

Tattingstone Parish Council

Minutes of Parish Council Meeting held on Monday 6th November 2017 at 8.00pm in Tattingstone Village Hall

Present: Cllr. Wood [Chairman] , Cllr. Mendel, Cllr. Gipps, Cllr. Self, Cllr. Tweedy, Cllr. Stanger

1 member of the public was present.

Cllr. Wood stated that all proceedings of the Parish Council Meeting could be filmed or recorded.

1. Apologies for Absence:

Cllr. D Clarke, Cllr. P Clark, Cllr. Hawes

2. Declaration of interest:

N/A

3. To consider requests for dispensations

N/A

4. To approve minutes of meeting held on 7th August 2017

The minutes were then agreed and signed as a correct record by Cllr. Wood.

Proposed: Cllr.Gipps

Seconded: Cllr. Self

Passed unanimously

5. Clerk's Report

The A3 printer had been purchased at a cost of £50.

6. Matters arising from the minutes

The clerk reported a request had been placed both on line and in Tattingstone News to ask villagers to locate Ash Trees that might be prone to Ash Die Back. She and the village tree warden are recording these.

7. Open Forum for members of the public

Mr Richmond from Collins Skip Hire addressed the meeting regarding the Suffolk Local Waste and Minerals Plan which is being prepared to cover the next 20 years. Cllr Wood declared an interest in this as, as a County Councillor, he sits on this County Committee. There will be an open drop in session by Suffolk County Council at the Village Hall on 17th November. Mr Richmond asked that as many people as possible attend this to gather information. He was also inviting all councillors and members of the public to visit the site of Collins Skip Hire on 18th November at 9.15am to see for themselves what is proposed. He would send a personal invitation to all residents of The Heath. The clerk agreed to put the invite on the village website and Facebook page. Some members of the council would also accept his invitation the following Saturday. The Suffolk Waste and Mineral Plan will be on next month's agenda.

[D. Cllr McCraw arrived 8.20pm]

8. Reports from District and County Councillors

Report from District Councillor McCraw

- The proposed merger between Babergh District Council and Mid Suffolk District Council is still under discussion as the suggestion of a telephone poll has been called in by the Scrutiny Committee as not being rigorous enough. This committee meets next week and it is hoped that the decision will be brought before the whole council.
- The move to Endeavour House is proving very expensive and is lowering staff morale.
- The developing the redundant Hadleigh and Needham Market sites is now being investigated at the cost of £550,000 for consultancy.

[D. Cllr. McCraw left the meeting at 8.25pm]

Report from County Councillor Wood

- A motion was put forward which called on the Council to lobby central government for more Early Years funding for Suffolk. Unfortunately, the Conservative majority refused to back the motion.
- There will be 2 workshops to further discuss Home to School Transport
- Suffolk County Council is seeking views on its proposed admissions policy for 2019/20. Consultation documents can be found on www.suffolk.gov.uk/consultations
- Suffolk County Council will launch a series of campaigns to encourage more Suffolk residents to become foster carers.

- It was agreed by the Speed Limit Panel for a 40mph speed limit in the location of Freston Crossroads. Finance is still to be agreed.
- Natural England have agreed that public consultation on the proposed extension of the AONB will commence on 18th January.
- Unfortunately, the bid to the Heritage Lottery for the Landscape Enhancement Project on the Shotley Peninsula was unsuccessful.
- A six month highspeed broadband trial is now in operation at Tattingsstone White Horse. If successful this may be rolled out in other areas of the Peninsula.

9.Planning

No planning applications were received this month

10. Correspondence requiring immediate discussion at the discretion of the Chairman.

- Notification of the public consultation of the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan would take place throughout the county. The relevant ones to Tattingsstone being 17th November, 2.00pm-8.00pm in the village hall and 23rd November 2.00pm-8.00pm at Wherstead Community Centre.
- A letter from Shotley Holdings Ltd [Collins Skip Hire] regarding a site visit on 18th November at 9.15am for residents of the village to look at their proposals for the Waste and Minerals Local Plan.
- Letter from Babergh and Mid Suffolk district councils concerning potential merger.
- Monthly update from AONB.
- An info graphic from Suffolk Constabulary to illustrate the demand it experiences in an average week.
- A note from UK power Networks to encourage people to be Winter Ready in case of a power cut in extreme weather.

