

Great Bealings Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Statement

This Consultation Statement (the Statement) is to be read in conjunction with the submission draft of the Great Bealings Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) as approved by the Parish Council on 8 March 2016. The parish of Great Bealings was accepted by Suffolk Coastal District Council as the relevant Neighbourhood Area in December 2012.

The Statement is in accordance with Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and follows the Consultation Strategy attached to the Plan at Appendix 7.

The Statement sets out:

- Who was consulted and when,
- The basis on which public meetings were held throughout the process and what feedback was generated at those meetings,
- How the Plan Questionnaire was developed, circulated and evaluated,
- What the responses were to the Questionnaire and how these responses informed the drafting of the Plan,
- How the draft Plan was presented at public meetings,
- The basis for the Public Consultation draft,
- How and when the Public Consultation was arranged,
- What responses were received as a result of the Public Consultation and how those responses have been reflected in the final submission version of the Plan.

- 1. PC decision to create a Neighbourhood Plan – July 2012**
Presentation of the benefits of a Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) (Appendix 1) given to the Parish Council (PC), who agreed to go ahead and apply to Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) for approval to set the parish boundary as the relevant Plan area. An approach had been made to Little Bealings to see if there was any interest in drawing up a joint Plan, but they declined to become involved in the process.
- 2. SCDC Approval to Proceed – December 2012**
SCDC gave approval after their own consultation exercise and having established funding for their Neighbourhood Planning team.
- 3. Housing Needs Survey commissioned – January 2013**
As a precursor to drawing up the Plan, a Housing Needs Survey was commissioned from Community Action Suffolk to assess the level of potential need.
- 4. Survey complete and submitted to the PC – March 2013**
The CAS report was submitted to the PC for noting and it was agreed to then hold the first public meeting.
- 5. First Public Meeting – June 2013**
The first public meeting was held over two days on 14th and 15th June 2013. Notices were placed on village notice boards; an insert was printed and circulated with the Parish Magazine (Appendix 2) which is circulated to all residents; businesses and landowners were informed, and all neighbouring parishes were also invited to attend.

Key elements of the presentation included:

- Maps showing listed buildings, County Wildlife Sites, footpaths, viewpoints, etc.
- Affordable Housing presentation
- Video loop of key views and aspects of the village
- Wall charts organised on the basis of the draft survey recommended to the PC, suggesting major issues, to which attendees were invited to attach post-it notes with comments and suggestions
- Copy of the SCDC Local Plan

45 people attended (there are 222 on the electoral roll) and a comprehensive set of comments and suggestions were received (Appendix 3) on the draft survey. A key recommendation was that Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT) should be asked to do a comprehensive survey of the parish so as to provide the evidence of what environmental features were deserving of protection.

The comments made at the public meeting were the basis of the detailed Questionnaire that was then produced.

- 6. DCLG Funding approved – July 2013**
A grant of £7,000 was received from DCLG based on our budgeted costs for the Plan.
- 7. SWT Report received – January 2014**
The report was received in January 2014, which taken together with the comments from the public meeting greatly assisted with the drafting of the Questionnaire.
- 8. Annual parish Meeting – May 2014**
An update was provided to the Annual Parish Meeting, to ensure that progress on the Plan was understood by all.

9. Questionnaire circulated – June 2014

The Questionnaire (Appendix 4) was circulated in June 2014 and hand delivered to all residents. The response rate was 65% of the number of copies distributed – a remarkably high level of engagement. Notice of the Questionnaire was also publicised in the Parish Magazine and copies were delivered to the businesses and farmers with activity in the parish. Copies were also provided to the neighbouring parishes.

10. Responses analysed – July 2014

An analysis of responses (Appendix 5) was presented to the PC and this formed the basis of the first draft of the Plan.

11. Second Public Meeting – September 2014

A further public meeting was announced (Appendix 6) at which the responses to the questionnaire were presented and the approach to the draft Plan set out. Drafting the Plan was a time-consuming exercise, given the size of the village and the number of people who were available to assist.

12. Annual Parish Meeting – May 2015

A further update was given to the 2015 Annual Parish Meeting, together with a full Powerpoint presentation (Appendix 7) on progress to date, key issues, and the basis of the emerging Plan.

13. Third Public Meeting – October 2015

Once a developed draft had been written, a further public meeting was held to amplify the presentation given at the Annual Meeting and to explain the basis of the proposed policies. (Appendix 8)

14. Formal Public Consultation – 1st December 2015 to 21st January 2016

Following the approval of the Parish Council, the draft Plan was made available for formal public consultation for a period of 8 weeks, greater than the statutory requirement but so as to allow for it to be read over the Christmas break.

A notice was placed in the Parish Magazine, businesses and farmers were emailed individually, and neighbouring parishes alerted. In addition a letter (Appendix 9) from the Chairman of the Parish Council was hand delivered to every address in the parish.

A full schedule of all responses and the agreed amendments adopted by the PC is attached at Appendix 10.

Appendix 1 - Presentation to Parish Council – July 2012

Introduction to the Neighbourhood Plan Process

Since the parishes of Great Bealings, Little Bealings, and Playford co-operated on a Parish Plan in 2007/9, much has changed. As set out in Section 2 below, the new national planning guidelines allow for individual parishes to write and adopt a Neighbourhood Plan which, once approved by a village referendum and adopted by the District Council, has statutory force. This process by its very nature allows the parish to state its objectives clearly and offers a degree of protection with respect to future planning issues in a way that has not been possible until now. It is an opportunity not to be missed.

Section 1: What is our Objective?

