

# **MUTFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Communicating with the Residents .....	3
Public events and consultation activities.....	4
Village survey .....	4
Key findings of survey: .....	4
Other public engagement .....	4
Contact with statutory consultees.....	6
Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation .....	7
Open meeting .....	7
Distribution to Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultees .....	7
Responses to the pre-submission consultation .....	8
Appendices.....	10
Appendix A – Letter of Introduction (5 <sup>th</sup> May 2017).....	10
Appendix B – Results of the Village survey .....	13
Appendix C – Printed flyer for Public Meeting (November 2017) distributed to every household in Village.....	18
Appendix D – Printed flyer for Mutford Village Fete (7-8 July 2018).....	19
Appendix E – Pre-submission consultation: List of consultees contacted for feedback .....	20
Appendix F – Pre-submission consultation: Covering letter sent to residents with final draft Mutford Plan (1 <sup>st</sup> December 2018) .....	21
Appendix G – Pre-submission consultation: Email sent to statutory consultees .....	22
Appendix H – Pre-submission consultation: Comments/ concerns and action(s) taken (Listed in chronological order).....	23

## **Introduction**

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan ('the Mutford Plan').

The legal basis of this Consultation Statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:

- contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- explain how they were consulted;
- summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

The policies contained in the Mutford Plan are community-led, based on the findings of a village survey, public engagement and other evidence.

The need for a Mutford Neighbourhood Plan was unanimously approved at the Annual Parish Meeting in May 2016. Waveney District Council agreed the parish of Mutford to be the designated area for the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan in September 2016.

During the preparation of the plan, a group of volunteers – the 'Working Party', consisting of residents and representatives of Mutford Parish Council, met on an ad hoc basis at the village hall or a member's home to review progress. At least one member of the working group also attended the monthly meetings of the Mutford Parish Council, to answer any questions about the preparation of the draft Mutford Plan.

## **Communicating with the Residents**

An initial 'Letter of Introduction' was distributed to every household in the parish in May 2017 – see Appendix A. This was accompanied by roadside notice boards being erected on all approach roads into Mutford.

The Parish website <http://mutford.suffolk.cloud/new-content-page/> provided updates on the progress of the Plan, and any special events held as part of the consultation process.

A free community newsletter was launched in September 2018, as a direct response to feedback from the village survey which identified that there was a desire amongst residents to know more about events and activities within the village. It also communicated progress on the preparation of the plan, encouraged participation and made residents aware of recent planning applications and their determinations.

The newsletter – Mutford News – is produced and distributed by volunteers; printing costs are funded for the first year by a grant from the Waveney Community Enabling Fund and Mutford Parish Council.

An update on progress of the Neighbourhood Plan was also provided at every monthly meeting of the Parish Council, and the bimonthly meetings of the Parochial Church Council

## Public events and consultation activities

A combination of qualitative and quantitative research was undertaken to provide a sound evidence base for the policies and supporting text contained within the Mutford Plan.

### Village survey

A village survey was designed by the Working Party. All households (216 homes, based on the 2011 Census) and eight businesses registered in the parish were invited to take part in the survey, which was open for a period of eight weeks in September and October 2017. The survey was available both online and as a paper copy.

In total, 130 questionnaires were returned from 122 households – a response rate of 56% of all households in the parish. Results of the survey were collated via SurveyMonkey, an online survey tool.

### Key findings of survey:

- More than 90% of respondents considered it important to maintain the rural character of the parish, protect local wildlife habitats and retain the detached nature of the village.
- At least 90% of respondents felt that access to woodlands, fields, green spaces, footpaths, and wild flowers in the parish were important.
- Almost half of respondents supported small new developments of 1-2 homes; only 22% supported larger housing developments of 5+ homes.
- There was a strong preference – by 86% of respondents - for homes of between 1 and 3 bedrooms.
- In reference to the proposed new development sites<sup>1\*</sup> in Mutford, respondents to the survey commented on the potentially negative impact of additional traffic on narrow lanes, existing poor infrastructure including sewerage and drainage, and the potential for flooding across the roads from surface-water at those sites.
- There was no clear support for any specific alternative sites within the parish. Options included alternative sites on Chapel Road (both towards St Andrews, and near St Michael, in Rushmere); Mill Road; Hulver Road; and Church Road.

See Appendix B for further details of the survey, including the questionnaire and summary of responses.

### Other public engagement

The need for a Neighbourhood Plan for Mutford was first discussed at the Annual Parish Meeting in May 2016. Residents had expressed concern about possible future housing developments in the parish following an invitation from Waveney District Council to local landowners to identify land for possible future development as part of their initial work on the Waveney Local Plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time of the village survey, the draft Local Plan identified two sites for new housing in Mutford. The final draft Local Plan reduced the allocation to 'approximately six homes' on one site north of Chapel Road (policy WLP7.13).

Date	Event
22 May 2017	<p><b>Annual Parish Meeting</b> – 51 members of public attended.</p> <p>Neil Glendinning, Chair of MNP working group, provided an update on progress of the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan. Residents present expressed concern about the proposed location of the new housing allocation for Mutford, in the draft Local Plan.</p>
25 Nov 2017	<p><b>Public meeting</b> - 56 members of the public attended</p> <p>Neil Glendinning, Chair of MNP working group, summarised key findings of the village survey.</p> <p>Points raised by members of the public included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of AONB designation</li> <li>• Lack of comprehensive environmental survey for the proposed site allocation for new housing.</li> <li>• Need to avoid large estate of new housing such as has been developed in nearby Carlton Colville</li> <li>• Lack of bus service</li> <li>• Interest in village newsletter</li> </ul>
25 May 2018	<p><b>Annual Parish Meeting</b> – 26 members of the public attended.</p> <p>Neil Glendinning (NG), Chair MNP working group, outlined progress of the Mutford Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 sets of 3 x A1-sized posters listing the 9 current draft policies, were displayed in the Village Hall.</li> <li>• NG provided a summary of the policies, the possible NP process &amp; timeline going forward, culminating in a referendum 'end 2018/ early 2019'</li> <li>• There was positive endorsement of the draft policies proposed in the draft MNP output to date.</li> <li>• There was agreement that the draft policies were appropriate.</li> <li>• A few questions were raised about the development site north of Chapel Road, as proposed by the draft Final Local Plan.</li> </ul>
7-8 July 2018	<p><b>Stand at Village Fete</b></p> <p>Volunteer members of the working group manned a stand at the fete, held in the Village Hall and playing fields over two days. The event included a popular Scarecrow Hunt, which attracted around 500 people across the 2 days.</p> <p>See Appendix D for flyer.</p> <p>A few residents asked general questions, but only one new comment was posted, noting importance of retaining hedgerows</p>

12 January 2019	<p><b>Pre-submission consultation - Open Meeting</b></p> <p>The event was publicised in the covering letter to the final draft Mutford Plan, which was distributed to every household and registered business in Mutford.</p> <p>The event was also billed in two issues of the Mutford News – the monthly community newsletter.</p> <p>Neil Glendinning, Chair of the MNP Working Party, and other members of working group attended the meeting at Mutford Village Hall. 11am – 1pm.</p> <p>10 residents attended.</p> <p>Comments were unanimously positive.</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification sought on level of protection against development for land identified by MNP.1; specifically, whether ‘exceptional circumstances’ would still apply</li> <li>• Potential future use of brownfield sites within Mutford</li> <li>• Inappropriate use/ change of use of land; for example, light industrial to heavy industrial use</li> <li>• Concern about location of Waveney Local Plan’s allocation of approximately six new homes in Mutford, and request for more information on timing of approval.</li> </ul>
-----------------	---

### Contact with statutory consultees

Four face-to-face meetings<sup>2</sup> were held between the Mutford Plan working group and representatives of East Suffolk planning department.

On behalf of the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan working group, East Suffolk planners undertook a Screening Determination in October 2018, which concluded:

*“It is considered by Waveney District Council in consultation with Natural England, Environment Agency and Historic England that it is not necessary for a Strategic Environmental Assessment to be undertaken of the draft Mutford Neighbourhood Plan to ensure compliance with EU obligations.”*

Suffolk County Council Highways department was consulted on car parking guidelines and design guidance.

---

<sup>2</sup> Four meetings were held in Mutford with planners from Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils (9<sup>th</sup> May 2018, 1<sup>st</sup> June 2018; 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018 and 12<sup>th</sup> October 2018).

## **Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation**

Mutford Parish Council approved the final draft Mutford Plan on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2018.

