












Appendix x - Summary of Pre-Submission consultation comments

Do you support the content of Chapters 1, 2, and 3?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		78.57%	11
2	No		7.14%	1
3	No opinion		14.29%	2




Do you support the Vision and Objectives in Chapter 4?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		76.92%	10
2	No		15.38%	2
3	No opinion		7.69%	1

Do you support Policy HAR1 - Hargrave's Spatial Strategy?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		64.29%	9
2	No		28.57%	4
3	No opinion		7.14%	1



Do you have any other comments on Chapter 5 – Hargrave's Planning Strategy?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		42.86%	6
2	No		57.14%	8




Do you support Policy HAR 2 – Housing Development?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		78.57%	11
2	No		14.29%	2
3	No opinion		7.14%	1




Do you support Policy HAR 3 – Housing Mix?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		92.86%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		7.14%	1




Do you support Policy HAR 4 - Housing Design?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		85.71%	12
2	No		7.14%	1
3	No opinion		7.14%	1




Do you have any other comments on Chapter 6 - Housing?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		35.71%	5
2	No		57.14%	8
3	No opinion		7.14%	1




Do you support Policy HAR 5 – Community Facilities?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		78.57%	11
2	No		14.29%	2
3	No opinion		7.14%	1



Do you support Community Action 1 – Groups and Societies??

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		78.57%	11
2	No		7.14%	1
3	No opinion		14.29%	2




Do you support Community Action 2 – Village Hall?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		78.57%	11
2	No		14.29%	2
3	No opinion		7.14%	1



Do you support Policy HAR 6 – Village Playing Field?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		92.86%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		7.14%	1



Do you support Community Action 3 – Car Sharing Initiative?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		71.43%	10
2	No		7.14%	1
3	No opinion		21.43%	3



Do you support Community Action 4 – Promoting small-scale employment opportunities?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		78.57%	11
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		21.43%	3



Do you support Community Action 5 – Promoting Hargrave?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		78.57%	11
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		21.43%	3



Do you support Policy HAR 7 – Communications Technology?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		92.86%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		7.14%	1



Do you support Community Action 6 – Communications Technology Improvements?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		92.86%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		7.14%	1

Do you support Community Action 7 – Working with the agricultural community?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		92.86%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		7.14%	1

Do you have any other comments on Chapter 7 – Services, Facilities and the Local Economy?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		23.08%	3
2	No		76.92%	10

Do you support Policy HAR 8 – Biodiversity and Habitats?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	100.00%	12
2	No	0.00%	0
3	No opinion	0.00%	0

Do you support Community Action 8 – Hedgerows?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	100.00%	13
2	No	0.00%	0
3	No opinion	0.00%	0

Do you support Policy HAR 9 - Protecting the Landscape Setting of Hargrave?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	92.31%	12
2	No	7.69%	1
3	No opinion	0.00%	0

Do you support Community Action 9 – New woodlands?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	100.00%	13
2	No	0.00%	0
3	No opinion	0.00%	0

Do you support Policy HAR 10 – Local Green Spaces?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	100.00%	13
2	No	0.00%	0
3	No opinion	0.00%	0

Do you support Community Action 10 – Village Verges?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	100.00%	13
2	No	0.00%	0
3	No opinion	0.00%	0




Do you have any other comments on Chapter 8 – Natural Environment?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	69.23%	9


Do you support Policy HAR 11 – Local Heritage Assets?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	84.62%	11
2	No	7.69%	1
3	No opinion	7.69%	1


Do you support Policy HAR 12 – Development Design Considerations?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		84.62%	11
2	No		7.69%	1
3	No opinion		7.69%	1


Do you support Policy HAR 13 – Sustainable Construction Practices?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		100.00%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		0.00%	0



Do you support Policy HAR 14 – Flooding and Sustainable Drainage?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		100.00%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		0.00%	0



Do you support Policy HAR 15 – Dark Skies?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		100.00%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		0.00%	0


Do you have any other comments on Chapter 9 – Built Environment?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		23.08%	3
2	No		76.92%	10


Do you support Community Action 11 – Public Transport?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		84.62%	11
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		15.38%	2



Do you support Community Action 12 – Traffic Calming?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		100.00%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		0.00%	0



Do you support Community Action 13 – HGV management?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		100.00%	13
2	No		0.00%	0
3	No opinion		0.00%	0




Do you support Community Action 14 – Public Rights of Way?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		92.31%	12
2	No		7.69%	1
3	No opinion		0.00%	0




Do you have any other comments on Chapter 10 – Highways, Transport and Travel?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		33.33%	4
2	No		66.67%	8



Do you support the content of the Policies Maps?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		75.00%	9
2	No		16.67%	2
3	No opinion		8.33%	1

Do you have any comments on the Appendices?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		18.18%	2
2	No		72.73%	8
3	No opinion		9.09%	1

Do you have any other comments on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		41.67%	5
2	No		58.33%	7

Appendix x - Responses received to Pre-Submission Consultation, Responses to Comments and Proposed Changes

The tables in this appendix set out the comments that were received during the Pre-Submission Consultation Stage and the responses and changes made to the Plan as a result of the comments. The first table is laid out in Plan order with the general comments following the comments on the policies. Where proposed changes to the Plan are identified, they relate to the Pre-Submission Draft Plan. Due to deletions and additions to the Plan, they may not correlate to the paragraph or policy numbers in the Submission version of the Plan.

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
Chapters 1, 2, and 3				
S deLaat	-	<p>Chapter 3-planning policy context.</p> <p>The village has flourished for at least a millenni by adapting to the the world around it. If Hargarve is to flourish for the next thousand years, it must adapt to the reality of the outside world.</p> <p>Taking a pragmatic approach to development has allowed the village to grow steadily, although the population has declined as larger and fewer houses, have been occupied by older and smaller families. See 2.7 2021 census statistics. This is a trend that's likely to accelerate.</p> <p>Our only option to reverse the trend, if we wish to do so, is to build more houses that are likely to attract younger families.</p> <p>I would be in favour of developments of affordable and market price houses within or adjacent to, the settlement boundary.</p>	Noted	None
C Painter	-	Very well structured	Noted	None
S Painter	-	Well structured	Noted	None
D Osborne	-	<p>Re: Chapter 3.11</p> <p>A large number of properties in the village border the settlement boundary and could therefore be affected by an affordable exception site or a future 'site allocation'.</p> <p>While this plan does not propose any sites for development, what is the process for any future proposals and what type of building/housing (and amount of</p>	Any proposals for development outside the settlement boundary would, if they satisfy Policy HAR1, still have to meet the other policy	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		dwellings) on any future sites would be permitted if outside the settlement boundary?	requirements of the Local and Neighbourhood Plans in terms of development design and impact.	
R Jozefowski	-	<p>3.9 Given the West Suffolk new Local Plan is under preparation, why is it considered necessary to update the Hargrave Neighbourhood Plan at this stage? Could we not have waited another year until the details of the new Local Plan have firmed up? Is it possible we'll have to update our Neighbourhood Plan again, once the new Local Plan is adopted?</p> <p>3.11 Please clarify if a rural exception site could be allocated for any purpose, other than solely to facilitate affordable housing.</p> <p>Please clarify if a development to help fund a community infrastructure project, such as a village hall, could be considered as a proposal on a "case-by-case" basis, or would such development only be possible as a site allocation under a new Neighbourhood Plan?</p>	<p>The final draft Local Plan was approved for consultation by West Suffolk Council in Dec 2023 and does not impact on the Neighbourhood Plan Review document.</p> <p>The rural exception site policy is purely for the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The starting point for considering any planning application is the local and neighbourhood plan. An enabling development would have to be taken on a "case-by-case" basis.</p>	None
	Suffolk CC	<p>Archaeology SCC welcome the historic background for Hargrave in Chapter 2. The Council suggests that this could be enhanced by a search of the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER).1 The inclusion of an HER search in map format within this chapter (or alternatively Chapter 9) would be a beneficial addition to show all heritage assets (above and below ground) in the area.</p>	This is not considered necessary for the Plan given that such maps are frequently updated	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
			and would soon render the NP out-of-date	
	West Suffolk Council	Please make clear what the status of the Community Actions are and are not. Paragraph 1.12 currently explains this, but assuming the introduction will change for Made version it would be better to have some agreed text for the examination version.	Paragraph 1.12 will be amended to make it clear that Community actions will not be used when making planning decisions.	Amend para 1.12 to make it clear that Community actions will not be used when making planning decisions.
Vision and Objectives				
S deLaat	-	"To protect and enhance the distinctive character and assets of the Village for the community both young and old" I feel this is incompatible with the following; "To improve residents' access to a range of energy efficient sustainable housing to meet lifetime and generational needs" How is this achieved if we aren't prepared to build more houses?	Opportunities should be taken to facilitate the improvement to the existing stock.	None
C Painter	-	Still remains relevant	Noted	None
S Painter	-	Important to have a clear direction	Noted	None
Anonymous	-	Services, Facilities and the Local Economy. - One of the unique features of Hargrave is the absence of any shops, pubs etc. The objective should be clearer that 'improving access' does not mean having these facilities in the village, rather having schemes where people are easily able to access nearby villages / towns.	The residents' survey identified some support for a small shop.	None
R Jozefowski	-	4.2 The Housing objective appears to only refer to new homes. Section 9.17 mentions climate change. Is there any objective or community action to assist with the challenges most of us will face in the coming years of converting from fossil-fuelled heating systems and improving the energy efficiency of existing homes?	Much of the retrofitting of homes can be carried out without the need for planning permission	None
	Suffolk CC	SCC supports the vision statement outlined in paragraph 4.1, highlighting health and wellbeing as a priority for Hargrave.	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>Minerals and Waste 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 Plan⁴, adopted in July 2020, which forms part of the Local Development Plan.</p> <p><i>Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2020</i> SCC notes that paragraph 3.14 mentions the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan and states that there are no minerals safeguarding areas, which although a factual statement SCC would advise a slight amendment in wording:</p> <p>"In July 2020, Suffolk County Council adopted the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Nowhere in the parish is defined as a "minerals consultation area" in the Plan, meaning that there is no requirement to consult the County Council in relationship to the potential impact of a proposal on the winning of <i>receiving planning consent to extract minerals under the current Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</i>"</p> <p>There are no safeguarded sites in or around the settlement and therefore SCC perceives no impacts on Minerals and Waste.⁰</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Paragraph 3.14 will be amended as suggested</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend para 3.14 as suggested by SCC</p>
Policy HAR1 - Hargrave's Spatial Strategy				
S deLaat	-	With the proviso that we should be open minded to development within and also adjacent to, the settlement boundary.	Noted	None
D Clarke	-	<p>The second part of item d. (re. small-scale development) is very different from "replacing an existing dwelling". It therefore either needs to be incorporated into item c (re Policy DM27) or listed as a separate item.</p> <p>Also, the term "small-scale" is too loose in my opinion and could be interpreted in different ways by different parties. I therefore recommend it says "up to 5 dwellings" to be in line with the responses to previous surveys on the Neighbourhood Plan (para 6.2 of the NP) and as is stated in item e. "affordable housing".</p>	<p>The policy will be reviewed in the light of the publication of the Draft Local Plan (January 2024)</p>	
Anonymous	-	Any development should be limited to the housing settlement boundary only. There is no need for development outside given there are already large	The policy does not support general,	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		developments underway in the neighbouring village of Barrow where the infrastructure is more suited and set up for development.	market housing outside the settlement boundary.	
D Osborne	-	<p>Har 1 d) needs clarification as it seems two different circumstances are outlined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'the replacement of an existing dwelling on a one for one basis...' I agree on this. - 'and small scale residential development in accordance with other policies on housing in the countryside' Is this different to (c) Policy DM27 or e) small affordable housing scheme? If yes, why is it repeated? If no, the 'other policies' which would allow small scale residential development outside the housing settlement boundary should be outlined. 	<p>The policy will be reviewed in the light of the publication of the Draft Local Plan (January 2024)</p>	
R Jozefowski	-	<p>b. Could such development include housing, if it contributes towards the financing of the small-scale facilities? If so, please indicate this and specify the maximum permitted size of such a housing development.</p> <p>e. Would an affordable housing scheme be limited to up to five dwellings in total, or could there be additional market housing, if this was deemed necessary to make such a scheme viable? If so, please indicate this and specify the maximum permitted size of such a development.</p>	<p>Such a proposal would have to be taken on a case-by-case basis by West Suffolk Council at the time of any planning application.</p> <p>The adopted West Suffolk Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2019) states that "An exception site is normally but not explicitly likely to consist of ... no more than five units in a smaller village." It does not state whether this would include any market housing that might be required</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>In the minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group meeting on 2 June 2021 it states, "It was agreed the Neighbourhood Plan should include appropriate wording to indicate any development on land successfully selected would require a contribution from the land owner to village infrastructure development". This is not mentioned in this plan. Would such a contribution be required for development potentially permitted by this plan and under what circumstances? If so, please state this clearly in the plan. I think if this was an incentive to permit development within parts of the village I think there should have been prior consultation at household level.</p> <p>Ref: https://hargrave.suffolk.cloud/assets/Neighbourhood-Plan/NPWG-02-06-2021.pdf</p>	<p>purely to make the affordable housing viable. The SPD does state that, given the exception status, land values should be considerable lower than that achieved on an unfettered housing development site.</p> <p>Developer contributions are only required by the local planning authority where it is:</p> <p>a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) Directly related to the development; and c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development</p> <p>The Plan does not need to state this.</p>	
Other comments on Chapter 5 – Hargrave's Planning Strategy				
S deLaat	-	I do believe we should allow development within and adjacent to, the settlement boundary. The word limited, is somewhat loaded, it could mean one or twenty houses. My preferred approach would be allowing development that	Market housing adjacent to the settlement boundary	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		could be a catalyst for investment in vital services such as a bus service, enhanced broadband, medical services.	would be contrary to the strategic policies of the Local Plan and the neighbourhood plan would therefore not be in conformity with the Local Plan	
D Clarke	-	Point 5.3 refers to Policy DM27 but only part of it is reproduced here. I feel the missing sentence is important in the context of both the amenity of Hargrave specifically (visually important gaps) and also road safety so should be included: "Permission will not be granted where a proposal harms or undermines a visually important gap that contributes to the character and distinctiveness of the rural scene, or where development would have an adverse impact on the environment or highway safety."	It is not necessary to fully reproduce local plan policies in the neighbourhood plan.	None
D Osborne	-	<p>While strongly supporting affordable housing, especially self build and social housing, it's important that new homes are built in the right place where there are adequate services, as outlined in the policies listed at 5.2.</p> <p>The Local Plan has housing allocations for the nearby villages of Barrow, Chedburgh, and Wickhambrook because they have adequate services, including schools and bus routes.</p> <p>If an affordable housing site was proposed for Hargrave outside the settlement boundary, there must be an improvement in footpaths, accessibility and the current bus service.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	None
R Jozefowski	-	<p>5.7</p> <p>In the 2017 neighbourhood plan consultation, several villagers felt the Housing Settlement Boundary should be larger, in particular to include Wickhambrook Road.</p> <p>Members of the West Suffolk Joint Steering Group also suggested that the settlement boundary could be more ambitious and the Independent Examiner's Report states, "One representation suggests consideration is given to housing settlement boundaries for some of the other clusters of dwellings in the Parish. The Parish Council may wish to consider this when the Plan is reviewed."</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Response stated it is not appropriate to extend the boundary as it would essentially support a significant amount of new housing. I</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Policy DM27 would apply to the</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>do appreciate and accept this view. However, isn't DM27 countryside status overly restrictive? Isn't there concern it effectively renders the Wickhambrook Road cluster unsustainable for development?</p> <p>It's stated that Neighbourhood Plans cannot propose less development than is planned for in the Local Plan. The inference is a Neighbourhood Plan could propose more development than that under the Local Plan. Therefore, would it be possible to permit infill development, in-line with DM27, and assess other applications for limited development on their own merits? e.g. Cheveley (East Cambridgeshire) considered such an approach as an alternative to their development envelope.</p> <p>Refs: https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/upload/Submission-Consultation-Statement-December-2017-compressed.pdf https://democracy.westsuffolk.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=14019 https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/neighbourhood-planning/upload/HargraveNP_SEBC_Examiner_Report-Final.pdf</p>	<p>Wickhambrook Road cluster but the same policy states "the scale of development consists of infilling a small undeveloped plot by one dwelling or a pair of semi detached dwellings commensurate with the scale and character of existing dwellings within an otherwise continuous built up frontage.</p> <p>Policy DM27 of the Local Plan still applies and the neighbourhood plan is not a mechanism to provide planning permission, but to set out policies against which applications are considered.</p>	None
Policy HAR 2 – Housing Development				
Anonymous	-	Although affordable housing is of great importance for the country, given the limited public transport the village has any funding for affordable housing	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		schemes should be given to better sites / projects. Housing development should focus on sustaining the character and history of the village.		
R Jozefowski	-	<p>Please bear in mind:-</p> <p>i) In the 2013 household survey, 70% of those who expressed an opinion did not think Hargrave could accommodate more new housing.</p> <p>ii) In the most recent household survey (2021), only 19 of the 48 people who responded supported small groups of up to 5 homes within the built-up area.</p> <p>In 2010, eleven settlements in St Edmundsbury had their housing settlement boundaries removed and were assigned countryside status. Of those, I believe only Hargrave and Great Barton (with the assistance of the same planning consultancy) have adopted a neighbourhood plan and reinstated their housing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>I've been told that we need a housing settlement boundary, as it provides us with some protection against development. Is this really more protection than we'd have got, had the whole village retained countryside status? Rather it appears our parish council wishes to pursue development as, in spite of the results of the 2013 and 2021 household surveys, it actively sought out possible sites for development.</p> <p>As an alternative to having a housing settlement boundary, could we define our own limits for development? Cheveley (East Cambridgeshire) considered such an approach as an alternative to their development envelope.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Great Bartron already had a settlement boundary</p> <p>Having a Settlement Boundary provides certainty in the planning decision making process.</p> <p>Cheveley's NP has updated the now out-of-date development envelopes of the 2015 Local Plan.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
Policy HAR 3 – Housing Mix				
S deLaat	-	We need to be open minded about allowing houses of exceptional design merit, they may not be "in keeping" but they are part of a vibrant built environment.	Noted	None
Policy HAR 4 - Housing Design				

