



Aldringham cum Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

Summary of Representations

This document contains summaries of the representations made in response to the consultation on the Submission Aldringham cum Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan which was held between 7th May and 18th June 2025. The representations were submitted to the Examiner for consideration during the Examination of the Aldringham cum Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan. Full copies of the representations can be viewed on the following webpage:

<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-plans-in-the-area/aldringham-cum-thorpe-neighbourhood-area/>

Respondent	Summary
Anglian Water Services	<p>Welcomed changes made as a result of comments made at Regulation 14 stage.</p> <p>Noted, however, that the updated text on water supply and drainage (Section 2.23) is only partially amended and does not fully explain the position on infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>Requested that amendments are made in line with the original representation submitted at Regulation 14. The Neighbourhood Plan should clarify how infrastructure capacity will be assessed in the event development is proposed.</p>
Arthur Day	<p>Welcomed the proposals to limit the number of new holiday/second homes in the village.</p>
East Suffolk Council	<p>Supported the Lowestoft Neighbourhood Plan, and it was considered that overall, it complements the East Suffolk- Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (September 2020).</p> <p><u>Comments about the submission document are set out below.</u></p> <p>Comments on policies:</p> <p>Policy ACT1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council commented that there is concern that insufficient consideration has been given to the viability

	<p>of the requirement for all new development in Thorpeness to deliver community benefits in the form of contributions to coastal defence measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council commented it is unclear what mechanism will be used to secure these contributions and what projects contributions will be spent on. <p>Policy ACT2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council commented that the policy will benefit from clear references to Local Plan requirements and the Affordable Housing SPD, particularly in relation to the thresholds for affordable housing delivery. • The Council commented that the policy will benefit from stronger references to viability considerations. <p>Policy ACT3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council commented that the policy should more clearly set out where the policy applies. If the policy applies only to development immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary, then it should be stated in paragraph 7.50. <p>Policy ACT4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council comments that the policy should be revised to clarify that BNG legislation does not allow all biodiversity gain habitat to be delivered solely within the parish where the development is taking place. Additional biodiversity gain habitat creation and/or enhancement would also be required to meet the 10% gain requirement on the development. <p>Policy ACT6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the lack of a definitive timeframe around the aspiration to deliver 20% biodiversity gain by then end of the Plan period, the Council suggests this is removed from the policy text. <p>Policy ACT10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council comments that point 3 is ambiguous with which buildings it refers to. If they are identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal, then that should be stated here, or if they are identified elsewhere then that should be explained. <p>Policy ACT17:</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council identified a typo for correction in final sentence ‘...subject to subject to compliance with the other policies in this Plan.’ <p>Comments on supporting text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 1 requires updating. Para 1.8 should be amended to make clear that the Suffolk Coastal district no longer exists. Paragraphs 1.12 & 1.13 should be updated. A reference to the Thorpeness Article 4 Direction should be considered for para 2.10. The word ‘again’ should be removed in paragraph 3.5. Section 4 should be updated. The relationship between the views identified in the conservation area appraisal and the neighbourhood plan should be explained in paragraphs 8.26-8.34. Paragraph 8.46 should be updated to reflect that consultation on the Suffolk LNRS ended in June 2025. A reference should be added in paragraphs 9.8-9.11 to East Suffolk’s criteria for the identification of Non Designated Heritage Assets. Text in paragraph 10.4 appears to have merged together. The Council suggests an additional return between the final bullet and the text that starts ‘When taken....’ The final sentence in paragraph 11.5 appears to be missing a word ‘...support for a...’ ?
Environment Agency	<p>Commented that they are pleased to see comments made in the Regulation 14 consultation implemented.</p> <p>The Environment Agency noted the Biodiversity Policies within the plan but highlighted the lack of inclusion of a watercourse metric for windfall developments. They highlighted that BNG became mandatory on 12 February 2024, meaning Developers must deliver a net gain in biodiversity of at least 10%.</p> <p>For any windfall developments where development falls within 10m of a watercourse, a watercourse metric should be applied to the assessment.</p> <p>The Environment Agency highlighted their published guidance on Neighbourhood Planning, available here: How to consider the environment in Neighbourhood plans - Locality Neighbourhood Planning</p>
Historic England	<p>Commented that they do not consider it necessary to provide further detailed comments, instead referring to the previous comments submitted as part of the Regulation 14 consultation,</p>

