

Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement

(The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 – Regulation 18)

Date of Publication: 11 March 2025

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan underwent examination with the independent Examiner publishing their report in January 2024. The Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the Local Planning Authorities) disagreed with some of the Examiner’s modifications and proposed some alternative modifications. Following a consultation on the alternative modifications, the Local Planning Authorities have decided to take forward the alternative modifications alongside those from the Examiner which are agreed. The Local Planning Authorities now confirm that the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum subject to the modifications set out in section 3.

2 Background

- 2.1 Carlton Colville Town Council, as the Qualifying Body, successfully applied for designation of their Neighbourhood Area under The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The [neighbourhood area](#)¹ was designated by East Suffolk Council, in consultation with the Broads Authority, on 5th June 2019.
- 2.2 The Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan was published by Carlton Colville Town Council for pre-submission consultation (Regulation 14) between 26th March and 21st May 2022.
- 2.3 Following the submission of the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan ([submission version](#)²) to the Local Planning Authorities, the Plan was publicised and comments

¹ <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Neighbourhood-Planning/Designated-Neighbourhood-Areas/Carlton-Colville/Determination-and-decision.pdf>

² <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Neighbourhood-Planning/Designated-Neighbourhood-Areas/Carlton-Colville/Carlton-Colville-Neighbourhood-Plan-Submission.pdf>

invited over a six week period commencing on 10th May and closing on 21st June 2023.

- 2.4 The Local Planning Authorities, with the agreement of Carlton Colville Town Council, appointed independent examiner, Nigel McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI, to examine the Plan and to consider whether it met the Basic Conditions required by legislation and whether it should proceed to Referendum.
- 2.5 In the Examiner's [report](#)³ received on 15th January 2024, the Examiner recommended a number of modifications to the neighbourhood plan which he deemed were necessary in order for the plan to meet the 'Basic Conditions' and proceed to a referendum. He recommended that the neighbourhood plan referendum area should be based on the approved Neighbourhood Area.
- 2.6 After considering the Examiner's report and following discussion with the Town Council, the Local Planning Authorities proposed to take a different view on some of the recommendations made by the Examiner. The Neighbourhood Planning legislation (www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/schedule/4B) states that if the Local Planning Authority(s) propose to make a decision which differs from that recommended by the examiner, under certain circumstances the authority must notify prescribed persons of their proposed decision (and the reason for it) and invite representations. Furthermore, if the Local Planning Authority(s) consider it appropriate to do so, they may subsequently refer the matter to independent examination.

Additional Focused Consultation on Proposed Alternative Modifications

- 2.7 Accordingly, the Local Planning Authorities carried out an 'Additional Focussed Consultation' on proposed alternative modifications between the 11th December 2024 and 5th February 2025. Everyone who was consulted as part of the Regulation 16 publicity stage, plus anyone responding to the Regulation 16 publicity (who was not originally notified), were notified of the consultation. This includes all statutory consultation bodies and any person or body whose details were supplied by the Town Council as part of the Regulation 15 submission. The consultation material can be accessed here: <https://eastsuffolk.inconsult.uk/CCNPAFC/consultationHome>
- 2.8 10 responses to the consultation were received from the following:
- Anglian Water
 - Carlton Colville Town Council
 - Historic England
 - Lowestoft Town Council
 - Marine Management Organisation
 - National Highways
 - Natural England

³ <http://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Neighbourhood-Planning/Designated-Neighbourhood-Areas/Carlton-Colville/Carlton-Colville-Examiners-Report-15th-Jan-2024.pdf>

- Suffolk County Council (Neighbourhood Planning)
- Suffolk County Council Directorate of Public Health and Communities
- Water Management Alliance

In respect of the proposed alternative modifications, all of the responses can be summarised as either 'no comment', 'no objection', or 'in support'. Some additional general commentary was provided by some of the respondents, but this did not relate to the proposed alternative modifications.

Summarised responses are provided in Appendix A, and the full responses can be viewed in here: <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Neighbourhood-Planning/Designated-Neighbourhood-Areas/Carlton-Colville/Responses-to-Carlton-Colville-NP-Additional-Focused-Consultation.pdf>

- 2.9 Following the consultation, [part 4B of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act](#)⁴ states that "if the authority consider it appropriate to do so, they may refer the issue to independent examination." The Act does not say how an authority should approach the matter of whether further examination is appropriate or not. Accordingly, in determining whether it is 'appropriate' to refer the neighbourhood plan to a further examination, two main factors are considered:
- a) Whether there are any conflicting views to be resolved by an examiner, and
 - b) Whether the proposed alternative modifications meet the Basic Conditions
- 2.10 With respect to a) resolving conflicting views, no representations were received which disagreed or objected to the proposed alternative modifications in any sense. The comments were either supportive or neutral. As such there were no conflicting views to resolve.
- 2.11 With respect to b) whether the alternative modifications meet the Basic Conditions, an analysis of each alternative modification against each Basic Condition has been carried out. This finds that each of the alternative modifications meets each of the Basic Conditions. This analysis can be found in Appendix B.
- 2.12 Accordingly, the LPAs find no reason to refer the neighbourhood plan to further independent examination.
- 2.13 The legislation requires that the LPAs consider each of the Examiner's recommended modifications, the reasons for them, and decide what action to take. The LPAs are taking these decisions based on the Examiner's report and the consultation on the proposed alternative modifications. The decisions on each of the Examiner's recommended modifications and the reasons for them are set out in table 1 below. Ahead of this consideration, the Report and its findings have been considered between the Council and Carlton Colville Town Council.

⁴ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/schedule/4B>

3. Decision and Reasons

- 3.1 East Suffolk Council, under powers delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control, and the Broads Authority, using powers delegated to the Director of Strategic Services, have considered each of the Examiner's recommended modifications. Where the LPAs agree with the Examiner's recommended modifications, this is clearly stated and the amendments are made accordingly. Where the LPAs disagree with the Examiner's recommended modifications, this is clearly stated along with the reasons why and the revised modifications to be made. This is all set out in Table 1 below.
- 3.2 The LPAs have also identified a further modification to the Plan which is considered necessary to clarify the role of supporting text in the neighbourhood plan, set out in Table 2 below.
- 3.3 With the inclusion of the modifications in Table 1 and Table 2, The Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council have decided that the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions identified in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, is compatible with the Convention rights and complies with provisions made by or under Section 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Consequently, the submission version of the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan will be modified as set out in tables 1 and 2 below for it then to proceed to referendum.
- 3.4 The LPAs have considered the referendum area as recommended by the Examiner and have decided there is no reason to extend the area for the purposes of the referendum. The Referendum area will be the same as the designated Neighbourhood Area for the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan.
- 3.5 The list of modifications and actions required are set out in Tables 1 and 2 below. As a consequence of these changes the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan will be re-published and titled the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum Version).



Ben Woolnough MRTPI

Head of Planning and Building Control

East Suffolk Council

10th March 2025



Marie-Pierre Tighe

Director of Strategic Services

Broads Authority

11th March 2025

Table 1: Decisions and Actions by the LPAs in response to the Examiner's recommended modifications