11. Finance: report from R.F.O

- Bank Balances : Community Account: £10,372.83
Business Savings Account: £3,167.54
Bank reconciliation was presented.
- The following cheques and associated invoices were presented for approval and signature:
 - Clerk's wages and expenses: £314.27

- TGC [playing field maintenance]: £337.50
- Vertas: £127.30

Approved and signed

Proposed: Cllr.Self

Seconded: Cllr.Mendel

Carried unanimously.

- The summary of income and expenditure for period ending 31st October 2017 was presented.

12. Report from Playing Field representative.

See attached.

The Council denied asking for tenders for the Playing Field.

13. To review and approve action on bin on Playing Field.

A meeting had been held to discuss the Joint Local Plan. The council expressed its thanks to Mr R. Chadburn for his assistance. The council also thanked the clerk for her hard work putting the Council's submission together, It was proposed that the Parish Council's Response to the Joint Local Plan should be submitted.

Proposed: Cllr. Gipps

Seconded: Cllr. Mendel

Carried unanimously

A copy of the Council's Submission is attached

14. To Review progress on Community Led plan

Cllr. Mendal had attended a meeting at Holbrook about their Neighbourhood Plan. The only plan that has any weight over planning with Babergh is a District Plan. A Neighbourhood Plan must be supported by at least 50% of the community and involve the whole village before it is adopted.

It was agreed that a Village Survey be carried out to formulate a vision for the village. This survey will be presented at the next meeting. It was stressed that Neighbourhood Plan had cost implications and required involvement from many other people in the village and not just Councillors.

15.To review Progress on Community Action Plan

Deferred as Cllr. Clark not present.

16. To review and consider Verge Cutting

It was agreed to write a letter of thanks from the Parish Council to the Abbot family for the excellent maintenance of their hedges and verges around their farm. Suffolk highways have a contract to maintain the verges and the Parish Council would be in breach of this if they commissioned work by a third party.

17. To Review and Consider purchase of a new grit bin by the Wheatsheaf.

The Clerk presented the Council with three quotes and a recycled plastic one from GritBins. Net, the same as the one at Lemon's Hill Bridge, was proposed. The clerk will purchase and arrange siting and disposal of old damaged one.

Proposed: Cllr. Tweedy

Seconded: Cllr. Stanger

Carried unanimously

18. To Review Fete Finances

Cllr. Gipps advised that the Fete committee would like to open a separate bank account for the fete instead of it being under the Parish Plan Action Group's remit. This group is not under the Parish Council's jurisdiction. Cllr. Wood as the Council's representative on this group would raise it at the next meeting of the Parish Plan Action Group.

19. Other urgent village matters

- A van had been broken into at a premise on Church Road. There had been a series of similar incidents in the area and residents need to be vigilant. Any suspicious activity should be reported to the police on 101.
- Cllr. Wood is unable to chair Parish Council meetings in January, February and March 2018. Cllr. Mendel will chair or an interim chair will be elected before a meeting if necessary.

Meeting closed at 9.30pm

Items for next Agenda

Budget

Response to Suffolk Local Waste and Minerals Plan

Village survey

Community Action plan

Response to Boundary Commission

PLAYING FIELD REPORT MONDAY 30TH OCTOBER 2017

14 Members present with no apologies.

Treasurer reported that the Bank balance still stands just short of £1500.

Fire equipment has been inspected and passed; additional extinguishers have also been placed in each of the porter cabins.

Babergh District Council was requested to provide a blue waste bin on the playing field. To which they replied that the playing field is not entitled to any bins at all and would be removing the Black bin from the playing field in the next six months.

It was agreed that a deep clean of the pavilion be made annually.

Both the Football and Cricket clubs requested additional cuts to the playing field due to the mild weather. I pointed out that the Parish Council pays for the cutting set at 17 cuts a year. Any additional cuts would have to be approved by the Council prior to cutting or alternative funding for additional cuts would have to be found. It was reported that the Council are at present asking for tenders. After discussion it was agreed that any additions to that agreed should be included in next years tenders.

The question of remuneration for the Cricket Club was discussed and declined as it was felt that this may set a precedent and also be unfair to the tennis and football clubs.

Tennis club are still playing due to the very mild weather.

The Football club have been knocked out of the Cup but have won two of there last three games.

DONM 27th November 2017

TATTINGSTONE PARISH COUNCIL

RESPONSE: Babergh And Mid Suffolk joint Local Plan

Consultation Questions:

Vision and objectives

Q 1. What do you think the vision should be?