At first glance, Great Bealings is a village without immediate appeal. It has no pub, no shop, no village green, and it is split into two quite separate settlements. But dig a little deeper. Great Bealings is mentioned in Domesday Book. Its roots run deep through the fabric of Suffolk and indeed through the history of England.

Like many early settlements, it was established near to the sea and the gravel banks in the area are full of ancient signs of such settlement. The River Fynn remained navigable until Victorian times, when smugglers crept up the river and left their wares under the hedge at The Lodge, having ‘borrowed’ the rector’s horse and cart to distribute their haul. Our church was built in the 12th century. The area became the home of the Seckford family, who built Seckford Hall, prospered under Elizabeth I, and also endowed a church in Clerkenwell. Barrack Cottages are said to be a remnant of the accommodation needs of the army that was based in Woodbridge waiting for Napoleon to invade. Margaret Catchpole worked in Great Bealings. Major Moore returned from the wars in Southern India, complete with the booty of early empire, and settled here, his son becoming a noted rector whose diary is a marvellous evocation of Victorian England. The copse at the top of Kiln Lane was where the home guard hid and waited for Hitler, who fortunately never came. The village has been lived in by a Lord Chancellor, a Lord Lieutenant, and a Chief of Police, among others. Books have been written recording past times in the village. In short, it is a microcosm of English life and English history. Why does this matter?

As with any small village in modern England, the pressures are enormous, and growing. We are squeezed between Ipswich and Woodbridge, never mind the new developments around Martlesham. The sound, the speed, and the density of traffic grow all the time, very little of it originating in the village. Housing needs in the surrounding area are increasing and will not be met for many years. And yet many people choose to live in Great Bealings. Why?

The very scale, and peace, of a village such as Great Bealings make it somewhere that offers a real contrast to the growth being experienced in the region generally. The delicate balance of countryside, wildlife, vernacular buildings, yet within reach of major transport links and urban facilities, is a fragile one. If we do not act to protect it, we will be over-run. Up to now there has been no mechanism to support that protection, since the only body that represents the village – the Parish Council – has limited resources and no statutory power. Local effort can achieve much – look at the playing field – but we have always been at the mercy of decisions taken elsewhere. The character of the village and its residents has changed a lot in the last 40 years. There are now many more young families and a greater sense of belonging, all of which is to be welcomed. Those families have chosen to live here, and the reasons they have done so are the reasons that we now need to act to preserve.

The Parish Council believes that we should take advantage of the Neighbourhood Plan process. That there is a possibility of getting additional funding through the amenity fund which EA1 might set up to compensate us for the considerable disruption caused by the laying of the connector cable through the village is an added opportunity.

In the end this will be your Plan. It will be written based on the evidence of what is already here, both the built and the natural environments, and your opinions expressed through the result of the questionnaire you will be asked to fill in. It is therefore your Plan, your vision, and indeed your future.

Section 2: Why a Neighbourhood Plan?

1. The National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') and the Localism Act together encourage and enshrine the right of local communities to create their own Neighbourhood Plan ('NP') which, once passed by simple majority in a referendum, must be referred to by the Planning Authority (Suffolk Coastal ('SCDC') in our case) when applications are considered. No such statutory protection is provided by Village Plans or by Parish Council objections in current circumstances.
2. The relevant local authority has a duty to support the creation of NPs, and is required to meet certain costs such as examination of drafts to ensure conformity with regional objectives, running the referendum, etc. Third party funding may also be available to assist the writing of the NP.
3. SCDC is concerned that they have neither the budget nor the resources to deal with this requirement. More to the point, all local authorities are highly uncertain about the longer term impact of such a significant change in the powers of local communities. The Planning Authority will no longer be able to ignore local views properly expressed and ratified through the NP process. This is a major change in culture. SCDC are encouraging the updating of Village Plans to head off this change, but this will not provide statutory protection.
4. The NPPF covers 80% of the objections raised by CPRE to the first draft however major issues remain, for example no implicit protection is given for undesignated countryside. The status of a Special Landscape Area ('SLA') is unclear, but the NP would provide the **evidence** that SLA status or its equivalent should be preserved.
5. It follows that where, as in the case of Great Bealings, protection is sought for a delicate balance of landscape, amenity, housing, undesignated heritage assets, etc., the creation of an NP is a powerful tool. Many other villages in Suffolk are of the same view. The only NP to have reached final draft so far is Rendlesham, but Melton and Grundisburgh are working on proposals. Collaboration with other villages in the area would obviously be valuable.
6. The process allows communities to identify sites for local development, such as a village shop, affordable housing, small scale commercial units on community land, etc. and, if correctly drawn under the NP, to grant planning permission for such development. If for example Great Bealings was able to identify a site for 2 affordable housing units, it could, subject to funding, acquire the land and build 3 units of which 1 could be sold at open market price to subsidise the costs of the scheme. The affordable units could be let to tenants such as young families, older couples wishing to downsize, etc., chosen by the community, avoiding the risk of families from a different background being located in the village by a third party.