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
S deLaat	-	I welcome a more diverse range of designs, I don't wish to see pastiche or cookie cutter designs	Noted	None
Other comments on Chapter 6 - Housing				
C Painter	-	Small development is essential for the survival of the Village. Adherence to well planned alterations/extensions will ensure the look of the village will be preserved	Noted	None
D Clarke	-	Section 6.3 asserts "there will be a need for minor growth" of housing. We never be certain what the future holds so I think it would be more appropriate to add "it is highly likely that" before these words.	The population forecasts for West Suffolk suggest a continued need for housing, which could trickle down to Hargrave, especially given the trend for people to live longer and on their own.	None
D Osborne	-	Re: 6.1. p20 While there are fewer smaller properties in the village, the number of 4 bedroom properties should be seen as a positive given the move towards multi-generational living and people working from home who need office space. 6.6 p24 Affordable Housing Hargrave is a small village and at 6.2 the results of the 2021 survey (the most recent survey that went out to the whole village) showed 0% support for groups of 6-10 houses adjoining the built up area. If a local housing need is identified, and a site outside the settlement boundary is proposed, will there be a limit of 5 houses as stated in Policy Har 1 (e)?	Noted Policy LP22 of the Draft West Suffolk Local Plan sets out the criteria against which such proposals would be considered.	None
R Jozefowski	-	6.1 How much evidence is there of people wanting to downsize but remain in the village? Whilst when fit and healthy people may wish to remain in the village, this may not be so realistic and practical as they get older. They might decide they'd prefer to downsize into a nearby village, such as Barrow, which has better	This might equally be the case.	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>facilities but still allows them to stay in touch with friends locally. Or they may want to move closer to children or move into sheltered accommodation or a home.</p>		
		<p>6.2 In the 2021 household survey, the only development the majority said they'd be willing to allow were infill plots. The survey didn't define the meaning of infill plots, but the fact that there were separate questions regarding small groups of up to 5 homes suggests most people took it to mean limited to one or two houses, as per DM27.</p>	Noted	None
		<p>It should be reflected that only 19 of the 48 people who responded supported small groups of up to 5 homes within the built-up area and only half supported small groups of up to 5 homes adjoining the built-up area. Furthermore, there was zero support for developments of 6-10 homes.</p>	<p>The wording is no different to that in the made neighbourhood plan, although opportunities for such developments within the Housing Settlement Boundary are very scarce.</p>	None
		<p>At present the plan permits small groups of up to 5 homes within the housing settlement boundary and potentially larger-scale development adjacent to it. Whilst at the moment there may be limited opportunity for such development, I can envisage there may be opportunities arising in the future. How can we have such development whilst accommodating the views expressed in the 2013 and 2021 household surveys, which didn't want this scale of development?</p>		
		<p>Personally, I would not object to there being small groups of homes, within the current clusters, provided these do not unreasonably impact neighbouring properties and do not materially affect the character of the village. However, I am concerned about potentially larger-scale development that could take place anywhere adjacent to the settlement boundary (presumably excluding the Wickhambrook Road as this is defined as an important gap). Have any other areas adjacent to the settlement boundary been considered for such protection?</p>	<p>There are no proposals for larger-scale development outside but adjacent to the settlement boundary.</p>	None
		<p>6.3 In the 2018 neighbourhood plan, one of the main justifications cited for re-establishing the housing settlement boundary was that little or no development presented a major threat to Hargrave's demographic structure, particularly</p>	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>given a recent decline in population. I'm not aware of this ever being a great concern in the village and I notice this appears to have been dropped in the new neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Is it meaningful to apply population forecasts for West Suffolk to a small village like Hargrave and does it matter if Hargrave's population falls by a few people?</p> <p>Hargrave's population will fluctuate according to the changing demographics. At the moment some larger houses are occupied by just one or two people, often where their children have grown up and left home. In due course, these houses are likely to be occupied once more by larger families, which will serve to increase Hargrave's population.</p>		
	Suffolk CC	<p>SCC notes that paragraphs 6.13 - 6.15, and Policy HAR4 Housing Design refer to the support of adaptable and accessible homes built to M4(2) standards, which is welcomed by SCC. This can help to meet the needs of an ageing population without compromising the needs of younger occupants and families.</p> <p>Concerning paragraph 6.12, SCC is supportive of this, but would recommend the inclusion of reference to the Suffolk Guidance for Parking, 2019,⁷ provides information about specifications for cycle storage facilities.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Paragraph 6.12 will be amended to refer to the SCC specifications for cycle storage facilities in the Suffolk Guidance for Parking</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend para 6.12</p>
	West Suffolk Council	<p>The comments made in relation to self-build and size of homes have not been addressed in this version of the plan. Email 05 07 2023 [reproduced below]</p> <p><i>Self Build Plots tend to be developed as larger homes and the Self-Build register currently identifies the requirement to build homes of 3 bedroom plus in rural locations. The support purely for self-build on infill developments contradicts a point made under sub heading 'House Size'. Paragraph 6.8 refers to where there is an opportunity for housing growth, 'the proposed Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to restrict the size of any new individual homes that are built' but paragraph 6.9 makes the reference that should developments come forward that are compliant with Policy HAR2, the mix of homes should include provision for two bedroomed homes.</i></p>	<p>While it is noted that self-build homes tend to be developed as larger homes, this does not necessarily mean that they meet the identified need, rather they meet a personal desire that might further skew the housing mix of an area.</p>	<p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<i>This is unlikely to be the case if you are promoting self-build on infill developments. It would be the Strategic Housing Teams preference that you do not restrict the type of development in the Neighbourhood Plan but you support the need for small scale development, promoting the requirement for smaller homes such as two bedroom homes to assist with older persons downsizing and younger people remaining in the village.</i>	The Parish Council does not support this suggested change	
Policy HAR 5 – Community Facilities				
R Jozefowski		<p>Policy HAR 5 – Community Facilities</p> <p>The village hall is a valuable community asset and I'm in favour of it being refurbished in the short term, especially if the hall has funds and there are grants available for this (didn't we receive about £30k Covid funding?). We shouldn't let the village hall slip into a state of disrepair to the extent it becomes unusable and we're forced to decide between a new village hall and no village hall.</p> <p>I would support the construction a new hall, provided it is proportionate to realistic identified needs, built to a reasonable specification fit to last decades, visually acceptable and doesn't involve controversial means of funding.</p>	Noted	None
S deLaat	-	There must be no loss of our last community facility, the village hall. We need to make every effort to replace the existing hall with a new facility with a minimum fifty year life-span.	Noted	None
Anonymous	-	I think under no circumstance should the open countryside be lost to any development.	Noted	None
	Suffolk CC	Policy HAR5 Community Facilities, part i. and part c. in relation to new facilities being accessible by walking/cycling/public transport, is supported by SCC.	Noted	Noted
Community Action 1 – Groups and Societies				
S deLaat	-	7.11 is incorrect. The hall is not well maintained nor is it in good order.	Noted	Noted
Community Action 2 – Village Hall				
S deLaat	-	The replacement of the village hall has now become a priority, the debate about leaving it in its somewhat poor state, has now been concluded. We now	This is a matter for the Parish Council working	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		need to move onto deciding how we wish to develop the hall and where the funds could be sourced from.	with the Village Hall Working Committee	
D Clarke	-	<p>Appendix 3 states that "The Parish Council's ambition is therefore to build a new facility to last for future generations" however I have seen no evidence that this is the best option, either in terms of:</p> <p>1) what the villagers need (or want) or 2) environmental impact</p> <p>Para 3.2 of the NP regarding the NPPF states that "Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development". It goes on to say that they should:</p> <p>a) mitigate climate change (amongst other things) and b) provide for objectively assessed needs</p> <p>My grave concern is that the Parish Council have not demonstrated that their ambition meets those two tests, so I recommend this is amended to:</p> <p>The Parish Council will reconvene the working group to re-engage with the Village to establish the best option which meets the defined needs of the villagers whilst minimising the effect on Climate Change.</p>	The Village Hall Working Committee have been advised to include within their project the need to minimise the impact on climate change during demolition and construction to ensure the new hall is more energy efficient.	
Policy HAR 6 – Village Playing Field				
	Suffolk CC	SCC notes and is particularly supportive of the last sentence of Policy HAR6 Village Playing Field, as it is supportive of inclusivity of play facilities to all ages and abilities.	Noted	Noted
Community Action 3 – Car Sharing Initiative				
R Jozefowski		<p>Community Action 3 – Car Sharing Initiative</p> <p>I don't think it's really necessary to formalise a car sharing scheme in a village like ours. I thought that's what we already did, in our small, friendly community. However, I don't object if people feel it's worthwhile.</p>	Noted	Noted
Community Action 4 – Promoting small-scale employment opportunities				
No comments received				

