



Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

Summary of Representations

This section contains summaries of the representations made in response to the consultation on the Submission Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan which was held between 10 May 2023 to 21 June 2023. The representations were submitted to the Examiner for consideration during the Examination of the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan. Full copies of the representations can be viewed on the following webpage:

<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-plans-in-the-area/carlton-colville-neighbourhood-plan/>

Respondent	Summary of response
East Suffolk Council	<p>The response sets out an overall support for the plan, identifying that the plan is well written with a good focus on important local issues. Additionally, the consultation statement is very effective at presenting how the comments received during the Regulation 14 consultation have been addressed and considered through subsequent changes. The response also identified support for the protection of assets listed in Table 2.1 in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The response identifies a small number of recommendations for changes to the plan within Section 4, Policy CC4 and Policy CC5.</p>
Broads Authority	<p>The response sets out an objection to Policy CC1,B,I and recommends including reference to the importance of design for extensions and suggests that this policy should be equally applied to extensions to existing development and new development.</p> <p>The response sets out an objection to Policy CC5, A and recommends a slight change to wording to ensure that the policy stance in terms of the natural environment is not weakened by the wording within this policy.</p>

	The response also sets out a small number of other minor recommendations to Figure 2.1, Section 4 and Policy CC6.
Andy Needham	The response sets out an objection to the proposed development on the 'land south of the street.' The response identifies that this land is a greenfield site comprised of farmland that provides food production. The response also identifies natural environment and infrastructure constraints on the site which may cause issues in the future. The response raises concern over the noise impact on the nearby primary school and questions whether a new school is required given the location of the existing school. Instead, future housing and schooling should be restricted to brownfield sites.
Anglian Water	The response sets out its support for the plan and highlights support for Policy CC5, Paragraph 6.18 and Paragraph 6.27. The response raises attention to the Lowestoft Water Recycling Catchment for consideration.
David Haverson	The response raises a number of concerns including: parking and traffic at peak times at Low Farm Drive, views of the countryside, access to green space, loss of habitat, increase risk of flooding, anti-social behaviour, housing density, affordability and delivery of services and facilities.
Mutford Parish Council	The response raises the omission of reference to limiting merging with, or encroachment on Mutford parish boundary.
National Gas (Avison Young)	The response provided information in relation to National Gas Transmission, Distribution Networks and gas assets.
National Grid (Avison Young)	The response provided information in relation to National Grid Electricity Transmission, proposed development sites crossed or close to NGET assets and Distribution Networks. The response confirmed that no NGET assets are currently affected by the proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
National Highways	The response identified that the area and location that are covered by this Neighbourhood Plan is remote from the SRN. Consequently, these draft policies set out are unlikely to have an impact on the operation of the trunk road and National Highways offer No Comment.
Natural England	Natural England did not provide any specific comments on the Carlton Coville Neighbourhood Plan.
Optima Carlton Colville Ltd	As the developer of the Bell Farm site, allocated for a residential-led mixed-use scheme under Policy WLP2.16 in the Waveney Local Plan,

	<p>Optima is preparing an outline planning application for the site, expected to be developed within the plan period.</p> <p>The response acknowledges the plan's intent to shape development but notes a lack of engagement with the landowner or developer during its preparation. While some policies align with national and district-level planning, others lack an evidence base and appear speculative.</p> <p>The response highlights support for Policy CC1 (High Quality Design) for balancing flexibility with high design standards. However, Policy CC2 (Particular Views) lacks justification, as the identified views have not been properly assessed for their importance or impact on development. Similarly, Policy CC3 (Key Movement Routes) prescribes specific routes without considering feasibility, conflicting with the flexibility needed for master planning.</p> <p>The response suggests that the draft plan inconsistently applies the town council's Design Code, sometimes following its framework and other times diverging without clear justification. The designation of parts of the Bell Farm site as a country park (Area B) and a development zone (Area C) is unexplained and contradicts the local plan's master planning requirements. Additionally, some community facility allocations lack supporting evidence and contradict the Design Code.</p> <p>Overall, the response sets out its support for key elements of the neighbourhood plan but urges amendments to ensure policies are evidence-based, flexible, and aligned with the ongoing site assessment and master planning process. The developer invites further dialogue with the town council to refine the plan and support sustainable development in Carlton Colville.</p>
Suffolk County Council	<p>The response sets out support for the changes that have been made to the plan following the Regulation 14 consultation. The response recommended alterations to policy CC7 in order to ensure that the policy was not too restrictive on the location of a new primary school as this could cause issues at the application stage.</p>
Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service	<p>The response sets out support for the plan and commended the sections covering heritage for the amount of research undertaken and research tools used. The response recommended some additional text within the section 4 to provide clarity to developers</p>

	for any future development sites. The response also emphasised the necessity to undertake archaeological evaluations before the development of site allocations.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	The response sets out an overall support for the plan and does make any further comment.



Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

Summary of Representations

This section contains summaries of the representations made in response to the additional focused consultation on the Submission Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan which was held between 11 December 2024 to 5 February 2025. Full copies of the representations can be viewed on the following webpage:

<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-plans-in-the-area/carlton-colville-neighbourhood-plan/>

Respondent	Summary of response
Anglian Water	The response stated that Anglian Water had no specific comments to make.
Carlton Colville Town Council	The response set out support for the proposed modifications. The response raised that any future consultations conducted by developers with the general public should be guided and facilitated by the Town Council.
Historic England	The response stated that Historic England had no specific comments to make.
Lowestoft Town Council	The response stated that Lowestoft Town Council had no specific comments to make. The response did commend the level of detail within section 6 of the Neighbourhood Plan.
Marine Management Organisation	The response stated that Marine Management Organisation had no specific comments to make. The response did identify relevant policies from the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and encouraged reference to these plans within the Neighbourhood Plan.
National Highways	The response stated that the proposed modifications to the plan will not result in a significant impact on the operation of the SRN

	and therefore indicated that National Highways had no specific comments to make.
Natural England	The response stated that Natural England had no specific comments to make. The response provided some information covering the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.
Suffolk County Council	The response stated its support for the proposed modifications and made no further specific comments.
Suffolk County Council Directorate of Public Health and Communities	The response stated its support for the proposed modifications and made no further specific comments.
Water Management Alliance	The response did not make comments on the modifications, but did recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan includes reference to the relevant regulators for drainage and flood risk. The response also provided some information on maintenance of water courses and surface water drainage matters.