

# Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 – part 5, paragraph 18

## Summary

1.1 Following an independent examination, Suffolk Coastal District Council now confirms that the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum subject to the modifications set out in section 3.

## 2. Background

2.1 Framlingham Town Council as the “qualifying body” successfully applied for Framlingham Parish to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area under The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The neighbourhood area was designated by Suffolk Coastal District Council on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2013.

2.2 The Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan was published by Framlingham Town Council for pre-submission consultation (Regulation 14) in January 2016

2.3 Following the submission of the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan (submission version) to Suffolk Coastal District Council, the plan was publicised and comments invited over a six week period which closed 31<sup>st</sup> August 2016.

2.4 Suffolk Coastal District Council, with the agreement of Framlingham Town Council appointed an independent examiner Mr Andrew Matheson MEd MPA DipTP MRTPI FCIH, to review the plan and to consider whether it met the Basic Conditions required by legislation and whether it should proceed to referendum.

2.5 The Examiners Report concluded that subject to modifications identified in the report, the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to Referendum. The Examiner further recommends that the referendum area should be the same as the designated neighbourhood area, which is the same as the administrative boundary for Framlingham Town Council parish.

2.6 Following receipt of the Examiners Report, legislation requires that Suffolk Coastal District Council consider each of the modifications recommended, the reasons for them, and decide what action to take.

### **3. Decision and Reasons**

3.1 Suffolk Coastal District Council, under powers delegated to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management, has considered each of the modifications recommended and concurs with the reasoning provided by the Examiner in his Report dated 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016. With the Examiner's recommended modifications, Suffolk Coastal District Council has decided (delegated decision dated 8<sup>th</sup> December 2016) that the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions mentioned in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and is compatible with the Convention rights and complies with provision made by or under Section 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. As a consequence, Suffolk Coastal District Council will modify the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan accordingly, for it then to proceed to referendum.

3.2 The Council has considered the referendum area and has decided there is no reason to extend the neighbourhood area for the purposed of referendum. The Referendum area will be the same as the designated Neighbourhood Area covering the entire parish of Framlingham.

3.3 The list of modifications and actions required are set out in the following table. As a consequence of these changes the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan (referendum version) has accordingly been re-formatted (paragraph numbers/page numbers, headers etc).

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> Add “2016-2031” to the cover page title and remove ‘Submission Stage Consultation (Regulation 16)’.</p>	<p>A neighbourhood plan must specify the period during which it is to have effect. I note that there is an early reference to the end date in the Plan at para 1.1, but I believe it would be helpful for the cover to include a clear reference to the period that the Plan will span.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with the recommendation</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> Delete the Foreword and amend the Contents page accordingly.</p>	<p>Since all consultations are complete the Foreword has become redundant and therefore should be deleted. The helpful pyramid diagram might suitably be relocated and referenced in para 1.5 – see recommendation 8.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation. Move diagram as suggested.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> Add an appropriate reference to “the ‘saved policies’ from the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan 2001” in para 1.1.</p>	<p>Setting out a brief background to the preparation of the Plan is helpful both to provide a context for the themed sections that follow but also to signpost to related documents with which the Plan ought to be read for completeness. Some modifications ought to be made for accuracy and to ensure that the wording is appropriate for the submission version (rather than for the previous consultations).</p> <p>Strictly speaking the development plan documents also include the ‘saved policies’ from the Suffolk Coastal Local</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation including ensuring that the text is appropriate for this version of the document.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
	Plan 2001.	
<b>Recommendation 4:</b> <i>Correct para 1.2 to read 'Qualifying Body' in place of 'Relevant Body'.</i>	The responsibility for Plan preparation rests with the 'Qualifying Body'	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with the recommendation.
<b>Recommendations 5 &amp; 6:</b> <i>Amend para 1.3 to say 'has been prepared' in place of 'is being prepared'.</i>  <i>Remove 'Submission Stage Consultation (Reg 16)' from the document header.</i>	The wording here needs to be updated to reflect the fact that the Plan is at submission stage, as does the page header for the whole document.	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with the recommendations.
<b>Recommendation 7:</b> <i>Amend the title of Figure 1.1 and the wording in para 1.4 to say 'Neighbourhood Area' in place of 'Neighbourhood Plan' area or boundary.</i>	As correctly stated in para 1.2, the map referenced here is to show the designated Neighbourhood Area and so the reference here and the title to the map (Figure 1.1) need to use those words.	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with the recommendation.
<b>Recommendation 8:</b> <i>Add in para 1.5 a reference to the suitably relocated and numbered (Figure 1.2) process pyramid diagram.</i>	As noted under recommendation 2, the helpful pyramid diagram might suitably be relocated and referenced in this paragraph.	This modification is already agreed under recommendation 2.
<b>Recommendation 9:</b> <i>Add to para 1.10: "Fuller details are included in the Consultation Statement, available to view through the Framlingham Town website: <a href="http://www.framlingham.com">www.framlingham.com</a>".</i>	This is the appropriate point to cross-refer to the Consultation Statement as a supporting document for the Plan.	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation
<b>Recommendation 10:</b> <i>Add a para 1.15: "Further details on the relationship between the 3 levels of planning documents are included in the Basic Conditions Statement, available to view on the</i>	This is the appropriate point to cross-refer to the Basic Conditions Statement as a supporting document for the Plan	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p>Framlingham Town website: www.framlingham.com”.</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 11:</b> <i>Devise and add a table summarising how each policy contributes toward the Plan objectives</i></p>	<p><b>How to read this document</b> This would be a helpful text box if only it were entirely true. The presaged ‘justifications’ for policies are not always clearly identifiable and no actual ‘summary of how each policy contributes toward the objectives of the plan’ has been included. It would be helpful if the promised summaries were devised and included in the final Plan document.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation and having regard to later recommendations / comments against individual policies.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 12:</b> <i>In para 2.1 remove the words ‘major trunk’ so that the end of the paragraph would simply read: “...and the only one west of the A12 road” .</i></p>	<p>Factual correction. I am advised that the A12 is not designated as a “trunk road” .</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 13:</b> <i>Amend the reference in para 2.2 to ‘Scheduled Ancient Monument’ to read ‘Scheduled Monument’.</i></p>	<p>As noted in one representation, the term Scheduled Ancient Monument is no longer used.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendations 14 &amp; 15:</b> <i>Include as Figure 2.1 and reference within para 2.8 the map of the Conservation Area and listed buildings (the boundary of the Conservation Area is defined here: <a href="http://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Design-and-Conservation/SCDC-Conservation-Area-Appraisals/FramlinghamCAASPDDecLoRes2013.pdf">http://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Design-and-Conservation/SCDC-Conservation-Area-Appraisals/FramlinghamCAASPDDecLoRes2013.pdf</a>).</i></p>	<p>I have sympathy with the representation that suggested that the Plan rather underplays the significance of the town’s heritage assets – this may not be so apparent to people who have the benefit of them every day.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<i>Amend the numbering of Figures after new Figure 2.1 in Section 2.</i>		
<b>Recommendation 16:</b> <i>Amend bullet point one in para 3.1 to: “Housing – identifying land to accommodate at least the minimum amount of housing required and then the most suitable locations for this, whilst ensuring it addresses the needs of Framlingham.”</i>	I am sure that the opening of the first bullet point on housing was meant to read ‘at least the minimum amount of housing required’	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation
<b>Recommendation 17:</b> <i>Delete sentences two and three from para 3.3.</i>	Paragraph 3.3 seems to relate mostly to completed community participation. All but the first sentence can now be deleted.	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.
<b>Recommendation 18:</b> <i>Move the table setting out non-policy actions from Section 16 to an Annex and amend the reference at para 3.6, the title to Section 16 and the Contents page accordingly.</i>	In accordance with Planning Practice Guidance (ref: 41-004-20140306) the parts of the document that relate to non-land use matters are “clearly identifiable” as Section 16 but I feel that they interrupt the flow of the Plan, coming between the main body and the important paragraphs on ‘Delivery and Plan Review’.	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.
<b>Recommendations 19, 20 &amp; 21:</b> <i>Rephrase and edit para 4.3 as: “The additional housing growth allocated in this Plan will be delivered on sites that meet the community’s preference for a small or medium size, up to 30 dwellings, since these provide best fit with the scale and grain of the town and its infrastructure. These site allocations reflect the</i>	The general purpose of the ‘physical limits boundary’ as set out in Policy SP19 in the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan is upheld here – and a reference to that might usefully be added under the Policy FRAM1 box as is done on other general Policies in the Plan.	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations, but note that the reference to the cemetery should correctly read (FRAM25)