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
Community Action 5 – Promoting Hargrave				
R Jozefowski		<p>Community Action 5 - Promoting Hargrave More use could be made of the village website, with an update to make it more attractive, with more information about the village. Could the village newsletter be made available online (subject to privacy concerns)?</p> <p>How do we measure the effectiveness and benefits of efforts to promote the village?</p>	Noted. These matters will be considered outside the neighbourhood plan process	None
S deLaat	-	I'm unclear where flexible office space would be located.	Paragraph 7.22 notes that "Subject to improvements, the Village Hall could provide opportunities..."	None
Policy HAR 7 – Communications Technology				
No comments received				
Community Action 6 – Communications Technology Improvements				
R Jozefowski		<p>Community Action 6 – Communications Technology Improvements Bear in mind that satellite internet (e.g. Starlink) is now a viable alternative to fixed-line services in rural communities.</p> <p>As I commented in the 2017 consultation, reasonable broadband speeds will be important in the future for viewing TV, when terrestrial broadcasting ends.</p> <p>I also pointed out that rural villages often have access to at least one mobile network, but not all. This means connectivity varies from village to village, according to the network you're with. Has anything been done to lobby to compel networks to share infrastructure, where they don't have their own presence in a village (as I believe already happens with Vodafone and O2), or to support network roaming for UK subscribers? It seems ludicrous that someone with a foreign SIM is able to roam networks and have better rural connectivity</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		than someone with a UK SIM.		
S deLaat	-	Fibre to the door should be the objective along with Gbit speed to all households. A survey of the maximum speed to all Hargarve households, would be very enlightening.	Noted	None
Community Action 7 – Working with the agricultural community				
R Jozefowski		Community Action 7 – Working with the agricultural community I think some of us would be interested in understanding more about the local agriculture. If there were sufficient demand, perhaps some local farmers would be willing to put on a talk or drop-in event for the villagers and promote better awareness of our agricultural surroundings.	Noted	None
Other comments on Chapter 7 – Services, Facilities and the Local Economy				
R Jozefowski	-	<p>7.8, 7.9, Community Action 1 - Groups and Societies I think we need to be realistic in our expectations of the usage of a new village hall. We are still a small village and some of the ideas proposed are probably only relevant and sustainable in a larger community. This will be a major investment (£500k - £1m?) and development should be planned carefully, based on facts and proper research. Talk to other villages about their experiences. Particular account should be taken of the views of the younger than retired people. We moved to Hargrave over 30 years ago and back then activities were organised by the younger people e.g. the infamous barn dances! The current generation appears to have less interest in such activities, possibly due in part to technology providing alternative means of socialising.</p> <p>The 2013 residents' survey revealed interest in a number of clubs and activities. As I recall, these were suggested activities and it was easy to tick a box, without requiring any real commitment. If there were strong demand for these activities, why have we not been able to organise them in the past 10 years? Whilst the condition of the village hall might play a part, I don't believe it would prevent most of them. These activities would have happened, if they'd been sufficient demand and, most importantly, someone with sufficient energy and drive to organise and run them. A new hall might help stimulate the setting up of these activities, but will they be sustainable?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>Being a small village, many of the activities will likely only be viable if we attract people from other villages. e.g. the keep-fit group ran for over 30-years and often the majority of people attending were from outside of Hargrave. Neighbouring villages already run many of the activities suggested. In order to be viable, these activities have to be sufficiently unique to attract people from a wider area (e.g. Chevington table tennis, Dalham boxing). There was insufficient interest to sustain the Hargrave table tennis club, which ran from Nov 2016 to Jan 2018, not because of the state of the hall but because there's a vibrant club in Chevington. There's already an active walking group, nominally for Barrow and District, which attracts people from a 20 mile radius, and a pub at the end of a walk is more welcoming than a village hall! It's not possible for every village to have its own W.I. Joining a group in another village helps to broaden one's acquaintances.</p>	Noted	None
		<p>It's a different matter with village social activities, such as the pop-up pub, quiz night and the annual barbeque, and these seem to be well attended, in spite of the condition of the village hall. Perhaps it's these types of activities we should focus on.</p>	Noted	None
		<p>Power supply Could we lobby to improve the robustness of our power supply and reduce the number of days per year we are expected to be without power for maintenance work? This often affects every household in the village. Or is this something we should simply accept, as part of living in the countryside?</p>	This is outside the remit of the Parish Council	None
		<p>Sustainable energy With the exception of section 9.17 (Climate Change) there appears to be little or nothing in the plan to address sustainable energy. Is this not a serious omission?</p>	These matters are addressed in the Local Plan and national planning policy	None
		<p>In the coming years most of us are all going to have to find alternative means of heating. At the moment the main option is electrically powered heat pumps. I estimate on a cold day these could increase electricity consumption in the village by about 0.5 MW (my sums may be wrong). In addition, more of us will be using electric cars, which will require charging.</p>		

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>As a village, could we not produce some, if not all, our energy needs through locally generated renewable energy? Could we explore the feasibility of community-owned or part-owned renewable energy projects, where the financial benefits could be shared with the villagers through funding of community infrastructure projects and/or reduced electricity tariffs? Doubtless they'd be concerns to address and we'd need to work to try to unite the village in support of such a scheme, but surely this is worth exploring and live up to being a "forward-looking" village.</p> <p>As an example, please look at Community Action D1 in Newmarket's Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031.</p> <p>Ref: https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/neighbourhood-planning/upload/NNP-final.pdf</p>	This is a matter outside the remit of the Plan at this time	None
Policy HAR 8 – Biodiversity and Habitats				
S deLaat	-	<p>Residents should be actively encouraged to plant insect friendly plants and to refrain from cutting verges and hedges except where visibility and road safety, would be compromised.</p> <p>The wide verges, in particular on the Wickhambrook Road, should be protected and cut no more than twice a year, except where they border access drives.</p>	Noted	None
	Anglian Water	<p>Anglian Water supports the aims of the policy and considers that biodiversity net gains can help to enhance biodiversity on site and through priority areas identified within the parish. Multi-functional green and blue infrastructure provision within the development site can offer tangible benefits for biodiversity whilst addressing other matters such as surface water management and water quality, and local amenity space. We would advise that the policy should be clear that any offsite delivery of biodiversity net gains should be delivered within the parish, if there are suitable areas that can be identified by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Suffolk County Council will be delivering a Local Nature Recovery Strategy over the next 18 months or so, which may also provide further opportunities for</p>	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		environmental enhancement within the parish including new woodlands sought through Community Action 9.		
	Suffolk CC	<p>SCC notes Policy HAR8, the Council considers that this would be improved by referring to the Environment Act 2021. Although stated in supporting text, SCC considers it would be of further benefit to state a measurable increase "<i>of 10%</i>" or refer to the "<i>existing DEFRA metric</i>", as defined in the Environment Act 2021. Please note that for small sites this will be enforced from spring 2024 and for major sites, although recently the Government announced a delay in implementation, this is expected from January 2024.</p> <p>Suffolk County Council therefore recommend protecting verges through an amendment to Policy HAR8 or HAR9, referring the protection unless permitted development is required. The following wording is proposed:</p> <p><i>Policy HAR8 Biodiversity and Habitats</i> "Development proposals must seek to protect and should avoid the loss of, or substantial harm to, trees, <i>grass verges</i>, hedgerows and other natural features such as ponds and watercourses. Where such losses or harm are unavoidable: [...]"</p>	<p>Noted. The policy will be brought up-to-date to reflect the legislation in force at the time of submitting the Plan</p> <p>Policy HAR 8 will be amended as suggested</p>	Amend policy to bring it up-to-date and to include grass verges
Community Action 8 – Hedgerows				
	Suffolk CC	<p>SCC queries how landowners would be encouraged to maintain existing hedgerows and plant new hedgerows to retain and improve wildlife corridors through the parish.</p> <p>Community Action 8 Hedgerows which supports the retention and improvement of wildlife corridors is welcomed by SCC.</p>	This would be a Parish Council initiative working with landowners	None
Policy HAR 9 - Protecting the Landscape Setting of Hargrave				
S deLaat	-	Where the landscape setting would inhibit development of suitable housing or building of design merit.	Noted	None
R Jozefowski	-	d. This too limiting. It should maintain the key features of the important views of the public vantage points (including public rights of way) throughout Hargrave, not simply within, and adjacent to, the built-up area.	The criterion will be reviewed to reflect the views identified on Map 5	Amend criterion d in HAR 9 to reflect the views identified on Map 5