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>Para 1.2 change last sentence to: "...and therefore its policies carry equal weight to those of the relevant Local..."</p> <p>However, the Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the development plan and therefore <u>its policies carry equal weight to those of</u> is given equal weight to the relevant Local Plan in the decision-making process.</p>	This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
<p>Delete last sentence of Para 1.3 ("It is...provided."). NB, the policies of the Development Plan are considered as a whole.</p> <p>It is therefore assumed that the Plan will be read as a whole, although some cross-referencing between Plan policies has been provided.</p>	This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
<p>Change first sentence of Para 1.4 to: "...actions which are not contained within the Neighbourhood Plan's policies. This is..."</p> <p>The process of producing the Neighbourhood Plan has identified a number of actions which <u>are not contained within the Neighbourhood Plan's policies.</u> have not been included in the policies' sections.</p>	This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
<p>Change first sentence of Para 1.8 to: "The allocation in the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan establishes the following principles for the development of the site:"</p>	This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p><u>The allocation in the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan establishes the following principles for the development of the site:</u> There are a number of important principles that have already been identified in the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan which development of the site is expected to address:</p>		
<p>Delete Para 1.9. NB, the site is allocated in an adopted Local Plan. It is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan to "work with these principles to deliver better outcomes..."</p> <p>This Neighbourhood Plan seeks to work with these principles to deliver better outcomes built on local knowledge and needs</p>	<p>This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>
<p>Delete Para 1.12, which appears to suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan has a different role in respect of adopted allocations than is the case.</p> <p>Carlton Colville Town Council wanted its community to be able to help shape any new developments across the area, including the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan allocations. The Neighbourhood Plan provides an opportunity to identify priorities and policies that can shape our local area for the period to 2036. In respect of the Local Plan allocations, it should be recognised that we cannot at this stage say definitely what these</p>	<p>This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
developments will finally look and feel like but we can help guide and shape them. To do this we will need engagement with developers, the local planning authority and the community.		
<p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not provide “a blueprint for development.” Change first sentence of Para 1.13 to: “A group consisting...” Change last sentence of Para 1.13 to “Community feedback received formed an important part of the consultation process and has informed the production of this Neighbourhood Plan.”</p> <p>Consequently, a A group consisting of members of the public and councillors....</p> <p>Using this feedback plus the local knowledge of the Neighbourhood Plan Group we have produced a plan that creates a blueprint for development in our community for the period to 2036. Community feedback received formed an important part of the consultation process and has informed the production of this Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
Para 2.8. This Para does not refer to a Policy requirement in the Neighbourhood Plan, change wording of second sentence to: “...designation, the Town Council will seek to ensure that this site of historic interest to the local community, including its setting, are	This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>considered in respect of any new development proposals."</p> <p>Although this is not a formal designation, <u>the Town Council will seek to ensure that this site</u> it should be noted that this is a site of historic interest to the local community, <u>including its setting, are considered in respect of any new development proposals.</u> the setting of which should be considered when planning new development.</p>		
<p>Change last sentence of Para 2.13 to: "The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan requires that development on this part of the site should not be commenced until the land for sports and leisure use has been made available for use."</p> <p><u>The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan requires development</u> Development on this part of the site <u>should</u> will not be commenced until the land for sports and leisure use has been made available for use.</p>	<p>This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>
<p>Para 3.1, delete last three sentences ("In doing so...needs.")</p> <p>In doing so we recognise that we cannot at this stage say definitely what these developments will finally look and feel like but we can help guide and shape them. To do this we will need engagement with developers, East</p>	<p>This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
Suffolk Council and the community. We can guide and influence these discussions by being clear on what this community feels it needs.		
<p>Para 3.1 change third sentence to: "In addition, where possible, we want to help shape the two major development allocations in the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan."</p> <p>In addition, where possible, we want to help be able to guide and shape the two major development allocations in the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan.</p>	This modification was recommended for clarity and accuracy.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
<p>Policy CC1, delete part v of the Policy ("in the case of...amenity of neighbours;")</p> <p>v. in the case of residential development, providing a level of private open space that reflects the size of the household:</p> <p>a. On major development (as defined in the NPPF5), back gardens should ensure that they meet the Local Plan Policy WLP8.33 requirement to be 'attractive, useable and proportionately sized', with properties of at least 3 bedrooms providing a minimum of 60m2 of back garden space where possible;</p> <p>b. Proposals to extend any residential property that materially reduces the existing levels of garden space</p>	Part v. of the policy was considered to be reliant upon an adopted Policy in the Local Plan and therefore is unnecessary.	Agreed. Policy CC1 has been amended as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>should only be permitted if it does not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours;</p> <p>Policy CC1, delete part vii of the Policy ("supporting...document.")</p> <p>vii. supporting and enabling walking and cycling by effectively integrating walking and cycling infrastructure (including public rights of way and Key Movement Routes as identified in Policy CC3) into development and ensuring that links into the wider network are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. Development must demonstrate how it has been informed by the Suffolk Design Streets Guide or any successor document.</p>	<p>Part vii is considered to impose onerous requirements on all forms of development without evidence to suggest that these requirements are deliverable, whilst having regard to Paragraph 16 and Paragraph 57 of the NPPF 2021.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The whole of part A of the policy applies to development proposals 'as appropriate to their scale, nature and location' - therefore it does not need to be applied to all development and is not considered to be onerous. A minor change to the wording with respect to the application of the Suffolk Design Streets Guide will help to clarify this. It is unclear how paragraph 57 of the NPPF 2021 is relevant to this part of the policy. It is considered that amendment to Policy CC3 rather than deletion of this part of the policy is a more reasonable modification.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (1):</p> <p>Amend part vii to read:</p> <p><i>'vii. supporting and enabling walking and cycling by effectively integrating walking and cycling infrastructure (including public rights of way) into development and ensuring that links into the wider network are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. Where appropriate,</i></p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		<i>development must demonstrate how it has been informed by the Suffolk Design Streets Guide or any successor document.'</i>
<p>Policy CC1, part B, delete first two sentences and replace with "All new development should demonstrate high quality design and is required to respect its surroundings. The following will be supported:"</p> <p>B. In delivering high quality design, all development proposals must demonstrate that they make appropriate use of materials and features. As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, the following are encouraged to be part of design proposals for development: <u>All new development should demonstrate high quality design and is required to respect its surroundings. The following will be supported.</u></p>	<p>It is considered unclear how development proposals "must demonstrate that they make appropriate use of materials and features." There is no indication set out in the Policy as to what an appropriate use of materials and features comprises, who will determine this and on what basis.</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC1 has been amended as recommended.</p>
<p>Policy CC1, part B i, delete last two sentences ("The choice...existing properties.")</p> <p>The choice of materials is expected to minimise the carbon footprint of development. This only applies to new development as opposed to extensions of existing properties.</p>	<p>It is considered that there is no indication for how a requirement for the choice of material to "minimise the carbon footprint of development" will be judged or controlled. This part of the policy is judged to be ambiguous and therefore does not have regard to national guidance.</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC1 has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
Policy CC1, delete part B iv iv. Layouts of large residential development that are required to provide on-site public green space shall ensure this is located at the heart of the development where activity levels are highest.	It is considered that the wording in this part of the policy has the unintended outcome of suggesting that extensions to existing buildings need not respect their surroundings.	Agreed. Policy CC1 has been amended as recommended.
Policy CC1, delete part C C. Proposals for residential development must demonstrate how the design of individual units takes account of changing demands and lifestyles by providing adaptable internal layouts and allowing for cost effective alterations.	It is considered that there is no information to demonstrate that provision of adaptable internal layouts allowing for cost effective alterations in respect of every new home to be provided in the Neighbourhood Area, as required by the Policy, is deliverable.	Agreed. Policy CC1 has been amended as recommended.
Para 4.3, change to: "...focusing on how the Neighbourhood Plan can help to support the creation of a cohesive..." As the single largest development that is likely to affect the community during the plan period, we have spent a lot of time focusing on how the Neighbourhood Plan can help to support the creation of we can ensure this development can become a cohesive, attractive part of the Plan Area through its design and layout.	It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
Para 4.4, change second sentence to: "The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan (shown at Figure 1.1 in this plan) establishes these, including locating..."	It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>Many of these have already been established by the illustrative masterplan in the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan (shown at Figure 1.1 in this plan); <u>The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan (shown at Figure 1.1 in this plan) establishes these,</u> including locating the country park in the west to allow the existing water runoff pattern to be preserved, thus retaining the scheduled monument's seasonal wet characteristic.</p>	<p>it should not comprise policy requirements</p>	
<p>Delete Para 4.5 (which appears to suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan has a different role in respect of adopted allocations than is the case)</p> <p>The guidance contained in the Neighbourhood Plan should influence discussions with developers and East Suffolk Council, but the final layout, look and feel will be subject to detailed plans. However, the Neighbourhood Plan has been informed by the aspirations and desires of our community to ensure that these are not over-looked.</p>	<p>It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>This paragraph correctly states that the neighbourhood plan will influence discussions with developers and the Local Planning Authority with respect to the site allocated by Local Plan policy WLP2.16. It also acknowledges that the final design will be subject to detailed plans. It is not agreed that this text provides an inaccurate indication of the role of the Neighbourhood Plan. Nonetheless, there is scope to add clarity with respect to the text being guidance only and also in relation to the role that masterplanning will play in delivering the allocated site, as required by adopted policy WLP2.16. Accordingly, it is recommended that some additional text is added to address this within the supporting text.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (2):</p> <p>Amend para. 4.5 to read: <i>'The guidance contained in the Neighbourhood <u>Plan is intended to</u> should influence discussions with developers</i></p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		<i>and East Suffolk Council, but the final layout, look and feel will be subject to <u>a developer-led Masterplanning process which will be informed by detailed site appraisal and assessment and ongoing community engagement</u> detailed plans. However, the Neighbourhood Plan has been informed by the aspirations and desires of our community to ensure that these are not over-looked <u>and this presents an early insight into the challenges and opportunities for the future Masterplanning process</u>.</i>
Para 4.9, change last sentence to: "...should be considered are identified..." Specific views that should be <u>considered</u> preserved are identified separately in Policy CC2.	It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
Para 4.10, change second sentence to: "...edge of the development should respect the existing..." For example, the buildings adjacent to the Bell Farm development site do not exceed two storeys, therefore the edge of the development <u>should</u> will need to respect the existing building height, tapering off in height as they meet the open countryside.	It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
Delete Figure 4.9 (which does not show the precise location of heritage assets/issues but appears as a confusing plan)	It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and	Agreed. Figure 4.9 has been deleted as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
Figure 4.9 Map showing heritage issues	it should not comprise policy requirements	
<p>Delete Paras 4.15 to 4.21 inclusive. Delete Figure 4.12. (This section reads as though it comprises policy requirements, which is not the case)</p> <p>Natural environment and open space</p> <p>4.15 Street trees and hedges should form the main boundary treatment between private and public space and existing hedges and trees should be retained and enhanced whenever possible.</p> <p>4.16 In larger developments there should be generous provision of open space to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deliver a 'garden character'; • facilitate healthy lifestyles and wellbeing for future residents; • provide space for nature (including the retention of the best of existing hedgerows and trees)²; • where necessary, accommodate sustainable drainage (although developers are encouraged to incorporate sustainable drainage throughout a 	It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Use of supporting text to guide the application of the policies is supported. The supporting text is distinct from the policy text, which is contained within a green text box. Parts of paras 4.15 to 4.21 apply to parts of policy CC1 which are removed. Alternative supporting text is therefore set out below.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (3):</p> <p>Paras 4.15 to 4.21 inclusive to be deleted and new text to be added to form new para. 4.19 to read: <u>'Open spaces provided as part of new developments should be connected to the wider town where possible using paths that encourage walking and cycling.'</u></p> <p>Natural environment and open space</p> <p>4.15 Street trees and hedges should form the main boundary treatment between private and public space and existing hedges and trees should be retained and enhanced whenever</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>development and to manage water at source, rather than conveying surface water to a single location, such as areas of open space); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide opportunities for residents to grow their own food, including good sized gardens and allotments. <p>²Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan paragraph 2.14 and Policy WLP2.19 note the presence of the Carlton Grove ancient woodland/County Wildlife Site and require its conservation</p> <p>4.17 Well subscribed allotments already exist off Rouncles Lane and Policy CC7 proposes that a minimum of 0.57 hectares of new allotment space is provided at the Bell Farm development³.</p> <p>4.18 Back gardens should meet the Local Plan Policy WLP8.33 requirement to be 'attractive, useable and proportionately sized'. Most major development sites (which the NPPF defines as 10 or more homes or a site of 0.5 hectares or more) have the scope to ensure that all gardens are a minimum of 60m². This is based on its depth being 10m in order to avoid being overlooked and 6m being the approximate width of a house. This broad level of private open space provision should, where possible, be reflected in the housing layouts proposed,</p>		<p>possible.</p> <p>4.16 In larger developments there should be generous provision of open space to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> deliver a 'garden character'; facilitate healthy lifestyles and wellbeing for future residents; provide space for nature (including the retention of the best of existing hedgerows and trees)²; where necessary, accommodate sustainable drainage (although developers are encouraged to incorporate sustainable drainage throughout a development and to manage water at source, rather than conveying surface water to a single location, such as areas of open space); and provide opportunities for residents to grow their own food, including good sized gardens and allotments.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>particularly for larger, family-sized houses where large back garden spaces are most well used. The design of gardens is also important and should be considered to allow leisure and horticultural activities.</p> <p>4.19 Extensive tree planting and retention of existing hedgerows and trees will assist in defining the character of the new development area.</p> <p>4.20 The design should recognise and provide the support for flood alleviation and encourage water retention for re-use. This is addressed in more detail in Section 6.</p> <p>4.21 The Bell Farm site will need to contain different types of open spaces to mitigate heritage and flooding issues as well as to meet the needs of the people living within the development. The open spaces should be connected to the wider village as well as each other with pedestrian paths in order to encourage walking and cycling. It should also seek to provide views from the retirement homes/care home looking out over the open space, aiming to enhance the experience for these residents, which should be a key consideration for development. Ultimately the open spaces should aim to offer a variety of experiences adding interest.</p>		<p>²Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan paragraph 2.14 and Policy WLP2.19 note the presence of the Carlton Grove ancient woodland/County Wildlife Site and require its conservation</p> <p>4.17 Well subscribed allotments already exist off Rounces Lane and Policy CC7 proposes that a minimum of 0.57 hectares of new allotment space is provided at the Bell Farm development².</p> <p>4.18 Back gardens should meet the Local Plan Policy WLP8.33 requirement to be 'attractive, useable and proportionately sized'. Most major development sites (which the NPPF defines as 10 or more homes or a site of 0.5 hectares or more) have the scope to ensure that all gardens are a minimum of 60m². This is based on its depth being 10m in order to avoid being overlooked and 6m being the approximate width of a house. This broad level of private open space provision should, where possible, be reflected in the housing layouts proposed, particularly for larger, family-sized houses where large back garden spaces are most well used. The design of gardens is also important and should be considered to allow leisure and horticultural activities.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>³How this figure is derived is explained in paragraph 7.6</p> <p>Figure 4.12 Principles and examples of open space</p>		<p>4.19 Extensive tree planting and retention of existing hedgerows and trees will assist in defining the character of the new development area.</p> <p>4.20 The design should recognise and provide the support for flood alleviation and encourage water retention for re-use. This is addressed in more detail in Section 6.</p> <p>4.21 The Bell Farm site will need to contain different types of open spaces to mitigate heritage and flooding issues as well as to meet the needs of the people living within the development. The open spaces should be connected to the wider village as well as each other with pedestrian paths in order to encourage walking and cycling. It should also seek to provide views from the retirement homes/care home looking out over the open space, aiming to enhance the experience for these residents, which should be a key consideration for development. Ultimately the open spaces should aim to offer a variety of experiences adding interest.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		<p>³How this figure is derived is explained in paragraph 7.6</p> <p>Figure 4.12 Principles and examples of open space</p>