The vision as laid out is fine but it could go much further. Tattingstone Parish Council would place more emphasis on the Environment and on Healthy Communities and Infrastructure before considering Housing and Economy. These are both the cornerstones of why people want to live, work or visit this area of Suffolk. Without the necessary infrastructure to support transport, education, health and commerce and the protection of this beautiful area is unlikely to thrive and grow.

Q 2. Do you agree with the identified objectives?

See above

Q 3. Are there other objectives which should be added?

No

Q 4. What should be a priority across the district area? (please state which district)

In Babergh, more emphasis should be placed on protecting the environment especially those areas designated AONBs. Planning on all occasions, which fall inside an AONB should be granted only in extreme cases when all other sites outside these areas have been considered. Some recent planning decisions in the vicinity of Tattingstone have not taken this into consideration. Biodiversity should be encouraged where possible.

Q 5. What is most important for your town or village?

The most important aspect for Tattingstone is to maintain its current character of 3[three] interconnected but distinct areas/hamlets as shown on your maps of the village. Ribbon development which threatens these distinct areas is not wanted.

Duty to Cooperate

Q 5A. Do you agree or disagree with the identified key issues for compliance with the Duty to Cooperate for the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan?

We agree with the duty to cooperate as it is a legal requirement.

Q 6. Are there any other key planning issues which need to be considered in accordance with the Duty-to-Cooperate?

Tattingstone Parish Council would wish that AONB for Shotley Peninsula and also Stour and Orwell Society be added to the list of Key DtC partners when considering Environmental Protection.

Housing Requirement

Q 7. Do you agree with the proposed approach set out under Option HR1? If not, please explain why and what alternatives you propose

Tattingstone Parish Council would back HD2:

No contingency

Allocate sites to meet the housing requirements [including taking account of the likely contribution from windfall], but do not allocate above the housing requirement.

We feel there is no need for reserve sites since this will lead to constant speculation that additional sites will come forward and be a developers' charter.

.

Please explain why.

Tattingstone Parish Council support HD2 with no contingency. This policy approach should be formulated so that it is adequate for future needs.

Q 9. Are there any specific measures that could be included within the Joint Local Plan that would assist with delivery?

No comment

Q 10. What factors or priorities should be set as triggers for reserve sites to come forward?

As stated above we do not see the need for reserved sites.

Review of the Settlement Hierarchy

11. Do you agree with the proposed criteria approach to rank settlements in the hierarchy?

The criteria are not really clear especially in respect to broadband reception and bus routes.

Tattingstone does not believe it is a Hinterland Village. Tattingstone is comprised three distinct areas: Tattingstone The Heath, Tattingstone Church, Tattingstone White Horse [see your own maps] separated by open countryside. Using your criteria all three together only score 9/10, the facilities available in each area vary considerably and would in each case score less than 7.

Tattingstone would propose that we are termed hamlet and countryside.

Q 12. Do you agree with the proposed joint settlement hierarchy?

If no, please provide further details as to how the hierarchy should be amended.

We would support SET2:

Key and supporting services

A review of settlements based upon a weighed scoring system recognising relationships to higher order settlements, key services and supporting services.

The option of drafting hierarchy simply according to measurement of rural settlement size of population or existing housing stock, was discounted as it was considered too simplistic and many rural settlements of considerable size could be misrepresented if they do not have good access to key services and facilities. An extended criteria range of services and facilities was also discounted as a disproportionate approach, as this would be unlikely to distinguish any significantly greater sustainability characteristics.

Spatial Distribution

13. Which option(s) for housing spatial distribution do you think is the best

Please explain your answer.

Tattingstone Parish Council would favour BHD1:

Settlement Category	% of district Growth
Ipswich fringe area	50%
Urban areas and Market towns	25%
Core villages	15%
Hinterland villages	5%
Hamlets and Countryside	5%

The majority of growth is centred where the principal services are located. Large growth in Core, Hinterland villages and Hamlets would create environmental, unsustainable locations, increase in commuter and other traffic and danger to the natural environment which is a feature and strength of the area.

Q 14. Are there other realistic broad distribution options which should be considered?

Please explain your answer.