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
	Suffolk CC	<p>Suffolk County Council therefore recommend protecting verges through an amendment to Policy HAR8 or HAR9, referring the protection unless permitted development is required. The following wording is proposed:</p> <p><i>Policy HAR9 Protecting the Landscape Setting of Hargrave</i> <u>"e. it would not have a significant detrimental impact, or cause significant harm to, the existing grass verges of the parish."</u></p> <p>The plan identifies 15 Important Views, anchored in Policy HAR9 Protecting the Landscape Setting of Hargrave, rather than having their own policy.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the current important views are still derived from the original Character Appraisal (2017), or whether there has been a review (as there was not any evidence for this on village website). The Character Appraisal identified 19 views, but the Important Views Map only shows 16 views; Map 5 Important Views in the review Neighbourhood Plan only shows 15 views, and Policies Maps shows a total of 17 views.</p> <p>There is no evidence that the views were identified through consultation of the residents. The original Character Appraisal does however contain photos of all views, short descriptions and location maps with vision cones, and all views appear to be publicly accessible.</p> <p>SCC welcomes that settlement gaps are recognised in the plan as important feature and anchored in Policy HAR9 Protecting the Landscape Setting of Hargrave, part c.</p>	<p>The policy applies to sites outside the Housing Settlement Boundary. The verges are also within the Boundary and so the amendment is not appropriate.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>These anomalies will be addressed at the Submission stage of the Plan</p> <p>Noted. The views have been consulted on in the made Plan</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Clarify views and supporting evidence in Submission Plan</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
Community Action 9 – New woodlands				
	Suffolk CC	Community Action 9 New Woodlands which supports the aims for woodland creation within the parish is welcomed by SCC.	Noted	None
Policy HAR 10 – Local Green Spaces				
	Suffolk CC	SCC is generally supportive of Neighbourhood Plans that designate Local Green Spaces in Policy, as this supports the ongoing work to make Suffolk the	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>Greenest County.⁵ SCC notes that Policy HAR10 designates six Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>SCC notes that grass verges are considered important to the village, as shown in the Natural Environment Objectives. Whilst SCC does not disagree that they can help to contribute to the aesthetic and character of the village, the designation of these grass verges as a Local Green Space is not the correct mechanism.</p> <p>Suffolk County Council therefore recommend protecting verges through an amendment to Policy HAR8 or HAR9, referring the protection unless permitted development is required. The following wording is proposed:</p> <p><i>Policy HAR8 Biodiversity and Habitats</i> “Development proposals must seek to protect and should avoid the loss of, or substantial harm to, trees, <u>grass verges</u>, hedgerows and other natural features such as ponds and watercourses. Where such losses or harm are unavoidable: [...]”</p> <p><i>Policy HAR9 Protecting the Landscape Setting of Hargrave</i> <u>“e. it would not have a significant detrimental impact, or cause significant harm to, the existing grass verges of the parish.”</u></p> <p>SCC would recommend rewording the Supporting Document, to provide a better description of sites 5 and 6, Little and Great Knowles Greens. “Roadside verges” is not an adequate description of these sites.</p> <p>Highways verges as Local Green Spaces SCC notes that highways verges are designated as Local Green Spaces in this plan. As the Highway Authority, SCC has the right under Permitted Development, to make changes and undertake works on the highway networks. SCC can remove or undertake works to roadside verges, if required as part of footway widening for active and sustainable travel measures, such as the implementation of walking and/or cycling routes.</p>	<p>They are already designed as Local Green Spaces in the made Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This comment are addressed under the respective policy</p> <p>This comment are addressed under the respective policy</p> <p>The name will be amended</p> <p>The Parish Council accepts that the policy can only apply to planning applications</p> <p>Regardless of designation, such a</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend name</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>SCC notes paragraph 8.15 outlines that permitted development rights, including highway works by SCC, would not be affected by the Local Green Space designation. If SCC, as the LHA, seeks to repurpose highway verges to footway via permitted development, this may result in negative public feedback to a wholly beneficial redesign.</p> <p>As stated in paragraph 10.4 of the Plan, the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy states that the District Council “will develop and promote a high quality and sustainable transport system across the borough and reduce the need for travel through spatial planning and design.”</p> <p>The first Objective under Transport on page 15, sets out the desire for “a safer pedestrian environment”. Paragraph 7.14 of the plan states that there is a lack of joined-up, safe, walking routes through the village, in particular to the Village Playing Field.</p> <p>Therefore, by designating some of the highways verges as local green spaces, this could hinder the ability to achieve these aims for active and sustainable transport, and the potential for a connected and safe walking route. And subsequently, consideration needs to be given balancing the provision of high-quality walking and cycling infrastructure and the retention of highway verges and local green spaces.</p>	<p>proposal is likely to draw comment from the local community</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Such development would accord with the provisions for development in the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
Community Action 10 – Village Verges				
	Suffolk CC	SCC welcomes this community action	Noted	None
Other comments on Chapter 8 – Natural Environment				
D Clarke	-	Map 5 (para 8.8) appears to have an error. There is no "view no. 5". I assume view 6 should be numbered 5 and the 2 views near Hargrave Hall are 6 & 7.	The map will be corrected	Correct the numbering on Map 5
D Osborne	-	<p>Given the amount of housing needed across the UK it's important that in small villages like Hargrave any building outside the settlement boundary should be avoided, unless absolutely necessary.</p> <p>Question: If there was an affordable housing site built outside the settlement boundary, does the settlement boundary remain in its original place or is it</p>	<p>Policy HAR 1 addresses this</p> <p>The settlement boundary does not</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		extended to include the new housing? If extended, this then allows for further building proposals in the future and the loss of more countryside.	move to include exception site affordable housing	
Mr R Sudbury	-	I would be interested to know more about the ownership of the verge in front of my house, Harvington House 3 Ousden Road. I am not quite sure if this is included in the proposals for the Parish Council to establish the ownership of all verges.	Noted	None
R Jozefowski	-	Community Action 8 - Hedgerows It's a shame the hedge along the gymkhana/donkey field at the start of Wickhambrook Road was removed a few years ago. Would it be possible to reinstate this hedge, or might it affect the status of the important gap? 8.8 I commented on the important views in the 2017 consultation. Were the villagers ever consulted on the selection of the important views? Why are these views solely from the roads, which many of us only see briefly when driving through the village? Many of us consider the most important views to be those of the beautiful open landscapes we see from our homes and from the public rights of way. Why are none of these views included?	This would be a decision for the landowner The consultation on the neighbourhood plan is such consultation Views from homes are private views and, in the planning system, owners do not have the right to a view	None None None
	Anglian Water	Anglian Water welcomes and supports the explanation for works/development that could take place within areas designated as local green space. Whilst we do require planning permission for some types of infrastructure depending on the scale, type and location; in the main we do have permitted development rights and legislation to enable some types of infrastructure development and operational maintenance and repairs to our assets to be undertaken and this is most likely to be required for those assets affected by the local green space designation within Hargrave parish.	Noted	None
	Suffolk CC	SCC welcomes the objectives focussed on Natural Environment. Regarding paragraph 8.5, SCC would note that the Biodiversity Metric has moved on to 4.0 (and it is probable that this will be replaced by statutory guidance).	The paragraph will be brought up-to-date to reflect the situation as	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>SCC recognises that all six proposed Local Green Spaces are described as highways verges in the Local Green Space justification supporting document, which SCC considers cannot be defined as demonstrably special as set out in paragraph 102 of the NPPF 2023. Therefore, SCC objects to paragraph 8.14.</p> <p>"The verges make a significant contribution to the character of the village" is not a clear justification nor demonstration as to how these verges are special. There are no historic, ecological, wildlife (aside from the occasional tree), recreational or amenity value, and as highway verges are small roadside strips of land, they provide no tranquillity value.</p> <p>SCC also queries why some highways verges, but not all, have been designated as Local Green Spaces. The methodology of the selection of potential sites is unclear, and SCC seeks clarity on how some verges (but not others) were determined to be of value.</p> <p>Therefore, SCC is of the firm belief that highways verges should not be classified as a local green space, as they do not meet the criteria set out in paragraph 102 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>the time the Plan is submitted</p> <p>These areas are already designated as Local Green Spaces in the Made Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The substantial and wide verges, which may have been village greens at one time, are identified</p> <p>They have already been found to meet the criteria by virtue of their designation in the made Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
	West Suffolk Council	Para 8.13 Typo. Local G reen	This will be corrected	Amend typo in para 8.13
Policy HAR 11 – Local Heritage Assets				
S deLaat	-	Protecting the character of the village assumes we have identified what the character of the village is. Hargrave has developed the way it has, with a wide mix of building styles and sizes. The risk of attempting to protect the character of the village is that we end up with homogeneous housing developments that lack any design flair or innovation.	The Hargrave Design Guidance and Codes, referred to in the Plan, have identified the key characteristics of the parish.	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
	Suffolk CC	<p>Policy HAR11 could be improved by adding below-ground heritage as another form of heritage asset to be protected.</p> <p>Archaeology SCCAS have been reviewing Farmsteads throughout Suffolk, as part of an ongoing project funded by Historic England. The Neighbourhood Planning Group may wish to consider whether the information from the Suffolk Farmsteads Project 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 Explorer.</p>	This is not appropriate for this policy	None
Policy HAR 12 – Development Design Considerations				
	Anglian Water	<p>As a region identified as seriously water stressed we encourage plans to include measures to improve water efficiency of new development through water efficient fixtures and fittings, including through rainwater/storm water harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling. We would therefore welcome point 15 to reference both “energy and water efficient technologies” in the policy. This will then effectively tie in with Policy HAR 13 Sustainable Construction Practices, that we wholly support for recognising integrated water management solutions and the positive benefits for reducing potable water use.</p> <p>The Defra Integrated Plan for Water supports the need to improve water efficiency and the Government’s Environment Improvement Plan sets ten actions in 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>Point 15 of the policy will be amended as suggested</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Amend point 15 of the policy to reference both “energy and water efficient technologies”</p> <p>None</p>
	Suffolk CC	<p>SCC would recommend that the following additional wording be added to Policy HAR12 Development Design Considerations, to ensure the protection of the PROWs: “1. Integrate with existing paths, streets, circulation networks and patterns of activity, <i>including Public Rights of Way</i>.”</p>	The policy will be amended as suggested	Amend Policy HAR12 – 1 as suggested by SCC

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>SCC notes Part 12 of Policy HAR12 and is supportive, however, suggests that this could be amended to read "<u>sustainable</u> drainage infrastructure".</p> <p>Policy HAR12, part 16, which indirectly references the Suffolk Guidance for Parking is welcomed, however, the wording of this final line is a little unclear. SCC therefore suggests that this could be amended to read: "provided on the <u>development site</u>" and remove the phrasing of "within the plot", as this removes the possibility for parking which is provided not within the plot, such as courtyards or on-street. Please note that all new developments should be in accordance with the Suffolk Design Streets Guide.</p>	<p>Point 12 will be amended as suggested</p> <p>This is not considered appropriate as, given the likely nature of development in Hargrave, all parking should be within the plot</p>	<p>Amend point b12 as suggested</p> <p>None</p>
Policy HAR 13 – Sustainable Construction Practices				
S deLaat	-	could we investigate the erection of a wind turbine to supply electricity to the village?	This would be a matter for the Parish Council to pursue with landowners and residents.	None
R Jozefowski		<p>Policy HAR13 - Sustainable Construction Practices</p> <p>This policy covers "all appropriate development". We don't appear to have a policy to cover the improvement to the energy efficiency of existing homes and the transition we'll have to make from fossil fuel-based heating systems to renewable sources.</p>	These matters are addressed in the emerging West Suffolk Local Plan as well as the Building Regulations.	None
	Suffolk CC	SCC welcomes part e of this policy, for water harvesting and reuse.	Noted	None
Policy HAR 14 – Flooding and Sustainable Drainage				
D Osborne		<p>Policy Har14 Flooding and sustainable drainage</p> <p>Could this include making improvements to existing drainage in the village?</p>	Requirements to improve existing drainage through a planning permission can only be required where it is directly related to the	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
			development concerned and is required to make the proposal satisfactory.	
	Anglian Water	<p>Anglian Water supports the aims of the policy, particularly the inclusion of sustainable drainage schemes (SuDS) in new developments where multiple benefits can be achieved on site particularly in terms of rainwater/stormwater harvesting and recycling.</p> <p>It is the Government's intention to implement Schedule Three of The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to make SuDS mandatory in all new developments in England in 2024. However, we welcome this policy to ensure SuDS are incorporated in new developments, until the Schedule is formally implemented and the necessary measures are in place.</p>	Noted	None
	Suffolk CC	<p>SCC welcomes neighbourhood plans that include policies in relation to flooding and SuDS, however, suggests various amendments, as below, to improve the Policy's intent:</p> <p><i>"Any proposals for new development, or the intensification of existing development, in areas that are at risk of flooding from any source should be in Flood Zones 2 and 3 accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy and will not be permitted, unless the applicant has satisfied the safety requirements in the Flood Risk of the National Planning Policy Guidance and National Planning Policy Framework, Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, and the Local Planning Authority Sequential/Exception tests (where applicable). (and any successor)</i></p> <p>Proposals for all new development will be required to submit schemes appropriate to the scale of the proposal detailing how on-site surface water drainage and water resources will be managed so as to not cause or exacerbate surface water and fluvial flooding elsewhere <i>increase flood risk in the surrounding area.</i></p> <p>Proposals should, as appropriate include the use of above-ground open Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). These could include:</p>	The policy will be amended as suggested	Amend Policy HAR 14 as suggested by SCC