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>preferred options as consulted upon with the community of Framlingham. The sites were included in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Plan policies (set out in detail in ‘Sustainability Appraisal incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment May 2016’).”</i></p> <p><i>Amend the Policy FRAM1 as: “The development of Framlingham town shall be focused within the physical limits boundary as now defined on the Policies Map.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals within the physical limits boundary will be supported where they are of a size appropriate to the scale and grain of the town (generally sites of up to 30 dwellings) and subject to compliance with the other policies in the development plan. Development proposals outside the physical limits boundary will not be permitted unless:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• they are in accordance with the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan policies on appropriate uses in the countryside; o</i></li> <li><i>• they relate to necessary utilities’ infrastructure and where no reasonable alternative location is available.”</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Add under the FRAM1 Policy box: “Relevant District Core Strategy Policy: SP19”.</i></p>	<p>Parts of the wording of para 4.3 are misleading or ambiguous in two respects. I can see that the sites were selected through the community consultation and that efforts have been made to ascertain that there is a reasonable certainty that the sites are deliverable and will be built out; reference also ought to be added to the work undertaken to give assurance that the allocated sites represent sustainable development. In allocating land to meet the required level of development, the Plan is showing how Framlingham’s needs are being or will be met; the Plan is not internally consistent if it does not accordingly extend the physical limits boundary (as you note should happen in para 4.2) to include all the development land on which it is relying over the Plan period (see the Recommendations later under ‘Proposals Map’ for further detail); the status of the adjacent countryside is not altered by this step.</p> <p>The boundary would not encompass the cemetery (FRAM28) or the education reserve site.</p> <p>This would also be the appropriate point to include the expectation, presently set</p>	

