

# Responses received to Pre-Submission Consultation, Tattingstone Neighbourhood Plan

The table sets out the comments that were received during the Pre-Submission Consultation Stage. The comments are reproduced as received and no changes have been made to correct spelling or other errors. Any personal information such as emails or phone numbers have been redacted. The table is laid out in Plan order with the general comments following the comments on the policies.

Chapters 1, 2 & 3 .....	3
Vision and Objectives .....	5
Policy TATT 1 – Spatial Strategy .....	6
Chapter 5 – Planning Strategy .....	8
Policy TATT 2 – Housing Development .....	9
Policy TATT 3 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites .....	11
Chapter 6 - Housing .....	12
Policy TATT 4 - Protection of Landscape Setting of Tattingstone .....	14
Community Action 1 - Landscape Improvement Initiatives .....	15
Policy TATT 5 - Protection of Important Views .....	15
Policy TATT 6 – Biodiversity and Habitats .....	17
Policy TATT 7 - Local Green Spaces .....	19
Chapter 7 – Natural Environment .....	25
Policy TATT 8 - Design Considerations .....	27
Policy TATT 9 - Non-Designated Heritage Assets .....	28
Community Action 2 - Tattingstone History Trail App .....	28
Community Action 3 - Reducing Overhead Wires .....	29
Policy TATT 10 - Flooding and Sustainable Drainage .....	29
Policy TATT 11 – Dark Skies .....	30
Chapter 8 – Built Environment .....	30

Community Action 4 - Community Facilities .....	32
Chapter 9 – Services and Facilities .....	32
Policy TATT 12 - Public Rights of Way.....	33
Community Action 5 - Public Rights of Way Warden .....	34
Policy TATT 13 – Parking Standards .....	35
Community Action 6 - Electric Vehicle Charging Points .....	35
Community Action 7 - Cycling Provision .....	36
Policies Map and Inset Maps .....	37
Appendices .....	38
General comments.....	38

Name	Organisation	Comment
<p>Chapters 1, 2 &amp; 3</p>		
E West	-	<p>2.6 "Today there are three key parts to the Parish...Tattingstone Heath is an area of ribbon development along the A137" I live on Church Road and have never considered my property to be part of The Heath. However for the purposes of the Plan I see that the houses along Church Road as far as Peartree have now been included in this settlement. Should this sentence therefore reflect the updated settlement map and refer to ribbon development on A137 and Church Road?</p>
S Gipps	-	<p>Highways and Travel. Whilst I agree that car parking in the village needs to be addressed, the root problem is surely Tattingstone not having any useful bus service, therefore making the use of cars imperative</p>
M Bus	-	<p>Clear description</p>
S Hammond	Wickford Development	<p>Para 1.14 - There was also support shown for developments which would benefit the village via s106 planning gain agreements not just small scale development of 1-5 units.</p> <p>There is evidence within the plan of localism in action, clearly the plan being steered by individuals wishing to imprint their personal views on neighbourhood plan policies. This is very concerning.</p> <p>Quite clearly on a number of polices within the draft proposal have not followed the guidance contained within the NPPF.</p>
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	<p>1.6 suggests you are in Step 3 of the Key Stages of Neighbourhood Planning (Pre Submission Publicity &amp; Consultation), If so, where were the "Talks with Landowners" in regard to Local Green Spaces (&amp; property owners regarding to Non-Designated Heritage Assets) in Step 2? (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#key-stages-in-neighbourhood-planning">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#key-stages-in-neighbourhood-planning</a>) I would consider this a fundamental part of (following) procedures, and to have missed such a vital step could lose you support, trust and viability, possibly cause enough grievances with those affected that all this hard work of yours becomes totally undone.</p>
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	<p>As an interested party affected by this, it appears that the key stages of the government guidance on Neighbourhood Planning have been misrepresented during the process of putting together this plan. Step 3 appears to be underway ( pre-submission) , but Step 2, particularly points 2+3 seem to have been approached with a lack of attentiveness. I can't help think deliberately.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
	Suffolk County Council	<p>It is nice to see a good historic background for Tattingstone in section 2.1 - 2.6. This could be enhanced by a search of the Suffolk HER. The inclusion of an HER search in map format within this chapter would be a useful addition to show all heritage assets (above and below ground) in the area.</p> <p>SCC welcome the population data detailed in Figure 1. We would recommend inserting a paragraph between 2.7 and 2.8 to highlight age groups, using the following wording.</p> <p><i>The 2021 Census data indicates 30.4% of residents are aged 65+ which is significantly higher than the England average at 18.4%. 50.2% of residents are aged 20-64, lower than the England average of 58.4% and 19.5% of the population are aged 0-19 years, lower than the England average of 23%.</i></p> <p>Minerals and Waste Suffolk County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority for Suffolk. This means that SCC makes planning policies and decisions in relation to minerals and waste. The relevant policy document is the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan,<sup>2</sup> adopted in July 2020, which forms part of the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6 of the plan refers to the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the nearby safeguarded site, which is welcome.</p> <p>We also note that other than the Folly Farm operation and extension mentioned there are no other safeguarded sites within the settlement boundary of Tattingstone.</p>
	Babergh District Council	<p>Map 1, Para 1.4 Formatting. The northern tip of the designated plan area (the parish) has been clipped from Map 1. Please ensure that you show the whole boundary.</p> <p>Para 1.8 Grammar. To avoid repetition of the word 'following' in the first sentence, suggest: 'The following topic areas form the basis for the content of the Plan. <u>They build on</u> matters raised through community engagement to date.'</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
<b>Vision and Objectives</b>		
E West	-	<p>It would be hard not to support the Vision and Objectives as an existing resident. However I do not understand this in 4.2: "Ensure new development is of a scale and design which ... positively responds to the three areas of the Parish". What does "positively responds" mean? Do you mean is of a style in keeping with the existing character of the area in which it sits - in other words is this a design concept? Or is it about scale, or location?</p> <p>In particular, see above regarding ribbon development of the Heath (as defined). I thought I saw somewhere that extending further ribbon development is considered undesirable (this may be in the Babergh Plan rather than the Tattingstone one). Does "positively responds" mean that an existing ribbon development like the Heath is more likely to be developed as a ribbon development, rather than extending back from the road (for example)? I noticed that several respondents to the survey were in favour of linking the three areas of the village, whereas the plan proposes the exact opposite. This might therefore need a little more explanation.</p>
D Connolly	-	<p>4.1 There is no evidence I can see in the Residents survey to support three parts of the Parish retaining their own identities. One comment suggests teh reverse (Table 11 Comment 4) "Infill within the village and between three elements would bring the village together alone(sic) with public footpaths."</p> <p>I would support controlled in-fill housing development between the three areas, including the development of village resources such as a shop.</p>
S Hammond	Wickford Development	<p>The draft Local Neighbourhood plan lacks vision and does not meet the needs of the community,</p> <p>The vision statement on housing contradicts the proposed policies contained therein.</p>
J Marcus	-	<p>Important to emphasise that all the Objectives mentioned work together and not in isolation, i.e housing should not encroach on green space, or ignore the lack of services in the village.</p>
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	<p>4.1 I can not find one response in the Residents Survey suggesting that the three (separate) parts of the Parish should retain their own identities. There is in fact one comment suggesting the reverse (Tbl 11 Comment 4) "Infill within the village and between three elements would bring the village together alone with public footpaths." There are also several other comments expressing concern over a unliked/unwanted "Village Divide" we can only assume is referring to the physical detachment between</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		the three areas of the village. I would support controlled in-fill housing development between the three areas.
L Brown	-	Plan lacks vision
M Dan	-	We have no sustainable public transport. Those who cannot drive rely on neighbours, friends and family for essential shopping.
	Suffolk County Council	<p>It is good to see that protecting the historic environment has been included in the Vision for Tattingstone in section 4.1-4.2 and in the objectives to achieve this vision.</p> <p>SCC welcomes the Highways and Travel objective on page 11 to encourage safe and sustainable transport.</p> <p>SCC notes that the Vision, and one of the Objectives, puts an emphasis on the provision of services and facilities, and yet the plan does not include a policy either to protect the existing facilities, or to encourage/show support for additional services and facilities.</p>