The pre-submission consultation was launched on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2018 and ran for eight weeks – closing on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2019.

A printed copy was delivered to every household in the parish (total 216 homes), with a covering letter inviting residents to provide feedback. See Appendix F for a copy of this letter.

Copies of the final draft Plan were also sent to nine local businesses (See Appendix E for a list of the businesses) and emailed to statutory consultees and neighbouring Parish Councils (see below).

The consultation was publicised on the parish website (<http://mutford.suffolk.cloud>), a notice was posted on the Parish noticeboard outside the Village Hall and an item was included in the monthly community newsletter (Mutford News), which is hand-delivered to every household in the parish.

### **Open meeting**

An Open Meeting was held on Saturday 12<sup>th</sup> January 2019 in Mutford Village Hall, during the pre-submission consultation period. The meeting was publicised via Mutford News, and on roadside notice boards placed on the approaches to the village.

Volunteer members of working group were on hand to discuss the final draft Plan. A leaflet was available, which explained the next steps.

A total of 10 residents attended the event and six responses were received verbally and recorded by members of the Working Party for submission into the consultation.

### **Distribution to Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultees**

In accordance with requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, relevant statutory consultees were notified by email, with a pdf of the final draft Mutford Plan.

In addition, six neighbouring Parish Councils who were considered to have an interest in the plan were also written to.

All parties were advised that hard copies could be issued on request.

The full list of statutory consultees that were written to is as follows:

- Waveney District Council
- Suffolk County Council
- Natural England
- Historic England
- Environment Agency
- Suffolk Preservation Society

A copy of the letter emailed to the consultees is shown in Appendix G.

### Non-statutory consultees

The following Parish Councils were invited to comment on the final draft Plan.

- Barnby
- Carlton Colville
- Shadingfield, Sotterley, Willingham and Ellough Joint Parish Council
- Gisleham
- Henstead
- North Cove

### Responses to the pre-submission consultation

Overall, 17 respondents – including statutory consultees and residents, provided feedback on the final draft Mutford Plan.

In total, 74 individual comments were passed to the Working Party. All comments were taken into consideration in the preparation of the Submission version of the Mutford Plan.

Consultees	Invited	Respondents	Comments
Residents (households)	216	8	9
Statutory consultees	6	5	50
Local Parish Councils	6	2	9
Local businesses	9	0	0
Other	1	2	6
Totals	238	17	74

The five most significant changes to the Plan, in direct response to feedback, were:

1. MNP.2 – Conserving the setting of the Church.  
The wording of the policy and supporting text was amended. A separate doc – ‘Additional photographic evidence and maps’ was created, on the recommendation of Historic England.
2. List of ‘exceptional circumstances’ for development in the Open Countryside moved from Annex B to Section 5.
3. MNP.6 – Infill outside settlement boundaries  
The policy, which was in the final draft Plan (v11.0) was removed, and subsequent policies renumbered.
4. MNP.8 - Off-road parking  
Feedback from Suffolk Highways was considered; the wording of the policy was re-worded to reflect the fact that a ‘minimum of two car spaces’ was over and above Suffolk Parking Guidance minimum.



5. MNP.9 Rural tourism accommodation

The policy title was amended: ‘...within converted buildings’, to reinforce the fact that the policy was not in conflict with the Local Plan. The definition of ‘permanent structure’ was amended, with ‘long-standing’ replaced by ‘at least 5 years’.

See Appendix H for the full list of the 74 comments received, and action(s) taken following discussion with Mutford Parish Council.

## Appendices

### Appendix A – Letter of Introduction (5<sup>th</sup> May 2017)



## Mutford Neighbourhood Plan

Have your say about the future of Mutford

Dear Mutford Resident,

At the 2016 Parish Council AGM, residents voted that Mutford should have its own neighbourhood plan.

#### **What is a neighbourhood plan and why should you care?**

A neighbourhood plan gives Mutford residents a chance to protect the special character of the parish. It says what sort of housing and development is suitable for the parish over the next decade. To write it, we need you to tell us your views by responding to a questionnaire.

The completed neighbourhood plan document must be approved by Waveney District Council, and then voted for by you, the parish residents. If the vote is in favour, then the neighbourhood plan is adopted.

After that, the neighbourhood plan must be used by the District Council when considering planning decisions. So having a neighbourhood plan gives the parish additional protection from inappropriate housing development.

#### **What You can do.**

If you reply to this letter, we will send you the questionnaire during June. If you have any questions, or would prefer to give your answers face to face, we can either visit you or you can attend one of several open mornings at the village hall.

If you want to receive the questionnaire, please provide your details and either return this letter or send us an email with your contact details.


We welcome any advance comments you may have now about the neighbourhood plan or future developments in the parish.

If you have any questions the Neighbourhood Plan Team will be available at the Annual Parish Meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> May in the Village Hall.

**If You do not wish to be involved.**

Just return the contact page or email us and we will not send you any more information. You can change your mind at any time, and you will still be eligible to vote when the plan is ready for approval by the parish.

**More information and updates**

- News, background information and updates are available on the Mutford parish website: <http://mutford.onesuffolk.net/neighbourhood-plan/>
-  Find us on Facebook - follow the **Mutford Neighbourhood Plan** page.
- **Not on the internet?** Please tick the box on the contact page to let us know you would like paper copies of the information.

**Thank you for taking the time to complete and return your details**

***The Mutford Neighbourhood Plan Team*****Who are the Neighbourhood Plan Team?**

The Neighbourhood Plan Team are a group of residents of Mutford who have volunteered to help create the Neighbourhood plan.

The Parish Council will support the team throughout the process.

We are:

John Armstrong	Hulver Road	Clerk & Resident
Sara Barratt	Holly Lane	Resident
Pam Cross	Mill Road	Resident
Neil Glendinning	Chapel Road	Parish Council & Resident
Paul Randle	Church Road	Parish Council and Resident
Herbert Tonkin	Church Road	Resident
Tim Twineham	Mutfordwood Lane	Resident



## Mutford Neighbourhood Plan

Have your say about the future of Mutford

### CONTACT DETAILS

Please confirm the names and if applicable email addresses of registered voters in your household who wish to be sent the questionnaire.

Address	
Names	
Email	

At this stage we require replies from registered voters of Mutford Parish.

We will consult more widely later in the process.

Please tick all that apply to you:

- 1 Do not send me any more information or [reminders](#)
- 2 I would prefer to receive updates by email
- 3 I would like to be sent a paper copy of the background information

Please return only this page by the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2017 in the envelope provided to:

The Mutford Neighbourhood Plan Team

[The Village Hall,](#)

[Mill Road,](#)

[Mutford, NR34 7UR](#)

or email your reply to [mutfordfuture@outlook.com](mailto:mutfordfuture@outlook.com)

## Appendix B – Results of the Village survey

The village survey, designed by the Working Party, was distributed by hand to every household and local business in the Neighbourhood Area – the parish of Mutford. Responses were analysed using SurveyMonkey software.

Q1-3: Name, address and email address

[1 = Not at all important, 5 = Very important]

Each question had a space for respondents to provide additional comments; all these comments were taken into consideration when preparing the draft Plan.

<b>Q4 - How important are the following facilities to you? (please mark one box for each line)</b> <b>Answered: 131 Skipped: 0</b>	1	2	3	4	5
Publicly-accessible spaces such as woodlands and fields	2%	1%	8%	14%	76%
Green spaces	2%	0%	7%	12%	80%
Areas with wild flowers (such as St Andrew's churchyard, Mutford Big Wood)	2%	2%	6%	15%	75%
Use of public footpaths	2%	3%	4%	14%	78%
Access to local bridleways for horse riding	23%	10%	18%	13%	36%
Social facilities available in the parish (such as the children's play area, village hall, tennis court)	5%	7%	12%	16%	60%
Allotments	15%	11%	27%	16%	31%
An information board showing current and relevant parish information (such as a map of footpaths)	2%	4%	16%	28%	50%
An up to date website with parish and village information	8%	2%	21%	27%	43%

<b>Q5 - When considering the local environment, how important to you are the following? (please mark one box for each line)</b> <b>Answered: 131 Skipped: 0</b>	1	2	3	4	5
Maintaining the rural character of the parish	0%	0%	7%	12%	81%
Ensuring the rural landscape surrounding the village and outlying houses is conserved	1%	0%	4%	13%	82%
Ensuring local wildlife habitats (such as woodland and hedgerows) are protected	0%	1%	6%	6%	87%
Retaining the detached nature of the village	2%	2%	5%	10%	82%