<p>Delete Para 4.25 (which is not a policy requirement)</p> <p>4.25 These principles should inform the design of development generally but, in particular in the Bell Farm development.</p>	<p>It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>
<p>Para 4.26, delete last two sentences ("Any flood...surrounding area.") (which read as policy requirements, but are not)</p> <p>Any flood mitigation should have a natural character whilst recognising that it must fully be able to fulfil its primary function of flood mitigation. It should provide quieter spaces for relaxation and reflection as Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan Submission (Reg 16) Consultation Version 34 well as good pedestrian and cycling links through to the rest of the development and surrounding area.</p>	<p>It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The supporting text is distinct from the policy text, which is contained within a green text box. As such, the first sentence can be retained. Flood mitigation schemes which can provide pedestrian and cycle links plus quiet spaces are likely to be few, therefore this part of the text should be reworded so that this expectation does not need to be placed on all flood mitigation schemes.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (4):</p> <p>Retain penultimate sentence (Any flood mitigation...)</p> <p>Amend final sentence (It should provide quieter...) to read: <u>Where possible</u>, it should provide quieter spaces for</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		<i>relaxation and reflection and good pedestrian and cycling links through to the rest of the development and surrounding area.</i>
<p>Delete Paras 4.27 to 4.29 inclusive. (These paras read as though they are policy requirements, which they are not. In making this recommendation, I note that the retained Para 4.30 largely summarises the intent of previous paragraphs)</p> <p>4.27 In any larger development the neighbourhood 'general area' surrounding the centre is the largest character area and should provide a more open feel than the centre, with larger front gardens and a mix of housing typologies. The streets in this area should be used for local access, therefore providing a quieter atmosphere to the centre. The neighbourhood edge should have a less urban character and act as a soft boundary to the surrounding countryside, with the dwellings looking out over the open space. This character area should have edge lanes, which allows access to a smaller number of dwellings.</p> <p>4.28 The street layout should generally tend towards preserving the village feel of Carlton Colville although the streets at the centre of the development, including main access points, will need to have roads wide enough to</p>	<p>It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The supporting text is distinct from the policy text, which is contained within a green text box. The supporting text describes principles of good design which are applicable to major developments. There is no clear reason why these cannot be included in the plan. A re-wording is considered a more appropriate modification to clarify that the guidance applies to major residential developments (ie. 10+ dwellings) which about the countryside. Reference to pedestrian and cycle movement is included within the supporting text due to this principle being removed from the later 'Neighbourhood Edges' section of the plan.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (5):</p> <p>Delete para.s 4.27 to 4.29 inclusive.</p> <p>4.27 In any larger development the neighbourhood 'general area' surrounding the centre is the largest character area and should provide a more open feel than the centre, with larger front gardens and a mix of housing typologies. The streets in this area should be used for</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>facilitate buses access. This pattern will tend to distort towards the settlement edge and considerations of sustainable design will also influence layout. For example, the alignment of houses may need to be adjusted to maximise passive solar gain.</p> <p>4.29 Wherever possible, views down main roads should terminate with a focal point such as a building with distinctive features. This will help to improve legibility and provide visual interest.</p>		<p>local access, therefore providing a quieter atmosphere to the centre. The neighbourhood edge should have a less urban character and act as a soft boundary to the surrounding countryside, with the dwellings looking out over the open space. This character area should have edge lanes, which allows access to a smaller number of dwellings.</p> <p>4.28 The street layout should generally tend towards preserving the village feel of Carlton Colville although the streets at the centre of the development, including main access points, will need to have roads wide enough to facilitate buses access. This pattern will tend to distort towards the settlement edge and considerations of sustainable design will also influence layout. For example, the alignment of houses may need to be adjusted to maximise passive solar gain.</p> <p>4.29 Wherever possible, views down main roads should terminate with a focal point such as a building with distinctive features. This will help to improve legibility and provide visual interest.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		Insert after para. 4.30: <u>Where major residential development abuts the countryside, the edges should have a soft appearance which can be supported through dwellings facing out to the countryside. Where possible, edge lanes should be incorporated which allow access to a small number of dwellings. Edge lanes should allow for pedestrian and cycle movement around the edge of the site where possible.</u>
<p>Para 4.32 Guidance is precisely that, change opening sentence to: "Development should take account of the Suffolk Design...cars." Delete last sentence ("Development should...guidance.")</p> <p>It is important that development follows the guidance provided by <u>Development should take account of</u> the Suffolk Design Streets Guide⁴ which provides clear advice on different types of road layout for different types of streets and developments</p> <p>Development should ensure that it is informed by this guidance.</p>	It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
Delete Paras 4.33 to 4.43 inclusive. (These paras read as though they are policy requirements, which they are not)	It is considered that the supporting text for Policy CC1 contains a lot of text set out as policy requirements. Supporting text is precisely that and it should not comprise policy requirements	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>Neighbourhood edges</p> <p>4.33 Neighbourhood 'edges' where development adjoins open countryside should be landscaped to create a less urban character and act as a soft boundary to the surrounding countryside, with the dwellings having soft boundaries to the open land, looking out over the open space. These areas should have edge lanes, which allows access to a small number of dwellings. We want to be able to access and enjoy the views from the edge of the development, i.e. it is not just the home owner at the edge of the site that can enjoy the views/open aspects.</p> <p>4.34 The neighbourhood edge should consist of mainly detached houses on bigger plots, creating a looser grain more sympathetic to the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>4.35 Dwellings at the edge of the site should face outwards, looking over the surrounding countryside creating a soft boundary to the open space. Hard boundaries such as high fences and garden buildings should be avoided at the site edge.</p> <p>4.36 Edge lanes should be used for the roads at the site boundary. These lanes should have soft landscaping to blend into the open countryside and regular breaks in the roads and lanes should have a footpath and a cycle lane,</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>both of which should continue when the road terminates, aiming to limit car use and encourage pedestrian and cycle activity by enhancing safe links.</p> <p>Future-proofing</p> <p>4.37 Any development should be a forward looking, 21st-century development and the architectural design needs to be influenced by best sustainable design considerations whilst visually reflecting the character of traditional Suffolk buildings, eg pitch of roofs, building materials used, decorative features etc.</p> <p>4.38 Resource-efficient homes should be designed to take account of changing demands and lifestyles by providing adaptable internal layouts and allowing for cost effective alterations. For example, proposals should ensure provision of appropriate space for home working, safe family play, multi-generational living and adequate off-street parking.</p> <p>4.39 The interface between homes and other buildings should be carefully planned to fully integrate parking, bin storage, boundary treatments, planting and sustainable drainage in a considered way.</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>4.40 Light pollution from artificial light should be limited through detailed design for the amenity of local residents, the landscape and nature conservation (see Policy CC6 in Section 6).</p> <p>4.41 Proposals should recognise and take account of the wider historical and cultural heritage of the site. This includes identifying and taking opportunities to conserve the setting of listed buildings or monuments which are in close proximity to the site. Design for movement</p> <p>4.42 There should be a strong design focus on high quality housing and in particular good street design—streets must be designed primarily as places for people, as advocated in Manual for Streets, not primarily for cars.</p> <p>4.43 New developments should be designed to be carefully and sensitively integrated into both the existing adjacent residential areas and the open countryside. In the latter instance, development should have a carefully designed transitional character zone that ensures it sits well in the landscape on any approaches. They should allow for good connectivity primarily on foot and cycle without users feeling threatened by poorly designed routes that are more likely to attract crime and anti-</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
social behaviour. This matter, along with car parking, is addressed in Policies CC3 and CC4 in Section 5.		
<p>Policy CC2, delete first and second sentences and replace with: "Development must respect the Parish's scenic beauty and should demonstrate how the following views have been taken into consideration:"</p> <p>Development proposals are expected to conserve the scenic beauty of the parish. In particular, the four cherished views shown in Figure 4.21 shall be preserved: <u>Development must respect the Parish's scenic beauty and should demonstrate how the following views have been taken into consideration:</u></p>	<p>It is considered that Policy CC2 should seek to ensure that development respects its surroundings. However, it is worded to require the preservation of views. It is considered impossible to fully preserve a view a view can change on an annual, seasonal, daily and even hourly basis. It is therefore considered that Policy CC2 is currently a vague policy that would necessarily place a significant hurdle in the way of the Neighbourhood Plan's contribution to the achievement of sustainable development. As set out, the Policy does not meet the basic conditions.</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC2 has been amended as recommended.</p>
<p>Policy CC2, delete part B ("Development...preserved.")</p> <p>B. Development which may impact on any of these views must demonstrate through its layout how vistas from public viewpoints will be preserved.</p>	<p>It is considered that Policy CC2 should seek to ensure that development respects its surroundings. However, it is worded to require the preservation of views. It is considered impossible to fully preserve a view a view can change on an annual, seasonal, daily and even hourly basis. It is therefore</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC2 has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
	considered that Policy CC2 is currently a vague policy that would necessarily place a significant hurdle in the way of the Neighbourhood Plan's contribution to the achievement of sustainable development. As set out, the Policy does not meet the basic conditions.	
<p>Para 4.44, delete all after first sentence and replace with: "Based on input from the community, four important views have been identified and these are shown in Figure 4.21 and are described below."</p> <p>Based on input from the community and work undertaken to inform the allocation of the Bell Farm site have identified three views which are considered to be of particular significance and local importance. These views should be preserved when development proposals come forward. These views are shown in Figure 4.21 and described below. <u>Based on input from the community, four important views have been identified and these are shown in Figure 4.21 and are described below.</u></p>	The amendments to the supporting text for Policy CC2 is based on the suggested modifications to Policy CC2.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
<p>Para 4.46, delete penultimate sentence ("Preserving...the site.")</p> <p>Preserving the view enables the asset to be viewed in context and also preserves the community's enjoyment of this heritage asset and its setting and the views across the site.</p>	The amendments to the supporting text for Policy CC2 is based on the suggested modifications to Policy CC2.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>Para 4.47, delete last sentence ("This view...assets.")</p> <p>This view therefore preserves an historic landscape view and connectivity between two notable historic assets.</p>	The amendments to the supporting text for Policy CC2 is based on the suggested modifications to Policy CC2.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
<p>Para 4.48, last sentence, change to: "...proposals consider this in their design..."</p> <p>It will therefore be important that development proposals <u>consider</u> address this in its design and layout as Bloodmoor Hill and its views will become publicly accessible.</p>	The amendments to the supporting text for Policy CC2 is based on the suggested modifications to Policy CC2.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
<p>Delete title of Policy CC3 and replace with a new title: "Key Movement and Public Rights of Way"</p> <p>KEY MOVEMENT ROUTES <u>Key Movement and Public Rights of Way</u></p>	It is considered that the policy wording is confusing as it seeks to protect 'routes' that do not exist.	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Changes to Policy CC3 and supporting text move the focus away from Key Movement routes and place the focus on walking, cycling and public rights of way. The title of the policy should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (6):</p> <p>Delete title of Policy CC3 and replace with: '<i>Walking, Cycling, and Public Rights of Way</i>'</p> <p>KEY MOVEMENT ROUTES <u>Walking, Cycling and Public Rights of Way</u></p>