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wetland and other water features, <i>basins, swales, and raingardens</i>, which can help to reduce flood risk whilst offering other benefits including water quality, amenity/ recreational areas, and biodiversity benefits; and rainwater and stormwater harvesting and recycling; and other natural drainage systems where easily accessible maintenance can be achieved." 		
Policy HAR 15 – Dark Skies				
R Jozefowski		Policy HAR 15 – Dark Skies I note "subject to highway safety". I assume this includes pedestrians. I consider we need another streetlight in order to adequately illuminate the footway/pavement to/from the village hall and would not want the dark skies policy to be used to preclude this.	The policy would not preclude this given street lights do not require planning permission	None
	Suffolk CC	Policy HAR15 which is generally a robust policy, covering light pollution, and is supported by SCC. It could be made stronger by requiring that schemes minimise energy consumption, rather than just reducing it, and using best practice for lighting technologies.	The policy will be amended inline with the suggestion,	Amend Policy HAR 15 to seek lighting schemes that minimise energy consumption.
Other comments on Chapter 9 – Built Environment				
D Osborne	-	9.19 Flooding at The Wash is an ongoing problem, once the fields are saturated even a small amount of rainfall causes flooding at the turning into Barrow Hall. This becomes a traffic hazard when there are cars/lorries waiting on the hill to turn right into the village.	Noted	None
R Jozefowski	-	Please see my comment in question 19 regarding sustainable energy.	Noted	None
	Suffolk CC	<p>SCC notes that Figure 6 in the Design Code shows the location of all Listed buildings, this is welcomed.</p> <p>SCC welcomes that the HER and the role of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) have been included in paragraph 9.3, including a note of early consultation.</p> <p>Chapter 9 is currently titled 'Built Environment', SCCAS would recommend changing this to Historic Environment as this allows for the inclusion of below-ground and above-ground heritage.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The chapter does not solely address the historic environment</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>Flooding SCC, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, has the responsibility for managing flood risk arising from surface water, ground water and ordinary watercourses. The Environment Agency has the responsibility for managing flood risk from main rivers and the coast.</p>	Noted	None
		<p>As previously identified, there are areas of the village which suffer from occasional flooding because of the stream overflowing and is at high risk from surface water flooding. Analysing the flood maps shows that high surface water flooding occurs near the green and towards the pond along Bury Road.</p>	Noted	None
		<p>The following wording is suggested to be added to the supporting text, following paragraph 9.20: <u>"Development should be safe for its lifetime and not increase flow rate compared to a greenfield scenario, and where possible reduce flood risk overall. Proposals for development that provide upgrades to existing drainage in the area through additional SuDS and improvements to blue infrastructure will be encouraged.</u></p> <p><u>Drainage systems should be designed for the lifetime of the development, both in capacity and maintainability. New development should not increase flood risk off site, ideally limiting discharge rates to greenfield runoff rate (or 2 L/S whichever is higher) whilst observing the hierarchy of drainage discharge set by the Lead Local Flood Authority. Proposals for development that provide upgrades to existing drainage in the area through additional SuDS and improvements to blue infrastructure will be encouraged."</u></p>	Paragraph 9.20 will be amended as suggested	Amend para 9.20 as suggested by SCC
		<p>SCC would recommend that the plan include reference to the Suffolk Sustainable Drainage System Guide 2023 (Appendix A to the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy)³ and any updated guidance.</p>	Reference will be added to the Plan	Amend the Plan to include reference to Suffolk Sustainable Drainage System Guide 2023
		<p>Paragraph 9.19 only mentions the fluvial flood risk associated with the watercourse. In reality, this watercourse is also a receptor for several surface water flow paths and it is worth including an additional map displaying this as the NPPF now weights flood risk equally. Developments will require a Flood</p>	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>Risk Assessment and a sequential test in the areas of surface water flood risk which are actually larger than that of the fluvial risk.</p> <p>As such, SCC suggests including the additional following text into paragraph 9.19:</p> <p><i><u>"The route of the stream is also a receptor for surface water and at high risk of surface water flooding with multiple flow paths that contribute to this risk. New developments in areas of surface water flood risk are also subject to sequential and exception testing by the Local Planning Authority. Surface water flood risk is managed by the Lead Local Flood Authority (SCC)."</u></i></p> <p>Paragraph 9.13 states "The Design Guidance also includes site masterplanning guidance for the redevelopment of the village hall site and the adjoining "Bull Field" for a new village hall and housing". However, this appears to be incorrect, as the Design Guidance does not contain any masterplanning of sites.</p>	<p>Paragraph 9.19 will be amended as suggested.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.13 will be amended to delete the reference.</p>	<p>Amend para 9.19 as suggested by SCC</p> <p>Amend para 9.13 to delete reference to the site masterplanning</p>
Community Action 11 – Public Transport				
S deLaat	-	We will only be able to justify an enhanced bus service if we have an increased number of residents likely to use it. With more cars per family (some families having up to four cars) it's unlikely they would switch to a bus service except for school transport.	Noted	None
R Jozefowski		<p>Community Action 11 - Public Transport</p> <p>I believe there was a village survey and there wasn't much demand expressed for a bus service. Living in Hargrave most people have and need their own transport and therefore probably don't feel the need for a bus service and may not have travelled on a bus for years. I know some of us walk to/from the Chevington Greyhound to use the bus service, but this is not realistic for everyone, especially when carrying shopping. I'd prefer there to be a service in Hargrave, even if it only ran on market days. It might also be useful if there were a service to the hospital.</p> <p>Has any consideration been given to lobbying for a park & ride service, situated near the A14 at Westley?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This is not a matter for the Parish Council</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
Community Action 12 – Traffic Calming				
S deLaat	-	A physical calming scheme on the Wickhambrook Road similar to the ones in Westley.	Noted	None
	Suffolk CC	We note from Community Action 12 that the Parish Council will seek to work with the LHA.	Noted	None
Community Action 13 – HGV management				
R Jozefowski		Community Action 13 – HGV management We live in an agricultural community and need to accept there will be HGVs and at times large agricultural machinery on our roads.	Noted	None
	Suffolk CC	Paragraph 10.9, residents have expressed concerns about the number and size of HGVs travelling through the village. SCC notes Community Action 13. The County Council has been undertaking a county-wide review of HGV movement routes. ⁸ The LHA notes that Bury Road, which is classified as the C659, is not on the Recommended Lorry Route Network Map. ⁹ The parish council and/or members of the community can report and incident involving HGVs via SCC webpages	Noted	None
Community Action 14 – Public Rights of Way				
S deLaat	-	It's incumbent on landowners to maintain all rights of way that cross their land. It is also incumbent on walkers to stick to footpaths and not roam on private land. Dogs must also be kept under control	Noted	None
D Clarke	-	I agree with this action as far as it goes but another important aspect is accessibility on the existing (and potential new) footpaths and bridleways. I believe therefore that this action also needs to include a statement to the effect that "landowners need to keep all rights of way on their land clear and easy to pass"	Such a change is not considered necessary as the community action relates to the creation of additional paths rather than the legal requirement to maintain public rights of way	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
	Suffolk CC	SCC suggests this Community Action is extended to encourage inclusivity in any additional pathways, with the following additional proposed text: <i>"Any new pathways will be expected to conform to Suffolk Design Street Guide 2022, be Safe, attractive and convenient for pedestrians including disabled persons and those with impaired mobility. Regular benches should be positioned to aid those with limited mobility."</i>	This is not considered necessary given then policy is for public rights of way and not footways adjoining the highway	None
Other comments Chapter 10 – Highways, Transport and Travel				
C Painter	-	controlling the size and speed of the traffic passing through the village will be essential for our well being and safety	Noted	None
S Painter	-	A solution to stop speeding traffic needs to be found	Noted	None
D Osborne	-	The amount of traffic passing through the village is ever increasing and HGV vehicles are a particular problem. This causes noise and is also a safety concern for walkers, runners and horse riders as there are limited footpaths/ off road routes that pass through the village. Attempting to reduce through traffic HGVs that could follow longer main road routes would be a positive step and/or further reducing the speed limit through the village to 20mph.	Noted. This would be a matter for County Highways	None
R Jozefowski	-	10.6 Autonomous vehicles are still some way off for use on country roads but will doubtless come. When they do they'll change our way of life and living in a country village like Hargrave may become more viable for those without cars or unable to drive. 10.10 Strictly speaking, cutting of the ground vegetation on our field-edge footpaths is the responsibility of Suffolk County Council (SCC). However, the council has limited resources and, up until recently, no field-edge footpaths in Hargrave were on the council's cutting schedule. In practice, most of the field-edge footpaths in Hargrave get cut through the generosity of local farmers and private individuals. I'd like us to lobby SCC to include any uncut footpaths in their cutting schedule. I'd like us to explore the possibility of improving the network, through the addition of permissive paths. Such paths would require the consent of local landowners and might be limited to certain times of the year. This would likely	Noted Noted Community Action 14 addresses this	None None None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>be easier and less costly to achieve than creating new Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>As I pointed out in the 2017 consultation, we already have footpath access to Ousden and to the rear of Ickworth Park. Ousden is 2.2 miles, from village hall to village hall, which includes only a short stretch of road, although there is no direct route to Ousden from Hargrave village green. Footpath access to the rear of Ickworth Park is about 2.8 miles from the village hall, but it should be noted this is not a recognised entrance to Ickworth Park. I think it would be beneficial to have path access to Chevington (pub, bus stop and village hall) and perhaps Barrow.</p> <p>We have several single-step stiles in Hargrave. Whilst they are a quintessential feature of our countryside, stiles can present an obstacle for some walkers. For this reason, SCC will only approve new stiles in exceptional circumstances. We might wish to consult with landowners to see if they'd be prepared to replace some of the stiles with gates or gaps, or offer alternative permissive paths. SCC would probably be able to provide funding, at least in part.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
	Suffolk CC	<p>Within Chapter 10, there is opportunity to include provision for Active Travel and Air Quality. SCC suggests adding a paragraph with the following wording under the Context heading, following the text regarding public rights of way:</p> <p><i><u>"It is important to improve air quality and mitigate any risk to human health due to man-made emissions such as nitrogen oxides and particulate matter. Encouraging and facilitating active and sustainable travel can reduce vehicles on the road and therefore pollution and poor air quality, as well as improve people's mental and physical health."</u></i></p> <p>SCC notes that there is the Objective for improvements to public rights of way. Paragraph 10.3 states that the PROW are "celebrated" and yet the plan does little to ensure the protection or enhancement of such a valued feature of the parish.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the plan includes a new policy within Chapter 10, that is specifically for the protection and enhancement of the Public Right of Way network.</p> <p>The following wording is proposed:</p>	<p>Given the non-existent public transport and lack of safe cycle routes it is not considered appropriate to include this statement in such a remote parish.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This is not considered necessary given that the Submission Draft West Suffolk Local Plan</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p><u>"Policy HAR16 - Public Rights of Way</u> <u>Development which would adversely affect the character or result in the loss of existing or proposed rights of way, will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use.</u> <u>Any new housing development will have, where reasonable, new footpath(s) and/or bridleway(s) created to link with the existing right of way network within and surrounding the village.</u> <u>The rights of way network will be developed for different users including people with limited mobility, people using pushchairs or in wheelchairs, cyclists and horse riders."</u></p> <p>SCC recommends that terminology regarding PROW should be improved to provide clarity by replacing "bridle paths" (a colloquial term) with "bridleways" (a legal term).</p> <p>The Plan could identify public footpaths that might be suitable to be upgraded to bridleway status. This would facilitate more equestrian and cycle use on the network.</p> <p>SCC would encourage the plan including a reference to SCC's Green Access Strategy (2020-2030).⁶ This strategy sets out the Council's commitment to enhance PROW, 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>SCC, as the Local Highway Authority (LHA), 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>Regarding paragraph 10.2, SCC notes that traffic speeds are a concern and that 30mph and 40mph speed limits are in operation in and around the village. The LHA would highlight that speed limit enforcement is a matter for Suffolk Constabulary.</p>	<p>contains Policy LP58 "Rights of Way"</p> <p>The Plan will be amended as suggested</p> <p>This is not considered necessary at this time</p> <p>This is not considered necessary</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Amend references to bridle paths</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		Concerning paragraph 10.7, large road signs and carriageway white line marking is not always appropriate for rural communities such as Hargrave. Any change to highway signs or road markings must be approved in advance by the LHA.	Noted. This is what para 10.7 states and the County Council is encouraged to find a more appropriate solution.	None
Policies Maps				
Mr R Sudbury	-	Note that the map on page 53 does not currently show the listed buildings.	The map will be amended	Amend The Green Inset Map to identify listed buildings
R Jozefowski	-	The housing settlement boundary permits more development than the villagers indicated they wished to allow in the 2013 and 2021 household surveys. Could we not find an alternative way to permit limited development within Hargrave? Isn't the purpose of a neighbourhood plan that it grants us some flexibility?	Although the principle of development inside the Housing Settlement Boundary is supported by the Neighbourhood Plan, any proposals would still need to comply with other policies in the neighbourhood plan and local plan, including on matters relating to design and impact.	None
	Suffolk CC	<p>They Key on the Policies Map states that Important Views are from Policy HAR8, but they are in fact from Policy HAR9 along with the Settlement Gaps. This will need to be amended.</p> <p>SCC would note that the settlement gaps are only visible on The Green and The Grove Inset Maps and would be more legible if displayed on the overarching Policies Map also.</p>	Errors on the Policies Maps will be corrected	Amend Policies Maps to change reference in key to HAR9