<b>Q6 - When considering safety in the parish, how important to you are the following? (please mark one box for each line) Answered: 131 Skipped: 0</b>	1	2	3	4	5
Excessive speed of traffic	1%	0%	8%	8%	82%
Introducing heavy goods weight restrictions	6%	3%	14%	22%	55%
Introducing street lighting	60%	11%	14%	9%	6%
Improved pedestrian safety (such as having marked pedestrian routes)	19%	14%	29%	11%	27%
Well-maintained footpaths (clear and marked)	3%	5%	18%	16%	57%
Street parking	25%	13%	28%	15%	19%
Road signs	10%	12%	20%	20%	38%
Road maintenance	2%	2%	7%	17%	72%

<b>Q7 - Are you concerned about any of the following in and around the parish? (please mark one box for each line) Answered: 131 Skipped: 0</b>	1	2	3	4	5
The number of large vehicles	12%	5%	24%	16%	44%
Dog fouling	8%	8%	25%	17%	42%
Litter	5%	10%	22%	15%	48%
Fly tipping	2%	1%	7%	13%	78%
Flooding	12%	15%	26%	20%	28%
Use of agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes	8%	8%	20%	15%	49%
Use of farm and open land for equestrian purposes	34%	15%	25%	6%	20%

<b>Q8 - Do you think we should support more businesses based in the parish? Answered: 131 Skipped: 0</b>	% response
Yes	52%
No	15%
No opinion	33%

<b>Q9 - In your opinion, what types of business development would be appropriate? Answered: 69 Skipped: 62</b>	Yes support	No	No opinion
Rural (such as a farm shop)	96%	0%	4%
Craft (such as a joinery)	68%	9%	24%
Industrial (such as a garage)	34%	43%	26%

**Q10 - Business Development (Supplemental - for business owners) If you currently run a business within the parish, are there any important issues that you believe should be incorporated within the Neighbourhood Plan?**

**Answered: 13 Skipped: 118**

<b>Q11 - Would you support an application for wind turbines or solar farms within the parish? Answered: 131 Skipped: 0</b>	% response
Yes	12%
No	58%
No opinion	8%
Yes, with conditions/ limitations (please specify)	22%

<b>Q12 - Size of new developments.</b>	
<b>Mutford is obliged to recognise that the increasing need for housing across Waveney will include our village, so "no development" is not an option, but the local plan will show the types of development that are suitable and in keeping with the village character. (Please choose all that you think would be suitable). Answered: 129 Skipped: 2</b>	
Small infill developments within the village (for example, filling in a space between two existing houses)	78%
Developments of up to 1 - 2 homes	48%
Developments of 3 - 5 homes	45%
Developments of 6-12 homes	22%
Larger developments	2%

**Q13 - Siting of New Developments.**

The Neighbourhood Plan allows residents to propose sites for housing development, providing they meet planning requirements and align with the Waveney Local Plan which will apply until 2036 (the next twenty years or so). Waveney District Council have just published the first draft of the Local Plan prior to a consultation period which started on 28 July 2017. The draft Local Plan proposes two sites for Mutford and these are listed as locations 1 and 2. Please give your view on these two locations in the boxes below, stating whether you support them or not, and include any comments you may have.

**Note:** The survey software does not allow the map to be included, so please refer to the diagram sent in the invitation email or go to the online site given below and view it on the entry for Mutford (page 164). If you wish to take part in the Waveney Local Plan Consultation you must do this separately. The consultation finishes on 22 September 2017. Details on how to respond can be found here:

<http://consult.waveney.gov.uk/consult.ti/firstdraftlocalplan2017/consultationHome> This site can also be used to see the draft Local Plan for Waveney. The locations are:

Answered: 81 Skipped: 50

Location 1: WLP7.15: Land south of Chapel Road (0.57 hectares for 8 residential dwellings)	95%
Location 2: WLP7.16: Land north of Chapel Road (0.47 hectares for 6 residential dwellings)	91%

**Q14 - Where do you think additional developments could be located?**

Please list or describe any locations you think would be appropriate for local development, and if possible provide a reason for your choice(s)

Answered	51 – including: 4 mentions: Chapel Road, near St Andrews 3 mentions: Mill Road 3 mentions: towards Carlton Colville/ Mutfordwood Lane 3 mentions: Hulver Road 2 mentions: Chapel Road, near St Michael, Rushmere 2 mentions: Church Road 2 mentions: infill on Hulver Road near Newson Avenue
----------	--

Skipped 79

**Q15 Character of new developments**

**Do you believe new building developments should maintain and reinforce the character of the village?**

**Answered: 129 Skipped: 2**

Yes 85%

No 6%

No opinion 9%



<b>Q16 What sort of new housing do you believe is appropriate for the parish? (Please choose all that you believe are appropriate) Answered: 127 Skipped: 4</b>	
Houses with 1 - 3 bedrooms	86%
Houses with 4+ bedrooms	33%
Low-cost housing (such as starter homes)	42%
Residential care homes	13%
Other	10%

<b>Q17 - Do you think any essential services need improving? Answered: 127 Skipped: 4</b>	1	2	3	4	5
Domestic waste collection	64%	8%	13%	2%	11%
Mains Sewerage	44%	11%	13%	7%	23%
Electricity	53%	10%	17%	2%	16%
Landline phone network	52%	6%	16%	10%	17%
Mobile phone network	11%	2%	4%	12%	70%
Broadband	18%	3%	9%	11%	58%
Post boxes	44%	7%	19%	5%	25%
Public transport	10%	4%	16%	7%	62%

<b>Q18 - Any other concerns, observations or comments you would like to add.</b>	
Answered	40
Skipped	90

Appendix C – Printed flyer for Public Meeting (November 2017) distributed to every household in Village



## **Mutford Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Invitation to a Progress Meeting**

Substantial progress has been made on the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan.

We are now able to move forward to the next stage.

You are invited to an open meeting on  
**Saturday morning 25th November**  
**11am at Mutford Village Hall.**

The main issues and concerns identified by the questionnaire will be reported and your further observations will be welcomed

Refreshments will be available.

Mutford Neighbourhood Plan Team

## Appendix D – Printed flyer for Mutford Village Fete (7-8 July 2018)

**\* PLEASE TAKE & READ \***

### **MUTFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE**

A small group of volunteers has been working on the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan, which will support the Waveney Local Plan by providing local planning policies for new developments in Mutford.

Following the village survey last summer, which was completed by 56% of all households in the parish, the group has been preparing a draft Plan. We have met with Waveney District Council's planners several times and are close to completing a draft which will be circulated to all households in Mutford prior to a 6-week public consultation.

After this, the Plan will be formally submitted to Waveney who will conduct a wider public consultation and submit it to external and independent inspection.

When that is completed, residents of Mutford will be invited to vote in a referendum on the final version of the Plan. Once adopted by Waveney District Council, the Plan will become the framework for development in Mutford through to 2036 and will be a statutory consideration in determining all future planning applications in the parish.

If you have any questions on the Neighbourhood Plan, please complete the form and put it in the Box provided.

**Thank You.**  
**Mutford Neighbourhood Plan Working Group**  
(July 2018)



## **Appendix E – Pre-submission consultation: List of consultees contacted for feedback**

### **Organisation**

1. Suffolk County Council
2. Natural England
3. Environment Agency
4. Historic England
5. Suffolk Preservation Society
6. Waveney District Council
7. Barnby Parish Council
8. Carlton Colville Town Council
9. Shadingfield, Sotterley, Willingham and Ellough Joint Parish Council
10. Gisleham Parish Council
11. Henstead with Hulver Parish Council
12. North Cove Parish Council

### **Local businesses<sup>3</sup> registered within the parish**

1. The Dairy at Pond Farm, Mutford, Lowestoft, Suffolk, NR33 8HF - Self-catering holiday unit and premises
2. Ayers Acres, Chapel Road, Mutford, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 7UU - Stables and premises
3. Adj Beaulah Hall, Dairy Lane, Mutford, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 7QJ - Camping site and premises
4. David Warnes & Co Ltd. Ash Farm Cottage, Dairy Lane, Mutford, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 7QJ - Self-catering holiday unit and premises
5. Kiers Cottage, Hulver Road, Mutford, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 7UW - Self-catering holiday unit and premises
6. Serenity. Beauty Salon At 1, Hulver Road, Mutford, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 7UW – shop and premises
7. Block Engineering, Blacksmiths Shop, Hulver Road, Mutford, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 7UL - Workshop and premises
8. The Garage, Hulver Road, Mutford, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 7UL – workshop and premises
9. Mutford & Rushmere Village Hall, Mill Road, Mutford, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 7UP – hall and premises

---

<sup>3</sup> Source: Valuation Office Agency <https://www.gov.uk/correct-your-business-rates>

## Appendix F – Pre-submission consultation: Covering letter sent to residents with final draft Mutford Plan (1<sup>st</sup> December 2018)

### MUTFORD PARISH COUNCIL



1<sup>st</sup> December 2018  
Dear Resident,

#### MUTFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

This final draft of the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan is being distributed to every household and business in the parish as part of a formal consultation. The Plan is based on community-led aspirations for Mutford through to 2036; your views and comments on the document are important.

