



Worlingham Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

Summary of Representations

This document contains summaries of the representations made in response to the consultation on the Submission Worlingham Neighbourhood Plan which was held between 10th January and 21st February 2022. The representations were submitted to the Examiner for consideration during the Examination of the Worlingham 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/worlingham-neighbourhood-area/>

Respondent	
East Suffolk Council	<p>East Suffolk Council recommended amendments to policy WORL1: Village Identity to allow for the community’s latest needs and aspirations to be reflected and to allow the policy to be applied in a proportionate way. The Council also recommended some re-wording to achieve greater clarity around the role of trees in landscaping schemes.</p> <p>The Council recommended minor amendments to the wording of policies WORL4: Housing Design and Character; WORL6: Housing Design – Security; and WORL8: Parking Standards.</p> <p>East Suffolk Council requested greater precision in the wording for policy WORL10: The Design of Parking Courts.</p> <p>The Council recommended some re-wording to the supporting text in section 8 of the plan.</p> <p>East Suffolk Council recommended that part B of policy WORL13: Country Park and Landscaping and Management should be amended to improve clarity and justification, or it should be removed.</p>
Broads Authority	The Broads Authority made comments in relation to the front cover; the Vision; mapping the wildlife corridors; and adding a reference to the Broads Authority in the plan.
Historic England	Historic England had no specific comments.

<p>Isaac Carter</p>	<p>Mr Carter raised concerns relating to traffic generated by the Garden Neighbourhood; lack of public transport; the impact of traffic noise from the southern relief road on to new dwellings on the Garden Neighbourhood; and dangerous parking on Orchard Rise. Mr Carter supported an access road on to Ellough Road; provision of new pavements around the Garden Neighbourhood; planting of trees or woodland on and around the Garden Neighbourhood; added paved connections in Worlingham; and further parking controls.</p>
<p>Larkfleet Homes (DLP Planning Ltd)</p>	<p>The response outlined parts of the National Planning Policy Framework; National Planning Practice Guidance; and the Waveney Local Plan. Larkfleet Homes assert that the Garden Neighbourhood should be a comprehensive development and the Parish boundary should not play a role in masterplanning the site as a whole. They recommended removal of para. 4.9. Larkfleet homes provided comments on how the neighbourhood plan addresses the location of the proposed Community Centre.</p> <p>Larkfleet Homes contended that the first bullet point of part b) of Policy WORL1: Village Identity should be deleted as it is in conflict with policy WLP3.1 of the local plan and would undermine the delivery of comprehensive development.</p> <p>Larkfleet Homes objected to policy WORL2: Housing Mix as it has not been amended to include text referencing local market circumstances, viability, and localised housing need information.</p> <p>Larkfleet Homes objected to policy WORL3: Lifetime Design on the basis that the masterplan for the development should determine where homes meeting the requirements of M4(2) of Part M of the Building Regulations should be located.</p> <p>Larkfleet Homes asserted that policy WORL4: Housing Design and Character should be amended to exclude the Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood.</p> <p>Larkfleet Homes contended that policy WORL5: Heights of Dwellings should not seek to restrict development of higher buildings where it would be appropriate in design terms.</p> <p>Larkfleet Homes supported the revised wording to policy WORL6: Housing Design – Security.</p> <p>Larkfleet Homes considered that policy WORL7: Sports Facilities is in direct conflict with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and should be removed.</p>

	<p>Larkfleet Homes objected to policy WORL8: Parking Standards for the reason that it is in conflict with strategic policies and guidance and contended that the policy should be removed.</p> <p>Larkfleet Homes asserted that part B i) of policy WORL12: Landscaping should be removed as it is in conflict with the strategic policies.</p> <p>Larkfleet Homes referenced concerns about the draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule and the impact on delivery of the Garden Neighbourhood.</p>
Mr and Mrs Spence	<p>Mr and Mrs Spence raised concerns over whether local people will have the opportunity to occupy new homes, including Affordable Homes, in Worlingham. They raised concerns about the planned number of new homes in Worlingham and how infrastructure will cope. Mr and Mrs Spence also raised concerns over traffic congestion and pollution arising from new homes built in Worlingham.</p>
Natural England	<p>Natural England had no specific comments to make.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>Norfolk County Council confirmed they had no comments to make.</p>
Suffolk County Council	<p>Suffolk County Council recommended that the neighbourhood plan does not set parking standards higher than those in the County Council’s ‘Suffolk Guidance for Parking’. They welcomed the inclusion of cycle parking and electric vehicle charging in policy WORL8 ‘Parking Standards’.</p> <p>The County Council provided a copy of their comments responding to the Regulation 14 consultation of the neighbourhood plan for information.</p>
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	<p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust highlighted the importance of biodiversity in Worlingham. The Trust welcomed the creation of wildlife corridors in policy WORL14: Wildlife Corridors and suggested this could be expanded to larger scale networks. Suffolk Wildlife Trust recommended that a number of sites should be referenced in the plan and others should be protected due to their biodiversity value. The Trust recommended the neighbourhood plan should have a focus on linking and buffering ecological assets. Suffolk Wildlife Trust recommend policy WORL14 highlighted particular species which depend on wildlife corridors. They recommended a policy to provide increased protection of key Priority Habitats and species.</p>

	<p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust also recommended the neighbourhood plan contains a policy requiring Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>
<p>Water Management Alliance</p>	<p>The Water Management Alliance highlighted that the Board’s Byelaws will apply to new development. They welcomed the promotion of Sustainable Drainage Systems and reference to disposal of surface water in policy WORL16: Drainage. The Alliance highlighted the need for development to gain appropriate consents with respect to drainage and provided supporting information.</p>
<p>Worlingham Parish Council</p>	<p>Worlingham Parish Council provided comments in response to a representation from Suffolk County Council regarding the regulation 14 version of the neighbourhood plan. They proposed amended wording to policies WORL3: Lifetime Design; WORL4: Housing Design and Character; WORL7: Sports Facilities; WORL8: Parking Standards; WORL9: Design of On-Street Parking Provision; WORL10: The Design of Parking Courts; WORL11: Protection and Enhancement of Key Pedestrian and Cycling Routes; WORL14: Wildlife Corridors; and WORL16: Drainage.</p> <p>The Parish Council also recommended a number of minor wording changes to the supporting text relating to archaeology; transport and movement; a satellite medical centre; public rights of way; and other supporting strategies. A minor change was also recommended for the Vision and objectives.</p>