### Policy TATT 1 – Spatial Strategy

E West	-	Yes, provided that Map 4 will not impact on my own residential amenity. See 4 below.
D Connolly	-	<p>The Policy should make reference to the forthcoming JLP Part 2 and state it is proposing new Settlement Boundaries to be adopted in the JLP Part 2.</p> <p>I can see no reason for having two separate Settlement Boundaries for Tattingstone Heath. It would make sense to have a single contiguous boundary. I also feel there should be discussion to extend the Settlement Boundaries to include all existing properties between the three areas.</p>
S Gipps	-	The settlement boundary goes through my garden, please amend to incorporate the whole of my property
S Hammond	Wickford Development	There settlement boundaries certainly need updating to include development that has occurred outside the historic plan. Tattingstone is somewhat of a disparate village made up of a number of clusters. It would be good if the development boundary provided connectivity where possible. This would help assist future development and help the connectivity of these clusters. It would also help provide a more unified sense of place. I have personally witnessed in meetings residents of Tattingstone Heath state they feel excluded from decisions made for Tattingstone Village. This is an opportunity to rectify this and needs to be proposed and consulted on. Unfortunately the current consultation plan has failed to grasp this opportunity.

Name	Organisation	Comment
D Hawes	-	<p>Whilst I support the Spatial Strategy in principle, I am concerned about the defined area of the proposed settlement boundaries for The Heath and The White Horse. A large portion of privately owned land has not been included for some of the dwellings in this area. Namely, Peartrees which appears to have most of its land outside of the settlement boundary and this also includes neighbouring properties too. There is also a large portion of privately owned land at The Wheatsheaf which is also shown outside the boundary. Land owned by The White Horse is also excluded. Is there a reason for this?</p> <p>Have the owners of these affected properties been consulted?</p> <p>What does GP on The Heath proposed settlement mean?</p>
M Paxman	-	The plan is contradictory. There is no space within the boundaries for development so you are discounting it by decree.
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	<p>Oh my! The list is endless, this needs taking back to the drawing board and starting again. "A settlement boundary is a line that is drawn on a plan around a village, which reflects its built form". "Settlement boundaries define the built up area of settlements", so why are you excluding (for example) Pond Hall Farm, which has been part of Tattingstone Village a darn sight longer than Glebe Close, or The Close. The strip of terraces behind The White Horse Inn, why are they not included. If you're drawing new Settlement Boundaries, you need to include the current buildings. As for splitting The Heath in two?! RIDICULOUS! ABSOLUTELY! You get this opportunity to re-draw these perimeters, and look at what you come up with! It's not a good start, and as I may bring up again later, if I have not already done so; brings into question the entire credibility of this "Plan."</p>
M Alston	-	The vision and objectives in Chapter 4 include an aim to provide affordable housing, yet the settlement boundaries are so tightly drawn that they would seem to limit any substantial new housing.
J Neill	-	I would like to keep The Heath separate from other parts of the village and I don't agree with the green space provision for The Wheatsheaf as marked on the plan
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	Settlement boundaries don't appear logical. Very inconsistent around the village, almost nonsensical.
M Dan	-	Yes - but only if infrastructure comes with it.
	Suffolk County Council	The emphasis on the importance of settlement gaps could be stronger in the policy as could the supporting evidence in the text. As it stands, the important gaps which have been identified seem unsupported.