Policy CC3: delete wording of Policy and replace with new wording: "The protection, enhancement and	It is considered that Policy CC3 and its supporting text identify specific improvements to be made to cycling	Disagree.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>expansion of the public rights of way network, will be supported."</p> <p>A. To ensure that residents can access public transport, schools, retail, leisure and other important facilities serving Carlton Colville, all new developments should ensure safe and continuous pedestrian and cycling routes that connect to the Key Movement Routes shown on Figure 5.3 and, where relevant, public rights of way (PROWs).</p> <p>B. Proposals to enhance the identified Key Movement Routes and PROWs are strongly encouraged.</p> <p>C. Development should not harm the safety and/or accessibility of Key Movement Routes or PROWs. Major development (as defined in the NPPF) should ensure appropriate mitigation of the impact of additional traffic movements on the safety and flow of pedestrian and cycle access.</p> <p>D. Major development proposals must ensure that pedestrian and cycle access into and through the site is safe, convenient and attractive. In particular, provision of segregated cycle and pedestrian routes will be strongly supported. Such routes should also ensure that access by</p>	<p>and walking routes. However, there is no evidence to demonstrate that any of the proposals set out are deliverable. Policy CC3 therefore does not meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Additionally, part of the supporting text to Policy CC3 appears to relate to matters that will be considered through the planning application process.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that as it stands there is some uncertainty over how parts of Policy CC3 which relate to the Key Movement Routes would be delivered. In this respect deletion of parts A, B and C is considered to be supportable. It is not agreed, however, that all parts of the policy should be wholly removed. Several parts of the policy embody what are considered to be sound planning objectives in terms of supporting active travel and good design, with no apparent barriers to practical delivery. With some modification it is considered that elements of the policy can be retained without conflict with the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (7):</p> <p>Delete parts A and B and C.</p> <p>A. To ensure that residents can access public transport, schools, retail, leisure and other important facilities serving Carlton Colville, all new developments should ensure safe and continuous pedestrian and cycling routes that connect to the Key Movement Routes shown on Figure 5.3 and, where relevant, public rights of way (PROWs).</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>disabled users, the blind and deaf and users of mobility scooters is secured.</p> <p>E. Where major development is adjacent to open countryside, layouts should provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of the development and, where possible, provide access for all non-vehicular users into the countryside, particularly where this provides connections with public rights of way and permissive footpaths.</p> <p>F. Development which would adversely affect the character or result in the loss of existing or proposed PROWs will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use. This will apply to PROWs for pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider use. Improvements and additions to such PROWs shall be delivered as an integral part of new development to enable new or improved links to be created within the settlement, between settlements and/or providing access to the countryside.</p> <p><u>The protection, enhancement and expansion of the public rights of way network, will be supported.</u></p>		<p>B. Proposals to enhance the identified Key Movement Routes and PROWs are strongly encouraged.</p> <p>C. Development should not harm the safety and/or accessibility of Key Movement Routes or PROWs. Major development (as defined in the NPPF) should ensure appropriate mitigation of the impact of additional traffic movements on the safety and flow of pedestrian and cycle access.</p> <p>Modify Part D as follows:</p> <p>D. Major development proposals must <u>should</u> ensure that pedestrian and cycle access into and through the site is safe, convenient and attractive. In particular, provision of segregated cycle and pedestrian routes will be strongly supported. Such routes that also ensure that access <u>Access</u> to these routes by for disabled users, the blind and deaf and users of mobility scooters is secured <u>should be provided where possible.</u></p> <p>Modify part E as follows:</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		<p>E. Where major development is adjacent to open countryside, layouts should provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of the development where feasible and, where possible, provide access for all non-vehicular users into the countryside, particularly where this provides connections with public rights of way and permissive footpaths.</p> <p>Delete F and replace with:</p> <p>The protection, enhancement and expansion of the public rights of way network, will be supported. Development which would result in the loss of existing PROWs will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use. This will apply to PROWs for pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider use.</p> <p>F. Development which would adversely affect the character or result in the loss of existing or proposed PROWs will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use. This will</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		apply to PROWs for pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider use. Improvements and additions to such PROWs shall be delivered as an integral part of new development to enable new or improved links to be created within the settlement, between settlements and/or providing access to the countryside.
<p>Delete Paras 5.3 to 5.12, inclusive</p> <p>5.3 The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan does recognise the need for a Transport Assessment as part of any planning application for development at all of these sites. In particular, the impact of increased traffic on the already congested Bloodmoor Hill roundabout is singled out in the Local Plan as a risk factor when considering the final scale and scope of the Bell Farm development.</p> <p>5.4 There are other local factors too such as the impact of new development on access and surrounding roads. The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan already suggests main routes into and out of the Bell Farm development which, for the purposes of this document, we have not challenged but will consider as part of any formal planning application. Our assumption is that all of this will form part of the full Transport Assessment necessary before any plans can be approved.</p>	<p>It is considered that Policy CC3 and its supporting text identify specific improvements to be made to cycling and walking routes. However, there is no evidence to demonstrate that any of the proposals set out are deliverable. Policy CC3 therefore does not meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Additionally, part of the supporting text to Policy CC3 appears to relate to matters that will be considered through the planning application process.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Parts of the supporting text provide helpful commentary around the plan preparation process and the community's wishes and aspirations. Some parts incorporate good planning and design principles. It is not considered to be reasonable or necessary to delete these parts. Other parts could be seen as superfluous and removal of these parts is agreed. The identified improvements in para. 5.9 are considered to be useful background information for the community, as such it is proposed that these are moved to an appendix for reference and addressed as non-planning actions. The maps provide useful context and should be retained. Adding public rights of way to the map in fig. 5.2 will improve the information available.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>5.5 Whilst recognising these limits to what we can control and propose with regard to main routes, the community has expressed views through the Neighbourhood Plan process about possible layouts and routes within the proposed Bell Farm site in particular to try and minimise impact on the existing community and historical assets whilst also making movement easier for new residents, the school and the retirement facility. These will be fed in to the joint masterplanning process. The same principles will apply to the masterplanning of the other site allocations.</p> <p>5.6 Nevertheless, regardless of any particular considerations in respect of Bell Farm and Oakes Farm we do want to improve movement generally across our community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • linking existing and proposed residential and recreational areas with employment and services (for example to the principle major retail and local industries at the South Lowestoft Industrial Estate); • where possible having development concentrated within walking distance of facilities; and • providing improved cycling and pedestrian facilities as well as improving access and maximising safe movement. <p>In this regard, there are number of schemes identified in the East Suffolk Cycling and Walking Strategy⁷ which should form a core part of this⁸.</p>		<p>Modification following revision by LPAs (8):</p> <p>Delete para.s 5.3 and 5.4.</p> <p>5.3 The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan does recognise the need for a Transport Assessment as part of any planning application for development at all of these sites. In particular, the impact of increased traffic on the already congested Bloodmoor Hill roundabout is singled out in the Local Plan as a risk factor when considering the final scale and scope of the Bell Farm development.</p> <p>5.4 There are other local factors too such as the impact of new development on access and surrounding roads. The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan already suggests main routes into and out of the Bell Farm development which, for the purposes of this document, we have not challenged but will consider as part of any formal planning application. Our assumption is that all of this will form part of the full Transport Assessment necessary before any plans can be approved.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>5.7 Consequently we have identified as part of our Neighbourhood Plan the need for both dedicated and signed cycle and pedestrian walkways linking the north and south of the community and east and west with safer crossing points. By addressing and finding solutions to these we believe we will enhance links to national cycle networks, create easier and safer access to schools, improve access to retail and employment areas and also leisure facilities across the community.</p> <p>⁷East Suffolk Council (2022) East Suffolk Cycling & Walking Strategy</p> <p>⁸Appendix A shows the schemes from the East Suffolk Cycling & Walking Strategy that are relevant to the site allocations</p> <p>Solutions</p> <p>5.8 Figure 5.2 above identifies the existing provision of cycle-friendly routes and how they relate to key destinations such as schools, shops and employment areas and the new site allocations in the Waveney Local Plan. Figure 5.3 identifies the improvements to cycling and walking that, if made, can create 'key movement routes' which are attractive and safe for pedestrians and cyclists. It also identifies the 'key corridor recommendations' in the East Suffolk Cycling and Walking Strategy 2022⁹ which can complement the key</p>		<p>Para. 5.5: delete from first sentence: 'Whilst recognising these limits to what we can control and propose with regard to main routes'.</p> <p>Delete final sentence: 'The same principles will apply to the masterplanning of the other site allocations.'</p> <p>Add new sentence to end of para. 5.5: <u>'Furthermore, improvements to cycling and walking routes which were identified through the process of preparing the neighbourhood plan are included in Appendix B.'</u></p> <p>Para. 5.6: amend first sentence to say: 'Nevertheless, regardless of any particular considerations in respect of Bell Farm and Oakes Farm We do want to improve movement generally across our community <u>through:...</u></p> <p>Delete para. 5.7.</p> <p>5.7 Consequently we have identified as part of our Neighbourhood Plan the need for both dedicated and</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>movement routes in providing a coherent and safe network of routes for non-motorised traffic.</p> <p>⁹https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy-and-local-plans/east-suffolk-cycling-and-walking-strategy</p> <p>5.9 The improvements are as follows (the references below correspond to those on Figure 5.3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve Beccles road crossing points at (C1) Hollow Lane and at the junction of Chapel Lane and Marsh Lane (C4) – at the moment there are no crossing aids to allow pedestrian, cycle or mobility access across the Beccles road to the Broads Authority Executive Area and Carlton Marshes Nature Reserve. Suggested improvements would be to provide suitable traffic crossing facilities at these two points plus better signage and way-finding measures both to and from the important tourist and leisure sites (e.g. Carlton Colville Transport Museum and Carlton Marshes Nature Reserve). • There are poor connections between the developments in the north of the Neighbourhood Plan area and those in the south plus the major retail, leisure and employment hub at Gisleham. A suggested improvement (R1) is that the main non-vehicular movement south-north from the proposed Bell Farm development could be via Low Farm Drive, Shaw Avenue, Rounces Lane, Hollow Lane (linking separately to Capstan Way), Grove Road and Clarkes Lane. The benefits are to give safe walking and cycle 		<p>signed cycle and pedestrian walkways linking the north and south of the community and east and west with safer crossing points. By addressing and finding solutions to these we believe we will enhance links to national cycle networks, create easier and safer access to schools, improve access to retail and employment areas and also leisure facilities across the community.</p> <p>Add Public Rights of Way to fig 5.2.</p> <p>Amend title of fig. 5.2 to 'Existing cycle-friendly routes and Public Rights of Way'.</p> <p>Figure 5.2 Existing cycle-friendly routes and Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>Delete heading 'Solutions'</p> <p>Solutions</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>routes to all primary schools, provide easier access to the Nature Reserve and link with the national cycle route.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main West-East route (R2) is fragmented and there are poor condition pathways creating difficulties for people trying to access retail and employment at South Lowestoft Industrial Estate. The suggestion is to join up current fragmented routes by better signage and clearer road markings from the proposed Bell Farm development (C), through the Dales Estate to Bloodmoor Hill where it links with a cycle path on Bloodmoor Hill or provides direct access to the South Lowestoft Industrial Estate for employment and retail purposes. East to west cycle routes would provide access to the proposed country park (B) and existing Primary School. It should be noted that some parts of this route are outside the Neighbourhood Plan, therefore Policy CC3 does not apply. • Pedestrian access to the dedicated foot and cycle path on Bloodmoor Hill (C2 – see picture below) – the issue is the ramp goes over the road to Pakefield side and does not allow cycle, pushchair or wheelchair access to the existing dedicated path and cycle way running alongside Bloodmoor Hill. There are steps down but these cannot be easily managed by pushchairs, other forms of mobility and cyclists. A suggestion would be to replace the steps with a ramp on the Dales development side which would encourage both pedestrians and cyclists to access the retail and employment opportunities on the Gisleham 		<p>Delete paras. 5.8 and 5.9. Bullet pointed text from para. 5.9 to be moved to new 'Appendix B'.</p> <p>5.8 Figure 5.2 above identifies the existing provision of cycle friendly routes and how they relate to key destinations such as schools, shops and employment areas and the new site allocations in the Waveney Local Plan. Figure 5.3 identifies the improvements to cycling and walking that, if made, can create 'key movement routes' which are attractive and safe for pedestrians and cyclists. It also identifies the 'key corridor recommendations' in the East Suffolk Cycling and Walking Strategy 2022⁹ which can complement the key movement routes in providing a coherent and safe network of routes for non-motorised traffic.</p> <p>⁹https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy-and-local-plans/east-suffolk-cycling-and-walking-strategy</p> <p>5.9 The improvements are as follows (the references below correspond to those on Figure 5.3):</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>Estate more easily and safely reducing pressure on car usage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South/West routes (R3) could provide access to sports and social sites at Oakes Farm (A) via Rushmere Road/Secrets Corner and Hall Road traversing the National Cycle Path. A suggested improvement would be to access a cycle free route from the proposed Oakes Farm sports development alongside of Hall Road to Secrets Corner, Rushmere Road then accessing the country park to provide off road route all the way to Carlton Colville Primary School. This would be assisted by the widening of Hall Road. • The existing National Cycling Route between Beccles Road and Mutfordwood Lane is indirect (C5). A suggested improvement would be to provide a cycle path as part of any development at Oakes Farm to connect Castleton Avenue to Mutfordwood Lane. • Improvements to west end of Castleton Avenue (Swallowfields) (C3). Currently the wellused route remains uncompleted. A suggested improvement is that the short, incomplete cycle path could be completed from Swallowfields to Beech Road which will extend connections in this part of Carlton Colville and provide direct access to sports facilities. Safer crossing of Castleton Avenue is also required. <p>5.10 Design of major development that incorporates 'neighbourhood edges' creates the opportunity to provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter</p>		<p>Amend para. 5.10 as follows:</p> <p>'Design of major development that incorporates 'neighbourhood edges' creates the opportunity to provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of developments. Not only will this help to provide a soft edge to development but it will provide attractive routes for non-vehicular movement and enable easy support access into the countryside through the network of public rights of way (which include bridleways) and permissive footpaths.'</p> <p>Delete para. 5.11</p> <p>5.11 It should be noted that the Key Movement Routes identified on Figure 5.3 that are outside the Neighbourhood Plan area are not directly part of Policy CC3. Carlton Colville Town Council will work with the neighbouring parish of Gisleham to ensure that these routes are protected and enhanced for pedestrians and cyclists. More inspirationally, we would welcome</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>of developments. Not only will this help to provide a soft edge to development but it will provide attractive routes for non-vehicular movement and enable easy access into the countryside through the network of public rights of way (which include bridleways) and permissive footpaths.</p> <p>5.11 It should be noted that the Key Movement Routes identified on Figure 5.3 that are outside the Neighbourhood Plan area are not directly part of Policy CC3. Carlton Colville Town Council will work with the neighbouring parish of Gisleham to ensure that these routes are protected and enhanced for pedestrians and cyclists. More inspirationally, we would welcome proposals for improved road connectivity that directly links major proposed developments such as Bell Farm and the Oakes with the existing major retail and employment hub at South Lowestoft (Gisleham) Industrial Estate/Retail Park ('D' on Figure 5.3) reducing impact on existing roads/communities.</p> <p>5.12 Alongside new cycling routes, the provision of suitable cycle parking at key destinations, e.g. shops, schools, workplaces, etc. is supported.</p>		<p>proposals for improved road connectivity that directly links major proposed developments such as Bell Farm and the Oakes with the existing major retail and employment hub at South Lowestoft (Gisleham) Industrial Estate/Retail Park ('D' on Figure 5.3) reducing impact on existing roads/communities.</p> <p>Amend para. 5.12 as follows:</p> <p>'Alongside new cycling routes, the provision of suitable cycle parking at key destinations, e.g. shops, schools, workplaces, etc. is supported <u>encouraged</u>.'</p>
<p>Delete Figure 5.3</p> <p>Figure 5.3 Key Movement Routes</p>	<p>It is suggested that this figure is deleted as it will no longer be relevant after the suggested modifications to CC3 have been made.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Figure 5.3 is relevant to the aspirational routes which are proposed to be moved to new Appendix B. It is noted however that some of the routes on the map need clarifying.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		<p>Modification following revision by LPAs (9):</p> <p>Move figure 5.3 to new appendix B. Minor modifications to be made to the map to improve clarity as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer labelling of red routes • Clearer labelling of routes from the East Suffolk Council Cycling and Walking Strategy • Change Castleton Avenue route from red to orange <p>Remove route C5 as it is not necessary</p>