When preparing the NP, proposals and criteria must be **evidence based**. Drawing up that evidence will be a key role for the Parish Council working party. The plans proposed must show how the consultation process and evidence gathering has determined the recommended outcomes. The plan must address three key considerations:

- a. Environmental
- b. Economic
- c. Social

Great Bealings is deemed an ‘other village’ (Little Bealings is a service centre) and therefore development is not expected in any significant way (unless proposed as under 6 above) but some degree of new housing will be required **if the survey establishes a need.**

Section 3: The Neighbourhood Plan process

1. We have a Parish Council (‘PC’) and they must sponsor the NP but they can call on as wide a range of help in the process as they wish (or can afford). The first step will be to set up a working party including PC members and others.
2. SCDC then has to approve the area covered by the NP. In our case that would be the parish boundary.
3. The working party establishes the aims of the NP and draws up a questionnaire designed to get the views of the residents in relation to the main aims of the plan.
4. Based on those responses, which are critical to establishing the evidence of need and support for the plan proposals, the aims of the plan are validated and developed further as required.
5. The PC working party then drafts the NP, having drawn up the relevant headings and carried out appropriate consultation. That will include public meetings at which the conclusions of the questionnaire are presented and the emerging draft plan explained.
6. The draft plan is checked for conformity by SCDC. It has to conform with the wider local authority planning objectives (housing, sustainability, etc.).
7. SCDC arranges the referendum.
8. Once passed by simple majority, SCDC adopts the NP.

Section 4: Suggested Questionnaire

1. *Great Bealings and You*

- Why did you choose to live in Great Bealings?
- List the four things you most like about the village.
- List the four things you most dislike.
- How do you see the village in 10 and 20 years time?
- What in your view should be the Plan’s principal objective?
- Should it be designed to manage change, or should its principle aim be to preserve and manage what is here now?
- In what other areas do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should concentrate to protect what you value about the village?
- Did you participate in the joint Parish Plan process in 2007/9? If so did it meet your expectations?
- If not, how could we do better as we prepare the Neighbourhood Plan?
- Do you believe that you have enough information, e.g. from the parish council and/or from SCDC, to inform you about what the threats and opportunities are in relation to the village?

2. *Traffic and Transport*

- Would you like to see more control over traffic speed through the village?
- Do you use the bus service?
- If so, is it sufficient for your needs?
- Do you support the idea of ‘quiet lanes’, e.g. Rosery Lane
- Please state any other important – to you – transport issues.

3. *Services*

- What changes would you like to see in services delivered by SCDC?
- Are you satisfied with broadband speeds?
- Are there other services that you would like to see provided?
- Are there enough facilities for young people? If not, how could they be provided?
- Are there enough services for old people? If not, how could they be provided?

4. *Conservation*

- The village lies in a Special Landscape Area under the current planning rules, but such status does not exist *per se* under the new guidelines. Do you believe this is important?
- There are a few listed buildings (see Appendix XX) but they are mostly on the margin of the village. Would you like to see more protection for unlisted buildings that contribute to the character of the village?
- Do you have any suggested buildings or groups of buildings that could be designated as ‘non-listed heritage assets’?
- There might be an opportunity to negotiate a sum of money from EA1 due to the disruption to the village that will be caused by laying the connector cable. What would you like to see such money used for?
- Do you support a ‘legacy fund’, e.g. for conservation works, maintenance, etc., or would you prefer a ‘one off’ benefit such as the village hall roof (remember the village hall is not in Great Bealings)?
- Would you like to see a detailed conservation plan for the village landscape, flora, fauna, etc? [See Appendix xx for outline plan suggested by Suffolk Wildlife Trust]
- If so, do you think it should include tree planting, river bank maintenance, habitat management, etc?
- Is bird habitat important? [See Appendix XX for birds sighted in Great Bealings]
- If a detailed conservation plan included your house, garden, or other land, would you be prepared to allow limited access, e.g. a village open day?
- Do you believe that landscape and conservation are of value to Bealings School? If so, would that change your answer to the previous question?
- Should trees be preserved to protect the landscape around the village?
- If you own a tree or trees that form part of the backdrop to the village, would you be prepared to see them preserved?
- Please suggest the views and/or groups of trees that you would like to see preserved.
- Do you agree that the results of the hedgerow survey carried out [5] years ago should be built into the Plan?
- Are there views of countryside, or street scenes, that in your opinion contribute to the character of the village? If so please list them, or enclose photographs.

5. *Development*

- Do you think development should be allowed in Great Bealings?
- If not, what are your reasons?
- If you do think development is needed, do you think it should be allowed:
 - i.* To modernise and enlarge existing properties, irrespective of scale or size;
 - ii.* To allow new houses to be built;
 - iii.* To allow capacity for small business units;
 - iv.* To allow for community assets such as a shop;
 - v.* For affordable housing;
 - vi.* If you think affordable housing is needed and should be allowed, who should be allowed to occupy it?
 - vii.* Would you like to suggest:
 - 1.* Sites that could be developed;
 - 2.* Sites that should NOT be developed.

- viii.* The Neighbourhood Plan process allows ‘a community right to build’. For example a community shop or affordable housing. In such case would you be prepared to support such a scheme, either with manual assistance or with money?

6. *Design Criteria*

- The Neighbourhood Plan could include a set of broad design criteria covering any future development. Is this important?
- Do you have any suggestions as to what such criteria might be?
- Do you think design criteria are unnecessary?

7. *Recreation and Access*

- Are there sufficient footpaths in the village?
- If not, do you have any suggestions as to possible new routes?
- We share the use of the Village Hall and the John Belstead Playing Field with Little Bealings. Are you satisfied that this meets the needs of the village?
- Would you like to see a piece of land acquired or leased using public subscription and/or EA1’s amenity fund for the purposes of recreation, education, and conservation?

8. *Neighbouring Villages*

- Should the Parish Council be encouraged to do more in concert with our neighbouring parishes to respond to major planning issues such as the EA1 connector cable, windfarm proposals, the Ipswich Northern Bypass, etc.?
- Do you consider that the statutory nature of the NP will help to protect the village in such circumstances?