Name	Organisation	Comment
	Babergh District Council	We have no comments per-see on this policy but draw your attention to the following. The desire to maintain the important gap between Tattingstone Village and Tattingstone Heath, and to identify the important gap south of Tattingstone White Horse is understood, but your Plan should explain more clearly how and why these have been identified.
<b>Chapter 5 – Planning Strategy</b>		
E West	-	<p>5.4 and 5.5. This is not necessarily an objection, but I notice that while my house is now inside a settlement boundary, almost all of my garden is outside of it. In other places, the settlement boundary has been moved to include gardens which were formerly outside the boundary. My property was not in a settlement map when I bought it and have therefore had no legal advice on the impact of this. My property (including the area of the house) is a third of an acre, of which one quarter of an acre is a former orchard, shown linked to my house (built c1830) in the same way as far back as the 1881 Ordnance Survey map (the current OS map is slightly inaccurate). I emphasise I have absolutely no desire to see that former orchard "developed" for housing whether by me or by future owners. However, small single storey buildings of the sort people normally put in their gardens (shed, greenhouse) are normally "permitted development"; if they are "permitted" development then logically they must be "development" and therefore in principle could be governed by this Plan. For me and for other householders whose gardens are not either wholly within or without the boundaries, please could you explain the implications, or confirm that there are no implications. I notice that it is stated that the local plan does not override national planning policies - does this include national planning exemptions related to permitted development?</p> <p>If there IS an impact for those whose properties are bisected by the boundaries, perhaps you could publish some FAQs?</p> <p>For example, if my current shed becomes beyond repair, and I wish to rebuild something similar, am I going to have to get planning permission? Or will it be subject to the design considerations? Or when calculating the total area of property for the purposes of what I can build under "permitted development", is the location of the settlement plan boundary relevant, or irrelevant? Other people may have similar concerns about extensions, garages etc.</p>
D Connolly	-	The current settlement boundaries need to be reviewed. There seems to have been no consultation on the proposed new boundaries, they appear to have materialised out of thin air, with no justification for the proposed boundaries. It is important that these reflect the wishes of those affected by the potential impact of future development between now and 2037. It is also important to take into account the potential



Name	Organisation	Comment
		impact on any businesses affected by these boundaries, specifically The White Horse and Wheatsheaf pubs and the Tattingstone Garden Centre.
S Hammond	Wickford Development	The settlement boundaries need to be visited once more in more detail, there are still clusters of development that have been ignored and should be included, proposals should be rewritten and consulted upon with the local community.
M Paxman	-	When our nation is suffering a chronic housing shortage, and bearing in mind the strong possibility of a change in national government with its already declared strategy. It is in my view somewhat naive to have such a limited housing policy. There must be a long term strategy to grow the village in such a way as to keep much of its character but allow for sufficient growth so as to remain a sustainable unit. If we adopt a not in my backyard approach we run the risk of imposition by central government, rather than remaining in control.
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	Smaller houses with fewer bedrooms and more provision for social housing for locals
S Sakal	Untied Pub Limited	A distinct lack of communication and consultation with land owners.
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	As mentioned in responses 2 & 3. I'm not sure keeping all three areas separate is the way forward, there will always need to be room for a small amount of development, and surely the occasional bit of infill is a preference to mini housing estates being built on the outskirts instead.
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	As above
	Babergh District Council	Para 5.1 and 5.4 While this is mentioned in para 5.2, it might be helpful to add the 2006 date before or after 'Babergh Local Plan' in para's 5.1, 5.4 and 5.5.  Para 5.6 Suggest inserting the word 'this' and a colon as follows: ' – Part 1 and <u>this</u> Neighbourhood Plan, such as;
<b>Policy TATT 2 – Housing Development</b>		
D Connolly	-	Further discussion and consultation is required to understand the impact of the Settlement Boundaries. Following this, the Settlement Boundaries need to be re-drawn to reflect the wishes of those impacted.
S Hammond	Wickford Development	Part 2 of Babergh & Mid Suffolk joint plan is still emerging with a call for development sites ending on the 2nd February 2024. It is a great shame the LNP committee did not have the foresight to propose locations