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
	out in para 12.8, that the community prefers and the Neighbourhood Plan is seeking to allocate sites that are small or medium in size.	
<p><b>Recommendation 22:</b>  <i>Rephrase para 5.4 as: “Since this time, Suffolk Coastal District Council has undertaken further work on providing a more detailed indication of the housing requirements for each of the market towns. In April and May 2016, it consulted on its “Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Local Plan” Proposed Submission Document which contains an indicative figure for Framlingham of 473 dwellings to be delivered over the plan period 2010 to 2027. By 2015 some 273 dwellings had either been built or had the benefit of planning permission, including land at Station Road for some 140 dwellings. This left a minimum of 200 dwellings to be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan. However, two planning consents were granted whilst the Plan was being completed: a recent appeal decision on land at Fairfield Road, although not a site promoted through the neighbourhood plan, will contribute some 163 dwellings; and a permission for 95 dwellings on land south of Mount Pleasant, a site supported in the draft Plan through exceptional circumstances, has</i></p>	<p>I find the numbers and the combination of the terms ‘in addition’ and ‘excludes’ in para 5.4 most confusing. The significant points are that the District Council is currently expecting that the Neighbourhood Plan will deliver at least 200 dwellings across the years 2015 to 2027 and that, even though the Plan extends to 2031, the planned allocations of additional land offer absolute assurance that this figure can be achieved.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance (ref: 41-009-20160211) says: “Neighbourhood plans should consider ..... allocating reserve sites to ensure that emerging evidence of housing need is addressed. This can help minimise potential conflicts and ensure that policies in the neighbourhood plan are not overridden by a new Local Plan”. Thus the Framlingham Plan can be seen to be following good practice</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>already commenced on site. Therefore the minimum indicative housing requirement has already been met although, particularly as this Plan extends beyond 2027 to 2031, there is still a benefit in the Plan identifying and allocating the preferred sites for future growth.”</i></p>		
<p><b>Recommendations 23, 24, 25 &amp; 26:</b>  <i>Delete para 5.6 (as it essentially repeats 5.4) and renumber subsequent paragraphs.</i></p> <p><i>Remove reference to ‘Land south of Mount Pleasant (FRAM 22)’ from the table that follows para 5.8 (and amend the column total), from Policy FRAM2 and from para 5.11.</i></p> <p><i>Amend the table that follows para 5.8 to show 30 dwellings for Land off Saxtead Road.</i></p> <p><i>Amend the opening sentence of Policy FRAM2 as follows: “Over the period 2015 to 2031, in addition to consents that pre-date this Plan, new residential development will be accommodated on the land now allocated as below, with the detail provided in the related Policy as referenced:.....”</i></p>	<p>As the site to the south of Mount Pleasant (FRAM22) has already commenced there is no value in including it here (indeed the detail may lead to confusion) and so the paragraphs from 5.6 onward need to be brought in line with that (see also my Recommendations later under ‘Proposals Maps’). The detail for Land off Saxtead Road (Policy FRAM20) does assure 30 dwellings over potentially two phases, so it is reasonable to show the total of 30 (not 20-30) for that site.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations including the need to have regard to the wording of paragraphs 5.6 onwards.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 27:</b>  <i>Amend the final paragraph of Policy FRAM3 as follows: “An alternative dwelling mix will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that more current evidence of need should apply or where the required mix would fundamentally compromise the viability of the development,</i></p>	<p>Given the 15 year time horizon of the Plan it is likely that the data informing Policy FRAM3 on housing mix will become outdated and so some accommodation for updating needs to be made.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<i>taking into account other requirements of the development.”</i>		
<p><b>Recommendation 28:</b>  <i>Rephrase para 5.18 as: “In a town with such a rich heritage, it is important that new development has appropriate regard for this heritage. The Conservation Area, listed buildings and their settings are protected by national and local policy. However, development outside these areas could still have a significant impact on Framlingham as an historic market town.”</i></p>	As written para 5.18 is confused as to the importance of the statutory protections.	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.
<p><b>Recommendation 29:</b>  <i>Rephrase para 5.23 as: “Developers are encouraged to share draft submissions in respect of their Building for Life 12 assessment at a pre-application stage.”</i></p>	Para 5.23 potentially misleads as to what pre-application consultation can achieve.	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.
<p><b>Recommendation 30:</b>  <i>Rephrase Policy FRAM4 as follows:  “Residential development proposals must demonstrate that they have addressed the requirements of the Building for Life 12 criteria, including appropriate regard for the Town’s heritage assets. Unless there are explicitly justified reasons why it is not possible, developments must achieve ‘excellent/exemplary’ scores for at least 10 of the 12 criteria.”</i></p>	As with the pre-amble, the Policy FRAM4 wording ought to make specific mention of the Town’s heritage assets.	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.
<p><b>Recommendation 31:</b>  <i>Delete paras 5.24, 5.25 and Policy FRAM5;</i></p>	The Ministerial Statement of March 2015 was clear that “local planning authorities	Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>renumber subsequent Policies and cross-references and amend the Contents page accordingly.</i></p>	<p>and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. This includes any policy requiring any level of the Code for Sustainable Homes to be achieved by new development". Accordingly and to avoid any confusion on the matter, Policy FRAM5 should be deleted.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendations 32, 33, 34 &amp; 35:</b>  <i>Amend Fig 6.1 and its key to illustrate with directional arrows the views being protected and add a note to qualify the value of the photographs as only limited representations of the views being protected. Incorporate the illustration within the (as renamed) Policies Map.</i></p> <p><i>Amend the details relating to each view so as to provide an unambiguous guide to what is being protected eg for View 1 it cannot be realistic to protect the view from along the whole length of College Road which is built up for significant lengths.</i></p>	<p>The significance of views is difficult to illustrate successfully; for instance the photographic view of the setting of St Michael's Church does not include the Church and the view of Market Hill is, necessarily, from only one direction. Para 6.2 and Policy FRAM 6 need to be absolutely clear what view(s) is being referred to.</p> <p>The map at Fig 6.1 ought to be a clearer guide to the protected views of which the photos can give only a partial representation ie there ought to be multiple arrows around the Church setting and a double-ended arrow for views along</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>Amend para 6.7 to refer to ‘Scheduled Monument’ in place of ‘Scheduled Ancient Monument’.</i></p> <p><i>Amend Policy FRAM6 to be explicit about the view(s) of Market Hill that is being protected</i></p>	<p>Market Hill (as well as a better description than merely ‘Market Hill’).</p> <p>The requirement is that the Policy must “provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency” (NPPF para 17)</p>	