Tattingstone Parish council would reluctantly consider BHD4:

Settlement Category	% of district Growth
----------------------------	-----------------------------

Ipswich fringe area	20%
Urban areas and Market towns	20%
Core villages	15%
Hinterland villages	5%
Hamlets and Countryside	5%
New Settlement	35%

New settlement would need to be planned very carefully as the necessary infrastructure must be in place. New settlement should not be in existing countryside especially adjacent to AONBs.

Q 15. If a new settlement was to be planned in the area, where should it be located?

Please explain your answer

See above

Housing Types & Affordable Housing

Q 16. Should the Joint Local Plan include a requirement for new dwellings to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards?

Definitely.

Q 17. Do you have any views on the proposed approach towards self-build and custom build dwellings?

We support self-build homes and custom dwellings provided they are of a design sympathetic to their surroundings.

Q 18. What should the Councils' approach to Starter Homes be?

Starter homes should be included within the mix of any planning permission for 7+ houses. It is important that local people can afford to buy homes in their own villages if they wish and are not priced out of the market or forced to move away from family support.

Q 19. Should the Councils be prioritising the provision of any particular types of homes?

Tattingstone Parish Council support HM1:

Housing mix to accord broadly with SHMA [strategic housing market assessment]

Set a broad requirement for the mix of housing to be provided as part of all housing developments, with the precise nature to be determined by the market. Under this option developments would be expected to follow the mix identified in the SHMA.

However, Tattingstone Parish Council would support HM2 in relation to housing for older people, especially bungalows, and for the need specified in HM3 for residential, nursing homes and specialist housing. These options are not exclusive.

Q 20. Are there any other types of housing that should be planned for / required?

See above response.

Tattingstone Parish Council sees a great need for Affordable and Social housing for those many people who cannot afford homes and who are forced into expensive private, often substandard, rented properties.

Q 21. How can the Councils promote / facilitate development of homes for private rent?

Tattingstone Parish Council would support the building of Social Housing and the non-pursuance of Right to Buy which depletes the social housing stock.

Q 22. In relation to affordable housing, do you consider the requirement should be set at a percentage other than the current 35%? If so, please provide reasons.

Remain at 35%

Q 23. To what extent should affordable housing be (or not be) prioritised over provision of other infrastructure where viability is an issue?

Both are needed: you cannot approve more housing, affordable or other, without the necessary infrastructure to support such development.

Q 24. In relation to affordable housing, should there be any preference for housing to accommodate key workers?

Not applicable in Tattingstone.

Q 25. If Option RE2 is supported, what maximum percentage of market housing should be acceptable?

We support RE2:

Market housing supported on rural exception sites.

Include a rural exception site policy which would support an element of market housing where this is necessary to bring the site forward and where the scale is proportionate to the overall aim of delivering affordable housing.

Tattingstone Parish Council would accept 5%.

Rural growth and development

26. Which option for the policy approach to rural growth do you think is most appropriate?

Tattingstone Parish council support RG2:

Allocation with flexibility for small scale infill

Allocate sites in towns and core villages to provide certainty on the principle and potential scale of large developments. For hinterland villages review the current defined boundaries and have criteria based approach to enable proportionate development in hinterland villages and infill development in hamlets and clusters of 10 or more dwellings.

Q 27. Are there any other approaches to distributing development in rural areas that we should consider?

No Comment

Q 28. Do you support the approach proposed for hamlets? If not please explain?

Tattingstone Parish Council would support HG1:

Approach to infill in hamlets

Continuation of the current approach which would classify hamlets as open countryside in the settlement hierarchy.

Accommodation Needs of Gypsies and Travellers

Q 29. What should the Councils' approach to provision of negotiated stopping places be?

No comment

Q 30. Please submit details of any sites, or extensions to existing sites, which you consider are suitable for allocation as Gypsy and Traveller sites or Travelling Showpeople sites.

There are no sites in our parish which would be suitable.

Caravans and Houseboats

31. Should the Joint Local Plan include a policy which identifies areas where moorings would be acceptable in principal?

There are no moorings within the Parish

Q 32. If so, are there any specific locations where additional moorings could be located?

See above

Economic Needs

33. Should we continue to identify existing employment areas and protect land and premises in these areas from redevelopment/conversion to other uses unless marketing evidence demonstrates there is no demand for employment use?

Yes

Q 34. If we continue to protect existing employment areas, which areas should be identified?

Ipswich, Urban areas and market towns

Q 35. Are there any existing employment areas that could be reallocated to other uses?