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>of sustainable development of which there were a number of sites which could have been proposed. Especially when the consultation identified a need for housing to enable young people to afford to remain within their community. Quite clearly the draft plan has failed in acting upon the views and feedback received from the community. With it's close proximity to key transport links, Tattingstone is a sustainable location and as such the planning gain benefits to the Tattingstone community that an allocated site would have bought cannot be underestimated, for example financial contributions to improve sports facilities, village hall and provide affordable housing for local people. This has not been explored by the draft plan or consulted upon.</p> <p>The LNP committee have not sought the reasonable cooperation of Landowners or assessed the deliverability of land that could be identified for future development. There is no evidence that the LNP committee can provide that they have engaged with Landowners or the community for any such proposals as such the current proposal policy does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p>
M Paxman	-	I believe we should designate land that connects the 3 separate settlements as potential land for development with some specifically set aside for affordable housing. Unless we can maintain a steady flow of young families to the area the school will ultimately close. Any new infill development should have section 106 monies attached in order to provide a footpath connecting all areas,
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	Settlement Boundaries need readdressing before supporting any of this policy.
L Brown	-	They need to look again at areas that could be developed for youngsters to stay in the locality
J Clavey	-	I support this policy in general but feel that it would be beneficial for new houses to be smaller and perhaps terraced. This would make them more affordable and suitable for young people, or older people wishing to downsize. Large modern executive style houses don't fit in with the overall appearance of the village.
M Alston	-	Based on the limits of settlement boundaries, there is no effective encouragement to provide housing for young people.
M Dan	-	Depending if it accompanies infrastructure
	Suffolk County Council	The data [referred to in the response to Chapters 1-3] indicates a need for any future developments to be inclusive to the needs of an ageing population, with homes being adaptable and outdoor spaces being well lit, safe and easily navigable, neurodiversity and dementia friendly. It is important to ensure the needs of all residents are catered for, recognising the likely increase of co-morbidities as people get older. It is suggested that there could be provision for homes that are adaptable, built to M4(2) standards. This can

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>help meet the needs of elderly and frail residents, allowing them to maintain independence for longer, but also allowing for younger occupants and families.</p> <p>We recommended including additional wording to Policy TATT2 using the following wording:  <i>Housing Mix</i>  <i>Support will be given to the provision of a wide range of types of housing that meet local need from within the Neighbourhood Plan area, or adjoining Parishes, that cannot be reasonably met on a suitable, alternative, non-rural, site. Such housing should enable the creation of a mixed, balanced and inclusive community, with homes that are adaptable and accessible (meaning built to optional M4(2) standards) in order to meet the needs of the aging population, without excluding the needs of the younger occupants and families.</i></p>
<p><b>Policy TATT 3 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites</b></p>		
S Hammond	Wickford Development	<p>All plans whether Local or a neighbourhood plan must be reasonable and deliverable. To solely rely on a policy to provide affordable housing by a landowner wishing to gift land or sell under market value is not fulfilling the needs of the local community. This will never be delivered. Currently Approved affordable housing providers building to the New Future Home Standard cannot fund developments even when land is gifted, this is well documented. Legislation caps the rent of affordable housing which restricts the Approved Body of being able to raise capital funds to buildout such schemes. The delivery of affordable housing is achieved through the delivery of open market dwellings. Therefore, for affordable dwellings to be delivered there must be an acceptance within the neighbourhood plan for controlled development via land identified, proposed and consulted on and then allocated. There are a number of villages within close proximity of Tattingstone where this has been successfully achieved e.g: Sutton. It would benefit the community of Tattingstone to approve the allocation of land or parcels of land for a development of residential dwellings not exceeding 40 units. The number of units would suffice to trigger financial contributions to enable the improvement to facilities this village is in need of and to provide an affordable housing provision.</p>
M Paxman	-	<p>The policy is so narrow it is hard to see how anyone can meet the criteria. In the 21st Century we should have an affordable housing policy that allows for people to purchase their own home over time. Committing people to permanent tenancy only stores up poverty for old age. We should not forget that you buy a home over your working life, whilst you rent for a lifetime.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	I have never been a fan of "No, you can't build a housing estate, unless it's Social Housing", and other Back Door Policies in disguise. But I do realise the NP has little impact regarding such policies... doesn't make it ok though.
L Brown	-	How come 3 sites in the village have built houses and no affordable houses
M Slattery	-	The implications of this policy need far greater clarity
R Hobson	-	Support this policy, but concerning that nothing has been done for quite a number of years in this village. I was very disappointed that the affordable housing scheme earmarked for opposite the Wheatsheaf a few years ago.
M Dan	-	As above
	Babergh District Council	<p>TATT 3 is based on a tried and tested policy. It is also clear that TATT 3 has been amended to take into account new guidance on community-led development proposals introduced by paragraph 73 of the NPPF.</p> <p>To ensure consistency with a modification made to a recently examined neighbourhood plan we recommend that criterion iii be amended to read as follows:  'iii. Is offered, in the first instance, to people with a demonstrated local connection, as defined by Babergh District Council Choice Based Lettings Scheme. Where a property cannot be filled from within the Parish, it should then be offered to those with a demonstrated need for affordable housing <del>and a connection</del> in neighbouring villages and thereafter to the rest of Babergh District.'</p> <p>We also note that TATT 3 has dropped the reference to a small number of market homes being allowed where these are necessary only to make the scheme financially viable. While this does appear as policy guidance in both national and district level policy, the Parish Council may wish to include an appropriately worded paragraph that makes this clear.</p>
<b>Chapter 6 - Housing</b>		
E West	-	<p>"Affordable housing" in some people's mind has negative connotations. If you find objections (from people who haven't read the Babergh plan) perhaps some examples (with pictures) of local affordable housing schemes could be given, including how they brought benefit to the area.</p> <p>Does the Church own any land and have you approached the Church regarding social housing?</p>
S Hammond	Wickford Development	The draft local neighbourhood plan stance is to maintain the status quo with the presumption of no new development in the village. This is reinforced by the proposed changes to the settlement boundaries and