<p><b>Recommendations 36, 37, 38 &amp; 39:</b></p> <p><i>Rewrite para 6.15 to present a complete picture of the national policy context.</i></p> <p><i>Delete the sites named as Victoria Mill Road and The Knoll from the Policy FRAM7 and the (as renamed) Policies Map. Number each remaining FRAM7 site within the text to match with the renumbered key to the map at Fig. 6.2. and rewrite the justifications so that each explicitly addresses the four national criteria.</i></p> <p><i>Amend the title of Policy FRAM7 to say: “DESIGNATION OF LOCAL GREEN SPACES”.</i></p> <p><i>Delete para 6.18 as it does not relate to the Local Green Spaces.</i></p>	<p>The pre-amble to Policy FRAM7 does not present a complete picture of the national policy expectations. The NPPF (para 77) specifies the criteria listed in Plan para 6.15: “The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space...”. Planning Policy Guidance adds: “If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space” (Ref: 37-011-20140306). The justification provided for each site must therefore explicitly address each criterion in turn, including any existing designation. I cannot conclude – both from the written details and a visual inspection - that an adequate case has been made or is possible for two of the sites as being “<i>demonstrably special</i>” and of “<i>particular</i></p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
	<p>local significance” (my emphases added)            Their inclusion could lead to every incidental piece of open ground, more of which are planned in the new developments, being seen as needing the same designation. The two sites which do not meet the Local Green Space criteria are Victoria Mill Road and The Knoll; the planning system more generally will still afford them the appropriate protection.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 40:</b>  <i>Replace the reference in para 6.18 to ‘Suffolk Coastal Green Infrastructure Strategy’ with “Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy, being prepared for Suffolk Coast District Council with three other local authorities”.</i></p>	<p>I am advised that the relevant emerging strategy referred to here is named the ‘Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy’, being prepared on behalf of four authorities which includes Suffolk Coastal District and which is due for completion March 2017.</p>	<p>This modification relates to a factual correction within paragraph 6.18. However, under recommendation 39, paragraph 6.18 is recommended for deletion. Agreeing to amend the plan in accordance with recommendation 39 negates the need to modify the plan in accordance with recommendation 40.</p>
<p><b>Recommendations 41 &amp; 42:</b>  <i>Add to para 7.2 a cross reference to the reserve site allocation in Section 11.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for additional or replacement education facilities (Use Class D1) will be supported where the site:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>is well located in relation to existing education facilities and the catchment area served;</i></li> <li>• <i>has safe and convenient access on foot and cycle; and</i></li> </ul>	<p>In the absence of a site specific proposal – although later mention is made of a reserve site – Policy FRAM8 effectively is the opportunity to provide the local context within which new education proposals will be assessed, but there is little useful detail provided.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>accommodates appropriate off-street parking in accordance with Policy FRAM18.”</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendation 43:</b>  Rewrite Policy FRAM9 as:  “Proposals for additional or replacement medical facilities (Use Class D1) will be supported where the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is well located in relation to the catchment area to be served;</li> <li>has safe and convenient access on foot and cycle; and</li> <li>accommodates appropriate off-street parking in accordance with Policy FRAM18.”</li> </ul>	<p>In the absence of a site specific proposal, the Policy FRAM9 effectively is the opportunity to provide the local context within which new medical facility proposals will be assessed, but there is little useful detail provided.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 44:</b>  Omit the reference within Policy FRAM10 to the ‘Land south of Mount Pleasant (Policy FRAM22)’.</p>	<p>The Policy FRAM10 helpfully provides a context for the obligations attached to the later housing site allocation – now singular as a result of the deletion of Policy FRAM 22.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendations 45 &amp; 46:</b>  Include in the pre-amble a suitable reference to more specific guidance eg  <a href="http://www.verdantearth.co.uk/community-growing-spaces/">http://www.verdantearth.co.uk/community-growing-spaces/</a></p> <p>Rewrite Policy FRAM11 as:  “As part of the pre-submission community consultation for all development proposals, developers are encouraged to explore with the</p>	<p>Plan policies must “provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency” (NPPF para 17).The NPPF also requires (para 173) that the sites and the scale of development identified in a plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>community the potential for inclusion of a community growing space of a size appropriate to the local community it would serve.”</i></p>	<p>threatened. The expectations of Policy FRAM11 are unclear as to the nature and scale – and therefore the potential costs - of the provision being sought; there is also some contradiction between the preamble which ‘encourages’ provision and the Policy which ‘requires’ it. Given that the later site allocation policies already include an obligation to provide a quantum of open space, growing spaces may form part of that provision at the choice of the local community.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 47:</b> <i>Rewrite Policy FRAM12 as: “Proposals for Class B1, B2 &amp; B3 employment uses will be supported, subject to specific site and traffic assessments, at the following locations identified as existing General Employment Areas on the Policies Maps:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Station Road Industrial Estate</i></li> <li>• <i>Woodbridge Road Industrial Estate</i></li> <li>• <i>Land between Fairfield Road and Station Road.”</i></li> </ul>	<p>Whilst it is evident that there is support in the Core Strategy for positive policies to update or replace the ‘saved policies’ that presently sit alongside it, some of the wording in Policy FRAM12 is unnecessarily obscure. I cannot identify any other policy that would justify the “unless otherwise stated” exclusion and a prospective developer would not wish to be faced with that dilemma.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 48:</b> <i>Amend Policy FRAM13 as: “Proposals to provide incubator/start-up business space on flexible terms will be supported, subject to specific site and traffic assessments, through:</i></p>	<p>The case for small-scale business premises has been convincingly made but the wording of the Policy FRAM13 is faulty in some parts.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>conversion of existing buildings across the Plan area; or</i></li> <li>• <i>provision of new buildings or conversion of existing buildings within the Framlingham physical limits boundary.”</i></li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendation 49:</b>  <i>Amend Policy FRAM14 as: “The development and expansion of tourism facilities, accommodation, attractions and activities connected with day and residential visitors will be supported where the following criteria can be met:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>there are demonstrable economic and social benefits of the proposals; and</i></li> <li>• <i>there is no significant detrimental impact on the existing community, and</i></li> <li>• <i>adequate provision for parking is included, particularly for proposals within or adjacent to the town centre; and</i></li> <li>• <i>for development of accommodation:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>if within the physical limits boundary, there is no detrimental impact upon (i) accessibility for traffic through the town, and (ii) the character or appearance of the conservation area or the setting of any listed building; or</i></li> <li>• <i>if outside the physical limits boundary,</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Core Strategy Policy SP8 recognises the area that includes Framlingham as having potential to absorb additional tourism. With some minor wording amendments Policy FRAM14 will have suitable clarity.