



Suffolk Coastal District Council  
East Suffolk House  
Station Road  
Melton  
Woodbridge  
IP12 1RT

# Melton Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 – part 5, paragraph 18

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an independent examination, Suffolk Coastal District Council now confirms that the Melton Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum subject to the modifications set out in section 3.

## 2. Background

- 2.1 Melton Parish Council as the “qualifying body” successfully applied for Melton Parish to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area under The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 2.2 Following the submission of the Melton Neighbourhood Plan (submission version) to Suffolk Coastal District Council, the plan was publicised and comments invited over a six week period which closed on 13<sup>th</sup> April 2017.
- 2.3 Suffolk Coastal District Council, with the agreement of Melton Parish Council appointed an independent examiner Mrs Rosemary Kidd MRTPI to review the plan and to consider whether it met the Basic Conditions required by legislation and whether it should proceed to referendum.
- 2.4 The Examiners Report concluded that subject to modifications identified in the report the Melton Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to Referendum. The Examiner further recommends that the referendum area should be the same as the designated

neighbourhood area, which is the same as the administrative boundary for Melton parish.

- 2.5 Following receipt of the Examiners Report, legislation requires that Suffolk Coastal District Council consider each of the modifications recommended, the reasons for them, and decide what action to take.

### **3. Decision and Reasons**

- 3.1 Suffolk Coastal District Council, under powers delegated to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal *Management*, has considered each of the modifications recommended and concurs with the reasoning provided by the Examiner in her Report dated 8<sup>th</sup> September 2017. With the Examiner's recommended modifications, Suffolk Coastal District Council has decided (delegated decision) that the Melton Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions mentioned in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and is compatible with the Convention rights and complies with provision made by or under Section 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. As a consequence, Suffolk Coastal District Council will modify the Melton Neighbourhood Plan accordingly, for it then to proceed to referendum.
- 3.2 The Council has considered the referendum area and has decided there is no reason to extend the neighbourhood area for the purposed of referendum. The Referendum area will be the same as the designated Neighbourhood Area covering the entire parish of Melton.
- 3.3 The list of modifications and actions required are set out in the following table. As a consequence of these changes the Melton Neighbourhood Plan (referendum version) has accordingly been re-formatted (paragraph numbers/page numbers, headers etc).