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>limited development of small brownfield windfall sites of which none have been identified in the draft plan. Neighbourhood planning gives communities the opportunity to direct the development of their areas through creating plans and policies. This draft plan does not provide that opportunity and therefore the housing policy is not deliverable.</p> <p>Babergh's emerging Local Plan Pt2 when adopted will take precedence over Tattingstone's Neighbourhood plan if housing policies do not align. More thought must be given to the a Housing policy that meets the needs of the local community. The NPPF states that Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in any development plan that covers their area. As no consideration has been given to pt 2 of the Local Plan this may need to be reviewed to ensure harmony between the neighbourhood and local plan. Presently the draft Local Neighbourhood plan does not meet the basic condition as set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). (d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</p>
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	Smaller houses should be provided 2-3 bedroom not massive 5 bedroom mansions which none of our children can afford
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	Would like to point out; there will always be a need for more housing, and I am very much in agreement that infill of one or two houses here and there is the ideal way to help fulfil this need. Mini Housing Estates like The Limes on Church Road for example is not really in keeping with a traditional village like Tattingstone, and feel four houses built along the roadside would be far more appropriate, (no offence to those on The Limes!)
A Hall	-	Considering the infrequency of house sales in Tattingstone, the statistics used in section 6.5 comparing the average sold price for the past year in Tattingstone vs the whole of England does not seem a valid benchmark. Depending on which houses in Tattingstone have sold from one year to the next, it would likely reflect a drastic swing in this 'average' sold house value.
L Brown	-	There appears to be no development at all
M Slattery	-	As above
M Dan	-	These all link together, public transport and infrastructure
	Babergh District Council	<p>Para 6.8</p> <p>To pick up on new NPPF paragraph 73, we suggest that the last bullet be amended to read as follows: 'A registered social landlord (housing association/registered provider) <u>or a Community-led Development Organisation such as a Community Land Trust</u> willing to work willing to work with the Parish Council and District Council to fund and manage a scheme.'</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>Para 6.9  Recommend amending the last sentence to read:  'Given the limited policy guidance, this Neighbourhood Plan provides more detail as to how such an affordable housing scheme would be considered.'</p>
<h3>Policy TATT 4 - Protection of Landscape Setting of Tattingstone</h3>		
E West	-	Yes, subject to my comments at 4 above, re "Proposals for new buildings outside of the Settlement Boundaries..."
D Connolly	-	I would support this if the Settlement Boundaries were re-drawn, following consultation. There appears to be confusion between the Neighbourhood Plan Area and the Settlement Boundaries. Policy Tatt 4 should apply to the entire Neighbourhood Plan Area, not restricted to the Settlement Boundary,
S Hammond	Wickford Development	Again this is a poorly written policy which again demonstrates the protectionism of ensuring no further residential development occurs within Tattingstone. There is a disconnect between the housing Policy Tatt 2 and Policy Tatt 4. I would refer you to comments I have also made in the Policy Tatt 5 feedback box.
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	Can not support, as am strongly against proposed Settlement Boundaries. Disagree with Landscape Appraisals and other supporting documents also.
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	Statement on its own appears fine, until you drill down into detail. Settlement boundary inadequate. Initial vagueness of proposed areas. Address these first.
	Suffolk County Council	<p>Given that part of the parish is within Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape, is it enough to require development proposals to require development proposals to "have regard"? (see LURA 2023: The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 sections 245 (5) and (6)(a) will amend the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 in respect of the 'general duty' imposed on public bodies dealing with functions in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB): In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty in England, a relevant authority other than a devolved Welsh authority <u>must seek to further</u> the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.).</p> <p>The bar ('no significant adverse impact') seems to be low for proposals within the countryside, outside of settlement boundaries. Reference could be made to TATT1, which would help clarifying this.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
<b>Community Action 1 - Landscape Improvement Initiatives</b>		
S Hammond	Wickford Development	However, more initiatives could be included here. e.g: public footpath maintenance, Tattingstone in Bloom, encouraging AWS to tidy up Lemon Hill bridge.
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	The whole idea for keeping the play area as an open space is that it makes its maintenance more easily achieved and less costly. The whole playing field area is surrounded by trees already! You can not have trees near the football or cricket areas for safety sake! and it is meant for playing on not a wooded area.
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	Sorry, but have recently lost all faith in Tattingstone Parish Council, the Village Hall Committee, Playing Field Committee and Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (who I get the impression have had very little to do with actually producing this Village Plan...or at least I hope so,) so have no interest in encouraging any other Bullying Platform Groups & Who's Lived in the Village Longest Competitions.
	Suffolk Wildlife Trust 2	While the focus of this community action is landscape based, Suffolk Wildlife Trust note the strong connection to trees and hedgerows, which is reflected within the survey of residents. Where such initiatives take place, local provenance of the planting trees is frequently noted as important and is reflected within the plan. However, we also note that species selection is also important, selecting species already occurring within the area will provide landscape continuity and support local wildlife. Another way to deliver this is using natural regeneration, whereby areas of scrub area allowed to mature naturally, ensuring local provenance and species continuity, while also reducing maintenance costs and upkeep. Wider community actions could also be considered to promote biodiversity in the parish.
	Suffolk County Council	SCC welcome the aims of Community Action 1.
<b>Policy TATT 5 - Protection of Important Views</b>		
E West	-	Are there other views we can suggest as important? The survey said 76% of people highly valued the public footpaths and bridleways, which presumably includes the views from them.
D Connolly	-	I would like to see consultation with Anglia Water to open up views of the reservoir. If necessary carrying out some tree husbandry and re-planting.
S Hammond	Wickford Development	There is an over proliferation attached to the importance of street scene views. I cannot see the justification of some of these locations and have personally walked and viewed these. I would advise that these must be reviewed and reconsulted on. There are a number of views in the direction of Holbrook that have been completely ignored. There appears a fixation on the street scene of the A137.