<p>Delete Paras 5.14, 5.15 and 5.16</p> <p>5.14 Both of the Local Plan allocations at Bell Farm and Oakes Farm have PROWs running through them and these should be protected and enhanced as part of the delivery of each site:</p> <p>• Bell Farm has Carlton Colville Footpath (FP) 10 / Gisleham FP 2 and Carlton Colville FP11 / Gisleham FP1 running north to south through the site. These routes should ideally be accommodated through wide green corridors, with surfacing options considered in the context of the wider development. Improvements and upgrades to the routes may be desirable once the suggested masterplan has been drawn up. The main routes through the proposed country park should be at</p>	<p>It is considered that Policy CC3 and its supporting text identify specific improvements to be made to cycling and walking routes. However, there is no evidence to demonstrate that any of the proposals set out are deliverable. Policy CC3 therefore does not meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Additionally, part of the supporting text to Policy CC3 appears to relate to matters that will be considered through the planning application process.</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>least 3m wide to allow for two wheelchairs, prams etc to be able to pass comfortably. Other links and improvements to the wider PROW network may also be necessary.</p> <p>• Oakes Farm has Carlton Colville FP15 running east to west through the site. This route should ideally be accommodated within a wide green corridor, with surfacing options to be considered in the context of the wider development. Other links and improvements to the wider PROW network may also be necessary.</p> <p>5.15 In addition, improvements to the public right of way from Oulton Broad South railway station to the Carlton Marshes Nature Reserve would be welcomed. It is recognised that much of this route is outside the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>5.16 Development should protect and enhance PROWs and ensure they improve access within Carlton Colville, to neighbouring settlements and to the countryside generally.</p>		
<p>Policy CC4A, delete “and should be in accordance with Suffolk Guidance for Parking”</p> <p>A. Car parking arrangements should be safe, convenient and should not undermine the quality and amenity of the streets and should be in accordance with Suffolk Guidance for Parking.</p>	<p>There is no requirement for Policy CC4 to repeat the provisions of existing policy or to refer to Guidance not controlled by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC4 has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>Policy CC4C, change first sentence to: "...parking types will be supported, in the interests of good urban design."</p> <p>C. On major development sites (as defined in the NPPF), a mix of parking types will be supported, in the interests is encouraged to support the delivery of good urban design.</p>	It is considered not clear, in the absence of information, how Policy CC4 might "encourage" a mix of parking sites.	Agreed. Policy CC4 has been amended as recommended.
<p>Policy CC4C, delete last sentence ("Car...streets")</p> <p>Car parking arrangements should be safe, convenient and should not undermine the quality and amenity of the streets.</p>	It is considered that this is repetition of Policy CC4A.	Agreed. Policy CC4 has been amended as recommended.
<p>Policy CC5, part A, change first line to: "All development should protect existing habitats and species..."</p> <p>All development proposals should aim to protect existing habitats and species, including hedgerows and mature trees.</p>	It is considered that the wording in Policy CC5, part A, sets out an ambiguous requirement, contrary to national planning guidance.	Agreed. Policy CC5 has been amended as recommended.
<p>Policy CC5, part D, change to: "Implementation of the principles of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and natural flood management techniques to enhance biodiversity and ecosystems will be supported. Flood mitigation should, where possible, have a natural character..."</p>	Policy CC5, part D, provides no information to demonstrate that the requirement to implement Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) would be deliverable, or even appropriate, for all forms of development. This part of the policy would therefore run the risk of	Agreed. Policy CC5 has been amended as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
Development is required to implement <u>Implementation of</u> the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs) and natural flood management techniques to, which will enhance biodiversity and ecosystems <u>will be supported.</u> Flood mitigation <u>should, shall where possible,</u> have a natural character whilst ensuring that	placing an obstacle in the way of the Neighbourhood Plan contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.	
Delete Para 6.5 6.5 In addition to the SWT study, the Waveney Heritage Impact Assessment of the Bell Farm allocation¹⁴ and other earlier planning applications identified both views across the landscape and impact of prospective roads that were of importance to the setting and context of the heritage assets of the area, i.e. the view towards St Peters Church Carlton Colville from the west and the line of sight views between Gisleham Church and the Scheduled Monument in the area of Bell Farm.	It is considered that the supporting text refers to a view which is not relevant to Policy CC5.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.
Para 6.7, change to: "...Bell Farm site allocation could provide...and plants. Such an approach might also present an opportunity for the existing water run-off...wet characteristic. (NB DELETE "(how the Country...Policy CC8)"). Additional green areas might be introduced to act as flood mitigation where the flood risk is high. In this respect, there might be an opportunity...network. This might then be enhanced by	It is considered that the references to Bell Farm in the supporting text could be construed as policy requirements, which they are not.	Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>retaining the existing hedgerows, providing a possible opportunity for them to connect..."</p> <p>For example, introducing a country park in the west of the Bell Farm site allocation would <u>could</u> provide protection for the heritage aspects plus an opportunity for enhancing the environment through hedge planting, managed wetland/meadow and further planting of appropriate trees and plants. <u>Such an approach might also present an opportunity for the existing water run-off</u> It will also allow an existing water run-off pattern to be preserved, retaining the scheduled monument's seasonal wet characteristic (how the Country Park might be developed is included within our 'Community' Section and covered by Policy CC8). Additional green areas <u>might</u> can be introduced to act as flood mitigation where the flood risk is high. <u>In this respect, there</u> There is <u>might be</u> an opportunity to link these green spaces to the country park to form a network. This <u>might then</u> can be enhanced by retaining the existing hedgerows, <u>providing a possible opportunity for them to</u> which can connect with the green space via foot and cycle paths.</p>		
<p>Delete Para 6.8 (and delete title "General environmental principles for development")</p>	<p>Much of the content of Paragraphs 6.8 to 6.16 is worded as though it comprises Policy requirements, which it does not.</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>General environmental principles for development</p> <p>6.8 The design section of the Neighbourhood Plan suggests illustrative layout and styles for developments that will minimise environmental impact. Consequently, it is considered that development proposals should address the following:</p>		
<p>Delete Paras 6.10 to 6.16, inclusive</p> <p>6.10 Our first principle is that all existing hedgerows and mature trees (including those not formally protected by tree preservation orders) throughout our Plan area should be protected wherever possible. We would look favourably on development that can accommodate and enhance these assets to create a positive net gain in biodiversity. Development should not remove these important habitats unless they can meet their biodiversity net gain obligations on site.</p> <p>Create new wildlife habitats</p> <p>6.11 There are a number of areas where development can enhance our environment. These are presented below.</p> <p>6.12 Tree planting, retention and wildflower strips are considered essential to developments that are providing points of interest and natural screening. It is crucial that</p>	<p>Much of the content of Paragraphs 6.8 to 6.16 is worded as though it comprises Policy requirements, which it does not.</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>plants, trees and shrubs that are planted are native or have a known value to wildlife – in Carlton Colville oak is the prevalent tree species with some beech and ash. Invasive and non-native species should be avoided unless they have clear biodiversity benefits. Roadside verges should also be planted with native wildflowers for bees and butterflies.</p> <p>6.13 Wildlife corridors, habitat corridors or green corridors are areas of habitat connecting wildlife populations that would otherwise be separated by human activity. These corridors should be encouraged to enhance the existing wildlife and facilitate the re-establishment of populations that have been reduced or eliminated. Particular attention should be paid to hedgehogs, which require a 12cm x 12cm hole in the corner of fencing in order to move through.</p> <p>6.14 The hedgerows and tree corridors (shown in Figure 6.4) provide well-established wildlife corridors that enable biodiversity to thrive. These should be preserved and enhanced in order to provide the greatest benefit to wildlife.</p> <p>6.15 At the edges of development, green roofs can be used to help a building blend into its surroundings. They can help mitigate the urban heat island effect and contribute to rainwater retention. Green roofs can</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>provide full or partial coverage of vegetation, but their design should follow certain design principles such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should be incorporated into the initial stages of the design process; • They should be easy to access and maintain; • It should be ensured that the design, materials and proportions complement the surrounding landscape; • Its design should help to integrate the building with the countryside. <p>6.16 Swift populations are in decline in the UK as more development and a move towards air-tight buildings has resulted in a loss of habitat. To encourage swifts to live and breed in the area, swift bricks should be considered as they are easily installed, fitting within a multiple of standard UK brick sizes. Swift bricks do not generally overheat in the sun, however ones with thinner front walls should not be placed in the sun but rather in sheltered areas under eaves.</p>		
<p>Policy CC6, delete the second sentence of part A ("In the...met.")</p> <p>In the Broads Authority Executive Area, the requirements of Broads Local Plan Policy DM22 (Light pollution) must be met.</p>	<p>It is considered that this wording is unnecessary as there is no need for the Neighbourhood Plan to repeat the provisions of an existing policy within the adopted Development Plan.</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC6 has been amended as recommended.</p>
<p>Policy CC6, delete Parts B, C and D</p> <p>B. Development proposals are required to address light spillage and eliminate all unnecessary forms of artificial outdoor lighting. Other than householder development,</p>	<p>It is considered that the use of guidance should not be used as policy. Additionally, Policy CC6 does not provide indication of what is an unnecessary form of artificial</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC6 has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>development proposals are required to demonstrate that they meet or exceed the Institute of Lighting Professionals¹⁶ guidance and other relevant standards or guidance for lighting.</p> <p>C. Building design that results in increased light spill from internal lighting needs to be avoided, unless suitable mitigation measures are implemented.</p> <p>D. Development proposals which incorporate highway lighting will only be supported if required by the Highways Authority for reasons of road safety.</p>	<p>outdoor lighting. Moreover, highway lighting is the responsibility of the Highways Authority and is a matter outside the control of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
<p>Para 6.21, delete and replace with: "The Neighbourhood Plan requires development to respect the Neighbourhood Area's dark skies with the purpose of minimising the impact of lighting on the recognised qualities of the area."</p> <p>Lighting should specifically be planned to minimise impact. This is expanded upon below when considering protection of existing habitats. The Neighbourhood Plan requires development to respect the Neighbourhood Area's dark skies with the purpose of minimising the impact of lighting on the recognised qualities of the area.</p>	<p>The supporting text following immediately on from Policy CC6 does not relate directly to the Policy and is confusing. It includes wording that appears as though it is a policy requirement (which it is not) and it makes unnecessary references to existing policies in the Development Plan.</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC6 has been amended as recommended.</p>
<p>Para 6.22, delete all after first sentence ("Lighting should...buildings.")</p>	<p>The supporting text following immediately on from Policy CC6 does not relate directly to the Policy</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC6 has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>Lighting should be as low as permitted by guidelines and if the light is not essential the area should not be lit in order to encourage bat activity. Where lighting is needed there should be periods of time when the lights are switched off to provide some dark periods. Roads or trackways located in areas important for foraging bats should not be lit before a stretch totalling at least 10 metres either side of the bat commuting route. This is to avoid isolation of bat colonies which typically roost in older trees and/or buildings.</p>	<p>and is confusing. It includes wording that appears as though it is a policy requirement (which it is not) and it makes unnecessary references to existing policies in the Development Plan.</p>	
<p>Delete Paras 6.23 to 6.27 inclusive (including Figures contained therein)</p> <p>Encouraging use of green and natural energy and resources</p> <p>6.23 Car charging points: In order to ensure new development is ready for the future additional measures should be taken. This includes designing in provisions for electric car charging points, as well as ensuring broadband infrastructure is installed at the outset and not as an afterthought. This is already addressed by Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy 8.21 (Sustainable Transport) and amendments in 2022 to Building Regulations to require provision of charging points.</p>	<p>The supporting text following immediately on from Policy CC6 does not relate directly to the Policy and is confusing. It includes wording that appears as though it is a policy requirement (which it is not) and it makes unnecessary references to existing policies in the Development Plan.</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy CC6 has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>6.24 Rainwater harvesting is a system for capturing and storing rainwater as well as enabling the reuse of in-situ grey water. These systems should be integral to the design vision, to avoid unsightly pipes and storage systems being highly visible. Considering this, some design recommendations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceal tanks with cladding in materials that complement the main building. • Use contrasting, attractive materials or finishing for pipes. • Combine landscape/ planters with water capture systems. • Consider using underground tanks. • Utilise water bodies for storage, such as a pond. <p>Figure 6.11 Modular water tank</p> <p>Figure 6.12 Water butt</p> <p>6.25 This is already addressed by Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy 8.21 (Sustainable Construction).</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>6.26 Roof solar panels can be a good source of renewable energy; however, homeowners are sometimes hesitant to install them for aesthetic purposes. Therefore, some recommendations for incorporating solar panels are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • integrate solar panels from the start of the design process, forming part of the design concept. • use attractive options such as solar shingles or photovoltaic slates as a material in their own right. <p>Figure 6.13 Solar panels</p> <p>6.27 This is already addressed by Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy 8.21 (Sustainable Construction) and Broads Local Plan Policy DM15 (Renewable energy). The East Suffolk Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning Document and the Broads Authority Sustainability Guide provide further guidance.</p>		
<p>Delete Policy CC7</p> <p>POLICY CC7: COMMUNITY PROVISION AT BELL FARM ALLOCATION</p> <p>A. The development of land at Bell Farm (as allocated in Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy WLP2.16) is</p>		<p>Agreed. Policy CC7 has been deleted as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>expected to demonstrate that it has met the following requirements:</p> <p>i. The following uses are located together in the heart of the development, rather than at the countryside edges:</p> <p>a. The retirement community (comprising a care home/nursing home and/or extra care and/or sheltered dwellings).</p> <p>b. The primary school and pre-school.</p> <p>c. The equipped play facilities (provided they can also meet the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy WLP2.16 requirement to be located within the area set aside for flood mitigation).</p> <p>d. The local shops.</p> <p>ii. Allotment provision should provide at least 0.57 hectares of cultivatable land.</p> <p>B. Along with the provision of a local equipped area for play (LEAP), land and provision of equipment is encouraged in order to address the needs of older children. This should preferably be to neighbourhood equipped area for play (NEAP) standard and offer a range of play provision.</p>		
<p>Delete Paras 7.1 to 7.15 inclusive</p> <p>7.1 In the 2019 Neighbourhood Plan survey conducted across our community, the feedback showed a desire for: more sports and social facilities, more play areas, a wider variety of shops and better NHS services (eg surgery and pharmacy). Our Neighbourhood Plan can help to</p>	<p>The allocation in the Local Plan includes requirements for community provision. The detail relating to these will appropriately be determined via the planning application process. Additionally, the allocation in the Local Plan includes</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been deleted as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>formalise many of these wishes; however, it should be noted that provision of NHS services is not in our scope but there will be a requirement on the NHS commissioning bodies to provide appropriate support for any large scale development such as the proposed Bell Farm development. In addition, we cannot determine which type of retailers occupy particular shop units.</p> <p>Community provision at Bell Farm</p> <p>7.2 In meeting the desires of our community it should also be noted that the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan already identifies a number of 'community' objectives which the proposed Bell Farm development in Carlton Colville is required to deliver:</p> <p>1. A retirement community comprising a care home/nursing home and/or extra care and/or sheltered dwellings</p> <p>7.3 It is suggested that this facility be located near Bell Farm, in the heart of the community rather than at the edge, for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access by emergency and service vehicles without having to traverse the development; • views over land can be retained as open space both to the west and east, enhancing quality of life for the residents 	<p>an indicative masterplan. Matters relating to detailed layout, including the provision of play space, will appropriately be determined via the planning application process.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not open for the Neighbourhood Plan to seek to determine land uses or detailed layouts, or to set out development requirements in respect of the land allocated for development by Local Plan Policy WLP2.16.</p>	