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>the development is an appropriate use in the countryside.”</i></p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 50:</b>  <i>Rewrite Policy FRAM15 as: “To help ensure that residents can walk safely to Framlingham town centre, public transport facilities, schools and other important facilities serving the community of Framlingham, Walkway Routes have been shown on the Policies Map. All new developments must ensure safe pedestrian access to link up with existing pavements that directly connect with the Walkway Routes. Proposals to enhance the identified Walkway Routes will be supported. Development that is immediately adjacent to the Walkway Routes will be expected to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>ensure the retention and where possible the enhancement of the Walkway Route; and</i></li> <li>• <i>not have any detrimental impact on the Walkway Route, and assess and address the impact of the additional traffic movements on the safety and flow of pedestrians.”</i></li> </ul>	<p>It is very helpful that the Plan has identified the principal network of pedestrian routes that serve the town centre and inter-connect the community facilities. However, it is one thing to raise awareness of the importance of these but quite another to seek to place potentially significant burdens on new construction; certainly the S106 mechanism will rarely be appropriate for this purpose. You note that the Community Infrastructure Levy will become a suitable mechanism, subject to competing demands for available funds. For Policy FRAM15 to be sustainable and “provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency” (NPPF para 17) there needs to be more clarity and less complexity.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 51:</b>  <i>Rewrite Policy FRAM17 as: “All Transport Assessments (for larger sites) or Transport Statements (for smaller sites) - as required by Para 32 of the National Planning Policy</i></p>	<p>All policies must “provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency” (NPPF para 17). But Policy</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>Framework - should address to the satisfaction of the highway authority the cumulative transport impact on road junctions, in particular including the following, identified on Fig. 9.2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mount Pleasant/College Road</i></li> <li>• <i>College Road/Station Road/Bridge Street (Well Close Square)</i></li> <li>• <i>Fore Street/Station Road.</i></li> </ul>	<p>FRAM17 goes so far as to say that “proposals.....will be refused” if they, in some way which is undefined, have a “severe impact”. As with the Walking Routes above, it is one thing to raise awareness of the importance of traffic pinchpoints but quite another to seek to place potentially significant burdens solely on new construction. There are established methods for traffic assessments to be made and the highway authority is required to reach and justify conclusions. Accordingly Policy FRAM17 needs to be reworded to ensure that the basic conditions can be met.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 52:</b>  <i>Rewrite Policy FRAM18 as: “Development proposals should be designed to meet the parking standards contained in the Suffolk Advisory Parking Guidance, or any subsequent document; this includes the provision of unallocated/visitor parking spaces and cycle parking spaces.  Development that results in the loss of existing off- or on-street parking will be required to re-provide at least the same number of parking spaces in the immediate proximity of where the spaces would be lost.”</i></p>	<p>Whilst Policy FRAM18 is generally clear in intent, it could helpfully be simplified.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><b>Recommendations 53 &amp; 54:</b>  <i>Amend para 10.5 to: "Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Saved Policy AP56 (Town Centre) sought to reflect this approach and it is proposed that the wording of this policy is retained but updated to reflect current guidance."</i></p> <p><i>Rewrite Policy FRAM19 as: "In order to offer a choice of modes of transport, particularly for people who do not have the use of a car, Framlingham Town Centre – as defined on the Policies Map - is the preferred location for main town centre uses other than ancillary retail uses or farm shops (para 23 of the NPPF). If for a particular proposal it can be demonstrated that no suitable and viable sites exist in the Town Centre, then sites of the edge of the Town Centre may be considered appropriate, provided they are well connected to the Town Centre."</i></p>	<p>Para 10.5 needs to be amended for accuracy. Policy FRAM19 needs to include a specific reference to its definition of a Town Centre boundary.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 55:</b>  <i>Amend the map showing the Thomas Mills High School Area to include the new housing and employment development allocations (but not the reserve education site) within the physical limits boundary.</i></p>	<p>The map at the beginning of this section needs to be amended to include the new development allocations within the physical limits boundary. I understand that the parcel of land between the housing allocation (FRAM20) and the employment allocation (FRAM21) has the benefit of a 2015 consent for housing (DC13/3234/OUT) and so the boundary can</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
	be extended continuously to include all three sites.	
<p><b>Recommendations 56 &amp; 57:</b>  <i>Amend para 11.9 to:            “If the site is to be brought forward for a mix of school parking (approximately 20 spaces) and residential use, then it is expected to be suitable to accommodate approximately 20 dwellings, with the balance of 10 dwellings replacing the parking as phase 2. If however, it is demonstrated that school parking is not required then up to 30 dwellings are possible from the outset. Any development proposal must ensure that a full assessment of the requirement for parking accompanies a planning application. It will also be important that the design of the parking provision considers the amenity of local residents, both existing and from the new housing development.”</i></p> <p><i>Amend the Policy FRAM20 to:            “Land off Saxtead Road (opposite Thomas Mills High School) (approximately 0.9 hectares as identified on the Policies Map) is allocated for housing; proposals for up to 30 dwellings incorporating temporary parking for use by the High School will be supported subject to the following criteria:</i></p>	<p>As noted in my comments on Section 5 (Housing) above, since the need for parking is acknowledged to be temporary (if at all) then it is appropriate that the site is allocated for up to 30 dwellings, albeit that the total may be reached over two phases. The confusion created by differences between paras 11.8 and 11.9 needs to be resolved. The purpose of the Policy is to allocate land for housing.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a mix of dwelling sizes is provided in accordance with Policy FRAM3; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the design of the dwellings is in accordance with Policy FRAM4; and</i></li> <li>• <i>affordable housing is provided to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy DM2; and</i></li> <li>• <i>up to 20 temporary car parking spaces to serve the needs of the staff of Thomas Mills High School are provided unless it can be demonstrated that this car parking is not required; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate vehicle and cycle access into the site from the B1119; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate pedestrian access in accordance with Policy FRAM15; and</i></li> <li>• <i>an assessment of traffic impacts in accordance with Policies FRAM15 &amp; FRAM17; and</i></li> <li>• <i>appropriate landscaping is provided on the southern boundary to ensure that the development does not provide a 'hard' urban edge to the entrance to the town; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the retention of the existing mature tree belt along the eastern boundary of the</i></li> </ul>		