Name	Organisation	Comment
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	There seems to be substantial inconsistency regarding suggested Important Views; there are plenty of views across land and onto the Reservoir that seem to have been omitted (though I realise some areas are already protected). I understand you can't pinpoint every picturesque view, but I'm sure there are some (omitted) that are far superior to "Up The A137" and "Down The A137". Please note there is no View Point on Map 7 of the view from Church Road, The Heath end, looking North over the fields, which I am hoping is simply a Typo as the VP is included in "The Heath Inset Map" on pg 37 of the NP doc.
J Clavey	-	But there seem to be many important views that are missing on map 7.
R Sharp	-	<p>I would like to add several green spaces to the Local Green Spaces map, viz: field opposite Lemons Hill houses, including big field opposite the Walk and the smaller field just adjacent to the bridge car park on the North side of the res. The latter is part of Anglian Water property I believe.</p> <p>I would also add the big field known as Winnipeg. It is north of the allotments and contributes to the village landscape.</p> <p>I would also add the small field on the south side of the reservoir and on the left of the road as you approach the village hall and church. Again, it contributes to the rural feel of the village landscape.</p> <p>I would also add the fields between Tattingstone Place and the south and east side of the Close.</p> <p>If you have any trouble identifying any of these in the map, please give me a ring <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">[REDACTED]</span></p> <p>Thanks</p>
M Alston	-	These seem rather arbitrary and may fail to protect views in other directions which may also be good to conserve.
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	Reassessment of some areas, with greater involvement and consultation with those affected by it. How is the A137 an important view?
	Suffolk County Council	It is unclear from paragraph 7.11 which of the assessments contains an assessment of key views. It could not be found in the supporting documents on the parish website (Tattingstone Parish Landscape Appraisal, 2023; Tattingstone Design Guidelines and Codes, 2023). It would be helpful to know how the key views anchored in the policy were identified (e.g. was there a public consultation on key views?). Map 7 refers to the Tattingstone Landscape Appraisal, however this does not seem to contain a key view assessment. If a key views assessment exists it would be helpful to include this as a supporting document on the parish website. It would be useful to evidence the process, to clarify, whether all viewpoints are publicly accessible and to provide a title, description and photo for each view. For ease of identification and reference, it would be useful to number the views, including on the Policies Map.



Name	Organisation	Comment
		The second part of the policy seems to repeat policy TATT4 and its own first paragraph.
	Babergh District Council	Turning to the wording of Policy TATT 5, at the end of the first line in the second paragraph, we suggest adding the words 'or other appropriate and proportionate evidence' to ensure sufficient flexibility depending on the scale of the development proposal.
<b>Policy TATT 6 – Biodiversity and Habitats</b>		
S Hammond	Wickford Development	<p>No mention has been made to Bio Diversity Net Gain legislation which is mandatory as of 12/02/2024. Already therefore our proposed policy will be out of date. Reference must be made to this.</p> <p>In England, BNG is mandatory from 12 February 2024 under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). Developers must deliver a BNG of 10%. This means a development will result in more or better quality natural habitat than there was before development.</p>
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	(But isn't this national policy anyway?)
M Slattery	-	Reference to Alton Water needed
	Anglian Water	<p>Anglian Water supports the policy and prioritising the delivery of biodiversity net gains within the neighbourhood planning area to support habitat recovery and enhancements within existing green infrastructure. We would also support opportunities to maximise green infrastructure connectivity including through opportunities to minimise surface water run-off from existing urban areas, for example, through the creation of rain gardens.</p> <p>As the neighbourhood plan progresses, there may also be benefit in referencing the emerging Suffolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy (Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) - Suffolk County Council) which will identify priority actions for nature and map specific areas for improving habitats for nature recovery.</p>
	Suffolk Wildlife Trust 2	<p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust welcomes the strong wording that development should avoid the loss of, or significant harm, to trees, hedgerows, ponds, and watercourses. This could go further to include all priority habitat (including the priority grassland habitats present in the parish) and protected sites in the parish.</p> <p>We again state that, as well as mitigation and compensation, any new development should seek to enhance biodiversity. This is including in Paragraph 186 of the NPPF1.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>TATT 6 notes three examples of delivering a net gain for biodiversity, all of which can provide suitable biodiversity enhancement. However, the inclusion of swift-boxes or bat boxes to restore or repair a fragmented network is, in our opinion, misleading. Bird and bat boxes can provide compensation for a loss of nesting or roosting feature or provide an enhancement to increase nesting and roosting capacity. However, biodiversity networks rely on providing habitat for numerous parts of life including foraging for food, commuting to breeding, hibernating, foraging, or new territories. We therefore suggest the wording of C. is updated to reflect this.</p> <p>Where bird and boxes are provided, ensuring the correct number and correct installation is vital in ensuring successful uptake. The Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in their book <i>Designing for Biodiversity</i> (2nd Edition) recommends, “as a guideline, the number of built-in provisions of nest or roost sites per development should be approximately the same as the number of residential units.” Should swift boxes be included, we urge installers to consider The Gold Medal System of swift box installation to increase uptake rates of the new boxes. All bird boxes integrated into buildings should follow BS 42021:2022 Integral nest boxes. Selection and installation for new developments. Bat boxes should be suitably installed, with consideration to avoid illuminated areas and areas above doors or windows, boxes should be at least 3m high and face a range of aspects to allow use during different weather conditions.</p> <p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust support the reference to hedgehog holes in fences, which can be marked with “Hedgehog Highway” signs to promote the reason for the hole, helping new residents to understand its purpose.</p>
	Suffolk County Council	<p>The first sentence could be rounded off with <i>‘and other habitats of principal importance’</i> to make sure nothing of importance is forgotten, such as acid grasslands.</p> <p>The second part is clear and strong.</p> <p>As Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) has become mandatory in England on 12 February 2024. Policy TATT 6 should reflect this in more detail, for example by defining what level of BNG will be expected of projects to win the mentioned support. Should this go beyond the statutory requirements of 10%? Would Policy TATT4 apply to all developments, or would this be in line with national legislation? The use of the statutory Biodiversity Metric could be anchored into the policy.</p> <p>It is welcome to see the Biodiversity Mitigation Hierarchy put front and centre in Figure 1. A clear and helpful reminder.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
	Babergh District Council	With regard to criterion c., while valuable in their own right, it is understood that bird and bat boxes are excluded from the BNG metric and, therefore, would not count to any measure of net gain.
<b>Policy TATT 7 - Local Green Spaces</b>		
E West	-	<p>Replace the land next to the Wheatsheaf with the "former common" described in the Landscape Appraisal as The Heath's Green Space.</p> <p>I notice also that Green Spaces are stated not to affect permitted development rights.</p>
Anonymous	-	Not sure why The Pasture Field at the White Horse is included. It appears to be outside the settlement boundary and is used by the White Horse owners as a camping and caravan site and for other events. It benefits visitors rather than local Tattingsstone residents.
D Connolly	-	<p>I disagree with the designation of the areas of land by the White Horse and Wheatsheaf. Neither of these tracts of land meet the criteria in the NPPF . The only criteria they meet is reasonable proximity. My understanding is they should meet all three criteria. Neither of them are "Demonstrably special". These designations were made without any consultation with the landowners. Being designated potentially threatens the future business development of the two businesses. Both pubs have been recognised as valuable assets to the Parish and the wider neighbourhood. Creating any obstacles to future business viability is not acceptable. The Licensing Trade is currently under severe pressure to continue, with thousands of pubs closing every year. The White Horse and Wheatsheaf should be given every chance of survival.</p> <p>There are glaring inconsistencies in the designation of the green spaces. I have submitted a hard copy attachment showing other areas which could have been included. I am not suggesting these shaded areas are designated, just do not understand why some are included, others are not. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF states that "The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them." The local community were not given this opportunity.</p> <p>(Technically, the Village Sports Field should not be a designated Green Space, as this is adequately protected by Para. 102 &amp; 103 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Under Character Areas, Tattingsstone Heath, it describes it as "The remainder of the area is made of characterful residential use buildings" with no mention of a community asset.</p>
S Hammond	Wickford Development	This policy is extremely concerning! There has been no engagement with the said Landowners whom there land would effectively be sterilised. There are a number of parcels of land which are not areas of Public