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>• proximity to the required play area, providing additional visual security for the young people.</p> <p>2. A 2-form entry primary school and pre-school</p> <p>7.4 It is also suggested that the school is located near Bell Farm, in the heart of the community. The reason for this is based on the experience of traffic issues at other schools locally, particularly Carlton Colville Primary School immediately to the south-west of the Bell Farm site. It would also reduce the need for community and service traffic to criss-cross the new development site, does not build on a site for potential water attenuation and minimises the opportunity for existing roads to be used by parents for parking along with the associated problems for residents. In addition, in this location the school would have closer access to the Country Park, enabling it to be used as a learning resource as well as for leisure.</p> <p>3. A Country Park of at least 15 hectares</p> <p>7.5 This has been identified already in the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan as being required to be delivered on the western side of the Bell Farm allocation. This will help protect the scheduled monument and maintains valuable lines of sight between this site and Gisleham Church. An outline of the opportunities this park might provide</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>together with an illustrative layout is shown later in this section.</p> <p>4. Allotment provision of at least 0.57 hectares</p> <p>7.6 There are existing allotments in Carlton Colville off Rouncles Lane that are fully occupied with a waiting list. We have consequently identified a preferred area for additional allotment provision within the Bell Farm site (see the illustrative masterplan in Figure 11 of the Waveney Local Plan) that makes use of the area required for flood mitigation. As identified in the Waveney Open Space Needs Assessment 2015, South Lowestoft (which includes Carlton Colville) has the second lowest area of allotment provision per 1,000 people in Waveney (0.12 hectares per 1,000 people compared with a district average of 0.30 hectares). The area has a shortfall of over 10 hectares of allotment space. If the recommended standard of 0.30 hectares per 1,000 people is applied to the 900 new dwellings proposed at Bell Farm, an average household size of 2.1 persons¹⁷ requires 0.57 hectares of allotment space. It is considered that requirement for allotments at Bell Farm should provide this amount of space as a minimum.</p> <p>5. Flood mitigation</p> <p>7.7 This is a well understood local problem. In addition to the existing policies, flood mitigation forms a key</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>principle and objective of our Neighbourhood Plan design principles. As identified in Figure 4.8, the Bell Farm site is known to have drainage ditches and areas where surface water collects which may affect where development can be located.</p> <p>6. Play space (a local equipped area for play which provides for the play needs of younger children, ideally expanded to a neighbourhood equipped area for play which provides for older children)</p> <p>7.8 In our Plan area there are three existing play areas— Carlton Park, Hall Road Community Centre and Bloodmoor Hill Community Centre (The Dales). The play area at Carlton Park is modern, reflecting multi-age activities and includes an outdoor gym and skatepark. The Hall Road Community Centre play facilities are older and more limited in range with a small climbing frame and swings aimed primarily at a younger age group. The Bloodmoor Hill Community Centre play area also has small scale swings and play facilities aimed at younger age group. Both Bloodmoor Hill and Hall Road Community Centre facilities would benefit from the equipment being upgraded¹⁸ and facilities provided for a wider range of ages, eg outdoor gym facilities for older children and active adults.</p> <p>7.9 The Local Plan requires provision of a new local equipped area for play at Bell Farm. The community has</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>expressed their preferred location to be in the area of the new proposed primary school and retirement home(s) to ensure play areas are safely overlooked and are easily accessible to the wider community. In addition to the provision for younger children as a local equipped area for play, the lack of alternative provision for older children in Carlton Colville means that this should also make provision for a multi-age facility (a neighbourhood equipped area for play), mirroring the style of play and fitness equipment as per Carlton Park.</p> <p>⁴⁷ Source: 2011 Census</p> <p>⁴⁸ The need to upgrade facilities at Bloodmoor Hill was identified in the Waveney Open Space Needs Assessment 2015</p> <p>7.10 In addition to these defined play areas it is considered that the Country Park provides an opportunity for play through learning — an option would be to include an adventure play area within the scheme. We have described the opportunities for the Country Park later in the Plan.</p> <p>7. Local shops including a convenience store</p> <p>7.11 The community has expressed a preference for such provision to be made towards the centre of the new proposed Bell Farm development. Carlton Colville already has a selection of existing smaller shops at Ashburnham</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>Way, Famaona Road and on the Dales Estate. There are two post offices within existing newsagent/convenience stores. The new development provides an opportunity for further smaller scale retail opportunities, e.g. farm shop, take-away, café, bakery, pharmacy etc.</p> <p>7.12 In addition, our audit of Carlton Colville identified a number of key community facilities that would enhance the life of people who live in the Plan area:</p> <p>8. Sports and social facilities</p> <p>7.13 The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan allocates 30 hectares of land at Oakes Farm for sports and leisure uses. At least 20 hectares is expected to deliver sports pitches, non-pitch sports and other sports and leisure facilities together with changing facilities and car parking. This provision is supported and will provide benefits to the existing community of Carlton Colville.</p> <p>9. Access to doctor's surgery and pharmacy</p> <p>7.14 The Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan does not specifically address the access to new NHS facilities such as general practitioner (GP) services and/or a pharmacy. However, the Town Council has contacted NHS and sought assurance that any new developments would be adequately supported from existing or new resources.</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>7.15 More generally, Carlton Colville Town Council supports the Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (NWICS) in seeking to ensure suitable and sustainable provision of healthcare infrastructure and services for the residents of Carlton Colville. This is to be addressed by seeking to secure developer contributions. This will also support the community's stated desire for better NHS services. The NWICS notes that, if unmitigated, the impact of developments on healthcare infrastructure and services within the Neighbourhood Area would be unsustainable, including that of Primary Care, Community Care, Mental Healthcare, and the Acute Trust.</p>		
<p>Delete Policy CC8</p> <p>POLICY CC8: CARLTON COLVILLE COUNTRY PARK</p> <p>Proposals to deliver the Carlton Colville Country Park (required as part of the development of land at Bell Farm, as allocated in Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy WLP2.16) is expected to be informed by the principles shown in Figure 7.1. Provision is encouraged to be made for the range of activities shown.</p>	<p>Local Plan Policy WLP2.16 requires the provision of a country park of at least 15 hectares as part of the delivery of a comprehensive mixed-use development. Therefore, all of the detail relating to the delivery of the country park will appropriately be determined via the planning application process. It is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan to seek to determine this detail or to set out development requirements.</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The Examiner states in para. 130 of his report that all of the detail relating to the country park will be determined via the planning application process, and that it is not role of the Neighbourhood Plan to determine details or set out development requirements to be addressed at the planning application stage. This statement is not supported and it is the LPAs view that neighbourhood plans can set out development requirements to be addressed at the planning application stage, provided it is done in a way that meets the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Policy CC8 refers to fig. 7.1 which indicates uses for the country park which are considered to be both reasonable</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		<p>and deliverable. Flexibility around how these are applied at the planning application stage will be required, but there is no clear reason why they cannot form the basis to inform the country park masterplan.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (10):</p> <p>Re-word policy CC8 as follows:</p> <p><i>Proposals to deliver the Carlton Colville Country Park (required as part of the development of land at Bell Farm, as allocated in Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy WLP2.16) is expected to be informed by <u>should demonstrate how</u> the principles shown in Figure 7.1 <u>have informed the development of the masterplan</u>. Provision is encouraged to be made for the range of activities shown.</i></p>
<p>Para 7.17, change opening paragraph to “This provides an opportunity to create a successful country park for the benefit of the local community and visitors. To help achieve this, the Town Council has worked to produce a framework and a suggested outline plan for the country park, set out below. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan cannot control the delivery of the country park, the Town Council is keen to work with the applicant to ensure the country park’s long-term sustainability. The</p>	<p>Local Plan Policy WLP2.16 requires the provision of a country park of at least 15 hectares as part of the delivery of a comprehensive mixed-use development. Therefore, all of the detail relating to the delivery of the country park will appropriately be determined via the planning application process. It is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan to seek to determine this detail or to set out development requirements.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Para. 7.17 contains useful supporting information to help the application of Policy CC8.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (11):</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>purpose of the framework and plan below is to help achieve this.</p> <p>To meet these objectives and to also reflect the aims of our environment policy we have identified important principles and an illustrative layout for the Park. This framework builds upon the experience learned from the new park in Oulton and through feedback from the local community. Whilst the principles provides a detailed list, it is recognised that there must be flexibility in what is delivered to meet the overall objectives. Nevertheless, the following have been identified as important aspects if the country park is to be a successful thriving space: <u>This provides an opportunity to create a successful country park for the benefit of the local community and visitors. To help achieve this, the Town Council has worked to produce a framework and a suggested outline plan for the country park, set out below. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan cannot control the delivery of the country park, the Town Council is keen to work with the applicant to ensure the country park's long-term sustainability. The purpose of the framework and plan below is to help achieve this.</u></p>		Retain para. 7.17.
<p>Add new title above Nos 1-14 in list: "Country Park – Suggested Framework"</p>	<p>Suggested new wording to reflect the suggested modifications to the supporting text and deletion of Policy CC8.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
Country Park – Suggested Framework		<p>It is proposed to retain para 7.17 and a modified Policy CC8, therefore the addition of this new title is not needed.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (12):</p> <p>Do not add new title.</p>
<p>Add new sentence below title: “The following are suggestions only and the Town Council will seek to engage with the applicant to develop these ideas further.”</p> <p>The following are suggestions only and the Town Council will seek to engage with the applicant to develop these ideas further.</p>	<p>Suggested new wording to reflect the suggested modifications to the supporting text and deletion of Policy CC8.</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>It is proposed to retain Policy CC8, therefore this modification is not needed.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (13):</p> <p>Do not add the new sentence.</p>
<p>Change wording to bullet points Nos 1 and 2 as follows:</p> <p>“1...This could supplement existing...However, the country park could provide an additional...</p> <p>2...Main routes could be tarmacked or comprise compacted...Main paths could be at least...areas could be wood chip or...”</p>	<p>Local Plan Policy WLP2.16 requires the provision of a country park of at least 15 hectares as part of the delivery of a comprehensive mixed-use development. Therefore, all of the detail relating to the delivery of the country park will appropriately be determined via the planning</p>	<p>Agreed. The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
<p>1. To meet the play objective, a new play area is suggested for inclusion within the proposed development area utilising land identified for flood mitigation. This <u>could supplement</u> supplements existing play equipment areas at Hall Road Community Hall, Carlton Park Play Park and the Dales development (Bloodmoor Hill). However, the <u>country</u> park <u>could provide</u> provides <u>an</u> additional opportunity for adventure play.</p> <p>2. Accessible by and through the park. Main routes <u>could be</u> tarmacked or <u>comprise</u> compacted stone paths for all ages and abilities, by foot, by buggy, by cycle and mobility aid. Main paths <u>could</u> should be at least 3 metres wide to allow two wheelchairs or prams to pass comfortably. Other paths around the park or in sensitive environmental areas <u>could</u> to be wood chip or equivalent.</p>	<p>application process. It is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan to seek to determine this detail or to set out development requirements.</p>	
<p>Delete Para 7.18</p> <p>7.18 The Country Park will need to be supplemented by a full management plan once final layout/area are agreed as part of any development proposals.</p>	<p>Local Plan Policy WLP2.16 requires the provision of a country park of at least 15 hectares as part of the delivery of a comprehensive mixed-use development. Therefore, all of the detail relating to the delivery of the country park will appropriately be determined via the planning application process. It is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan to seek to determine this detail or to set out development requirements.</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>It is a reasonable and relevant objective to put in place a management plan for the country park. However, the wording of this paragraph does not reflect the planning policy requirements in this respect. This paragraph should be re-worded to reflect the more aspirational nature of this objective.</p> <p>Modification following revision by LPAs (14):</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
		Re-word para. 7.18 to read: <i>'The Country Park will need to be supplemented by a full Development proposals are encouraged to include provision for a comprehensive management plan for the country park once final layout/area are agreed as part of any development proposals.'</i>
Update the Contents, Policy, Page and Figure numbering and provide Paragraph numbering, to take into account the recommendations proposed.	Changes are required as a result of recommended modifications to the policies.	Agreed. The document has been amended reflected changes made.
Delete the Policies Map on page 69	Changes are required as a result of recommended modifications to the policies.	Agreed. The Policies Map has been deleted as recommended.
Appendix A, delete paragraph of text below the title to Appendix A and replace with: "Below are extracts from the East Suffolk Cycling and Walking Strategy 2022. These set out recommendations in respect of future Cycling and Walking schemes and are provided for information purposes."	Changes are required as a result of recommended modifications to the policies.	Agreed. Appendix A has been amended as recommended.