9. *Other matters*

- Are there other issues you would like to see addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan?
- Would you like more information on the new planning procedures set up by the Government and how they affect you?
- How would you like to be kept informed of progress?
- Do you support the idea of a community wind turbine?

GREAT BEALINGS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Great Bealings Parish Council have been given the green light by SCDC to commence the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan for the village. SCDC are required to give six weeks public notice to allow for any comments or objections to this process but this should not stop us from commencing the work required.

I hope you will have read the note we included in the Benefice Magazine late last year telling you that the Great Bealings Parish Council want to produce a Neighbourhood Plan for the village. As a first step in a consultation process that is designed to ensure that the Plan reflects what you, the residents of Great Bealings, are concerned about and want to see represented in the Plan, we are planning to have a meeting at the Angela Cobbold Hall in the next couple of months when we would like to have your views. We will let you know the date as soon as the Working Group has met and agreed the timetable. We do hope you will come along and share your thoughts with us in what will be a relaxed and informal session even though it has a serious purpose. Refreshments will be on offer.

Appendix 3 - Comments received from Open Day participants, June 2013

Open Day comments on Draft Questionnaire

1. *Great Bealings and You*

Why did you choose to live in Great Bealings and what do you like about it?

- Friendly and active community and nice people
- Close to job (BT and others)
- Family
- Open spaces
- Walks
- Beautiful village
- Peace and quiet
- Views
- Not a lot of rubbish
- Playground

List the things you most dislike.

- No pub or shop or post office
- Traffic
- Nowhere for teenagers to go in winter
- Miles from anywhere

What in your view should be the Neighbourhood Plan's principal objective?

- Protect against growth due to business expansion in the area.
- Protect the village way of life
- Limit change
- Maintain basis for village events

Should it be designed to manage change, or should its principle aim be to conserve and manage what is here now?

- Be very careful about change: use it to enhance the village and not destroy it.
- Manage change to enhance the vitality of the village to encourage more young families.
- Conserve what is here.

In what other areas do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should concentrate to protect what you value about the village?

- Nil response

Did you participate in the joint Parish Plan process in 2007/9? If so did it meet your expectations?

- No

Do you believe that you have enough information, e.g. from the parish council and/or from the District Council, to inform you about what the threats and opportunities are in relation to the village?

- Nil response

The Neighbourhood Plan, once passed by a referendum, has statutory force and must be considered when any planning application comes forward. This puts it in a quite different category to the previous Parish Plan. Do you agree that this is important?

- Three x 'Yes'

2. Traffic and Transport

Would you like to see more control over traffic speed through the village?

- Six x 'Yes'
- Control vehicle size rather than traffic calming (10 large lorries a day just in Lower Street)
- Consider blanket speed restriction on all villages

Do you use the bus service?

- I would if there was one
- Yes, but it is unreliable
- Not often
- Service needs to be more frequent

Do you support the idea of 'quiet lanes', e.g. Rosery Lane

- Yes, but risk traffic is diverted to other busy routes

Please state any other important – to you – transport issues.

- Sight lines at many junctions are very poor
- Far too many signs all over the place

3. Services

What changes would you like to see in services delivered by the District Council?

- Nil response

Are you satisfied with broadband speeds?

- Five x 'No'

Are there other services that you would like to see provided?

- Community asset such as pub/shop
- Free access to facilities: village hall has to be booked for a fee

Are there enough facilities for young people? If not, what do you consider should be provided?

- Children's club in village hall
- Youth club

Are there enough services for old people? If not, what do you consider should be provided?

- Nil response

4. Conservation

The village lies in a Special Landscape Area (the Lark Valley) under the current planning rules, but such status is subject to review in the context of Suffolk Coastal District Council's new planning framework. Do you believe we should seek to maintain this designation?

- Yes

There are a few listed buildings (see map) but they are mostly on the margin of the village. Would you like to see more protection for unlisted buildings that contribute to the character of the village?

- Three x 'Yes'

Can you suggest any buildings or groups of buildings that could be designated as 'non-listed heritage assets'?

- Bealings Barn, Suffolk Hall (?), there are several.

Would you like to see a detailed conservation plan for the landscape, flora, and fauna found in the village? Do you agree that these natural assets should be considered in the context of any future planning application?

- Two x 'Yes'

If so, do you think there should be a broad conservation plan that would include tree planting, river bank maintenance, habitat management, etc? Do you have any other suggestions?

- Yes

If such a conservation plan included your house, garden, or other land, would you be prepared to support this approach? Would you be prepared to participate in an 'open day' to allow access to sites of natural interest?

- We should try to include the Cranworth estate in our plans – they are the main landowner.
- Should trees be preserved to protect the landscape around the village?
- Four x 'Yes'

If you own a tree or trees that form part of the backdrop to the village, would you be prepared to see them preserved?

- Yes. More TPOs are needed

Can you suggest any views and/or groups of trees that you would like to see preserved?

- The 'lonely tree'. (It's in Little Bealings! Ed.)

Are there views of the countryside, or street scenes, that in your opinion contribute to the character of the village? Would you like to use the proposed website to upload photographs that illustrate your suggestions?