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
Appendices				
D Osborne	-	Appendix 3. While approving of the the Parish Council's 'ambition' to build a new village hall, this must have the support of the whole village. The initial decision to build new was made by those who attended the presentation, meaning those unable to attend had no say. If building new is truly the best option then it's important that everyone in the village gets behind the plan in order for it to be successful.	Noted	None
Mr R Sudbury	-	On page 62 there is a bullet point about existing views which is duplicated	The duplication will be addressed	Amend green spaces, views and character checklist on P62 to delete duplicated bullet point
	Suffolk CC	SCCAS welcomes the inclusion of a list of Listed Buildings in Appendix 4. In addition, it would be beneficial to include a list of any structures considered to be non-designated heritage assets which have been identified and to also identify any which could be suitable for listing.	This is referenced in Policy HAR 11	
General comments				
S Painter	-	Very well written and structured	Noted	None
D Clarke	-	Thanks to all who have put so much effort into this document.	Noted	None
D Osborne	-	Given the considerable amount of content in the plan, it would have been helpful to have had some additional public meetings where villagers could have had a 'question and answer session' on particular key topics, and to have surveyed children and teenagers on their views.	The preparation of the neighbourhood plan has met the requirements for consultation.	None
Mr R Sudbury	-	Thanks to everyone for all the hard work and thought that has gone into this.	Noted	None
R Jozefowski	-	The Neighbourhood Plan is a lengthy document. Clearly, a lot of work has gone into it, on a voluntary basis, and there is a lot to digest. I think people may be put off by the amount of time and effort required to comment. Sadly, I've heard some people say they feel there's no point, as the parish council won't listen and will do what it wants anyway. How did this happen? The plan is a blunt instrument. A yes vote shouldn't be interpreted as fully agreeing with every aspect of the plan. Most villagers are likely to agree with most aspects and only a few aspects will be contentious, such as policies	Noted The pre-submission consultation allows for opinions to be	None None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>concerning development.</p> <p>Whilst much of the plan is easy to comprehend, areas relating to development are quite complex and the implications may not be fully understood by all of us. Prior to this stage, I think there should have been more open-minded consultation and involvement with the village at the household level on the bigger issues, such as housing development and the village hall.</p> <p>I think some people took offence back in 2010, when they felt St Edmundsbury had declared Hargrave as being an unsustainable village. In fact, St Edmundsbury removed the housing settlement boundary, as it did with 10 other settlements, saying it considered that in these settlements the construction of further new homes was unsustainable and it was unlikely that additional development would provide sufficient further customers to render the provision of a shop or other community facility viable. Were they wrong? Would a few extra homes in Hargrave really make a difference to the viability of a shop, pub, bus service? Hargrave was then designated countryside status, which still permitted infill development, as well as replacement dwellings or dwellings for key agricultural workers. Do we need much more? Is Hargrave really going to wither and die without larger scale development?</p> <p>I know we were told, "It's not a parish council activity – it's a village activity", but I think the reality is this is a parish council activity, aided by the planning consultancy. I think it would be helpful to have a section to summarise the parish council's vision on how it would like Hargrave to develop, not simply a description of development that could be permitted. The parish council should then work to unite the community in support of its goals.</p> <p>As I said it 2017, Hargrave is a friendly village where people feel free to engage in village life as much or as little as they wish. In spite of its limited facilities and services, and in some cases because of them, people are very contented here,</p>	<p>provided on all elements of the Plan.</p> <p>Consultation events and surveys were carried out and informed the content of the new Plan. Much of the content remains the same as that which received a majority vote in 2018.</p> <p>Having a Settlement Boundary provides greater clarity when development proposals are considered.</p> <p>Noted. Paragraph 4.1 contains the vision for Hargrave</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>living quiet peaceful lives in beautiful rural surroundings. Many of us have lived here for decades, some have even been born here and remained here all their life. People move here specifically to enjoy a quiet, peaceful life. Whilst villagers are willing to accept a degree of housing development and improvements, most people would like the village to stay much as it is. Is that so wrong? What concerns people are the day-to-day issues of roads, communications, transport, flooding, footpaths etc. and they'd like to see the parish council put more effort into addressing them, as I believe it intends doing.</p>		
	Chevington Parish Council	<p>Chevington Parish Council met last week and discussed your Neighbourhood Plan. The only comment they would like me to bring to your attention is about cycling paths and routes. They would like you to work alongside your neighbouring villages to bring a more cohesive cycling route plan to the area if you are considering drawing up a cycling route. You may be aware that Chevington is carrying out a questionnaire and survey to see what parishioners want in their village and one of the topics being mentioned is more cycling routes. If you want more information about this, please contact me. Good luck with this plan</p>	The comments concerning cycle routes are noted.	None
	Wickhambrook Parish Council	<p>At its September meeting (Min. 23.09.20 refers) the parish council considered Hargrave's Draft Neighbourhood Plan and asked the clerk to send a general letter in support of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>No specific issues were identified on which to comment.</p>	Noted	None
	National Highways	<p>Thank you for your correspondence, received on 31 August 2023, notifying National Highways of the consultation above.</p> <p>National Highways is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England on behalf of the Secretary of the State. In the area within and surrounding the Hargrave Neighbourhood Plan area, National Highways have responsibility for the trunk road A14, part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p> <p>We have reviewed different policies (such as, HAR 1 – HAR 14 and Community Action 11 - 14) details within the Hargrave Neighbourhood Plan Review 2023-2040, pre-submission draft plan dated September 2023. The vision is supported</p>	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>by objectives in the six theme areas – i) Planning Strategy, ii) housing, iii) Services, Facilities and the Local Economy, iv) Natural Environment, v) Built Environment, and vi) Transport and Travel.</p> <p>The vision statement and proposed policies within this draft neighbourhood plan 2023-2040 would not have any predicted adverse impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p> <p>We do not have any more comment of this.</p>		
	Avison Young on behalf of National Gas Transmission	<p>National Gas Transmission has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.</p> <p>About National Gas Transmission National Gas Transmission owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.</p> <p>Proposed sites crossed or in close proximity to National Gas Transmission assets An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission's assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure. National Gas Transmission has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area. National Gas Transmission provides information in relation to its assets at the website below. • https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/network-route-maps Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Gas Transmission infrastructure.</p> <p>Distribution Networks Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting: plantprotection@cadentgas.com</p>	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>Further Advice</p> <p>Please remember to consult National Gas Transmission on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database, if not already included:</p>		
	<p>Avison Young on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission</p>	<p>National Grid Electricity Transmission has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to local planning authority Development Plan Document consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.</p> <p>About National Grid Electricity Transmission</p> <p>National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses.</p> <p>National Grid no longer owns or operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. This is the responsibility of National Gas Transmission, which is a separate entity and must be consulted independently.</p> <p>National Grid Ventures (NGV) develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States. NGV is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. Please also consult with NGV separately from NGET.</p> <p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to NGET assets:</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to NGET's assets which include high voltage electricity assets and other electricity infrastructure. NGET has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>NGET provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ <p>Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to NGET infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>Distribution Networks Information regarding the electricity distribution network is available at the website below: www.energynetworks.org.uk</p> <p>Further Advice Please remember to consult NGET on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database, if not already included:</p>		
	Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 01 September 2023. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species .</p> <p>Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient</p>	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission standing advice.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.</p> <p>Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.</p>		
	Anglian Water	<p>Thank you for consulting Anglian Water on the draft Hargrave Neighbourhood Plan review. As 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. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the plan and wish 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.</p> <p>Overall we are supportive of the policy ambitions within the Neighbourhood Plan Review, and wish the Parish Council every success in taking this forward.</p>	Noted	None
	Historic England	<p>Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment on the above consultation. We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan and the extensive and the references to the historic environment that are set out within it.</p> <p>We appreciate the plan is set out in a specific way however we consider the historic environment should sit in a chapter of its own or that Built heritage is renamed as Historic Environment. The historic environment covers a broader and more diverse range of subjects that just buildings, for example archaeology and historic landscapes. We note you have referenced archaeology and the Suffolk HER and your plan should reflect that work.</p>	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>We also recommend you establish specific heritage policies within the plan that seek to support local distinctiveness and protect the heritage asset. On way would be to align the plan policies more closely with Local Plan heritage policies which would perhaps strength the approach to the historic environment. We would welcome reference to a local list and perhaps the Parish Council NP team would give thought to whether the Parish have identify new features, buildings or spaces of historical merit that have local significance, that would welcome inclusion on the local or even potentially national lists.</p> <p>For general advice we refer you to our detailed document on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your plan, alongside advice on planning policy writing and some useful case studies, which can be found here: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/.</p> <p>For further advice regarding the historic environment and how to integrate it into your neighbourhood plan, we recommend that you consult your local planning authority conservation officer, and if appropriate your local Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>There is also helpful guidance on a number of topics related to the production of neighbourhood plans and their evidence base available on Locality's website: https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/, which you may find useful.</p> <p>To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.</p> <p>Please do contact us, either via email or the number above, if you have any specific queries relating to the historic environment in your plan area or a particular issue, and we will endeavour to respond as soon as we can to assist.</p>	<p>Only one building of local significance has been identified, as referred to in Policy HAR 11</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
	Suffolk CC	Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council (SCC) on the pre-submission version of the Hargrave Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted	None