#### What is the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan?

- On behalf of Mutford Parish Council, a group of volunteers has worked with residents to bring together this Plan.
- The Plan defines local policies to guide development in the parish through to 2036 and, once approved, will become a statutory consideration in all planning decisions within the parish.
- The policies have been based on the findings of the village survey undertaken in Summer 2017, and feedback from various public meetings.

#### What happens next?

- All households and businesses in Mutford are invited to comment on this final draft.
- Formal consultees including Suffolk County Council, Natural England and others will also be invited to respond.
- Feedback can be made
  - online via [MutfordFuture@outlook.com](mailto:MutfordFuture@outlook.com)
  - via the letter-box beside the front door to the Village Hall on Mill Road
  - at an Open Meeting at Mutford Village Hall. Volunteers of the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan working group will be available between 11am and 1pm on Saturday 12<sup>th</sup> January 2019 to answer any questions you may have about the Plan.
- All comments on this draft Plan will be taken into consideration when a revised version of the Plan is prepared.
- Mutford Parish Council will formally submit the revised draft Plan to Waveney District Council. The District Council will undertake another 6-week public consultation and appoint an independent examiner to review the Plan.
- Once any further modifications have been made, a local referendum will be held to decide if the residents of Mutford want to accept the Plan.

Please note that this Neighbourhood Plan cannot comment directly on the six homes north of Chapel Road which were allocated for Mutford as part of Waveney District Council's Local Plan.

The Mutford Neighbourhood Plan is an important document and will help shape Mutford for years to come. Once approved, the Mutford Plan will become part of the local Development Plan, alongside Waveney District's Local Plan and the strategic policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

**PLEASE READ THE DOCUMENT AND TAKE PART IN SHAPING THE FUTURE OF MUTFORD.  
THE CONSULTATION WILL CLOSE ON 31<sup>st</sup> JANUARY 2019.**

Neil Glendinning  
Chair, Mutford Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.

## Appendix G – Pre-submission consultation: Email sent to statutory consultees

Sent via [MutfordFuture@outlook.com](mailto:MutfordFuture@outlook.com) on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018

Subject: Mutford Neighbourhood Plan – Invitation to comment

Good morning/ afternoon,

Since 2016, a group of volunteers has been working on behalf of Mutford Parish Council to develop the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan to guide future development in Mutford until 2036.

Following input from the Waveney planning team, the final draft of the Mutford Plan has been prepared and we are now launching the pre-submission consultation to meet Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The consultation will take place over eight weeks, from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2018.

You are invited, as a [statutory consultee/ local business/ neighbouring Parish Council] to comment on this Plan. A downloadable .pdf version is attached to this email.

Please email your comments to [MutfordFuture@outlook.com](mailto:MutfordFuture@outlook.com) or post a paper copy to

John Armstrong  
Clerk,  
Mutford Parish Council  
Sandlewood  
Hulver Road  
Mutford NR34 7UL

The closing date for submissions is **12:00 noon on 31st January 2019**. It would however be much appreciated if you could respond as soon as possible, to assist the working group with the collation responses

All households in the Neighbourhood Area – defined as the parish of Mutford, will receive a paper copy of the Mutford Plan as part of this consultation, [as well as those with business interests in the area].

Many thanks for your contribution to the preparation of the Mutford Plan,

Neil Glendinning  
Chair, Mutford Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.

---

### Appendix H – Pre-submission consultation: Comments/ concerns and action(s) taken

Full listing, in chronological order, of 74 comments received during the pre-submission consultation, and changes made to the final draft Mutford Neighbourhood Plan (v11.0) to create the Submission version (v12.0), following discussion with and approval by Mutford Parish Council.

	Date received	Respondent	Comment	Action (underlined text = new)
1	01/12/2018	Individual - resident	<p>“light pollution... Like many resident's I enjoy the dark skies. Particularly so, as I enjoy photography. Mutford has bortle 4 skies which is Milky Way class. In other words it's possible to see the core of the Milky Way in the summer month's which isn't possible in urban areas and much of the world. Recently there has been some extremely bright lights added to Ellough which I think is the bio plant place. They are so bright that they are visible as soon as you enter Mutfordwood Lane from the Carlton Colville end. They are that bright they seem to give of more light pollution than Lowestoft does (at least visibly from Mutford). I was going to complain to the Council but wanted to raise with yourselves as I didn't know if you know any more than I do and whether anybody else has raised this?</p> <p>The dark skies is one of my favourite things about Mutford but I feel we are now losing these....”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue raised at Mutford Parish Council (MPC) (December 2018).</li> <li>• Issue discussed at MPC (February 2019); agreed to include request to residents to consider their outside lighting in an issue of Mutford News newsletter</li> <li>• Parish Action Plan to be discussed at MPC at later date</li> <li>• No further action required</li> <li>• See also comment #12</li> </ul>
2	12/12/2018	Statutory consultee: Natural England	<p>‘Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.’</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>

3	18/01/2019	Individual – former resident	‘useful to have paragraph numbers...’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Paragraph numbers added to Section 5 – Policies only.</li> </ul>
4	18/01/2019	Individual – former resident	Add list of policies after One-minute Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. List of policies added</li> </ul>
5	18/01/2019	Individual – former resident	Increase prominence of Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Shaded text box added to objectives (page 21 v11.0)</li> </ul>
6	18/01/2019	Individual – former resident	Introduce monitoring plan, for future reviews of the Mutford Neighbourhood Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed at MPC (February 2019). Agreed that all planning applications will be tested against the MNP, to ensure that MNP policies have been followed in the determination.</li> </ul>
7	18/01/2019	Individual – former resident	‘Conserving the open countryside’ - Add support for principles of the Suffolk Coast and Heath’s AONB Management Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. New text added to introductory text of Section 5 Policies: ‘The Mutford Plan supports the principles of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Management Plan 2018-2023.’</li> </ul>
8	18/01/2019	Individual – former resident	Add reference for ‘A Green Future’ cited on p24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. New footnote added to Section 5 Policies introductory text para 16: ‘Published by Department for Environment, Fisheries and Rural Affairs (Defra). 2018.’</li> </ul>
9	02/01/2019	Statutory consultee: Historic England	‘We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, and are pleased to see that it considers the built and historic environments of Mutford in the supporting text, and in its policies. In particular we welcome the inclusion of Policy MNP 2 - Conserving the Setting of the Church. Unfortunately, under current national planning policy and guidance, it is not possible to completely embargo all development in a given area. In order to ensure the wording of this policy is in line with national	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two sections of Historic England’s suggested text amalgamated into new paragraph for supporting text for MNP.2 – Conserving the setting of the church: ‘In order to conserve the significance and setting of the church, its landscape setting should be protected from harmful development. Conflict between any aspect of a development proposal and the conservation of the church’s significance must be avoided or minimised; where this is not possible, any harm must be clearly and convincingly justified.’</li> </ul>