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><b>RM1    Revise Policy MEL1</b> as follows: Delete the fifth bullet point; Correct the spelling of Coastal in the sixth bullet point.</p>	<p>Ensure policies work effectively by removing superfluous wording relating one policy to another.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend policy as recommended.</p>
<p><b>RM2    Revise Policy MEL2</b> as follows: Delete bullet points 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 relating to the crossing points and traffic calming measures. Include a new Community Action under the section on Non Land Use Issues stating “The Parish Council will strongly support the following: include bullet points 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7.</p>	<p>It is not appropriate to include in the policy proposals (pedestrian / cycle crossing points and traffic calming measures) that would not be subject to planning permission.</p>	<p>Agree. Move bullet points 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 from the policy to paragraph 11.2 in Section 11 NON LAND USE ISSUES - Transport.</p>
<p><b>RM3    Revise Policy MEL3</b> to read: “.....a significant adverse impact on....from the routes shown on the Proposals Map.” Include the routes shown on the map in Appendix A of the responses to the Examiner’s Questions on the Proposals Map.</p>	<p>Clarify the circumstances of how the policy is to be applied.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend policy and proposals map as recommended.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><b>RM4</b> <b>Revise policy</b> in that the second paragraph of Policy MEL6 be revised as follows:  “New development that results in the loss of off or on-road parking spaces should include adequate parking spaces in accordance with the adopted parking standards.”  Revise Paragraph 5.28 to read: “Development proposals that would involve the loss of existing parking provision should ensure that sufficient spaces are made available to serve the development and to make alternative provision nearby for any parking spaces lost.”</p>	<p>Clarity and to take into account the adequacy or otherwise of the existing parking in relation to the standards as set in parking guidance.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend the wording of paragraph 5.28 and policy MEL6 as recommended.</p>
<p><b>RM5</b> <b>A more detailed Inset Map</b> that shows the boundaries of the site referred to in Policy MEL7.</p>	<p>To readily distinguish the boundaries of the site in relation to project feasibility.</p>	<p>Agree. Insert a more detailed Inset Map that shows the boundaries of the site referred to in policy MEL7.</p>
<p><b>RM6</b> <b>Revise the second sentence of paragraph 6.5</b> to read: “....informal recreation and children’s play.”</p>	<p>Clarity of the existing provision at Melton Road Playing Fields.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend policy as recommended.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><b>RM7</b> <b>Revise Policy MEL12</b> as follows:  Delete the first bullet “Playing Fields on Melton Road” and the final bullet point.  Delete the second paragraph and last two bullet points and replace with:  “Proposals for development on these Local Green Spaces will only be permitted in very special circumstances in accordance with national policy on Green Belts.”  Include a new paragraph stating “The Playing Fields on Melton Road are designated as Safeguarded Open Space. Development within the area will only be acceptable where it delivers the proposals set out in Policy MEL9 or to enhance the use of the area for outdoor sport, play and recreation. Development should not result in the loss of sports pitches or play areas unless they are to be replaced elsewhere on the site.”  Revise the title of Policy MEL12 to “Protection and Maintenance of Green Spaces”  Revise the key to the Proposals Map to rename the policy and differentiate between Local Green Space and Safeguarded Open Space.  Include Burkes Wood on the Proposals Map as a Local Green Space.  Add a new bullet point “Burkes Wood”. Include a description of the woodland under paragraph 7.8.</p>	<p>Accordance with NPPF paragraphs 87 - 89 that development will only be acceptable in very special circumstances (the policy for managing development within Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts). Potential conflict between designating Melton Road playing fields as a Local Green Space and proposals under Policy MEL9 for a new community hall.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend the policy, proposals map and paragraph 7.8 as recommended.</p>
<p><b>RM8</b> <b>Revise Policy MEL13</b> as follows:  Revise paragraph 1 as follows: “New development within the area bounded by .....should help to retain the rural and wooded character of area.” Delete the second sentence and bullet points.  Revise the final paragraph to read “Proposals for development should ensure that the design..... of any new development will ensure that important trees and open spaces are safeguarded. Where trees are removed as a result of the development they should be replaced in a location to be agreed.”  Include the Leeks Hill and Melton Grange residential areas under Policy MEL13 on the Proposals Map.</p>	<p>So as to be capable of being interpreted consistently by decision makers. Introduce clarity and flexibility in the policy about when additional tree plating will be appropriate.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend policy as recommended including deletion of that part of the policy that restricts further development. Safeguard Leeks Hill and Melton Grange under policy MEL13 rather than policy MEL17.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><b>RM9 Revise Policy MEL15</b> as follows:            No additional moorings for residential houseboats will be approved on the section of the River Deben between Wilford Bridge and the boundary of the Neighbourhood Plan area in the direction of Sun Wharf at Woodbridge as shown on the Proposals Map.            Within that area, the replacement of a residential houseboat on an existing mooring with one that is substantially different in size and form should not have a serious adverse impact on visual amenity or the natural habitat of the area.</p>	<p>Improve clarity of the policy wording.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend policy as recommended.</p>
<p><b>RM10 Revise the first paragraph of Policy MEL16</b> as follows:            “New buildings or alterations or other development within or affecting the setting of the Melton Conservation Area should be designed and located to preserve and enhance the qualities of the conservation area. Special attention should be paid to:”</p>	<p>Support the preservation and enhancement of the conservation area by setting out locally important design considerations in compliance with NPPF paragraphs 128 - 132.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend policy as recommended.</p>
<p><b>RM11 Delete Policy MEL17.</b></p>	<p>Clarity and precision to reflect the justification.</p>	<p>Agree. Delete the policy and safeguard relevant areas under amended policies MEL11 and MEL17.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><b>RM12</b> <b>Revise Policy MEL19</b> to read:            “The land between Wilford Bridge Road and Dock Road identified on the Proposals Map is identified as a General Employment Area where the development within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 should be located. Other employment uses may be located in the area where it is demonstrated that there is no other appropriate location and the development will not involve a sensitive use that would impact on the operation of an existing employment use.”            Revise the Proposals Map to exclude the road adjacent to the station.</p>	<p>Reflect the range of existing employment uses and advice in national guidance to support all types of business with suitable safeguards to ensure that they do not impact adversely on existing uses by the introduction of sensitive uses.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend policy as recommended.</p>
<p><b>RM13</b> <b>Revise Policy MEL20</b> to read:            “Land and buildings within the Deben Mill site shown on the Proposals Map shall be developed and retained for B1 employment uses only.”            Delete the first sentence of paragraph 2 of the policy.            Revise the boundary of Policy MEL20 on the Proposals Map to indicate only the business area and open area.</p>	<p>Reflect development that has taken place.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend policy and proposals map as recommended.</p>

Examiners recommended modification (RM)	Reason for the change	Action by SCDC
<p><b>RM14 Revise Policy MEL21</b> as follows:  Revise the first paragraph to read; "Land off Wilford Bridge Road shown on the Proposals Map of 9.4 hectares is allocated for a mixed use development of business, residential and open space uses, subject to the following:"  Add an additional criterion: "A project level Habitats Regulation Assessment should be carried out and measures should be secured to ensure that the development does not have an adverse impact on international habitats. Where appropriate, developer contributions should be secured through a planning agreement towards the strategic mitigation scheme for impacts on international sites."  Add an additional criterion: "Development should avoid having an adverse impact on Protected Species and Priority Species and Habitats".  Revise the second sentence of paragraph 10.1 to read: "The western part of the site is a former employment site that has been vacant for a number of years; the remainder of the site is greenfield and contains some mature trees and hedgerows."  Update the reference to the development of the new District Council offices which have been completed.  Include reference to the "Recreational Avoidance Mitigation Strategy" in the justification to explain its role and how the development of the site could contribute to it: "The Habitats Regulations Assessment Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy is a means by which sustainable housing growth can be delivered in Suffolk Coastal District, and neighbouring Ipswich Borough and Babergh District, facilitating development whilst at the same time adequately protecting European wildlife sites from harm that could otherwise potentially occur because of increased recreation pressure arising from the new housing growth."</p>	<p>Project level assessments of impacts on Deben Estuary wild bird habitats.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend policy and supporting text as recommended.</p>



The Council further agrees with the Examiners conclusions as set out in paragraph 97 of his report in which he states:

*"I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan is compatible the Convention rights and would remain compatible if modified in accordance with my recommendations; and subject to the modifications I have recommended, meets all the statutory requirements set out in paragraph 8(1) of schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and meets the basic conditions....."*

Signed

Date: 23/10/2017

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A Fryatt'. The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Cllr Tony Fryatt  
Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Planning