>73</sup>

**Policy TATT13 - Parking Standards**, sets parking standards for new development.

The Plan explains that there are high levels of car ownership despite the Plan area's proximity to Ipswich. This is expected to continue into the foreseeable future. The high level of car ownership then leads to on-road parking on the Plan area's generally narrow highways which can affect the ability of the emergency services to respond to calls.

The NPPF supports local parking standards provided that accessibility, type, mix and use of development, the availability of public transport, local car ownership levels and the need to provide adequate provision of plug-in and other ultra low emission vehicles is taken into account.<sup>74</sup>

Suffolk County Council has produced guidance for parking. Policy TATT13 sets out minimum requirements which are higher than the SCC guidance for 1 and 3 bedroom dwellings. It also requires electric vehicle charging points; an issue highlighted in the

---

<sup>70</sup> NPPF para 105

<sup>71</sup> Ibid para 96

<sup>72</sup> Ibid para 109

<sup>73</sup> Design Guidelines and Codes, pages 19, 24 and 25

<sup>74</sup> NPPF para 112

Design Guidelines and Codes document.<sup>75</sup> Given the local circumstances, the policy is acceptable.

Both **Policies TATT12 and TATT13** meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, being in general conformity with the JLP and helping to achieve sustainable development.

### ***Policies Map***

A very clear and useful Policies Map and Insets are provided. Changes to the Policies Map have been recommended at the relevant places in this report.

### ***Appendices***

There are two appendices. Appendix 1 is the Design Guidelines based on the work undertaken in the Design Guidelines and Codes document. Appendix 2 is a list of heritage assets in the Plan area and is future proofed.

### ***Glossary***

A helpful glossary is included at the end of the Plan. The definition of “affordable housing” should be changed to reflect the definition in the most recent NPPF.

- **Change the definition of “Affordable housing” in the glossary to that in the NPPF 2024**

## **7.0 Conclusions and recommendations**

I am satisfied that the Tattingstone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan, subject to the modifications I have recommended, meets the basic conditions and the other statutory requirements outlined earlier in this report.

I am therefore pleased to recommend to Babergh District Council that, subject to the modifications proposed in this report, the Tattingstone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan can proceed to a referendum.

Following on from that, I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Neighbourhood Plan area. I see no reason to alter or extend the Plan area for the purpose of holding a referendum and no representations have been made that would lead me to reach a different conclusion.

---

<sup>75</sup> Design Guidelines and Codes, page 46

I therefore consider that the Tattingstone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan should proceed to a referendum based on the Tattingstone Parish Neighbourhood Plan area as approved by Babergh District Council on 19 July 2021.

*Ann Skippers* MRTPI

Ann Skippers Planning

9 January 2026

## **Appendix 1 List of key documents specific to this examination**

Tattingstone Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2024 – 2037 Submission Draft Plan July 2025

Basic Conditions Statement July 2025 (Places4People Planning Consultancy)

Consultation Statement July 2025 (Places4People Planning Consultancy)

Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Determination Notices April 2024 (BDC)

Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion Final Report March 2024 (LUC)

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report Final Report March 2024 (LUC)

Design Guidelines and Codes Final Report July 2023 (AECOM)

Landscape Appraisal Final Report March 2023 (Alison Farmer Associates)

Local Green Space Assessment July 2025

Non-designated Heritage Assets Assessment January 2024

Regulation 15 Checklist (BDC)

Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan Part 1 adopted 21 November 2023

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Draft September 2025 (BDC)

Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape Management Plan 2023 - 2028

**List ends**