			<p>planning policy, we would therefore suggest the following alteration to its wording (in italics):</p> <p><i>Great weight is placed upon the conservation of the Grade I listed St Andrew’s Church. In order to conserve the significance and setting of the church for future generations, its landscape setting, as identified on Map 4, should be protected from harmful development.</i></p> <p><i>Any development proposed within the area identified will be required to submit a heritage statement that sets out any potential harmful impacts upon the significance of the church, including through development in its setting. Conflict between any aspect of a proposal and the conservation of the church’s significance must be avoided or minimised, but where this is not possible any harm must be clearly and convincingly justified’.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy MNP.2 amended Original text: ‘The landscape setting of St Andrew’s church will be protected from any future development to conserve the setting of the Grade 1 listed building. The land is identified in Appendix A – Map 4</li> <li>• Revised text, following team discussion and comment #48: ‘All development proposals which will have a view of the church will be required to avoid harmful impact on the setting of the church – a Grade I listed building. All such planning applications must include a heritage statement plan that sets out potential harmful impacts upon the significance of the church, including any development in its setting.</li> <li>• Additional text added: ‘The setting of the church is defined in Appendix A – Map 4; protection for adjacent areas will be considered on a case by case basis.’</li> </ul>
10	02/01/2019	Statutory consultee: Historic England	‘We would suggest also that this policy could be strengthened by an additional views analysis of specific views and vistas from and towards the church, which can be included upon a map and, with high quality and suitably proportioned photographs, used to support the policy.’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed Supporting document created – ‘Additional photographic evidence &amp; maps’ supports MNP.2 - Conserving the setting of the Church, as well as providing general context.</li> <li>• Footnote in MNP.2 references this supporting doc</li> </ul>
11	02/01/2019	Consultee: Carlton Colville Town Council	“Carlton Colville Planning Committee think that this is a very well written comprehensive plan which will serve Mutford Parish very well”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>

12	07/01/2019	Individual – resident of neighbouring Parish	“I have... taken note of your reference to dark skies. As a Rushmere resident I find it inconceivable that someone would wish to light up the outside of their house as is the case with the newly refurbished house just along from Rushmere church. It is out of character with a village dwelling... Is there any way of persuading the occupier to reconsider?”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No amend required for MNP.</li> <li>• Issue discussed at MPC (4th Feb 2019); agreed to put a request to residents to consider their outside lighting in a future issue of the Mutford News newsletter (MPC and Waveney have no power of enforcement) – See also Comment #1.</li> <li>• Issue mentioned in Appendix F v11.0. To be part of Parish Action Plan, to be discussed at MPC at a later date</li> </ul>
13	12/01/2019	Individual-resident [Attendee at Open Meeting]	Concern expressed about potential use of brownfield sites for business purposes and potential issue to neighbours of noise and/or traffic volume	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required – issue adequately covered in the WLP. Brownfield – previously developed land is mentioned in Waveney Local Plan para 1.17: ‘National planning policy states that development... promotes regeneration of brownfield sites... When considering how development is distributed, it is necessary to consider the effects on existing infrastructure and the environment’.</li> </ul>
14	12/01/2019	Individual-resident [Attendee at Open Meeting]	Concern expressed about inappropriate use of land – a change of use from one business category to another	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required – issue is a matter for WDC’s enforcement officers</li> <li>• Issue mentioned in Appendix F v11.0. To be part of Parish Action Plan</li> </ul>
15	12/01/2019	Individual-resident [Attendee at Open Meeting]	Concern expressed about location of Waveney Local Plan’s allocation of approximately 6 new homes in Chapel Road, Mutford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required – outside jurisdiction of Mutford Plan.</li> </ul>
16	12/01/2019	Individual-resident [Attendee at	Request for clarification on Waveney Local Plan’s definition of infill outside Settlement Boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required - development outside settlement boundaries is only permitted in ‘exceptional circumstances’ (previously listed in Appendix B, now moved into main report</li> </ul>

		Open Meeting]		– see Comment #43. Existing wording in Mutford Plan is adequate.
17	12/01/2019	Individual-resident [Attendee at Open Meeting]	Request for clarification of MNP.1 – level of protection from future development for land identified between the two settlement boundaries in Mutford; specifically, whether ‘exceptional circumstances’ would still apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix B – List of exceptional circumstances for development in Open Countryside to be moved into Section 5 – Further development.</li> <li>• New text added ‘New development outside settlement boundaries - and so in the open countryside, including between the two settlement boundaries in Mutford - is only permitted in certain special cases which the Mutford Plan has termed ‘defined circumstances.’</li> <li>• New text added: ‘The Waveney Local Plan (policy WLP1.3 Settlement boundaries) states ‘<i>Land which is outside of settlement boundaries and allocations in the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans is considered as the Countryside. New residential, employment and town centre development will not be permitted in the Countryside except where specific policies in this Local Plan indicate otherwise.</i>’</li> </ul>
18	12/01/2019	Individual-resident [Attendee at Open Meeting]	No mention in Mutford Plan of ‘affordable or social housing’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required – provision of affordable housing covered by Waveney Local Plan.</li> </ul>
19	22/01/2019	Consultee: Shadingfield, Sotterley, Willingham and Ellough Joint Parish	‘The Mutford NP is clearly written in an accessible style, despite the cautionary statement that it inevitably contains planning terminology!’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>

		Council (SSWE)	<i>Note: SSWE returned a list of responses. Point 1 was a statement of thanks for the document. Comments on the content of the MNP start at point 2.</i>	
20	22/01/2019	SSWE	'The one-minute summary is a particularly useful brief overview and guide the Plan's content and reflects the friendly style'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No action required</li> </ul>
21	22/01/2019	SSWE	'There was some feeling that the parish description was overly long, containing some unnecessary detail (e.g. on history) that was not very relevant to current and future development.'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No action taken. Existing narrative provides useful context.</li> </ul>
22	22/01/2019	SSWE	'The NP is slightly repetitive in places. For example, the fact that development will only be permitted in the 'countryside' in 'exceptional circumstances' appears to be mentioned at least six times. However, in some cases it is probably helpful to emphasise important points.'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No action taken. Repetition used to reinforce the fact that whilst there is a presumption against development outside settlement boundaries, it was important to note the existence of these 'exceptional circumstances'.</li> </ul>
23	22/01/2019	SSWE	'In the example in para 5 above, it appears that the Mutford Plan may rather over-state the restrictions imposed on development in the countryside. The NPPF and Local Plan do not refer to 'exceptional' circumstances but simply refer to, for example, 'where specific policies in this Local Plan indicate otherwise'.'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The list of 'exceptional circumstances' will be moved from Appendix B to supporting text of Section 5 - Future Development (para 36)</li> <li>'exceptional circumstances' to be retained as a categorisation. There is a presumption against development in the Open Countryside, notwithstanding exceptional circumstances. The use of 'exceptional' reinforces the fact that development is not usual and places the burden of proof on the exceptional nature of the development on the developer.</li> <li>See comment #27, #43 and #44</li> </ul>

24	22/01/19	SSWE	‘The NP provides considerable amount of information relevant to development in rural areas drawn from the NPPF and the Waveney Local Plan. This is very helpful as it clearly indicates the extent of the controls that exist on development in addition to those in the Neighbourhood Plan itself.’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>
25	22/01/19	SSWE	‘It’s unclear whether Policy MNP.6 – “Infill outside settlement boundaries” is needed as it appears to be covered by the NPPF and the Waveney Local Plan policies on development in the countryside. If Mutford have more specific concerns, it may be worth making this clearer.’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. Policy MNP.6 - Infill outside settlement boundaries deleted Policies to be renumbered</li> <li>• See also comment #56</li> </ul>
26	22/01/19	SSWE	‘Policy MNP.10 – “Rural tourism accommodation” is a little unclear but appears to impose more restrictions than the Local Plan Policy WLP8.15. The latter policy applies to a ‘broad spectrum of accommodation available including camp sites, chalets, log cabins, caravan sites and glamping sites’ and allows for a ‘flexible approach for small sites of up to 10 units’, with such sites being ‘accommodated anywhere in the rural area subject to compliance with other policies of the Local Plan’. Sites with 11 to 79 units may also be permitted although there are stricter requirements, relating to transport. The Mutford Policy MNP.10 limits development of rural tourism accommodation to the conversion of existing buildings. This would apply greater restrictions than WLP8.15, which is not appropriate.’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed Title of policy ‘Rural tourism accommodation’ amended to ‘Rural tourism accommodation within converted buildings’</li> <li>• MNP.10 (v11.0) specifically covers conversion of existing buildings and does not conflict with WLP8.15.</li> </ul>