- Nil response

5. Development

The proposed planning framework drafted by Suffolk Coastal defines Great Bealings as an 'Other Village', that is to say it is not a Service Centre (with school, pub, shop, etc.), and it states under Spatial Policy SP28 that:

"New housing will firstly and primarily be directed to and integrated within the settlements for which physical limits or boundaries have been defined. The strategy for Other Villages is that it be strictly controlled and limited to:

- a) replacement dwellings on a one to one basis where they are no more prominent or visually intrusive in the countryside than the building to be replaced;*
- b) the sub-division of an existing larger dwelling where this would meet a local need;*
- c) conversion of an existing building subject to certain controls.*

New housing might be permitted in order to address local needs but only in exceptional circumstances where there is demonstrated community support e.g. through a community plan."

Do you agree with this policy?

- Yes

If not, do you think more development should be permitted?

- No

If you do think development is needed or should be permitted, do you think it should be allowed:

To modernise and enlarge existing residential properties, irrespective of scale or size?

- In some cases, yes

To allow new houses to be built?

- Only for those with local links

For affordable housing?

If you think affordable housing is needed and should be allowed, who should occupy it?

- Ex-council houses on Boot Street could be affordable homes

In the business context, should some capacity for small business units be considered?

Would you support community assets such as a shop?

- Village hall to be extended as a community shop
- Community owned pub

Would you like to suggest:

1. Sites that could be developed;
2. Sites that should NOT be developed.
 - Nil response

The Neighbourhood Plan process allows 'a community right to build', for example a community shop or affordable housing. In such case would you be prepared to support such a scheme with manual assistance or with money?

Do you support the idea of a community wind turbine installation?

- Good idea, but site is an issue
- No
- Yes if it avoids nuclear risk e.g. Japan/USSR

6. Design Criteria

The Neighbourhood Plan would include a set of broad design criteria covering any future development. Do you agree that design criteria are necessary?

- Yes – very

Do you have any suggestions as to what such criteria might be?

- Relation of building to plot size

7. Recreation and Access

Are there sufficient public footpaths in the village?

- No, but farmers have been helpful in leaving wide headlands which is much appreciated

If not, do you have any suggestions as to new routes?

- Edge of field along Boot Street
- Re-route path (from humpbacked bridge to playing field) along bank of river

We share the use of the Village Hall and the John Belstead Playing Field with Little Bealings.

Are you satisfied that this meets the needs of the village?

- We need a sports ground/football pitch for children
- There should be land for allotments (x 2)

Do you think there is a need for additional recreation or play areas in Lower Street or Boot Street?

Would you like to see a piece of land acquired or leased using public subscription for the purposes of recreation, education, and conservation?

8. Other matters

Are there other issues you would like to see addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan?

- History of 'bomb holes'
- Parham Museum has notes on 'British Secret Army'

Would you like more information on the new planning procedures set up by the Government and how they affect you?

- Yes

How would you like to be kept informed of progress?

- By email

Appendix 4 - Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire

See the website, www.gbnp.co.uk, for this document.

Appendix 5 - Questionnaire Response Analysis – July 2013

[Percentages are based on replies received – 120 copies distributed; 79 copies returned; 66% response rate]

Appendix 6 - Notice of Second Public Meeting – September 2013

Great Bealings Parish Council - Neighbourhood Plan 'A Village in a Landscape'

Dear Resident,

Following the successful circulation of the Questionnaire before the summer holidays, we are holding a public presentation and discussion in the Angela Cobbold Hall on Thursday 25th September at 7.00pm.

There will be a display showing the work we have done so far on the Natural Environment and Built Environment, and a presentation of the results of the Questionnaire, followed by a Q&A session. We will report on the excellent survey Suffolk Wildlife Trust have done on the landscape and habitat features of the village. We will also outline the proposed content of the Plan and suggest a timetable for the next steps.

All welcome. Refreshments provided. We look forward to seeing you.

Eric Barnett, Chairman, Great Bealings Parish Council

Appendix 7 - Powerpoint Presentation to Annual Parish Meeting

See the website, www.gbnpc.co.uk, to view this file.

Appendix 8

Notice of third public meeting – October 2013

GREAT BEALINGS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN “A VILLAGE IN A LANDSCAPE” PUBLIC MEETING Angela Cobbold Hall - Thursday 15th October - 7.00pm

The Parish Council has approved the draft Plan which we now look forward to sharing with residents and other interested parties at a Public Meeting as above. There will be a presentation followed by a question and answer session. The draft Plan is now on the website: www.gbnpc.co.uk. Do take the opportunity to read it. If you cannot access it or would like a hard copy, please contact me at the address below.

The Plan represents three years hard work by a number of people who have all given a huge amount of time and support. It follows closely from the earlier public meetings and the responses to the Questionnaire that was circulated last year and which achieved a two thirds response rate: a remarkably high level.

Refreshments will be served. We look forward to seeing you. Please can you let me or the clerk know if you intend to come so we have an idea of numbers.

Charles Barrington, Chairman, Great Bealings Parish Council

Email: charles.barrington@ardachy.com

Appendix 9 - Letter to Residents re. Public Consultation – October 2015

Dear Resident,

I am delighted to tell you that we have reached the stage of publicising the Plan for formal consultation prior to submitting it to Suffolk Coastal District Council. The consultation period commences on 1st December and lasts for eight weeks until 22nd January. The best way to access it is via the website (www.gbnp.co.uk) but you can get a hard copy from me or the clerk to the Parish Council. This is a longer period than is required by the regulations, but is designed to allow you plenty of time to read it over the Christmas break.

Firstly I would like to thank the members of the Working Group, which is now a sub-committee of the Parish Council, whose sterling efforts over the last three years have got us to this point. Their names are shown at the foot of this letter.