Name	Organisation	Comment
		Open Space or where public footpaths enter and pass through. There has been no declaration of interest by members of the Parish Council of land identified as green space adjacent to Chedworth Hall. This could be construed as localism in action of a person of group wishing to serve a self interest. For these local green spaces to be identified there should be evidence that the LNP Committee have cooperated and consulted with the said land owners prior to the publication of the draft local neighbourhood plan and alternatives explored. The Landowners to whom this land designation effect may wish to make further representation at the examination stage of the plan. I would likely see these land designations subject to a legal challenge by disgruntled land owners.
A Moore	-	Removal of Spaces 6 & 8 on the Plan I believe the green spaces owned by the 2 pubs in the village should be open to be used by them as they see fit. In order to keep their business viable, either pub may need to diversify and use their land.
S Drane	-	I think the pubs should be able to adapt their business to suit the changing demands of the community, and to survive as local businesses. if that means changing the use of their land that should be more easily possible than having it a protected green space.
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	I fear that a green space order would cause great problems for the playing field committee in its efforts to upgrade the pavilion changing facilities ,it has taken a ridiculous amount of time for us to obtain planning permission for us to update and replace old play equipment!
S Scott	-	with regards to the green spaces of both of the pubs in the village, it needs to be changed, both the pubs needs to be able to diversify as necessary to be able to remain as a viable local amenity as otherwise they will close!
S Sakal	Untied Pub Limited	<p>It is common knowledge that the majority of the countries public houses are in dire straits and their businesses continue to suffer during these challenging times. The intention to impose restrictions on the paddock at The White Horse can only be seen as detrimental to the survival of the pub and as an asset of the community. It is vital that all business options remain open to the owners of The White Horse and its grounds. We strongly oppose the inclusion of the paddock at The White Horse in the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and Local Green Spaces (LGS) proposal. Our reasons are as follows:</p> <p>1. Conflict with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): The restrictions in the NP must conform to the policies set out in the NPPF. We believe the restrictions are in conflict with national policies. The NPPF in the UK provides guidance for local planning authorities in making decisions regarding planning policies and applications. It emphasizes the importance of engaging with communities and stakeholders in the planning process, including landowners. There has been no direct contact and consultation with the land owners of The White Horse and if the local parish council wishes to impose restrictions on a privately owned paddock without consulting the landowners, it could potentially contravene the NPPF, particularly in</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>terms of the requirement for meaningful engagement with affected parties.</p> <p>2. Procedural Impropriety: We believe that the Tattingstone Parish Council did not follow the proper procedures in developing the NP or in consulting stakeholders, and therefore we may have grounds to challenge the validity of the restrictions. It is important to note that while the NPPF encourages consultation with landowners and stakeholders, the specific circumstances of the case would need to be considered to determine whether the council's actions are in compliance with the framework. Factors such as the nature of the restrictions being imposed, the reasons for them, and any legal obligations or planning considerations involved would all be relevant.</p> <p>3. Disproportionate Impact: We would further argue that the restrictions unfairly target our paddock. There is no clear and meaningful analysis for implementing a LGS initiative at The White Horse. (In many cases, assessing whether a policy or action has a disproportionate impact requires careful analysis of data and consideration of the broader social, economic, and historical context.)</p> <p>4. Lack of Evidence or Justification: The parish council has not provided sufficient evidence or justification for the restrictions imposed on our land. We argue that they are arbitrary and not based on sound planning principles.</p> <p>5. Human Rights Considerations: The nature of the restrictions and their impact on our property rights or other fundamental rights leave us to believe that the NP infringes upon our human rights under the European Convention on Human Rights or other relevant legislation. European human rights law, specifically the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), provides protections for property rights.</p> <p>Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the ECHR states:</p> <p>"Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law."</p> <p>This means that while we have a right to the peaceful enjoyment of our property, the parish council may interfere with this right if it's in the public interest and subject to certain conditions, such as being provided for by law and being necessary in a democratic society.</p> <p>If the parish council is seeking to place restrictions on our private land, they would need to demonstrate</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>that such restrictions serve a legitimate public interest, such as environmental protection, public safety, or urban planning. However, any restrictions imposed must also be proportionate to the aim pursued and must not disproportionately interfere with our property rights. We believe that the restrictions proposed by the parish council are disproportionate or violate our rights under the ECHR, and we may have grounds for a legal challenge to them. We may consider seeking legal advice to assess our options and determine the best course of action based on the specific circumstances of our case. Additionally, we may explore any domestic legal remedies available to us.</p> <p>6. Economic Considerations: We can demonstrate that the paddock makes a valuable contribution to the local economy and tourism industry. We therefore argue that the restrictions could have negative economic consequences for the village if developing the land for the survival of the pub is the only option.</p> <p>7. Employment Opportunities: The White Horse offers local employment opportunities both directly and indirectly. Should the pub be forced to close because of restrictions placed on it, these opportunities would be lost. The pub requires staff for various roles such as management, maintenance, and customer service. Additionally, they create opportunities for local businesses to supply goods and services. Restricting any future development of the paddock for the survival of the pub would result in job losses and reduced income for workers and suppliers in the area.</p> <p>8. Alternative Solutions: We would seek to propose alternative solutions or mitigation measures that would address any concerns raised by the council while allowing our land to remain restriction free.</p> <p>The intention of the NP, as it stands, is detrimental in providing support to The White Horse and could well signal the demise of one of the country's oldest public houses. It is imperative that the full scope of business opportunities is retained by the owners of The White Horse without local parish council restrictions being placed on it.</p>
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	Where was this in the residents survey?! Sites 1, 6 and 8 are totally inappropriate, and do not in anyway fit the NPPF criteria... have you read it? These sites are not amenity land. Who selected these sites?! There are PLENTY more appropriate ones, in particular various sections of land east of The Close... or maybe just pick someone else's garden!! The NP Survey has highlighted how incredibly valuable the villagers consider both pubs, but the NP proposes restrictions which threatens the future development of both businesses.
P Moore	moore electrical	I think both pubs should be able to use their own land how they wish to in the future and the currently designated green spaces numbered 6 and 8 should be removed from the Plan.