27	30/1/2019	Individual - Resident	<p>Suggested amendment to MNP.1</p> <p>Original: "The open landscape between the two settlement boundaries of Mill Road and the crossroads will be protected from future development to avoid coalescence".</p> <p>"...we would like to suggest the following statement, in place of that which currently exists, which we feel removes any notion of the exclusion of those 'exceptional circumstances' whilst very clearly stating the desire to avoid the coalescence of the settlements: "Open landscape between the two settlement boundaries of Mill Road and the crossroads will be maintained at a level such as to avoid coalescence". "</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix B – 'Exceptional circumstances' for development in Open Countryside moved to Section 5, supporting text for Future development (para 36).</li> <li>• New text added 'New development outside settlement boundaries - and so in the open countryside, <u>including between the two settlement boundaries in Mutford</u> - is only permitted in certain special cases...'</li> <li>• See comments #23, #43 and #44 for further use of 'exceptional circumstances'</li> </ul>
28	31/1/2019	Statutory consultee: Suffolk County Council (SCC)	'SCC is supportive of the vision for the parish outlined in the plan'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>
29	31/1/2019	SCC	<p>'The plan outlines the history of Mutford and identifies a number of heritage assets, such as listed buildings, however the plan could also highlight the archaeological heritage within the parish as well. In addition to expanding on the historical background of the village, including this information can highlight to developers that assessment of archaeology may be necessary.</p> <p>Suggested text: "Mutford is situated in an area of archaeological potential, which is highlighted in the Suffolk County Council Historic Environment Record. There are</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed</li> <li>• Map of Mutford Common added to Appendices</li> <li>• New text added to Section 5 – Policies, below section on Green energy: New header: Conserving our heritage 'Mutford is situated in an area of archaeological potential...' and reference made to map of Common in Appendices</li> <li>• See comment #67 for WDC input.</li> </ul>

			numerous crop circles visible on aerial photography, indicating archaeological remains. Development may require archaeological investigation to ascertain if there are archaeological remains on site and what mitigation strategies may be appropriate. Developers should consult Suffolk County Council archaeological service at the earliest opportunity.”	
30	31/1/2019	SCC	‘...Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service has considered the plan and are of the opinion that, given the level of growth proposed, we do not envisage additional service provision will need to be made in order to mitigate the impact...’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>
31	31/1/2019	SCC	Acknowledgement of flooding in the parish is welcome. Please see accompanying this response maps of fluvial flood risk areas and pluvial flood risk areas, which also show information on recorded flood events. The parish council is welcome to include these maps in their evidence base.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fluvial (river and sea flood risk) and pluvial (surface water risk) maps to be added to Appendices for information</li> <li>• Footnote added to line on Hundred River in ‘Mutford and surrounding countryside’: ‘See Suffolk County Council’s Flood Risk maps – Appendix B’</li> </ul>
32	31/1/2019	SCC	‘There are no current or planned waste sites operating within the parish. As such SCC has no comments with regards to waste facilities.’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>
33	31/1/2019	SCC	‘The Neighbourhood Plan highlights the importance of footpaths and bridle ways as connecting routes to neighbouring towns and villages, which is welcome. The WLP, includes policies, which protects these routes and enables enhancement where appropriate.’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>
34	31/1/2019	SCC	‘Site specific transport issues have been addressed through the WLP consultation and examination process,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>

			so no additional comments on the site allocations are necessary.'	
35	31/1/2019	SCC	<p>Reference to the Suffolk Parking Guidance (2015) on page 33, while welcome, is not entirely correct. Two spaces per dwelling is not the minimum for all housing development. The minimum for small dwellings, or dwellings with shared parking areas can be 1 or 1.5 spaces. It is correct however that the minimum number of spaces increases depending on the number of bedrooms at the property.</p> <p>To reflect this, it is recommended the policy is amended. The wording below which has <del>struck through</del> is recommended to be removed from the policy:</p> <p>"All development will provide sufficient off-road parking, <del>with a minimum of 2 car spaces per dwelling</del> in accordance with Suffolk Parking Guidance (2015)."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed at MPC (February 2019). Agreed that the MNP should reference the SCC minimum allocation but due to the off-road parking issues in Mutford the Plan requires a minimum of 2 spaces per dwelling.</li> <li>MNP.9 Off-road parking to be amended – deletion of 'in accordance with the Suffolk Parking Guidance (2015)'</li> <li>Supporting text amended: <u>'The Mutford Plan notes the minimum requirements in the current Suffolk Parking Guidance of 1 or 1.5 spaces for new dwellings. However, due to the essential reliance on private transport for those living in or visiting the village, the Mutford Plan regards two off-road car spaces a minimum requirement for each new home...'</u></li> </ul>
36	31/1/2019	SCC	<p>MNP.11 Rural business It is recommended that this policy includes a requirement for the provision of cycle parking at businesses, in order to support cycling as a form of sustainable transport. Cycle parking standards are in the Suffolk Parking Guidance 2015.</p> <p>Recommended wording for an addition to the policy is below.</p> <p>"Cycle parking compliant with the Suffolk Parking Guidance 2015 should be provided."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. New line added to MNP.9: 'Cycle parking compliant with the current Suffolk Parking Guidance should be provided.'</li> </ul>
37	31/1/2019	Statutory consultee:	One Minute summary Bullet point 6 on page 1 states ' <del>...submitted to Waveney District Council who will</del>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line amended: 'Mutford Parish Council has approved this revised draft</li> </ul>



		Waveney District Council (WDC)	appoint an independent examination...' – should either state appoint independent examiner or conduct independent examination.	'submission' version and submits it to Waveney District Council, who will conduct an independent examination of the Mutford Plan.'
38	31/1/2019	WDC	Bullet point 3 on page 2 – should planning committee be moved to show that they will use NP to make decisions, i.e. '... used by planning officer and planning committee...'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Line amended: 'The text in the policies will be used by local planning officers and the Planning Committee in making decisions and recommendations when determining applications for development. <u>They will also be referred to by applicants and their agents when designing and submitting planning applications</u>'</li> </ul>
39	31/1/2019	WDC	(Section 1 p6 para 3) 'Are they determined to update the NP every 5 years? Do they have the resources to do this? Would it be better to state that it will be updated when policies are out of date?'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed at MPC (February 2019) Line amended: Current text: 'The Mutford Plan will be reviewed at least every five years, to take account of any changing circumstances affecting the area including any significant change to the local housing need, review of the Local Plan or any relevant changes in national policy.' Amended: "will be reviewed as necessary"</li> </ul>
40	31/1/2019	WDC	Section 1 Page 4: The Legal Framework, para 2 – The Local Development Framework is made up of a number of documents and they have been adopted at different times – not all in 2012. This part of the NP will need amending for accuracy. For further info: <a href="https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Wave">https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Wave</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed Current text in Mutford Plan: The Local Development Framework, originally published in 2012 and updated in 2016, will be superseded by the new Local Plan when it is adopted in early [end March? TBC] 2019; for this reason, the Mutford Plan has used the policies in the emerging Local Plan.</li> <li>Suggested revised text: 'The existing Local Development Framework, which consists</li> </ul>

			ney-Local-Plan/Waveney-Local-Development-Framework-Documents.pdf	<p>of several documents [see footnote] - some of which date back to 2009 - will be superseded by the new Local Plan when it is adopted in early 2019; for this reason, the Mutford Plan has used the policies in the emerging Local Plan.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Footnote: The Local Development Framework consists of the Core Strategy (adopted Jan 2009); Development Management Policies (adopted Jan 2011); Site Specific Allocations (adopted Jan 2011); Gypsy and Traveller Site Specific Allocations (Updated Needs Assessment); Proposals Map (updated as appropriate); Lowestoft Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan (adopted Jan 2012). See <a href="https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Waveney-Local-Plan/Waveney-Local-Development-Framework-Documents.pdf">https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Waveney-Local-Plan/Waveney-Local-Development-Framework-Documents.pdf</a> for a full list of supplementary planning documents.</li> <li>Revised text accepted by WDC on 07/02/2019</li> </ul>
41	31/1/2019	WDC	Page 19 – 196 new homes in rural areas? – 10% of Local Plan allocations would equal 865 as stated in the local plan. The sites allocated within the Local Plan (not including completions since 2014 and permissions) would equal 399. Therefore we are unclear where '196 homes' has come from. 167 in Smaller Villages is correct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text amended: Existing text: '...The final draft Local Plan, published in March 2018, revised the housing need across the district; overall, it identified a need for 8,223 new homes over the plan period 2014 – 2036, with 10% of this housing growth – 196 new homes - to be in allocated in rural villages, including 167 homes across ten 'smaller villages' in the district.'</li> <li>Amended text: '...The final draft Local Plan, published in March 2018, revised the housing need across the district. Ten per cent of the overall housing growth – equivalent to 865 new homes - were allocated to rural areas. Excluding homes completed since</li> </ul>