You might ask why it has taken us so long. Most of the work has been done on a wholly voluntary basis by the Working Group which means that we have been able to keep costs to a minimum but we have also been able to use to the full their knowledge and enthusiasm for the village we are all lucky enough to live in. The result is a Plan that fully reflects not only that knowledge but also, equally importantly, your views and comments gathered over 4 public meetings, as well as your answers to the Questionnaire we circulated last year. As you know we received a two thirds response rate – an exceptionally high level. That alone showed us how much you supported the proposed objectives of the Plan.

As we worked our way through the process, we realised that a conventional ‘buildings based’ approach was not the best way to reflect the importance of the landscape setting of the village. This was borne out by the Suffolk Wildlife Trust survey we commissioned (attached to the Plan as an Appendix) and by the excellent Suffolk County Council wildlife strategy document that was published a year ago (available on the SCC website). We are fortunate that our county council recognises the value of the local landscape and its importance to the quality of life of all who live here. It is a valuable public good that deserves recognition and protection in its own right. As a small village with no local services Great Bealings has had no housing allocation placed on it by Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC). This also underwrites the approach we have taken, namely to draw up policies that reflect the landscape setting of the village and seek to protect it in the context of future planning applications.

SCDC have been very supportive throughout the process. They have helped us with the drafting so as to meet the regulations, they have been supportive of the landscape proposals we have drawn up, and they have helped us with the criteria for Non Designated Heritage Assets, which is the mechanism we have adopted for the protection of those buildings and features that give the village its built character. As with the rest of the Plan, the identification of these assets is based on the consent of those who live in them: we want to make sure that you are all in favour of what we are proposing.

The rest of this leaflet is based on the presentation we gave you at the most recent public meeting, where we set out the process we have gone through and summarised the policies we are proposing. Once the 8 week consultation period has closed and we have made any amendments to the draft Plan, it will be submitted formally to SCDC. It must then be examined by an independent inspector to ensure it meets regulations and is consistent with SCDC’s Local Plan. SCDC will also put the Plan out for consultation to various statutory bodies including SCC, the Environment Agency, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, and others. When that consultation has closed SCDC will arrange for a referendum on which every resident of Great Bealings on the electoral register will be able to vote. Assuming we achieve a majority of votes in favour, the Plan will then become a formal statutory document that must be followed in determining planning applications in the future.

The challenge will then be for the Parish Council to apply the Plan and in so doing we recognise that an opportunity exists to make the Council more accountable and to revitalise the relationship between it and the community it serves. We all look forward to playing our role in that respect in future, and we hope you will also take the Plan as a basis on which we would all like to see the future of the village secured. Thank you for your support and encouragement so far, and please let us know if you have any comments on the Plan.

Yours sincerely

Charles Barrington
Chairman, Great Bealings Parish Council
charles.barrington@ardachy.com
07880 736672

Working Group members: Charles Barrington, Eric Barnett, Colin Hedgley, James Firebrace, Sue Prentice, Chris Chestnutt, Fiona Powell

Objectives of the Plan

- Value, understand and preserve what we have: what exactly does the community enjoy and how can we protect it?

Scope of the Plan

- The Plan covers any matter that would require planning permission and it must be compliant with Suffolk Coastal District Council's (SCDC) Local Plan. Some matters however, e.g. traffic, infrastructure, etc., are the responsibility of bodies such as Suffolk County Council (SCC), and are out of scope. The Plan can set aspirations however, thus giving legitimacy to the Parish Council (PC) in future.

What have we achieved?

- Approval to proceed from SCDC – December 2012
- Housing Needs Survey completed - March 2013
- First Public Meeting – July 2013
- Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT) report completed – June 2014
- Questionnaire circulated and analysed – May/June 2014
- Public Presentation of 'Final' draft Plan– October 2015

Strategy and Approach

Overriding objective is to conserve and protect what we have in terms of the landscape and the built environment.

- Five Landscape Protection Areas:
 1. Bealings House/Rosery Farm group;
 2. Lodge Road – the eastern approach;
 3. Kiln Lane and Lower Street;
 4. The Church, the Bridge, and the Meadows;
 5. Boot Street – the western approach.
- Non Designated Heritage Assets list created.

How do we know the Plan will be supported?

- Clear evidence from response at public meetings and extremely high level of response to questionnaire – two thirds of residents - overwhelmingly supportive of Plan objectives.

Third Party Validation

- National Planning Policy Framework and the Localism Act; SCDC Local Plan; SCC's County Wildlife Strategy; SWT Report.

Landscape Protection Areas (LPA) – Policy LP1

Objective: To ensure that the landscape and other natural assets are considered in every planning application and that wildlife habitats are given appropriate protection.

*All development must respect and enhance the special landscape qualities and the biodiversity of the area. This is equally important whether the development occurs within a settlement cluster or in the countryside. All development proposals must demonstrate that they do not have any detrimental impact on the **Special Landscape Area (SLA)** in general or on an **LPA** in particular. Planning applications must be accompanied by a comprehensive Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and appropriate ecological surveys and assessments in order to demonstrate that the proposed development:*

- *complies with all relevant Development Management Guidance issued by Suffolk County Council in relation to the character of the local landscape;*
- *is located to make the best use of existing hedges and trees to screen the proposed development;*
- *protects the biodiversity and geodiversity value of land and minimises the fragmentation of habitats;*
- *incorporates beneficial biodiversity conservation features;*
- *does not adversely affect a County Wildlife Site; and*
- *does not adversely affect any Priority habitat or species.*

A development may be regarded as having a detrimental impact on the SLA or LPA if one or more mature trees or established hedges either:

- *have to be removed to enable the development to take place, or;*
- *have been removed within the 2 years prior to the date of the application without adequate consultation;*

unless it can be demonstrated that they can be replaced in the same or a suitable nearby location if the development goes ahead. It will be for the developer to demonstrate that adequate landscape improvements will be put in place to compensate for the loss of the tree(s) or hedge(s). Permitted developments such as porches, minor extensions, sheds, garages, etc. that do not require planning permission would not need to undertake landscape, visual impact, or ecological surveys but consultation with the Parish Council would be encouraged in all cases to guard against removal of screening hedges and trees and to avoid the creation of large parking areas that change the appearance of the street.