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p>site; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a scheme of archaeological evaluation is provided, followed by appropriate mitigation; and</li> <li>• the provision of publicly accessible green space within the site in accordance with the requirements of Strategic Policy SP16 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan; and</li> <li>• ☒ the impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building is assessed and addressed.”</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendation 58:</b> Amend the opening sentence of Policy FRAM21 to: <i>Land to the west of New Street (approximately 2.8 hectares as identified on the Policies Map) is allocated for Class B1 employment uses; suitable proposals will be supported subject to the following criteria:...</i>”</p>	<p>The purpose of Policy FRAM21 is to allocate land for employment.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendations 59 &amp; 60</b> <i>Either add the content of the Reserve Site Policy, appropriately, within Policy FRAM8 and provide a cross-reference at this point in the Plan;</i>  <i>Or, make the Reserve Site Policy FRAM22 in place of the now deleted content (see below).</i>  <i>Amend para 11.3 to show Suffolk County Council as the “Local Education Authority” not</i></p>	<p>It is not clear to me why this particular Policy has been omitted from the numerical referencing system – perhaps it was a late addition? If that was the issue then there are two alternative ways to regularise this.</p>	<p>Potential options discussed with Town Council who have confirmed their preference to make the reserve site Policy FRAM22. Agree. Amend plan in accordance with Town Council preference and paragraph 11.3 as per examiner recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p>the 'provider'.</p>		
<p><b>Recommendations 61, 62 &amp; 63:</b>  Delete the heading 'Land south of Mount Pleasant' and the related paragraphs 12.2 to 121.8 and Policy FRAM22 and renumber subsequent Policies.  Amend the related 'West Framlingham' map to delete references to FRAM22 and show the 'land south of Mount Pleasant' with a colour and key that matches that used on the Policies Maps (see later Recommendations under 'Proposals Maps').  Add to the introductory para 12.1 as follows:  "The site to the south of Mount Pleasant was granted a planning consent during the preparation of this Plan and construction commenced during 2016."</p>	<p>As noted above under Policy FRAM2, as a planning consent for the site has already been granted and, at the time of my visit, construction was proceeding apace this site should be deleted at this point but shown as a site with an existing permission on the Policies Maps – see my Recommendations later under 'Proposals Maps'.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendations 64 &amp; 65:</b>  Delete para 12.14 (and renumber the subsequent paragraph).   Amend Policy FRAM23 as: "Land off Vyces Road/ Brook Lane (approximately 0.8 hectares identified on the Policies Map) is allocated for a community centre (Use Class D1) and housing; proposals for a community centre with associated parking and up to 15 dwellings will be supported subject to the following criteria:</p>	<p>The purpose of the Policy FRAM23 is to allocate land for a community centre and housing. The criteria as stated are confused as to the provision of affordable housing. I note that a planning permission has now been granted for almshouses as the housing element of this site (ref: DC15/0960/FUL) and so the speculative paragraph 12.14 can be deleted</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the design of the dwellings is in accordance with the requirements of Policy FRAM4; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the community centre provides a large meeting space and self-contained activity space for youth activities and associated facilities; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the dwellings are provided as affordable units with a mechanism to retain them in perpetuity for people with a proven local connection to Framlingham, to be secured by a suitable legal agreement; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate pedestrian access in accordance with Policy FRAM15; and</i></li> <li>• <i>an assessment of traffic impacts in accordance with Policy FRAM17; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate off-street parking in accordance with Policy FRAM18; and</i></li> <li>• <i>a scheme of archaeological evaluation is provided, followed by appropriate mitigation.”</i></li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendation 66:</b>  <i>Amend Policy FRAM24 as: “Land at the Green Shed, Fore Street (approximately 0.22 hectares as identified on the Policies Map) is allocated for housing; proposals for up to 8 dwellings will be</i></p>	<p>The purpose of Policy FRAM24 is the reallocation of land for housing. I note that the site borders the Conservation Area and therefore specific mention of that factor ought to be included.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>supported subject to the following criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>it provides a mix of dwelling sizes in accordance with Policy FRAM3; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the design of the dwellings is in accordance with the requirements of Policy FRAM4 and with appropriate regard for the adjacent Conservation Area; and</i></li> <li>• <i>it provides an appropriate scheme to deal with parking in accordance with Policy FRAM 18; and</i></li> <li>• <i>a scheme of archaeological evaluation is provided, followed by appropriate mitigation.</i></li> </ul>	<p>To meet the basic conditions this Policy has to have appropriate regard for national Policy which, after a clarification in the Court of Appeal, exempts sites of 10 dwellings or fewer from the obligation to provide affordable housing (ref: 23b-031-20160519); the NPPF will override any other obligation set down in the Suffolk Coastal Core Strategy; accordingly the affordable housing obligation must be removed.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 67:</b>  <i>Amend the opening sentence of Policy FRAM25 to:</i>  <i>“Land to the south of The Mowbrays (approximately 2.4 hectares as identified on the Policies Map) is allocated for use as an extension to the cemetery to provide additional burial space, subject to a scheme of archaeological evaluation, followed by appropriate mitigation.”</i></p>	<p>The purpose of the Policy FRAM25 is to allocate land for a cemetery.