

# THURSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2018 - 2036

## Reg 14 Pre-Submission Draft – Pigeon Investment Management Ltd (Land Developer)

Colour used	Meaning
	Agree/straightforward change
	To be passed onto Stakeholders
	No further action required

Page / Policy Number	Comment	Comments by NP	Action to be taken
Policy 1 A 1 B 1C	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Group may wish to consider providing some flexibility within Policy 1 to allow schemes to come forward that are adjacent to the settlement boundary (as shown at Figure 9.1) and the future village envelope, where development is able to deliver key infrastructure identified by criteria C.(b.).</p> <p>Taking account of the above Policy 1 B. should make reference to development proposals “adjacent settlement boundaries” in the same way that Policy 1 A. does.</p>	Disagree – the purposes of the settlement boundary is to provide the delineation of where the strategy for what is permissible changes.	
1 D a	In regard to Policy 1 D. the list of uses referred to in D a. should be extended to include recreation uses.	Disagree – it is felt that the list does not need changing as it is not exhaustive (the words “such as...” demonstrate this point.)	

1D	<p>Policy 1 D. itself should be extended to include matters such as “<u>d. Rural Diversification</u>” and “<u>e. Affordable Housing</u>”.</p> <p>The policy should also note that the list of uses referred to is not exhaustive and that other sites/uses which are separate from the settlement boundary can be considered on their individual merits. In this way such sites/uses which have the potential to benefit the village and its community can be appropriately considered.</p>	<p>Disagree as it is unclear what rural diversification relates to.</p> <p>Policy 1Da already makes reference to activities suitable in the rural countryside.</p>	
1 D	<p>In regard to Policy 1 D. the list of uses referred to in D a. should be extended to include recreation uses. Policy 1 D. itself should be extended to include matters such as “<u>d. Rural Diversification</u>” and “<u>e. Affordable Housing</u>”.</p> <p>The policy should also note that the list of uses referred to is not exhaustive and that other sites/uses which are separate from the settlement boundary can be considered on their individual merits. In this way such sites/uses which have the potential to benefit the village and its community can be appropriately considered.</p>	<p>Disagree – Affordable Housing separate from the settlement boundary should only come forward as a rural exception site. It is therefore, by definition, an exception to the policy therefore does not need to be reflect in the policy.</p> <p>Disagree – the general spatial strategy is to focus development within and adjacent to the settlement boundary. Any such amendment would suggest that uses other than those in Policy 1D are appropriate in open countryside.</p>	
Policy 2	<p>Flexibility required to allow an alternative mix of homes to come forward over the lifetime of the Plan (to 2036) where there is in accordance with an up-to-date housing market assessment (or similar evidence) or indeed evidence</p>	<p>Disagree as it is felt that Policy 2B provides the necessary flexibility.</p> <p>The NP has reviewed the last sentence of 2 A and regards it as overly complex. There is</p>	

		<p>agreement that the sentence as written could have resulted in an overabundance of 1 and 2 bed properties, the policy, as previously agreed, is to be reworded as below but there is a need to reflect the requirement also for those wishing to downsize. Policy to be reworded:</p> <p>‘Within the context of Thurston’s need, all housing proposals of five or more units must reflect the need across all tenures for smaller units particularly accommodation suitable for older people’.</p>	
Policy 3	As with Policy 2 consideration should be given to adding flexibility to this policy so that all options for meeting the care needs of older people can be considered i.e. not just C2 and a Care Home.	Wording already changed to provide flexibility as per guidance from Suffolk County Council	
Policy 4	The ambitions of A. within the policy are naturally to be supported but there are aspects of B. and C. which could be construed as being to prescriptive and as such greater flexibility in the policy is encouraged to acknowledge that the design quality of a scheme can be achieved in a number of ways. rescriptive	The policy wording is “encouraged to” as opposed to “required to” therefore it is not considered as being prescriptive.	
Policy 5	As per our comments in respect of Policy 1, the Neighbourhood Plan Group may wish to consider amending Policy 5 to allow schemes to come forward that are adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and the future village envelope, where they would deliver new or improved community facilities.	Agree wording to be changed to adjacent to the “ <u>existing</u> ” settlement boundary.	

	<p>It is acknowledged that the loss of community facilities is not to be encouraged but there are occasions where the loss is unavoidable and as such any re-provision is unlikely to be achievable. Policy 5 should acknowledge that there are circumstances where re-provision cannot be achieved.</p>	<p>In principal disagree as the village is already short of facilities and there is a recognized need for improved and enhanced facilities in terms of quality and scale, so any further loss would be unacceptable.</p> <p>However, there is a case to make policy 5 more flexible by acknowledging that there are circumstances where re-provision cannot be achieved.</p>	
<p>Policy 5 B e</p>	<p>At Policy B - it should be acknowledged that community facilities can be improved/provided “where appropriate” in locations which are separated from the settlement boundary. This, for example, already exists in regard to the rugby club north of the village</p>	<p>In principal disagree as the village is already short of facilities and there is a recognized need for improved and enhanced facilities in terms of quality and scale, so any further loss would be unacceptable.</p> <p>However an extra sentence is to be added to the criteria to read “...boundaries as defined in Policy 1. New provision or improvements to existing community facilities that are clearly separate from the settlement boundary will only be supported if it is demonstrated that new or improved provision of community facilities is not required or achievable within the settlement boundary”</p>	
<p>Policy 6</p>	<p>Key Movement Routes – figure 7.3 - we fully support Policy 6. Our recent scheme for 200 homes at Norton</p>	<p>Agree - amend Figure 7.3 to show proposed foot and cycleway link</p>	

	<p>Road will help to provide key movement routes, as set out by Policy 6, and is fully in accordance with the requirement for cycle and pedestrian connectivity. We would, however, comment that the proposed foot and cycleway link to be provided on Norton Road (east of Meadow Lane) will be provided on the north side of Norton Road. We would suggest that figure 7.3 should be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>on Norton Road (east of Meadow Lane) on the north side of Norton Road.</p>	
Policy 7	<p>Highway Capacity at Key Road Junctions - it is acknowledged that the impact of a scheme should be comprehensively considered but there are likely to be occasions where assessing cumulative impact will not be necessary. As such it is suggested that flexibility is added to the policy by introducing “where appropriate” to its wording.</p>	<p>Agree – although already changed following guidance from SCC</p>	
Policy 9	<p>Landscaping and Environmental Features - the ambitions of the policy are naturally to be supported but there are aspects of it (e.g. “A landscape buffer of at least five meters is required where a development abuts open countryside.”) which could be construed as being too prescriptive and as such greater flexibility in the policy is encouraged to acknowledge that the landscape quality of a scheme can be achieved in a number of ways.</p>	<p>Disagree – the buffer zone applies on boundaries adjacent to the open countryside. The NP feel that it is achievable.</p>	
Policy 12	<p>Minimising Light Pollution - The ambitions of the policy are to be supported but there needs to be recognition of County Council standards in regard to the public lighting of the adopted highway.</p>	<p>Agree – wording already changed to those advised by SCC</p> <p>“In recognition of the County Council’s standards in regard to public lighting of the adopted highway, new development should however be required to demonstrate how it has minimized</p>	

		light pollution”	
--	--	------------------	--