Objective: Create a conservation plan to protect the landscape - Policy LP2

*The **Five LPAs** shall be designated as protected spaces in accordance with SCDC policy SP15 and, unless they are also Areas Protected from Development (APD), the only acceptable development, other than permitted development rights, within them will be:*

- *the replacement of existing dwellings on a like for like basis, to include trees and hedgerows where relevant; or*
- *the sub division of an existing larger dwelling, where there is a demonstrated local need, as set out under SCDC Policies SP28 and DM3.*

Any Proposals to replace or adapt existing dwellings must comply with all relevant policies relating to both the Landscape and the Built Environment. Should development proposals be brought forward in these areas under SP28 or DM3, they would be required to demonstrate that enhancements would be included such that the LPA in question was enhanced as a result. There shall be no new development within any of the APDs.

The Built Environment – Policy BE1

Objective: Any new buildings or changes to existing buildings should respect the character and quality of the village and its setting in the landscape and enhance the surrounding area.

All development proposals should demonstrate good quality design and respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Development that fails to take the opportunities available to enhance the character and quality of the surrounding area shall not be permitted. In order to achieve this requirement, all development will:

- *Use good quality materials that complement the existing palette of materials used within the area;*
- *Be sustainable in terms of design and construction;*
- *Demonstrate how it respects and enhances the unique qualities and character of the area;*
- *Be proportionate in scale (height, mass and siting etc), both to the size of the plot and in relation to neighbouring properties.*

All proposals should also demonstrate that they comply with all relevant guidance and development management policies issued by SCC or SCDC; in particular DM6, DM21, DM24 and DM28.

Affordable Housing – Policy BE2

Objective: Affordable Housing should be subject to the same criteria as other development and should be subject to local consultation.

The PC would support a proposal for the building of one or two affordable units in the village, the potential need for which was indicated by the Housing Needs survey carried out in the context of the Plan, provided that:

- *the proposal contributes to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection;*
- *its use will be governed by an appropriate Section 106 Agreement;*
- *the development is outside any LPA;*
- *the development complies with all policies in the Plan;*
- *a clear majority of people living in the immediate area of the proposed development have indicated, following appropriate detailed consultation, that they support the plan.*

Flooding – Policy BE3

Objective: No new development should take place in flood risk areas both so as to avoid any impairment to the flow or runoff of floodwater or so as to intrude on the landscape value of the river valley.

All proposals must demonstrate that the proposed development :

- *is not in any Environment Agency designated Flood Zone 2 or 3;*
- *is not in any Environment Agency Flood Zone 1 which is covered both by the SLA and by those policies in the Plan designed to preserve the landscape and setting of the river valley, specifically in the context of the 5 designated LPAs;*
- *will not impede surface water runoff from existing buildings or structures (such as roads);*
- *where appropriate, incorporates design features that negate any potential flood risk to the new or existing buildings otherwise arising from the development; and*
- *meets the other requirements of DM28.*

Non Designated Heritage Assets – Policy BE4

Objective: Non Designated Heritage Assets (NDHA) should be recognised and they should be given additional protection.

There will be a presumption against demolition of an NDHA. Where the proposed development involves the demolition of all or part of the NDHA, the proposals must demonstrate that:

- *the building is no longer of local importance or is beyond repair;*
- *any replacement building will be of equal or higher standard of design to the NDHA.*

All proposals relating to the redevelopment of an NDHA must, in addition to complying with all other relevant policies in the Plan, demonstrate that the development:

- *complies with all relevant SCDC policy;*
- *respects the context and setting of the surrounding area;*
- *incorporates sustainability features; and*
- *will be built using traditional materials even if the new design is contemporary in character.*

Appendix 10 - Consultation Responses

Each response is considered below. The proposed amendments are designed to demonstrate that we have taken these comments into account. It is not proposed to change the thrust or basic content of the policies we have set out, since to do so would require a new public consultation period, but to amend the wording to reflect concerns where we and SCDC, whose advice we have sought, feel it is appropriate to do so.