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 68:</b>  <i>Amend the map for South Framlingham to show the up-to-date land use and physical boundary limit positions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the land between Station Terrace and</i></li> </ul>	<p>The map provided in this section needs to be a fair reflection of the policy context and so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the land between Station Terrace and Victoria Mill Road should not be identified as a general employment</li> </ul>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>Victoria Mill Road should not be identified as a general employment area as there is a consent for housing (already under construction); and</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the land off Fairfield Road with a permission for housing needs to be shown with a colour and key that matches that used on the Policies Maps; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the physical limits boundary needs to include the development allocations made in the Plan</i></li> </ul>	<p>area as there is a consent for housing (already under construction); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the land off Fairfield Road with a permission for housing needs to be shown with a colour and key that matches that used on the Policies Maps (see later Recommendations under 'Proposals Maps').</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Recommendation 69:</b>  <i>Amend Policy FRAM26 as: “Land off Victoria Mill Road (approximately 2.6 hectares as identified on the Policies Map) is allocated for housing for the second half of the Plan period (after 2025); proposals for approximately 30 dwellings will be supported subject to the following criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>it provides a mix of dwelling sizes in accordance with Policy FRAM3; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the design of the dwellings is in accordance with the requirements of Policy FRAM4; and</i></li> <li>• <i>affordable housing is provided to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy DM2; and</i></li> </ul>	<p>The purpose of Policy FRAM26 is the allocation of land for housing. Since this site extends the town boundary, is in an area which already has a concentration of new housing and sufficient land has already been allocated beyond the indicative required level, it may be appropriate to select this site for release later in the Plan period ie in the second half from 2026 onward; this could be accommodated as follows (but if an immediate allocation is preferred then simply omit 'for the second half of the Plan period (after 2025)'</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommended wording. The Town Council has confirmed its agreement to this option.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>if possible, the provision of a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP); and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of publicly accessible green space within the site in accordance with the requirements of Strategic Policy SP16 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate vehicle access into the site from Victoria Mill Road; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate pedestrian access in accordance with Policy FRAM15; and</i></li> <li>• <i>an assessment of traffic impacts in accordance with Policy FRAM17; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate off-street parking in accordance with Policy FRAM 18; and</i></li> <li>• <i>a scheme of archaeological evaluation is provided, followed by appropriate mitigation.”</i></li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendation 70:</b>  <i>Amend Policy FRAM27 as: “Land at the former Station Road allotments (approximately 0.34 hectares as identified on the Policies Map) is allocated for housing; proposals for up to 15 dwellings will be supported subject to the following criteria:</i></p>	<p>The purpose of Policy FRAM27 is the reallocation of land for housing.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>it provides a mix of dwelling sizes in accordance with Policy FRAM3; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the design of the dwellings is in accordance with the requirements of Policy FRAM4; and</i></li> <li>• <i>affordable housing is provided to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy DM2; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of publicly accessible green space within the site in accordance with the requirements of Strategic Policy SP16 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate vehicle access into the site; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate pedestrian access in accordance with Policy FRAM15; and</i></li> <li>• <i>an assessment of traffic impacts in accordance with Policy FRAM17; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate off-street parking in accordance with Policy FRAM18; and</i></li> <li>• <i>a scheme of archaeological evaluation is provided, followed by appropriate mitigation.</i></li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendation 71:</b> Amend Policy FRAM28 as: “Land off</p>	<p>The purpose of Policy FRAM28 is the allocation of land for employment uses,</p>	<p>Agree. Amend wording in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>Woodbridge Road (approximately 3.7 hectares as identified on the Policies Map) is allocated for employment uses; proposals for Use Class B employment developments will be supported subject to the following criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the introduction of soft landscaping on all boundaries of the site, in particular ensuring that the development has acceptable impact on its setting; and</i></li> <li>• <i>an assessment of traffic impacts in accordance with Policy FRAM17; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of a scheme of archaeological evaluation, followed by appropriate mitigation.”</i></li> </ul>	<p>the need having been established in Section 8.