				<p>2014 and permissions, 167 homes were allocated across ten 'smaller villages' in the district.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised text accepted by WDC on 07/02/2019</li> </ul>
42	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>Section 5 page 22</p> <p>1st para, last sentence. The policies will be used by planning officers in making recommendations and decisions using delegated powers. They will also be used by the Planning Committee. Plus they will be referred to by applicants and their agents when designing and submitting planning applications. This sentence in the NP should align with Section 1, Bullet point 3 on page 2 (as above)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Text corrected and aligned with page 2</li> <li>Original text: 'The policies – shown in shaded boxes - must be used by local planning officers when determining applications for development.'</li> <li>Amended: 'The policies – shown in shaded boxes - must be used by local planning officers <u>and the Planning Committee</u> when determining applications for development. <u>They will also be referred to by applicants and their agents when designing and submitting planning applications'</u></li> </ul>
43	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>Section 5 page 22</p> <p>'Conserving the Open Countryside', para. 1, 2nd sentence. "Exceptional Circumstances" is not language used in the NPPF of Waveney Local Plan when addressing development in the countryside. As the NP identifies, the NPPF refers to such "circumstances" at para. 79, but does not use the term "exceptional". The NPPF does use the term 'exceptional' but only in certain cases such as when dealing with development in the Green Belt (which does not apply to Mutford). The Local Plan refers to development being permitted by "specific policies" at WLP1.3. We note that the exceptional circumstances are expanded in Appendix B, nonetheless we would urge caution in using this term when it is not</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix B – 'Exceptional circumstances' to be moved to Section 5 - supporting text to Future development (para 36)</li> <li>Comment about suggested alternative use of 'defined circumstances' noted. However, it was agreed to retain 'exceptional circumstances' as categorisation. There is a presumption against development in the Open Countryside, notwithstanding exceptional circumstances. The use of 'exceptional' reinforces the fact that development is not usual and places the burden of proof on the exceptional nature of the development on the developer.</li> <li>See comments #23, #27 and #44</li> </ul>

			fully consistent with other planning terminology. A term such as “specific circumstances” or “defined circumstances” could be more fitting.	
44	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>Section 5 page 31</p> <p>The “exceptional circumstances” are referred to directly in policy MNP.6 and throughout the document. Therefore, we recommend that the description of the circumstances in appendix B is moved to the main document so that it can be given full weight as part of the planning considerations and its status in the NP document is not undermined or weakened. This is similar to the recommendations in the Wenhaston with Mellis NP Examiner’s report.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to #43</li> <li>• Appendix B – ‘Exceptional circumstances’ to be moved to Section 5- supporting text to Future development (para 36)</li> <li>• ‘Exceptional circumstances’ retained as categorisation</li> </ul>
45	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>Page 24 and page 25</p> <p>Paragraph relating to ‘Coalescence of Settlements’ in the LP is repeated under the ‘Conserving the Open Countryside’ and ‘Landscape Character’ sections. We think it’s only needed under the ‘Landscape Character’ section as it directly relates to that policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. Deleted duplicate para from page 25</li> </ul>
46	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.1 – The Examiner did not agree with the use of the word “will” in policy wording in his report for Wenhaston with Mellis NP (policy WwM P1). He recommended that “should” was used instead. On this basis we would recommend that the first sentence of the policy is reworded to say: “In order to conserve the rural identity of Mutford, all new development should enhance and reinforce the existing landscape character and biodiversity.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussed at MPC (February 2019). Working Party delegated to test use of ‘will’, ‘should’ or ‘may’ for each policy, to ensure the policy was not diluted beyond intended use.</li> </ul>

47	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.2 – ‘We support the inclusion of a policy that highlights the great importance of the Grade I listed parish church and which aims to protect its setting.</p> <p>We suggest the policy uses “preserve” rather than “conserve”. This aligns with the terminology used in Listed Building legislation.’</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> <li>• Preservation of the church is covered by existing regulations for listed buildings.</li> </ul> <p>Conservation will be applied to the setting of the church</p>
48	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.1 – ‘How has the setting of the Church been arrived at? The NPPF glossary defines the setting of a heritage asset. This states that the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced and its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Does the policy imply that everything beyond the shaded area on the map will not have an impact on the setting of the church? Trying to define the setting on a map could potentially backfire in this way. This is not something we have previously come across and in our view caution is required. My recommendation would be not to include a geographically defined area.’</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map to be retained in supporting text and appendices. Boundaries are based on hard landscape features (hedgerows, and lanes) with concern for areas along Chapel Road which have the potential to come under significant pressure for development.</li> <li>• Historic England’s comments add weight to need to protect setting</li> </ul>
49	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.1 - Is it reasonable to protect the church from any development whatsoever? What if it was sympathetic to the church, conserved its setting, and also provided other benefits?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action taken</li> <li>• The setting of the church will be conserved; the church will be preserved</li> </ul>
50	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.3 - para. 2. There is a more up to date AONB management plan here:  <a href="http://www.suffolkcoastandheaths.org/assets/About-Us/Man-Plan-Docs/2018-2023/2018-23-SCH-Management-Plan.pdf">http://www.suffolkcoastandheaths.org/assets/About-Us/Man-Plan-Docs/2018-2023/2018-23-SCH-Management-Plan.pdf</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed.</li> </ul> <p>Reference updated and text amended</p>

51	31/1/2019	WDC	Page 28 Future Development, para. 1 – ‘development is also expected to take place on the allocated WLP7.13 site. This is outside of the settlement boundaries.’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed Original text: ‘...Any new development in Mutford is expected to be located within one of the two settlement boundaries in Mutford defined by the Waveney Local Plan.’</li> </ul> <p>Amended text: Page 19 penultimate para, following advice from WDC on 07/02/2019: ‘The proposed site to the north of Chapel Road is currently outside of the settlement boundaries. Once the site is developed settlement boundaries may be reviewed.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addition to text page 28, following advice from WDC on 07/02/2019: ‘...Any new development in Mutford is expected to be located within one of the two settlement boundaries in Mutford defined by the Waveney Local Plan. <u>The housing allocation for Mutford is currently outside the settlement boundary; once the site is developed, this settlement boundary may be reviewed.</u>’</li> </ul>
52	31/1/2019	WDC	Future development P. 29, para. 5, final sentence: “The Mutford Plan therefore strongly supports this policy and requires that these concerns about capacity should be explicitly addressed...” – Where/how does the NP require this? If the neighbourhood plan does not require it (such as through a policy) then this part should be re-worded.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new policy required – covered by existing legislation</li> <li>Text amended: ‘...the Mutford Plan <del>therefore</del> strongly supports this policy and <del>requires that</del> <u>the need for these concerns about capacity to be explicitly addressed when planning applications are submitted.</u>’</li> </ul>
53	31/1/2019	WDC	MNP.5 page 30/31 Infill development – first paragraph could be reworded as it’s not clear whether ‘5 or more	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Amended text:</li> </ul>

			<p>dwellings' relates to the gap or continuous frontage. The next paragraph says a gap is space for no more than 1 or 2 dwellings, but the first paragraph should make it clear that 5 or more refers to the continuous frontage.</p>	<p>'... usually comprise a continuous frontage of five or more dwellings.'</p>
54	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>Page 30, para. 5 – "...evidence presented to the working party by Waveney District Council..." Any such discussions were at an Officer level only and have not been endorsed by Waveney District Council. Waveney District Council's position with respect to housing density policy for development is set out in the local plan. The Neighbourhood Plan working group may wish to adopt or adapt the information discussed as their own evidence. This will be more robust than evidencing a planning policy purely on Officer's opinion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed.</li> </ul> <p>Amended text:  'The Mutford Plan therefore recommends that new development within the settlement boundaries should not significantly increase the existing housing density. <u>The Waveney Local Plan states that the residential land opposite the proposed new housing 'has a housing density of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare' (para 7.121) whilst it is proposed that the new site will be developed 'at a density of approximately 20 dwellings per hectare' (policy 7.13).'</u></p>
55	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.5 – Infill within SBs.  'Any guidance on how a detrimental impact on the street scene can be avoided will make the policy more effective and easier to apply. It will be useful for decision makers, consultees providing comments, and designers.'</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended text:  'The design and layout of the development will not be detrimental to the local street scene and will not cause harm to the living conditions of residents in the existing dwellings either side of the plot, by <del>including visual intrusion, or noise nuisance, intrusion, loss of privacy light and loss of privacy and loss of light and privacy.</del></li> </ul>
56	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.6 – Infill outside SBs  is this policy necessary? The supporting text says that the local plan provides sufficient protection and this policy arguably does not provide anything more than the local plan policy.</p> <p>Where does the definition of infill in the supporting text come from? This should be clarified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> </ul> <p>Policy removed. Policies renumbered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comment #25.</li> </ul>

