



Beccles Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

Summary of Representations

This document contains summaries of the representations made in response to the publication of the Submission Beccles Neighbourhood Plan which was held between 14th December and 8th February 2021. The full representations were submitted to the Examiner for consideration during the Examination of the Beccles 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/beccles-neighbourhood-area/>

Respondent	Summary of representations
East Suffolk Council	<p>Need evidence to support Nationally Described Space Standards in BECC10.</p> <p>Clarification needed relating to what types of development BECC12 applies to and if the sequential approach is needed.</p> <p>Having Heritage as a sub-section of 'Community and Tourist Infrastructure and Facilities' does not give it the weight it deserves. Could be helpful to include NDHA identification criteria.</p>
Alan Keeley	<p>Tourist facilities – Travis Perkins area should be use for tourism and need safe route between Quay and Town Centre.</p> <p>Heritage and Design – Would welcome incentive to reinstate original front boundaries of established roads.</p> <p>Transport and Movement – reverse direction of traffic along Grove Road to reduce number of cars entering town.</p>
Alison Woodstock	<p>Main concern is development's impact on the environment and flooding. In favour of building on brown field sites over green sites. Needs to be more work to make homes resilient to flooding.</p>

Respondent	Summary of representations
Anglian Water Services	Support Policies BECC10 and BECC12.
Beccles Society	Have been involved through development and support Plan, specifically BECC5 and BECC10.
Beccles Twinning Association	Support reference to Petit-Couronne and recommend links to twin towns be encouraged and best practice is shared, especially regarding BECC3 and BECC12.
Broads Authority	<p>Para 4.33 – UPVC may not always be acceptable, dependent on location and design and Beccles Conservation Area being covered by Article 4 direction.</p> <p>Para 4.35 – concerns over requirement for Georgian and Victorian style.</p> <p>Should there be a specific policy on shop signage and advertisements?</p> <p>BECC9 – should mention cycle parking and electric vehicle charging points.</p> <p>BECC10 C – replace with ‘Proposals should seek to avoid any adverse impact on heritage assets (including archaeological assets) on the development site or in its surroundings’.</p> <p>BECC10 E – Any development of any size can impact this, more related to location, context, character and design. Not clear why threshold of 10 has been used.</p> <p>BECC11 – Should include cycle parking.</p> <p>BECC11 C – Broads Local Plan seeks to address lighting.</p> <p>BECC11 G – should seek ‘not adversely affect any heritage assets on the development site or in its surroundings’.</p> <p>Heritage assets need to be defined somewhere.</p> <p>Numerous changes to refer to the Broads more consistently.</p>
Bungay Cherry Tree Angling Club	<p>Lack of reference of Angling or Fishing Pursuits. Comments made in relation to Angling/Fishing.</p> <p>General comments made on Local Context; Vision and Objectives; Community Facilities; and water quality.</p>
C Bickmore	Encourage policies to address public transport; parking; cycle routes; cycle parking; shopping in the town centre; open spaces and recreation; boat parking; and use of former timber yard.

Respondent	Summary of representations
David Bennett	Support given.
Environment Agency	Information provided on and coverage encouraged of water quality and water resources.
Historic England	No comments to make. Refer to representations made as part of the Regulation 14 consultation.
Janet Lloyd	Raises concerns over HGV traffic in Beccles.
Kelvin Allen	Encourages references to Angling and Angling competitions.
Larkfleet Homes	Concern raised over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parts of plan in connection with the allocated Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood which could undermine a comprehensive, masterplanned approach to the site. • the plan text and policies addressing matters outside of the neighbourhood area. • Lack of evidence to support policy requirements of BECC6
Marine Management Organisation	Request reference to the East Marine Plans.
Martin Thompson	Comments made in relation to public transport; pedestrian routes; and highway safety in Beccles.
Michael Ellwood	Concerns raised over highway safety and vehicular traffic levels. Encouragement for proposals to support activity and viability of Beccles town centre.
Michelle Golding	Concerns raised over highway safety; vehicular traffic levels; and public transport.
Natural England	No comments.
Norfolk County Council	No comments.
RSPB	General comments made. Support offered to help improve environments for birds.
Suffolk County Council	Comment made on HGV traffic in town centre.
Suffolk County Council Archaeology	Request link added to Suffolk Heritage Explorer website.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Recommend addition of a new policy to protect and enhance biodiversity and which will deliver biodiversity net gain.
Sustrans	Would like to see improvements in the town with detailed plans.
Theatres Trust	Support for policy BECC2, however would like to see more protection given to community, cultural and social facilities.
Waveney Lower Yare & Lothingland Internal Drainage Board	Request to be consulted over detailed drainage proposals for development.

Late Responses	
Respondent	Summary of representations
Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland IDB	<p>The Parish is located partially within and near to the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the Waveney, Lower Yare, and Lothingland Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and therefore the Board’s Byelaws apply. Advice for new developments provided.</p> <p>Do not believe that flooding and potential issues with the drainage system have been covered sufficiently.</p>
Worlingham Parish Council	<p>Support respect for Parish boundaries on the Garden Neighbourhood.</p> <p>Pedestrianisation and removal of on-road parking could be detrimental to residents of Worlingham; Beccles town centre; and tourism.</p>