No comment

Q 36. Should we identify areas where non-B class uses, such as car showrooms, tyre and exhaust centres and building material stores, can be located?

No comment

Q 37. Should there be a policy that allows a wider range of uses than just B class on all employment sites or selected employment sites?

As long as employment areas are not situated where noise and increased traffic can cause a disturbance to residents.

Q 38. Should we allocate more than enough land to meet the forecast needs to enable more choice in the market and give flexibility to changing circumstances?

No

Q 39. Should we make specific employment provisions for small and medium sized enterprises? If so, how and where?

No comment

Q 40. If we expand, or allocate additional employment land where should these be?

Additional employment sites should be located adjacent to major trunk roads wherever possible to avoid extra traffic on rural lanes.

Q 41. What approach should we take to supporting new business formation across the Districts?

Tattingstone Parish Council would support the formation of small business and encourage diversity of use of agricultural buildings.

Town Centres and Retail – this section not applicable to Tattingstone

42. Do you consider that any of the sites put forward as part of the Call for Sites should be allocated for retail or commercial leisure use?

Please state why.

Q 43. Are there any other sites that should be considered for retail or commercial leisure use?

Q 44. If you consider allocations for retail development should come forward as mixed use, please provide details.

Q 45. Do you agree with the proposed Town Centre boundaries, Primary Shopping Areas, Primary Shopping Frontages and Secondary Shopping Frontages?

If not, please explain why.

Q 46. Do you agree with the approach to not define Primary Shopping Area boundaries within settlements other than the three main towns? If not, please explain why.

Q 47. Do you agree with the approach to maintain and increase retail provision within the District Centres?

If not, please explain why.

Q 48. Do you agree with the proposed thresholds relating to the mix of uses within Primary Shopping Frontage? If not, please explain why.

Q 49. Do you agree with the proposal to require an impact assessment for all edge of centre and out of centre retail proposals that are 400sqm gross floorspace or more?

If not, please explain why.

Q 50. The Councils propose to protect A1-A5 uses in Core Villages and Hinterland Villages, and in local centres within towns. Do you consider this to be the correct approach?

Yes

Biodiversity

Q 51. Do you have views on the Option BIO 1 and / or BIO 2?

Tattingstone Parish council would support option BIO2:

Protection and enhancement of designations, habitats and species

Protect designated sites/ areas, protected species and priority habitats and species and local sites, whilst also seeking a collective inter authority approach to enhancement. All developments to provide appropriate protection as per option 1, and also to seek enhancement for the network of habitats and biodiversity where appropriate.

Tattingstone Parish council believe that support for Special Protection areas and AONBs should be strengthened.

Climate Change

Q 52. How should the local plan consider the impact of renewable technologies?

What types of effects should be assessed within the policy criteria?

Tattingstone Parish Council would support option RE1:

Renewable energy – leave to NPPF [National Planning Policy Framework] to provide policy framework.

The NPPF requires local planning authorities to approve applications for renewable energy if the impacts are [or can be made] acceptable.

Q 53. Do you support the Council's initial preference to include water efficiency measures in new build?

If no, please explain why?

Yes

Q 54. Are there any other additional environmental standards Babergh and Mid Suffolk should be requiring?

If so, please provide details and reasons why.

Tattingstone Parish Council believes more encouragement should be given for new builds, housing, industrial and commercial properties, to incorporate renewable technologies. We would also encourage installation of renewable technologies on existing commercial and industrial buildings.

Landscape, Heritage & Design

Q 55. Are there any other approaches that the Joint Local Plan could take to protect the landscape?

Tattingstone Parish Council supports option L1:

Maintain Local Landscape designations

Under this option Special Landscape Areas, Visually Important Open Spaces and Areas of Visual and Recreational Amenity would be retained and within these areas development would be required to maintain or enhance the special landscape qualities.

This option protects well-known and important landscapes which have been established over many years.

Q 56. Should additional protection be given to areas which form part of a landscape project area but which aren't designated?

Yes

Q 57. How can the Joint Local Plan make the most of the heritage assets?

Heritage aspects of the District are important to the character within settlements and have economic benefits to the area with regard to tourism. These assets should be protected and extended.

Q 58. What level of protection should be given to identified non-designated assets? Are there any specific situations in which the balance should favour or not favour protection of identified non-designated assets?