57	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.7 – Backland development –</p> <p>‘as the plan should be read as a whole does this policy need to refer to the off-road parking policy MNP.9? MNP.9 would apply in any case and therefore does not require specific reference.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> <li>Line covered by off-road parking policy</li> <li>Line of text to be removed from MNP.7: ‘...Sufficient off-road parking and space for turning vehicles within the curtilage is retained to comply with the Mutford Plan’s policy on off-road parking’</li> </ul>
58	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.8 – Backland and street frontage</p> <p>What is meant by ‘contributes’? Is this through architectural quality and character? Or local association? Historical use? Landmark quality? The policy could be made more effective by saying ‘which contributes positively to the existing street frontage’. Any further guidance on how this might take place will be useful for anyone applying the policy including decision makers, consultees, and designers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text amended: ‘Development of a backland site which requires the demolition of a building, <u>where this building</u> which contributes to the character of the existing street frontage, will not be supported.’</li> </ul>
59	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.9 – off road parking</p> <p>The supporting text and the policy could be altered to refer to ‘current’ parking guidance, rather than specifying the 2015 guidance. This can help prevent the Neighbourhood Plan become out of date if the parking guidance is updated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> <li>Reference to ‘2015’ removed and replaced with ‘current Suffolk Planning Guidance...’</li> </ul>
60	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.9</p> <p>Policy text: “...plots will be positioned to ensure that there is adequate on-plot turning space...” This will be more effective wording for the policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> <li>Original text: ‘...Car parking plots will be positioned to ensure that there is adequate on-plot turning space and forward access to the highway...’</li> <li>Revised:</li> </ul>



				<p>'...Car parking plots should be positioned to ensure that there is adequate on-plot turning space and forward access to the highway...'</p>
61	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.10 – rural tourism          'The wording of this policy is not clear. Is the policy only allowing tourism development in the form of conversion of existing buildings? If so, this would be in conflict with local plan policy WLP8.15 which allows small camping type developments to take place in the countryside (which may not involve permanent structures). Or, is the policy meant to be applied only in the case of conversions of existing structures to holiday accommodation? Either way it is not clear and should be re-worded to improve clarity.'</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MNP.10 (v11.0) relates to a specific part of WLP8.15 and is not in conflict with it</li> <li>• Title of policy amended: 'Rural tourism accommodation <u>within converted buildings</u>'; this will show that the MNP policy sits within the scope of WLP8.15 and strengthening the controls on converting existing buildings, and that it is not in conflict with WLP8.15</li> </ul>
62	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.10          'The supporting text includes reference to a business case but the policy text refers only to a financial viability assessment. These aren't the same thing and it will be helpful if the text and policy are consistent. The policy could require a viability assessment and business case.'</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed.              Amended supporting text:              'A business plan <u>ease which includes a financial viability assessment</u> for the economic viability of any rural tourism development...'</li> <li>• Amended line in policy:              'A <u>business plan which includes a</u> financial viability assessment will be submitted as part of the planning submission.'</li> </ul>
63	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>MNP.10          'Does the policy apply to tourism accommodation conversions within the settlement boundaries? In this location the principle of residential development is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required – the policy applies to conversions both within and outside the settlement boundaries.</li> </ul>

			accepted therefore are the policy requirements necessary?'	
64	31/1/2019	WDC	MNP.10 'Some guidance on what is meant by "long standing" will be very helpful in the interpretation and application of the policy. As it stands there is little to guide or advise on this matter in the neighbourhood plan which could make it difficult to apply and result in confusion for applicants and decision makers.'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Amended text: '...Rural tourism accommodation developments will should only be permitted with the conversion of existing buildings into short-term holiday accommodation provided that the permanent structure <del>is long established</del> <u>has been established for at least five years.</u>'</li> </ul>
65	31/1/2019	WDC	MNP.11 – Rural business Policy bullet point 3: What is meant by "public health matters"? If this is Environmental Health considerations, for example, then this will be dealt with under separate, non-planning legislation and the planning system should not try to resolve these matters. It will not be in the power of decision makers to determine a planning application based on non-planning matters. Matters such as noise are a material planning consideration, but this part of the policy suggests going beyond purely noise considerations. It is recommended that this bullet point is re-worded or removed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Bullet 3 '...Development proposals should demonstrate that they comply with the current public health standards in regard to environmental policies....' deleted from policy.</li> </ul>
66	31/1/2019	WDC	Appendix A Map 2 - It would be helpful to reference where this map comes from to help understand where the policies and allocation can be found.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waveney Local Plan to be identified as the source of Appendix A Map 2 = Map of Settlement boundaries, Open Space and land identified for housing allocation.</li> </ul>
67	31/1/2019	WDC	Appendix C - This list omits the individually Grade II listed barn that lies 20 metres south of Mutford Hall.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. List updated</li> </ul>

68	31/1/2019	WDC	Appendix C - The Suffolk County Council Historic Environment Record shows several interesting features for Mutford including a former common and several finds sites that could usefully be included in the historical section to add further detail. Mutford Common is clearly depicted on Hodskinson's 1783 map and is clearly an important historical feature in the development and layout of the village.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. Map of Mutford Common to be added to Appendices for information. Reference to be added to new para 'Conserving our heritage' in intro to Section 5.</li> <li>• See comment #29</li> </ul>
69	31/1/2019	WDC	<p>General - Site allocation WLP7.13. Following the Waveney Local Plan examination in public, the Council has consulted on a Main Modification to the local plan which include adding the word 'approximately' before each reference to dwelling numbers in housing site allocations. If this modification is supported then the NP should reflect this in all references to the dwelling numbers for WLP7.13.</p> <p>Consultation viewable at this link. Ref MM5:  <a href="http://consult.waveney.gov.uk/consult.ti/waveneyLPmainmodifications2018/consultationHome">http://consult.waveney.gov.uk/consult.ti/waveneyLPmainmodifications2018/consultationHome</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed Noted: 'approximately' added to reference to WLP7.13.</li> </ul>
70	31/1/2019	WDC	General - "Working Party" references throughout. Is this the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party? Would be helpful to clarify.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed 'the Mutford Plan Working Party ("the Working Party")...' in chapter 'What is a Neighbourhood Plan?'</li> </ul>
71	31/1/2019	Statutory consultee: Environment Agency (EA)	<p>Section 5 – page 28</p> <p>'In the section 'Future Development' the Neighbourhood Plan makes reference to capacity at the local Water Recycling Center and the emerging Waveney Local Plan. We recommend that this is taken forward and made into a policy locally for the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required – covered by WLP1.4</li> <li>• See comment #52</li> </ul>

			Neighbourhood of Mutford. We welcome the addition of the drainage hierarchy being included in this policy where new development should connect to the public mains sewer, wherever possible/	
72	31/01/2019	EA	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>‘The main river Lothingland hundred and tributaries lies along the boundary of Mutford. Due to this part of Mutford falls within flood zones 2 and 3, which are known as the high and medium flood zones. The Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate any new development within this area, however, it should be included that any future development within flood zones 2 and 3 should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. The development should also ensure it does not increase flood risk elsewhere. ‘</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required – covered by WLP8.24 Flood Risk</li> </ul>
73	31/01/2019	EA	<p>Ground Water</p> <p>‘Mutford lies over a principal and Secondary Aquifer. For land that may have been affected by contamination as a result of its previous use or that of the surrounding land, sufficient information should be provided with any planning application to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF for dealing with land contamination. This should take the form of a Preliminary Risk Assessment (including a desk study, conceptual model and initial assessment of risk), and provide assurance that the risk to the water environment is fully understood and can be addressed through appropriate measures’</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required – covered by usual planning process. Not for MNP</li> </ul>

74	31/01/2019	EA	<p>Natural Capital</p> <p>'Studies have shown that natural capital assets such as green corridors and green amenity spaces are important in climate change adaptation, flood risk management, increasing biodiversity and for human health and well-being. An overarching strategic framework should be followed to ensure that existing amenities are retained and enhanced. Development management will guide the provision of green infrastructure which should be delivered in a collaborative approach between developers, councillors and the local community.'</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No action required – not for MNP</li></ul>
----	------------	----	---	--

END