Examiner's Recommended Modification (Examiner's modification in BOLD, tracked changes below)	Reason for Examiner's Recommended Modification (summarised)	Decision and Action by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the LPAs)
Below are extracts from the East Suffolk Cycling and Walking Strategy 2022 showing how proposed improvements intersect with the site allocations at Bell Farm and Oakes Farm. The recommendations shown below should be incorporated into any detailed masterplanning with an emphasis on connectivity for cyclists. They should also be read in conjunction with the Movement Policy CC3 where additional opportunities have been identified. Below are extracts from the East Suffolk Cycling and Walking Strategy 2022. These set out recommendations in respect of future Cycling and Walking schemes and are provided for information purposes.		
Whilst not essential, the addition of page numbers to the contents page and hyperlinks from the contents page would be helpful. East Suffolk Council has suggested this and may be able to help with this.	This suggestion is made to improve navigation and understanding of the document for the reader.	Agreed. The document has been amended as recommended.

LPAs' further modifications

Under section 12(6) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the LPAs considers that the following modifications are also needed in order that the Plan meets the basic conditions or for the correction of errors.

Table 2. LPA's further modifications

Policy/Supporting Text	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by ESC and the Broads Authority
<p>Add sentence at end of para. 1.3: ‘The supporting text in the plan is intended to support the implementation of the policies and should not be applied as policy.’</p> <p><u>The supporting text in the plan is intended to support the implementation of the policies and should not be applied as policy.</u></p>	<p>The Examiner’s report references in several places that the supporting text is written in a way so that it appears to be a planning policy requirement. This view is not shared by the Local Planning Authorities - the supporting text is clearly distinct from the planning policy text, which is contained within a green box, and gives guidance on applying the policies in the plan. In order to provide additional clarity over this matter, the additional modification is proposed.</p>	<p>The supporting text has been amended as recommended.</p>

Appendix A – Summary of Representations from the ‘Additional Focussed Consultation’, the 11th December 2024 and 5th February 2025

Respondent	Summarised response
Anglian Water	No comments to make.
Carlton Colville Town Council	The modifications are accepted. The Town Council added that they should be involved in guiding and facilitating community engagement conducted by developers.
Historic England	No comment on the alternative modifications. Historic England referenced previous comments on the main plan document for further information purposes.
Lowestoft Town Council	No objection to the alternative modifications. Support given for sections 4 and 6 of the main neighbourhood plan document.
Marine Management Organisation	No comment on the alternative modifications. General commentary was made about some of the East Marine Plan policies.
National Highways	No comments to make.
Natural England	No comment on the alternative modifications. Some advice on general neighbourhood plan matters was included.
Suffolk County Council (Neighbourhood Planning)	No objections.
Suffolk County Council Directorate of Public Health and Communities	Support given to alternative modifications 1, 4, 5, 8 and 11.
Water Management Alliance	No comments made on the alternative modifications. The Water Management Alliance recommended the neighbourhood plan includes reference to drainage and flood regulators. General comments around

	<p>maintenance of water courses and surface water drainage matters were provided.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Full responses are available here:

<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Neighbourhood-Planning/Designated-Neighbourhood-Areas/Carlton-Colville/Responses-to-Carlton-Colville-NP-Additional-Focused-Consultation.pdf>

Appendix B – Assessment of the Alternative Modifications against the Basic Conditions

A neighbourhood plan must meet the ‘Basic Conditions’ set out in the Town and Country Planning Act if it is to proceed to a referendum. This section sets out how each of the alternative modifications proposed by the Local Planning Authorities meets the Basic Conditions. The Basic Conditions are set out directly below, and then the alternative modifications are assessed in turn after that.

Schedule [4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990](#)⁵ states that:

A draft order meets the basic conditions if—

- (a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order,
- (b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order,
- (c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, it is appropriate to make the order,
- (d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development,
- (e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area),
- (f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations, and
- (g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order.

⁵ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/schedule/4B>

Alternative Modification 1:

Amend Policy CC1, A, part vii to read:

‘vii. supporting and enabling walking and cycling by effectively integrating walking and cycling infrastructure (including public rights of way) into development and ensuring that links into the wider network are maintained and, where possible, enhanced. [Where appropriate](#), development must demonstrate how it has been informed by the Suffolk Design Streets Guide or any successor document.’

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	<p>Part A, vii of Policy CC1 supports provision of walking and cycling infrastructure in line with the National Planning Policy Framework’s (NPPF) objective of promoting healthy communities.</p> <p>Alternative Modification 1 adds a small amount of text to this policy which adds clarity around how the policy should be applied by decision makers. This meets the objective of ‘clearly written and unambiguous’ policies required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.</p>
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	<p>Part A vii of the policy does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. The alternative modification does not alter this, and accordingly the alternative modification is considered to be compatible with this Basic Condition.</p>
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	<p>Part A vii of the policy does not affect character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. The alternative modification does not alter this, and accordingly the alternative modification is considered to be compatible with this Basic Condition.</p>
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	<p>Part A, vii of Policy CC1 supports provision of walking and cycling infrastructure which contributes strongly toward achieving sustainable development. This helps to reduce car use thereby reducing climate change and helping deliver the environmental objectives of sustainable development. It also supports healthy communities with improved access to services and facilities, thereby helping deliver the social objectives of sustainable development.</p>

(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order.	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.

Alternative Modification 2:

Amend para. 4.5 to read:

'The guidance contained in the Neighbourhood Plan is intended to ~~should~~ influence discussions with developers and East Suffolk Council, but the final layout, look and feel will be subject to a developer-led Masterplanning process which will be informed by detailed site appraisal and assessment and ongoing community engagement ~~detailed plans~~. However, the Neighbourhood Plan has been informed by the aspirations and desires of our community to ensure that these are not over-looked and this presents an early insight into the challenges and opportunities for the future Masterplanning process.

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	The changes in Alternative Modification 2 provide additional guidance around how the neighbourhood plan and its contents is intended to be used in the process of shaping the development of the allocated Bell Farm development site. This helps to meet the objective of 'clearly written and unambiguous' policies required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features	Para. 4.5 does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. The alternative modification does not alter this, and

of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	accordingly the alternative modification is considered to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	Para. 4.5 does not affect character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. The alternative modification does not alter this, and accordingly the alternative modification is considered to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development,	The retention of para. 4.5 and the addition of guiding text supports the incorporation of the community's aspirations in the masterplanning process. This strengthens the social dimension of achieving sustainable development.
(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order.	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.