Tattingstone Parish Council would support Option HA1:

Protection of non-designated heritage assets

Include a policy which identifies the types of assets which would be considered as non-designated heritage assets, such as identified buildings, features, gardens, greens, commons and ties. A policy approach consistent with the weight afforded to non-designated assets in the NPPF would be applied.

Q 59. Should a more flexible approach toward climate change objectives be adopted where this would assist protecting a heritage asset?

Not sure what this means

Q 60. Is there any aspect of design that priority should be given to?

Existing character of design should be better supported with the avoidance of a pastiche of vernacular architecture e.g. mock Tudor

Q 61. Is there any aspect of design that should be introduced to the Councils' policies?

No Comment

Q 62. Is there an area of design related to past development that you consider needs to be addressed in future development?

Often housing from large national contractors on huge dense sites do not assimilate into the character of the local existing houses. Often, they use a 'one plan fits all' no matter where they are in the UK. Avoidance of 'Little boxes on the hillside, little boxes looking just the same'.

Infrastructure

Q 63. Which option do you consider most appropriate?

Please explain why?

Tattingstone Parish Council would support Option INF1:

Leave to NPPF to provide the policy framework

The NPPF provides a general requirement for Local Plans to plan positively for the development and infrastructure in the plan area.

There is no need to have own strategic infrastructure Policy which might be opposed.

Q 64. What do you consider the key infrastructure issues in your community?

The key infrastructure issues in our community are access to medical facilities; these are only accessible by private transport. With increased development in neighbouring villages and in adjacent Essex towns of Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley, the amount of traffic on the A137 is much increased, especially on the occasions when A12 or A14 are closed. Serious thought must be given to safety on this important trunk road through the village.

Q 65. What infrastructure issues do you consider to be a priority for the future?

See above

Q 66. What infrastructure do you think would be needed to support the growth scenarios?

See above

Q 67. What comments do you have on the proposed strategic approach to infrastructure delivery?

No Comment

Q 68. Should a separate policy be developed to manage provision of education and healthcare?

Yes, including provision for better support for small rural Primary Schools

Healthy Communities

Q 69. Should the strategy of the Plan be focussed on addressing deprivation?

The focus of the plan should be on addressing deprivation and supporting rural communities with a high percentage of elderly residents.

Q 70. Are there any specific approaches that should be applied to address deprivation?

There should be more affordable and social housing to address deprivation.

Q 71. Are there any other circumstances and / or provisions under which open space, sports facilities or community facilities should be required and / or protected?

Tattingstone Parish Council supports Option OS1:

Set a Prescriptive requirement for on-site provision

Set a prescriptive standard for provision of on-site space similar to that contained in the existing Babergh Local Plan, which would apply to sites of 1 hectare or more.

On-site sports provision would be required as part of the strategic allocations.

Q 72. Through the Plan should any other areas of Local Green Space be identified and protected?

Tattingstone Parish Council would support Option POS2:

Protection of Open Spaces

Include a policy which protects open spaces and sports facilities in line with the NPPF approach but which also recognises the local distinctiveness afforded by open spaces in Babergh.

Q 73. Are there any specific facilities that should be included in the definition of community facilities?

Tattingstone Parish Council would favour the approach outlined in Option CF1:

Leave to NFFP to provide policy framework.

The NPPF contains a requirement to plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities and to guard against the loss of valued facilities and services.

Functional Clusters

Q 74. Do you consider the approach to identifying functional clusters appropriate for Babergh and Mid Suffolk?

If not, please explain what would be your preferred approach?

Yes

Settlement Boundaries

Q 75. Do you consider the proposed new settlement boundaries to be appropriate?

(please explain your answer)

Yes

Q 76. Are there any other settlements that should be given new settlement boundaries? (please explain your answer)

No

Tattingstone should be viewed as 3 interconnected hamlets [as shown on your 3 separate maps] and not a hinterland village.

Q 77. Is the threshold (10 well related dwellings) for identifying settlement boundaries appropriate?

Yes

Potential Land for Development

Q 78. Do you consider the sites identified to be appropriate for allocation or inclusion within the settlement boundary?

(please explain why and quote the settlement and site reference numbers ie. SS0001)

Tattingstone Parish Council agree that those allocated in our parish are appropriate for inclusion within the settlement boundary.

Q 79. Are there any other sites/areas which would be appropriate for allocation? (If yes, please provide further information and complete a site submission form)?

No there are not.