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 72:</b>  <i>Amend Policy FRAM29 as: “Land at the old Gas Works site, College Road (0.13 hectares as identified on the Policies Map) is allocated for housing; proposals for up to 7 dwellings will be supported subject to the following criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the design of the dwellings is in accordance with the requirements of Policy FRAM4, sympathetic to the surrounding dwellings and with appropriate regard to the adjacent Conservation Area; and</i></li> <li>• <i>in this central location a high density development providing small dwellings will be supported and therefore the</i></li> </ul>	<p>The purpose of Policy FRAM29 is the reallocation of land for housing. I note that the site borders the Conservation Area and therefore specific mention of that factor ought to be included. To meet the basic conditions Policy FRAM29 has to have appropriate regard for national Policy which, after a clarification in the Court of Appeal, exempts sites of 10 dwellings or fewer from the obligation to provide affordable housing (ref: 23b-031-20160519); the NPPF will override any other obligation set down in the Suffolk Coastal Core Strategy; accordingly the affordable housing</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>requirements of Policy FRAM3 will not apply; and</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate vehicle access into the site; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate pedestrian access in accordance with Policy FRAM15; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the provision of appropriate off-street parking in accordance with Policy FRAM18.”</i></li> </ul>	<p>obligation must be removed.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 73:</b>  <i>Move the table setting out non-policy actions from Section 16 to an Annex and amend the reference at para 3.6, the title to Section 16 and the Contents page accordingly.</i></p>	<p>Whilst the parts of the document that relate to non-land use matters are “clearly identifiable” within Section 16 (Planning Practice Guidance ref: 41-004-20140306), I feel that they interrupt the flow of the Plan, coming between the main body and the important paragraphs on ‘Delivery and Plan Review’.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendations 74, 75, 76 &amp; 77:</b>  <i>Amend the title on p 73 from ‘Proposals Maps’ to “Policies Maps”.</i></p> <p><i>Add on the map the two housing areas (Fairfield Road and to the south of Mount Pleasant) with an existing consent that count toward meeting the local housing requirement; show these on the Key as “FRAM2: Land with existing residential permission”.</i></p>	<p>These maps no longer represent ‘proposals’ but, subject to the outcome of the referendum, are the illustration of the local policies applying in Framlingham; accordingly the maps need to be retitled, as well as being complete and accurate. The Policies Maps need to show all the land allocations which assure general conformity with the strategic policies in the Local Plan and that the objectively assessed level of housing need is being</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendations</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><i>Incorporate the (amended) illustration of Policy FRAM6.</i></p> <p><i>Make the amends arising from earlier Recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>alter the line of the 'physical limits boundary';</i></li> <li>• <i>add to the key the appropriate Policy number for the Education Reserve Site;</i></li> <li>• <i>remove the two Local Green Spaces that do not match the criteria;</i></li> <li>• <i>remove the General Employment Area off Station Terrace that is now housing.</i></li> </ul>	<p>met; these two sites at Fairfield Road and to the south of Mount Pleasant can be shown as "FRAM2: Land with existing residential consent".</p> <p>I note that the maps have not picked up from Policy FRAM6 (as amended by my recommendations).</p> <p>Changes arising from other earlier recommendations need to be picked up.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 78:</b></p> <p><i>Correct the definition of the Local Plan to: "The planning policy document adopted by Suffolk Coastal District Council in 2013. This addresses strategic planning matters and the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Local Plan.</i></p>	<p>Correction and clarification</p>	<p>Agree. Amend plan in accordance with recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 79:</b></p> <p><i>Recheck the 'saved policy' position with Suffolk Coastal District Council and amend Appendix B to be accurate accordingly.</i></p>	<p>My understanding is that the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan will supersede more 'saved policies' than those listed, namely AP28, AP51, AP138 and AP139.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend Appendix B. Re- title Suffolk Coastal Local Plan "Saved Policies" Which No Longer Apply To The Neighbourhood Plan Area. List those policies which are Framlingham specific and which will be superseded once the plan is "made" and those which will no longer apply within the plan area.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Examiners reason for the change	Action by SCDC
		A number of saved policies such as AP28 are still relevant to other neighbourhood plan areas and will not be fully superseded until the last relevant neighbourhood plan is “made”. The recommended change provides clarification
<p><b>Recommendation 80:</b>  <i>Correct the Basic Conditions Statement para 5.2 to omit the reference to a SCDC screening document.</i></p>	<p>Drafting error. During the course of my Examination I noted a discrepancy between the documents provided to me and the Basic Conditions Statement. The latter refers (para 5.2) to “a screening process in respect of the need for an SEA and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)” prepared by Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) “included in the submission documents”. On querying this I was advised that this reference was a drafting error and that, in view of the commitment at the start of the plan-making to undertake a full SEA, another document was not required.</p>	<p>Agree. Correct Basic Conditions Statement in accordance with recommendation.</p>

The Council further agrees with the examiner in terms of his conclusion under the heading “Other matters raised in representations” (page25) that there is no checklist of content that a Neighbourhood Plan must contain or subject matter that it must address. It is not the role of the examiner to recommend additional content.

Under the section European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) Obligations the Council agrees with the examiners conclusion (page 26) that the Framlingham Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with EU obligations and that it does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR.

In respect of the final paragraph Referendum Area it is noted that there is a typographical error. The date the neighbourhood area was approved by Suffolk Coastal District Council was 29<sup>th</sup> October 2013 not 2012.

Cllr Tony Fryatt  
Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Planning

Dated: 8<sup>th</sup> December 2016