Alternative Modification 3:

Para's 4.15 to 4.21 inclusive to be deleted and new text to be added to form new para. 4.19 to read:

'Open spaces provided as part of new developments should be connected to the wider town where possible using paths that encourage walking and cycling.'

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	Alternative Modification 3 deletes supporting text (which is no longer required due to deleted policy wording) and introduces new supporting text to guide the application of planning policies. This helps to meet the objective of 'clearly written and unambiguous' policies required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	The amended supporting text does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. Accordingly, the alternative modification is considered to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	The amended supporting text does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is considered to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	The supporting text offers guidance to support delivery of open spaces which are connected to the wider town and encourage people to walk and cycle. As such, this supports delivery of the social and environmental elements of sustainable development.
(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and

matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order.	prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Alternative Modification 4:

Retain penultimate sentence (Any flood mitigation...)

Amend final sentence (It should provide quieter...) to read: *Where possible, it should provide quieter spaces for relaxation and reflection and good pedestrian and cycling links ~~through~~ to the ~~rest of the development and~~ surrounding area.*

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	Alternative Modification 4 retains supporting text which guides design of flood mitigation features. It also alters the text to make it clear that it should be applied in a pragmatic fashion. This helps to deliver sustainable development whilst also having regard to the objective of 'clearly written and unambiguous' policies, required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	The amended and retained supporting text does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. Accordingly, the alternative modification is considered to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	The amended and retained supporting text does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is considered to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	The alternative modification supports the provision of flood mitigation, open space, and pedestrian and cycling routes which contribute to the social and environmental elements of sustainable development.

(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.

Alternative Modification 5:

Delete para.s 4.27 to 4.29 inclusive. Insert after para. 4.30: Where major residential development abuts the countryside, the edges should have a soft appearance which can be supported through dwellings facing out to the countryside. Where possible, edge lanes should be incorporated which allow access to a small number of dwellings. Edge lanes should allow for pedestrian and cycle movement around the edge of the site where possible.

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	Alternative Modification 5 removes three paragraphs in line with the Examiner's recommendation, and then introduces some new text in their place. The new text provides guidance on the design of major residential developments with the aim of delivering high quality design and also having regard to the objective of 'clearly written and unambiguous' policies. Both are required by the NPPF.
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed	The amended supporting text does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or

building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	their features. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	The amended supporting text does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	The new supporting text introduced by the alternative modification supports good design and pedestrian and cycle movements. These contribute towards the environmental and social elements of sustainable development.
(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.

Alternative Modification 6:

Delete title of Policy CC3 and replace with: [‘Walking, Cycling, and Public Rights of Way’](#)

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	Alternative Modification 6 amends the title of Policy CC3 to more accurately reflect the amended policy wording. This has regard to the objective of ‘clearly written and unambiguous’ policies, required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	The amended policy title does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	The amended policy title does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	The amended policy title provides extra clarity around the policy’s purpose. This will assist with applying the policy to walking, cycling and Public Rights of Way matters which in turn will help delivery sustainable development outcomes.
(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and

matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order	prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Alternative Modification 7:

Delete parts A, B and C of Policy CC3.

Modify part D of Policy CC3 as follows:

D. Major development proposals ~~must~~ should ensure that pedestrian and cycle access into and through the site is safe, convenient and attractive. In particular, provision of segregated cycle and pedestrian routes will be strongly supported. ~~Such routes that also ensure that access~~ Access to these routes ~~by~~for disabled users, the blind and deaf and users of mobility scooters ~~is secured~~ should be provided where possible.

Modify part E of Policy CC3 as follows:

E. Where major development is adjacent to open countryside, layouts should provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of the development where feasible and, where possible, provide access for all non-vehicular users into the countryside, particularly where this provides connections with public rights of way and permissive footpaths.

Delete part F of Policy CC3 and replace with:

The protection, enhancement and expansion of the public rights of way network, will be supported. Development which would result in the loss of existing PROWs will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use. This will apply to PROWs for pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider use.

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	Alternative Modification 7 removes some parts of policy CC3 (as recommended by the examiner) relating to key movement routes, around which there was uncertainty about how these would be delivered. Other parts of the policy are amended or replaced. The new and amended text allows the policy to be applied in a clearer and more proportionate and pragmatic way, whilst still helping to provide beneficial outcomes for walking, cycling and Public Rights of Way.

	Accordingly, the alternative modification has regard to the sustainable development objectives embedded in the NPPF, and also has regard to the objective of 'clearly written and unambiguous' policies, required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	The amended policy text does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	The amended policy text does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	The alternative modifications support the delivery of cycling and walking infrastructure, and also support the protection and enhancement of the Public Rights of Way network. These objectives help to deliver the environmental and social elements of sustainable development.
(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the

	alternative modification does not change this position.
--	---------------------------------------------------------

Alternative Modification 8:

Delete para.s 5.3 and 5.4.

Para. 5.5: delete from first sentence: '~~Whilst recognising these limits to what we can control and propose with regard to main routes~~'.

Delete final sentence: '~~The same principles will apply to the masterplanning of the other site allocations.~~'

Add new sentence to end of para. 5.5: 'Furthermore, improvements to cycling and walking routes which were identified through the process of preparing the neighbourhood plan are included in Appendix B.'

Para. 5.6: amend first sentence to say: '~~Nevertheless, regardless of any particular considerations in respect of Bell Farm and Oakes Farm~~ We ~~do~~ want to improve movement generally across our community through...'.

Delete para. 5.7.

Add Public Rights of Way to fig 5.2. Amend title of fig. 5.2 to 'Existing cycle-friendly routes and Public Rights of Way'.

Delete heading 'Solutions'

Delete paras. 5.8 and 5.9. Bullet pointed text from para. 5.9 to be moved to new 'Appendix B'.

Amend para. 5.10 as follows:

'Design of major development that incorporates 'neighbourhood edges' creates the opportunity to provide walking and cycling access around the perimeter of developments. Not only will this help to provide a soft edge to development but it will provide attractive routes for non-vehicular movement and ~~enable easy~~ support access into the countryside through the network of public rights of way (which include bridleways) and permissive footpaths.'

Delete para. 5.11

Amend para. 5.12 as follows:

'Alongside new cycling routes, the provision of suitable cycle parking at key destinations, e.g. shops, schools, workplaces, etc. is ~~supported~~ encouraged.'

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	Alternative Modification 8 removes some supporting text from the plan (as recommended by the Examiner), but retains some parts and amends others. This is intended to provide guidance on sound planning and design principles which reflect the objectives of the NPPF. It also provides additional clarity around how the objectives in the neighbourhood plan should be delivered and how site allocations in the local plan should be approached. This has regard to the objective of 'clearly written and unambiguous' policies, required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	The amended supporting text does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	The amended supporting text does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	The amended supporting text helps to achieve the effective delivery of well-designed cycling and walking infrastructure
(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.

(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Alternative Modification 9:

Move figure 5.3 to new appendix B. Minor modifications to be made to the map to improve clarity as follows:

- Clearer labelling of red routes
- Clearer labelling of routes from the East Suffolk Council Cycling and Walking Strategy
- Change Castleton Avenue route from red to orange
- Remove route C5 as it is not necessary

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	Alternative Modification 9 modifies the map in fig. 5.3 and moves it to appendix B. In doing so, the modification retains the information gathered by the community in the neighbourhood plan, but it is clear that this information is only for reference. The alterations to the map improve the accuracy of the information. This amendment assists the community in achieving their shared vision (as set out in the NPPF), whilst also being clear on what is relevant to the application of the planning policies and what is not. Accordingly, this has regard to the objective of 'clearly written and unambiguous' policies, required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	The amended supporting text does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or	The amended supporting text does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation

enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	Improving the accuracy of the map and retaining it in an appendix will help support the delivery of cycling and walking routes. This will assist in achieving the environmental and social elements of sustainable development.
(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.

Alternative Modification 10:

Re-word policy CC8 as follows:

Proposals to deliver the Carlton Colville Country Park (required as part of the development of land at Bell Farm, as allocated in Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan Policy WLP2.16) ~~is expected to be informed by~~ should demonstrate how the principles shown in Figure 7.1 ~~have informed the development of the masterplan~~. Provision is encouraged to be made for the range of activities shown.

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------

<p>(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State</p>	<p>Alternative Modification 10 amends the text of the policy so that the masterplan (which must be produced to accompany a planning application on the Bell Farm site) demonstrates how principles set out in the neighbourhood plan in fig. 7.1 relating to the proposed country park have been applied. This does not restrict an applicant to having to follow the principles, instead it requires them to show how the design of the masterplan responds to them. The principles are deemed to be reasonable and achievable uses and layouts for a country park. This approach follows the objective for plans to be ‘aspirational but deliverable’ in para. 16 (b) of the NPPF. The amended wording provides clarity around how the policy should be applied, pursuant to the objective of ‘clearly written and unambiguous’ policies, required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.</p>
<p>(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses</p>	<p>The amended policy does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.</p>
<p>(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area</p>	<p>The amended policy does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.</p>
<p>(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development</p>	<p>The alternative modification supports provision of open space that reflects current and future needs and support the community’s health, social and cultural well-being. This aligns with the social element of sustainable development.</p>
<p>(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of</p>	<p>No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.</p>

the authority (or any part of that area)	
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.

Alternative Modifications 11, 12 and 13

These alternative modifications are considered together as they all apply to related parts of para. 7.17.

Alternative Modification 11:

Retain para. 7.17

Alternative Modification 12:

Do not add new title.

Alternative Modification 13:

Do not add the new sentence.

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	<p>Alternative Modification 11 retains supporting text which relates to aspects of the country park which are identified as important to the local community.</p> <p>Alternative Modification 12 rejects the addition of a new title proposed by the Examiner. The new</p>

	<p>title would have been used in place of deleted text in para. 7.17, which Alternative Modification 11 retains. The proposed new title is therefore superfluous.</p> <p>Alternative Modification 13 rejects the addition of a new sentence proposed by the Examiner. The new sentence would weaken the importance of the aspects of the country park identified by the community.</p> <p>The amended text resulting from these three alternative modifications sets out the importance of aspects of the country park to the community. At the same time it acknowledges that there must be flexibility in how these aspects of the country park are approached in delivery of the park. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be 'aspirational but deliverable' as required by para. 16 (b) of the NPPF.</p>
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	The retained supporting text does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	The retained supporting text does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	The alternative modifications support provision of open space that reflects current and future needs and support the community's health, social and cultural well-being. This aligns with the social element of sustainable development.

(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modifications do not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modifications do not change this position.

Alternative Modification 14:

Re-word para. 7.18 to read: ~~'The Country Park will need to be supplemented by a full Development proposals are encouraged to include provision for a comprehensive management plan for the country park once final layout/area are agreed as part of any development proposals.'~~

Basic Condition	How this is met by the alternative modification
(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State	Alternative Modification 14 amends the supporting text to reflect that the objective of a comprehensive management plan for the country park is aspirational and not a policy requirement. This allows the plan to reflect the community's aspirations and also provide clarity for decision-makers as to how to treat this objective. Accordingly, this has regard to the objective of 'clearly written and unambiguous' policies, required by para. 16 (d) of the NPPF.
(b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features	The amended supporting text does not affect the preservation of Listed Buildings, their settings, or their features. Accordingly, the alternative

of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses	modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area	The amended supporting text does not affect the character or appearance of any Conservation Areas. Accordingly, the alternative modification is deemed to be compatible with this Basic Condition.
(d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	The alternative modification supports the community's aspiration to achieve a comprehensively managed country park. This contributes towards the environmental and social elements of sustainable development.
(e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)	No conflicts with the strategic policies in the development plan have been identified by the Local Planning Authorities and the alternative modification does not alter this.
(f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that the plan is compatible with the assimilated obligations. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.
(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order	The Independent Examiner was satisfied that prescribed conditions had been met and prescribed matters had been complied with. The Local Planning Authorities concur, and the alternative modification does not change this position.