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<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 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>Early Years Care As there are no additional housing sites allocated in this plan, this is likely to be a minimal impact on Early Years Care providers, and their capacity to take on additional children. Currently all provision is provided outside of this Parish for any children resident in Hargrave.</p> <p>Primary Education The primary education catchment school is Ickworth Park Primary, which is not currently forecast to exceed 95% capacity during the forecast period. The number of pupils arising from applications pending decision and local plan site allocations is also not expected to cause the school to exceed 95% capacity based on current forecasts.</p> <p>Secondary Education For secondary education provision, the parish used to be within a shared catchment area between King Edward VI CEVC School and County High School. King Edward VI CEVC School still admits children using catchment area within their admissions criteria, but County High School no longer operates a catchment area to prioritise applications to the school. King Edward VI CEVC School and County High School are not currently forecast to exceed 95% capacity during the forecast period. When considering secondary education provision in Bury St Edmunds, the schools in the town are also not forecast to exceed 95% capacity based on current forecasts.</p> <p>Fire and Rescue Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service (SFRS) has considered the plan and are of the opinion that, given the level of growth proposed, SFRS do not envisage</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>In addition, the Pre-Submission Plan policies were considered in relation to the 'Basic Conditions' required of a Neighbourhood Plan, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; • Contribute to achieving sustainable development; • Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan; and • Be compatible with European Union and European Convention on Human Rights obligations. <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment - Screening and Appropriate Assessment A Habitats Regulations Assessment has not been provided to the Council.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Appraisal A Strategic Environmental Appraisal has not been provided to the Council.</p> <p>Demonstrating an effective Pre-submission Plan consultation Policies within a Neighbourhood Plan need to be deliverable, and to this end any proposed allocations/ designations of land/ land use ambitions, should be made with the agreement of the relevant affected landowners. This appropriate consultation with third party landowners, should be evidenced within your Consultation Statement at Submission stage.</p> <p>If substantially material alterations are made to the content of the Neighbourhood Plan following feedback from the Pre-Submission Plan consultation (Regulation 14 stage), then careful consideration should be given to re-undertaking Pre-Submission consultation before advancing to the Submission Stage.</p> <p>One of the tests that the LPA must consider at the Submission stage is whether the General Regulations have been complied with; the General Regulations do</p>	<p>The Basic Conditions Statement that accompanies the Submission Plan demonstrates how the Plan meets the Basic Conditions</p> <p>West Suffolk Council were asked to screen the Plan for SEA/HRA at the pre-submission stage and the Plan has been screened out of requiring environmental assessment</p> <p>This Consultation Statement demonstrates how the Plan has been consulted on in accordance with the regulations</p> <p>No substantial changes have been made</p> <p>The Parish Council is satisfied that the</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment	Parish Council response	Changes to Plan
		<p>not expressly require a re-consultation if the draft plan is significantly amended after the consultation. However, West Suffolk Council consider that it would be difficult for the LPA to allow the plan to proceed to examination on the basis that "details of the proposals for a neighbourhood plan" had been publicised in accordance with Regulation 14, if entirely new proposals have been inserted, or the Plan proposals have been significantly altered from those publicised.</p> <p>If you have any queries about the council's comments which are outlined in the table attached to this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Simon Meecham who is the principal planning policy contact for this neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>General Regulations have been met</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

Appendix X – Schedule of Proposed Modifications to Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan

The table below sets out the changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan following the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation and the reasons for the modifications. Changes subsequent to the deletion of paragraphs or policies are not identified in this schedule.

Deletions are struck through eg ~~deletion~~ Additions are underlined eg addition

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
Front cover		Amend as follows: Pre-Submission Draft Plan September 2023 <u>February 2024</u>	To bring the Plan up-to-date
8	1.12	Amend as follows: The 2018 Plan also contained 14 Community Actions; proposals which would not be relevant in the determination of planning applications, but which residents had identified as matters and initiatives that should be pursued locally. Given that the Community Actions in the 2018 Plan are now five years old, they have been reviewed and those that remain relevant have been carried forward and, where necessary, updated. They are identified to be distinct from the planning policies in the Plan <u>and they will continue to not carry any weight in the determination of planning applications in Hargrave.</u> Appendix 1 provides some commentary on progress with the 2018 Community Actions.	In response to comments
9	1.17	Amend as follows: <u>Pre-submission public consultation was carried out by the Parish Council for seven weeks in September and October 2023.</u> Following this round of public consultation by the Parish Council, the comments received will be <u>were</u> considered <u>by the Parish Council</u> and any necessary amendments will be <u>were</u> made to form this “submission” version of the Plan. The Parish Council will then submit the draft Plan to West Suffolk Council, who will carry <u>are now carrying out</u> further public consultation ahead of the Plan being examined by an Independent Examiner. The Examiner will decide if the changes to the 2018 Plan are such that it is necessary for the Plan to be subject to a new Parish Referendum before it can be adopted by West Suffolk Council for use in determining planning applications.	To bring the Plan up-to-date

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
9	Timetable	Amend as follows: Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation SUMMER 2023 Submission to West Suffolk and further consultation AUTUMN 2023-SPRING 2024 Independent Examiner Examination WINTER 2023/24-SPRING 2024 Referendum <u>Referendum</u> (if deemed necessary) WINTER 2023/24-SUMMER 2024	To bring the Plan up-to-date plus correction of spelling error
12	3.2	Amend second sentence as follows: In July 2021 <u>December 2023</u> the Government published a Revised NPPF. The Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development.	To bring the Plan up-to-date
12	3.4	Delete paragraph as now out of date and amend following paragraph numbers as a consequence: Towards the end of December 2022 the Government published proposed changes to the NPPF for consultation, as well as a proposal to establish National Development Management Policies which would provide a standard approach to considering proposals relating to, for example, heritage assets. The draft Neighbourhood Plan will be brought up to date to reflect such changes should these be introduced before the Plan is put to a public referendum.	To bring the Plan up-to-date
12	3.5	Amend as follows: The following diagram shows the components of West Suffolk Council's Development Plan in place in September 2023 <u>February 2024</u> which are relevant to Hargrave.	To bring the Plan up-to-date
13	3.7	Amend paragraph by inserting following at the end: <u>(Policy LP26 of the Submission Draft West Suffolk Local Plan (2024) proposes to amend the size of a group down from 10 dwellings to seven.)</u>	To bring the Plan up-to-date
14	3.9	Amend as follows: West Suffolk Council has commenced work on the preparation of a new Local Plan for the area. The Plan will cover the period to 2040 although the Local Development Scheme (January June 2023) suggests that the new Local Plan will not be adopted until Spring 2025 <u>Winter 2024</u> , after the expected time of adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan. In May 2022 the Council consulted on the Preferred Options Local Plan document and consultation on the draft Local Plan is expected to commence in January 2024. In January 2024, West Suffolk Council commenced consultation on the "Submission Draft Local Plan".	To bring the Plan up-to-date

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
14	3.10	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The Preferred Options document identified <u>Submission Draft Local Plan identifies</u> Hargrave as a "Type-B village", defined as settlements that "have a very limited range of or no services and poor accessibility to public transport. It is likely that residents will rely on the private car to travel to meet their day-to-day needs. In these villages no sites would be <u>are</u> allocated through the local plan and only limited infill development or affordable housing exception sites would be permitted, <u>where it accords with other policies in the development plan dependent on other environmental and infrastructure constraints, to meet local needs within the village.</u>"</p>	To bring the Plan up-to-date
14	3.11	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph 6.3 of Part 3 of the May 2022 Preferred Options document <u>Section 5 of the Submission Local Plan states:</u> "There may be circumstances where policies will allow development to take place in either type B villages or in the countryside and further details are set out in part two <u>local policies</u> of this plan. Examples of where development may be appropriate include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scale infill residential development comprising one or two dwellings. • Replacement of existing dwellings on a one for one basis. • Conversion and re-use of buildings for employment or residential purposes. • An affordable housing exception site within or adjacent to a settlement boundary. • An agricultural and/or essential workers dwelling. • Where a neighbourhood plan is prepared and proposes site allocations." <p>Such proposals would be considered on a case-by-case basis and sites would not be allocated in the Local Plan for such purposes. In relation to the final bullet point, this Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate sites for development.</p>	To bring the Plan up-to-date
14	3.12	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Given that the Submission Draft West Suffolk Local Plan had yet to be <u>been</u> published when the draft Neighbourhood Plan was submitted <u>prepared</u>, regard has been had to <u>its content</u> the Preferred Options document while recognising that it might be subject to change <u>following examination as the Local Plan</u> it proceeds towards adoption in <u>Spring 2024</u> 2025.</p>	To bring the Plan up-to-date
14	3.14	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>In July 2020, Suffolk County Council adopted the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Nowhere in the parish is defined as a "minerals consultation area" in the Plan, meaning that there is no requirement to consult the County Council in relationship to the potential impact of a proposal on</p>	In response to comments

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
		the winning of receiving planning consent to extract minerals under the current Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.	
18	5.3	Insert the following at the end of the paragraph: <u>The adopted Local Plan policy is proposed to change in the Submission Draft Local Plan. Emerging Policy LP26 – Housing in the countryside, proposes to amend the size of a group down from 10 dwellings to seven.</u>	
18	5.4	Delete paragraph as it repeats para 3.9 of the Neighbourhood Plan West Suffolk Council has commenced work on the preparation of a new Local Plan for the area. The Plan will cover the period to 2040 although the Local Development Scheme (June 2023) suggests that the new Local Plan will not be adopted until Spring 2025, after the expected time of adoption of the new Neighbourhood Plan. In May 2022 the Council consulted on the Preferred Options Local Plan document and consultation on the draft Local Plan is expected to commence in January 2024.	To save repetition
18	5.5	Amend paragraph number to 5.4 and delete first paragraph as it repeats para 3.10 of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Preferred Options document identified Hargrave as a “Type B village” which are settlements that: “have a very limited range of or no services and poor accessibility to public transport. It is likely that residents will rely on the private car to travel to meet their day to day needs. In these villages no sites would be allocated through the local plan and only limited infill development or affordable housing exception sites would be permitted, dependent on other environmental and infrastructure constraints, to meet local needs within the village.” Amend second part of paragraph as follows: In addition, the document contained <u>The Submission Draft Local Plan contains</u> twenty draft Strategic Objectives. The most pertinent to Hargrave were <u>are</u> the three covering rural areas, as reproduced below: SO10 Support agriculture, farm diversification, estate management and rural tourism that will sustain the function and character of the countryside and its communities. SO11 Sustain and support the rural areas through the safeguarding of local centres and services and by encouraging rural diversification and the growth of the agricultural sector.	To bring the Plan up-to-date

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
		SO12 Meet the housing needs of rural areas appropriate to the requirements of individual settlements.	
18	Following 5.5	Insert new paragraph as follows: <u>Paragraph 4.3.34 of the Submission Draft Local Plan states "The scale of growth considered appropriate for type B villages is an indicative maximum scheme size of around five homes, as infill plots within the housing settlement boundary including making use of previously developed or brownfield land dependent on infrastructure and environmental capacity".</u>	To provide a relevant and up-to-date connection to the new Local Plan.
19	5.6	Amend third sentence as follows: Paragraph 79 <u>83</u> of the NPPF recognises that housing can promote sustainable development in rural areas through enhancing or maintaining the vitality of rural communities.	To bring the Plan up-to-date
19	5.7	Amend third sentence as follows: Outside this area, the cluster of 16 dwellings at The Grove, Wickhambrook Road (between Meadow Cottage in the north and Alma Cottage in the south) meets the definition of a closely knit cluster referred to in Policy DM27 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies (<u>Policy LP26 of the Submission Draft Local Plan</u>).	To bring the Plan up-to-date
19	HAR 1	Amend third paragraph of Policy as follows: Outside of the Housing Settlement Boundary, priority will be given to protecting and enhancing the countryside from inappropriate development. Proposals for development will only be supported where they are in accordance with national, and district, and neighbourhood plan level policies, or where: a. it is essential for the operation of agriculture, horticulture, equine related activities, forestry; or b. it is for small scale facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, community buildings, leisure and tourism use; or	In response to comments and to reflect the strategic policies of the draft Local Plan.