Respondent	Comment	Proposed Action
Mark Aldridge	Concerns about the PC becoming 'influential' over planning	The creation of the Plan has used appropriate guidance on consultation and followed the processes set out in the NPPF. It is thus not the imposition of the PC's views.
	The PC must support sensible proposals while seeking to protect the environment.	The advantage of the Plan is that it creates a formula to do exactly this, based on the responses of residents to the Questionnaire and at public meetings. All planning decisions contain a degree of judgement but if the Planning Authority ignores the Plan in making its decisions, it can be challenged at law.
	People should be allowed to live in their properties as they see fit.	The Plan recognises that, while seeking to manage new development in an appropriate manner.
Craig Robinson	The policy with regard to the removal of trees seems to create a disproportionate burden.	It is not intended to apply to ANY tree, but to create a presumption in favour of the retention of valuable trees. Each case would have to be determined on its merits. LP1 to be reworded accordingly.
	Subdivision of larger properties could be an issue/opportunity in the village. Policy should allow this where appropriate.	The SCDC policy for 'Other Villages' (SP28) already allows this and the Plan accepts the policy.
	Policy BE2 is unclear as the determination of people with 'a local connection'.	This will be a housing policy issue rather than a planning issue. The PC would expect to be consulted however on the relevant 106 Agreement.
	Policy BE4 calls for 'a higher standard of design'. How will this be assessed?	Wording to be revised to propose 'comparable' standard of design as balanced against any other relevant considerations.
	BE4 also insists on traditional materials which may not be sustainable.	Wording to be revised to propose the incorporation of traditional materials appropriate to the proposed replacement building.
Gillian Davidson on behalf of Howard Construction	LP1: the requirement for Landscape and Visual Impact assessments and ecological surveys are excessive.	Propose to amend wording to refer to relevant landscape, visual impact, and ecological surveys in accordance with SCDC's validation requirements.
	LP2: wording regarding APDs is too restrictive.	Propose to amend wording to make clear that the intent is to follow SCDC policy SP15 regarding the retention of gaps and spaces, and the avoidance of coalescence.

	The Plan does not recognise the benefit of re-using previously developed land.	BE1 wording to be revised to refer to the use of previously developed land.
	BE3: policy is too restrictive	Propose to simplify policy wording in accordance with SCDC policy SP28.
	BE4: required use of traditional materials is over-prescriptive.	Wording to be revised to propose the incorporation of traditional materials appropriate to the proposed replacement building.
Brian Whiteley, Planning Aid	LP2 is worded negatively, contrary to NPPF guidance.	Propose to amend wording to make clear that the intent is to follow SCDC policy SP15 regarding the retention of gaps and spaces, and the avoidance of coalescence.
	Cross-referencing is unnecessary within the document.	To be dealt with at examination stage.
	BE2 precludes more than 2 affordable units and should not be phrased in negative terms.	Propose to amend wording to refer to support for 'small scale affordable housing development', retaining the provisos but allowing for 'appropriate consultation'.
	BE3: draft policy is too restrictive.	Propose to simplify policy wording in accordance with SCDC policy SP28.
	BE4: presumption against demolition is too negative	Propose to amend wording to create a 'presumption in favour of retention'.
Strutt and Parker (on behalf of Lord Cranworth)	Not appropriate to impose further restrictions over and above those already in place.	NPs are enshrined in the Localism Act and are a policy supported by the NPPF to shift planning policy to the local level, rather than adding more red tape. The approach in the Plan – 'A Village in a Landscape' – deals positively with the setting of the village within the local landscape character.
	Para 1.12: no reference made to engagement with local landowners	Propose to add following wording at end of paragraph: 'This Plan seeks to support this approach both through its policies and through engagement with local landowners so as to achieve the above objectives.'
	<p>Para 3.5 (objectives of the Plan):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not the role of a Neighbourhood Plan to create a conservation plan for the landscape. 2. Affordable Housing should not be subject to the same criteria as other development. 3. Blanket ban on development in flood risk areas. 	<p>Both SCC and SCDC support the role of such Plans in achieving their wider policy objectives. The landscape designations in the Plan are consistent with the available evidence, landscape studies, and character assessments. It is the role of an NP to set out an approach to development that is consistent with relevant SCDC policy covering the type of settlement in question.</p> <p>This was a specific response to the consultation process. Propose to amend wording to refer to support for 'small scale affordable housing development', retaining the provisos but allowing for 'appropriate consultation'.</p> <p>See proposed amendment to BE3 as above.</p>

	4. NDHAs do not require additional protection.	We are following NPPF guidelines and SCDC policy, as well as the consultation responses to our Plan. However it is proposed to amend wording to state a ‘presumption in favour of retention’.
	Para 3.8: creation of LPAs not accepted	See response to comment on para. 3.5 above. The LPAs are consistent with and supportive of the wider SLA designation, and provide evidence and granularity in support of this designation at the local level. They acknowledge what residents value and enjoy and as such constitute the basis of a sustainable future for this rural village.
	Para 3.11: presumption against demolition of an NDHA not accepted.	See above.
	Para 4.11: the landscape setting of Great Bealings is ‘not special’ and does not deserve particular protection, and such an approach could mitigate against enhancement and sustainable development.	See comment on para 3.8 above. The SWT report contains ample evidence of the value and importance of the landscape setting and the creation of the LPAs is directly based on this evidence.
	Para 4.33: no further protection for trees is justified.	The wording in LP1 is not intended to apply to ANY tree, but to create a presumption in favour of the retention of valuable trees. Each case would have to be determined on its merits. LP1 to be amended accordingly.
	Para 4.36: Objection to LPAs and associated APDs.	The wording on APDs will be amended, but the intent of our policy is directly based on SCDC’s policy SP15 – ‘the preservation of gaps and spaces in their undeveloped form’. This approach is not inconsistent with the overall SCDC Local Plan strategy for an ‘Other Village’.
	Para 5.16: Affordable Housing. There should be no restriction on the number of units, and ‘only 65%’ of residents responded to the questionnaire of whom 56% were against any such supply, meaning that 35% plus 44% (i.e. 79%) were in favour or did not mind either way.’	A 65% response rate is exceptional. We do not agree that those who failed to respond can be assumed to have a view either way. However it is proposed to amend wording to refer to support for ‘small scale affordable housing development’, retaining the provisos but allowing for ‘appropriate consultation’.
	Para 5.20: removal of Hill Farm from the NDHA list	We have always said the list must be based on consent and therefore this property will be removed from the list.