	and to their detailed advice on their website on incorporating Historic Environment considerations into a Neighbourhood Plan.
Jane Blanchflower	<p>The following comments were made:</p> <p>Policy ACT1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy is too narrowed in its focus. Contributions should focus on enhancing the natural landscape away from vulnerable coastline and more long-term benefits. <p>Policy ACT2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with paragraph 7.42. New dwellings should be required to be principal residences. These should be gradually diminished as properties sell to avoid erosion of community sense. <p>Policy ACT3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should apply to replacement dwellings unless they are principal residences. <p>Policy ACT12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep joggers and walkers of the Thorpeness/Aldeburgh road and B1353 as it is too dangerous. <p>Policy ACT13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with policy. Second home owners cars should be parked on property boundaries to provide more parking for residents.
National Grid (Fisher German)	Confirmed the presence of one or more NGET assets within the Plan area. They confirm that there are no known new infrastructure interactions within the area.
National Highways	Noted that the nearest SRN junction is the A14 Junction 58 (Seven Hills Interchange). However, they comment that they do not anticipate that the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan to have any adverse impact on the operation of the A14 trunk road. Therefore, has no further comments on the proposed policies.
Natural England	Confirmed that they do not have any specific comments on this draft Neighbourhood Plan.
Suffolk County Council	<p>Welcomed the changes made to the plan in response to comments made at the Reg. 14 pre-submission consultation stage.</p> <p>The following comments were made:</p> <p>Archaeology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the Regulation 14 consultation, Suffolk County Council recommended an addition under section 9. This has not been implemented, however SCC comments

	<p>that it is required in order for the plan to accord with paragraph 5 of the PPG. Therefore, the wording set out within their Regulation 14 consultation response should be included.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCC welcomes that the parish council have taken in board their comments relating to paragraph 3.4. However, they note that the paragraph refers to a map of the minerals consultation area, but the map has not been included. For clarity, the SCC recommends removal of the reference or the addition of the map. <p>Natural Environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For clarity, figure 40 label should be amended to “Figure 40: Green <u>Settlement</u> gaps in Aldringham”. The amendment should also be reflected on the key of the Policies Map in Appendix E. • SCC identified a typo within Policy ACT5. An addition recommended by SCC has been added, however wording was not removed as suggested, resulting in lack of clarity. SCC recommends the following wording “[...] developments which would have a significant <u>unacceptable</u> adverse impact on the landscape or character of the view concerned will not be supported”. • Local Green Space 13 (formerly Space 16), set out under Appendix B, does not have a size included in its description. SCC recommend that a site size in hectares is added. <p>General Typographical errors should be amended within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2, page 39 • Objective 2, Page 54 • Paragraph 8.5 • Policy ACT6 requires a comma removal. • Repetitive paragraph numbers with paragraphs 7.11 and 7.12.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	<p>Welcomed amendments made in response to their Regulation 14 consultation comments.</p> <p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust comments their support of the following objectives and policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Environment: Objective 2 • Objective 3: To protect and enhance the parish’s important wildlife habitats and landscape

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 5: To encourage the provision of appropriate visitor facilities at key destinations, consistent with the protection and conservation of the environment, to facilitate responsible enjoyment, recreation, research, education, involvement, and communication. • Policy ACT6 Biodiversity. <p>However, the Suffolk Wildlife Trust recommends the following amendment: the final sentence of policy ACT4 (“Where such mitigations are required in respect of biodiversity the standard biodiversity net gain metric of 10% should be applied.”) should be amended to make clear that 10% is the statutory minimum in terms of delivering Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>
William Pecover	<p>Highlighted internal inconsistencies is the description, assessment and understanding of the unique nature of Thorpeness. Objected to Policy ACT3 and raised concerns that restrictions on second homes in Thorpeness is diametrically opposed to what drives the success of Thorpeness (tourism).</p> <p>Suggested that the impacts of large scale energy projects should also be noted under Housing Policy ACT1 and that large scale housing projects take into account the increase in construction traffic.</p> <p>Suggested that the golf practice range at the golf club should be designated as a Local Green Space in Policy ACT6.</p>