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
		<p>c. it is in conformity with Policy DM27 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Local Plan Document 2015 or succession policy; or</p> <p>d. is for the replacement of an existing dwelling on a one for one basis of a similar scale and floor area and small scale residential development in accordance with other policies on housing in the countryside; or</p> <p>e. is for a small affordable housing scheme for up to five dwellings adjoining but outside the Housing Settlement Boundary to meet a proven local need, in accordance with Policy DM29 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Local Plan Document 2015 or successor policy.</p>	
23	6.10	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The design features of new homes can have a significant impact on the character of an area. The Local Plan already contains detailed policies for the consideration of the potential impact on the character of an area and the amenity of existing residents. In addition, in December 2017, the local planning authority issued a “technical advice note” to achieve minimum internal floorspace standards. The advice note states that “the Government’s national space standards [March 2015] are the minimum acceptable space standards that should be applied to build both open market and affordable housing within West Suffolk.” <u>Policy LP21 of the Submission draft West Suffolk Local Plan requires all new homes to meet or exceed the national space standards. It is the intention of West Suffolk Council to include a policy requirement for all new homes to be built to the national space standards in the next version of their Local Plan. This Technical Advice Note is therefore an interim measure until such time as the new combined West Suffolk Local Plan is published.</u></p>	To bring the Plan up-to-date
23	6.11	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>The 2024 <u>2023</u> NPPF states that “Planning policies for housing should make use of the Government’s optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing, where this would address an identified need for such properties.” The March 2015 standards encourage provision of enough space in homes to ensure that they can be used flexibly by a range of residents. The standards also aim to ensure that sufficient storage can be integrated into dwelling units. It is emphasised that these standards, which are set out in Appendix 2, are expressed as minimum space standards.</p>	To bring the Plan up-to-date

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
23	6.12	<p>Amend paragraph as follows: Externally, it is also important that homes meet modern day requirements for the storage of wheelie bins and cycles. Without sufficient and appropriate space reserved for these uses, the consequence can be added clutter and a deterrent in the use of cycles as a mode of travel. The Suffolk Waste Partnership, which includes West Suffolk Council, published "Waste Technical Guidance for Residential and Commercial Developments" in 2019 and should be referred to when making space for wheelie bins. <u>Designs should also be informed by the Suffolk Guidance for Parking, 2019, which provides information about specifications for cycle storage facilities.</u></p>	In response to comments
25	7.3	<p>Amend paragraph as follows: Paragraph 84 88 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should enable the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. Further, paragraph 93 97 states that planning policies and decisions should guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs. The NPPF also emphasises the need to "support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable development".</p>	To bring the Plan up-to-date
34	Policy Context	<p>Insert paragraph number and amend subsequent paragraph numbers accordingly. Amend as follows: 8.4 The Joint Development Management Policies Local Plan document contains detailed policies on the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, as listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DM10: Impact of Development on Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance • Policy DM11: Protected Species • Policy DM12: Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity • Policy DM13: Landscape Features • Policy DM14: Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards 	

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
		<p>The emerging West Suffolk Local Plan is expected to continue to contain policies for the protection and enhancement of the natural environment and will bring the planning policy framework up-to-date. <u>Appendix A of the Submission Draft Local Plan identifies the new policies which would replace these policies.</u></p>	
34	8.5	<p>Amend paragraph as follows: Currently the NPPF encourages net gains for biodiversity to be sought through planning policies and decisions. In November 2021 the Environment Bill received Royal Assent. It introduced a <u>The Environment Act 2021 places a statutory requirement for all appropriate developments to deliver a minimum 10 per cent measurable net gain in biodiversity (BNG), calculated using the statutory metric and a biodiversity statement, submitted at the planning application stage, should set out how a development will deliver BNG. A Biodiversity Net Gain (Interim) Planning Guidance Note for Suffolk has been developed by the Suffolk authorities. The purpose of the interim guidance note is to provide further detail on how aspects of biodiversity net gain should be demonstrated within planning applications. The application of the mitigation hierarchy (avoiding impacts before mitigating and, as a last resort, compensating impacts) should be demonstrated. Suffolk County Council is preparing a local nature recovery strategy (LNRS) which will agree priorities for nature recovery and propose actions in the locations where it would make a particular contribution to achieving those priorities. The strategy will include a local habitat map and a written statement of biodiversity priorities. Until the LNRS is completed, the alternative plans which determine strategic significance are the West Suffolk Green Infrastructure Study (April 2022) or any subsequent published Suffolk wide guidance on strategic significance.</u></p> <p>While the Environment Act 2021 sets out the core components (from the use of a metric, a system of national credits, a register of net gain and more), the details of how biodiversity net gain will work is, at the time of preparing this Plan, still in development ahead of the requirement becoming mandatory in the winter of 2023. Natural England have published a "Biodiversity Metric (3.0)" which is expected to be the standard measuring methodology to appraise how development will meet the requirements of the Act.</p>	To bring the Plan up-to-date
34	HAR 8	<p>Amend first sentence of policy as follows: <u>In addition to the biodiversity net gain requirements of the Environment Act 2021, dDevelopment proposals must seek to protect and should avoid the loss of, or substantial harm to, trees, <u>grass verges, hedgerows</u> and other natural features such as ponds and watercourses.</u></p>	In response to comments and to bring the policy up-to-date

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
37	HAR 9	Amend criterion d as follows: d. it would maintain the key features of the important views of the surrounding countryside from public vantage points within, and adjacent to, the built-up area, as defined on the Policies Map and described in the Hargrave Character Appraisal.	In response to comments
38	8.12	Amend fourth sentence as follows: Paragraph 102 <u>106</u> of the NPPF states that the designation should only be used where the green space is:	To bring the Plan up-to-date
38	8.13	Amend first sentence as follows: A separate Local G-green Space Appraisal has been undertaken as part of the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, which demonstrates how certain local spaces meet the criteria in paragraph 102 <u>106</u> of the NPPF.	To bring the Plan up-to-date and correct error
38	8.15	Amend first sentence as follows: The identification of these spaces as Local Green Space means that the construction of new buildings on them is inappropriate, except in exceptional circumstances as defined by paragraph 149 <u>154</u> of the NPPF.	To bring the Plan up-to-date
41	9.5	Amend second and third sentences as follows: Policy DM15: Listed Buildings, in the Joint Development Management Policies Local Plan document (<u>Policy LP50 in the Submission Draft Local Plan</u>) sets out the considerations and criteria against which proposals to alter, extend or change the use of a listed building, or development affecting its setting will be considered. In addition, Policy DM18: New Uses for Historic Buildings (<u>Policy LP52 in the Submission Draft Local Plan</u>) addresses how proposals for the adaptation and re-use of historic buildings will be considered.	To bring the Plan up-to-date
42	9.6	Amend first sentence as follows:	To bring the Plan up-to-date

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
		In terms of the design of development, the NPPF makes it clear, in paragraph 131 424, 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.'	
42	9.7	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>Policy DM2: Creating Places - Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness, in the Joint Development Management Policies Local Plan document (<u>Policy LP10 Well-designed places - in the Submission Draft Local Plan</u>) sets out a range of criteria against which all development proposals, as appropriate to their scale, will be considered by West Suffolk Council. Other relevant adopted policies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DM6: Flooding and Sustainable Drainage (<u>Policy LP5 of the Submission Draft Local Plan</u>) • Policy DM7: Sustainable Design and Construction (<u>Policy LP1 of the Submission Draft Local Plan</u>) 	To bring the Plan up-to-date
43	9.13	<p>Amend paragraph by deleting the following:</p> <p>The Design Guidance also includes site masterplanning guidance for the redevelopment of the village hall site and the adjoining "Bull Field" for a new village hall and housing. This element of the guidance now has no status in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	In response to comments
44	HAR 12	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>1. Integrate with existing paths, streets, circulation networks and patterns of activity, <u>including Public Rights of Way</u>;</p> <p>12. Incorporate necessary services and <u>sustainable</u> drainage infrastructure without causing unacceptable harm to retained natural features;</p> <p>15. Positively integrate energy <u>and water</u> efficient technologies;</p>	In response to comments
45	9.19	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>Birds End and The Wash, in particular, sit at the bottom of steep slopes and feature a stream running parallel with Birds End. The area has been subject to flooding on a number of occasions and the immediate vicinity along the course of the stream is designated as Flood Zone 3 as</p>	In response to comments

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
		<p>defined by the Environment Agency. Flood Zone 3 is the area most likely to flood from rivers. <u>The route of the stream is also a receptor for surface water and at high risk of surface water flooding with multiple flow paths that contribute to this risk. New developments in areas of surface water flood risk are also subject to sequential and exception testing in accordance with the criteria set out in the NPPF. Surface water flood risk is managed by the Lead Local Flood Authority (Suffolk County Council).</u> Wider areas along the course of the streams are also at medium and low risk of flooding. The flood risk areas, as identified by the Environment Agency, are illustrated on Map 6.</p>	
47	9.20	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>National planning policy restricts the type of development that can take place in the areas likely to flood. It is essential that development proposals do not add to this risk through creating surfaces where rainwater can run-off into the highway or neighbouring sites and create new or exacerbate existing surface water flooding problems. <u>New development should not increase flood risk off site, ideally limiting discharge rates to greenfield runoff rate (or 2 L/S whichever is higher) whilst observing the hierarchy of drainage discharge set by the Lead Local Flood Authority.</u> New development will be required, where appropriate, to make provision for the attenuation and recycling of surface water and rainwater through Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) that might include on-site rainwater and stormwater harvesting and greywater recycling, and the management of run-off and water management in order to reduce the potential for making the situation worse. <u>Development should be safe for its lifetime of the development, both in capacity and maintainability, not increase flow rate compared to a greenfield scenario and, where possible reduce flood risk overall. Proposals for development that provide upgrades to existing drainage in the area through additional SuDS and improvements to blue infrastructure will be encouraged. Developers should, as appropriate to the proposal, make reference to the Suffolk Sustainable Drainage System Guide 2023 when designing schemes.</u></p>	In response to comments
47	HAR 14	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Proposals <u>Any proposals</u> for new development, or the intensification of existing development in <u>areas that are at risk of flooding from any source should be</u>, in Flood Zones 2 and 3 should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment <u>and drainage strategy</u> and will not be permitted, unless the applicant has satisfied the safety requirements <u>in the Flood Risk of the National Planning Policy</u></p>	In response to comments

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
		<p>Guidance, the NPPF, Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, and the Local Planning Authority Sequential/Exception tests (where applicable). (and any successor).</p> <p>Proposals for all new development will be required to submit schemes appropriate to the scale of the proposal detailing how on-site surface water drainage and water resources will be managed so as not <u>increase flood risk in the surrounding area</u> to cause or exacerbate surface water and fluvial flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>Proposals should, as appropriate include the use of above-ground open Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wetland and other water features, <u>basins, swales, and raingardens,</u> which can help reduce flood risk whilst offering other benefits including water quality, amenity/ recreational areas, and biodiversity benefits; and • rainwater and stormwater harvesting and recycling; and other natural drainage systems where easily accessible maintenance can be achieved. 	
47	9.21	<p>Amend first sentence as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph 180 (e) <u>191 (c)</u> of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should “limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation”.</p>	To bring the Plan up-to-date
47	HAR 15	<p>Amend policy as follows:</p> <p>Dark skies are to be preferred over lighting while ensuring that new developments are secure in terms of occupier and vehicle safety. Any future outdoor lighting systems should have a minimum impact on the environment, minimising light pollution and adverse effects on wildlife, subject to highway safety, the needs of particular individuals or groups, and security. Schemes should reduce <u>minimise</u> the consumption of energy by promoting efficient outdoor lighting technologies, keeping the night-time skies dark and reducing glare.</p>	In response to comments
51	Community Action 14	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Gaps have been identified in the public rights of way network, including bride paths <u>bridleways</u> around the village and the Parish Council will seek to work with landowners and the County Council to create additional paths to complete the network.</p>	In response to comments

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
52-56	Policies Map and Inset Maps	Amend maps as follows: Important Views Key reference should be HAR9 Amend The Green Inset Map to identify listed buildings	In response to comments
62	Green spaces, views and character:	Delete following duplicated bullet point: • How does the proposal impact on existing views which are important to the area and how are these views incorporated in the design?	Correct error