Name	Organisation	Comment
L Brown	-	Chedworth Place looks to be surround by green spaces. Need to be careful about naming the playing field a green space if it will make it more difficult to obtain planning permission to improve the changing facilities
R Sharp	-	The comments above should have been written here, I guess. Please read 10 above – thanks
M Alston	-	It is stated that the proposed local green spaces meet the criteria set out in paragraph 102 of the NPPF, but from my reading this does not appear to be the case. With the exception of LGS 7, the allotments, the other sites should be removed from the proposed designations.
J Sanderson	-	this neighbourhood plan seems overly complex, bureaucratic and restrictive. Current planning restrictions can suffice without adding unnecessary levels of bureaucracy and possibility of negative unintended consequences.
J Neill	-	I absolutely disagree with the fact that you can decide on what green spaces are in relation to The Wheatsheaf in particular. This land is not ours (as in the village) and I am really quite enraged that you find it in your 'remit' to designate the land a green space. I wonder if you owned the land you would act accordingly - of course you would not.
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	As 10: reassess with MUCH greater involvement and talking to those affected by it. Almost added by stealth, certainly misrepresented
S Paul		It has recently come to my attention that Tattingsstone Parish Council has undertaken a report on Local Green Space Assessment. Within your plan you have identified, Allotments Tattingsstone White Horse, I make it very clear that this land, The Allotments, is owned by me and at no time have I consented to the said land to be included within your Report/Plan. Furthermore I find the Parish's failure to even make contact with myself most unprofessional and indeed not very neighbourly. If at some point the Parish Council has the decency to make contact I will only respond with professional advice, who's cost I will expect the Parish Council to cover.
	R Chadburn	I suggest that the wood surrounding Southfield in Church Road should be considered for inclusion in the list of Green Spaces in the Tattingsstone Neighbourhood Plan. It lies close to the centre of the village; it is a tranquil environment; it offers an area for biodiversity - including owls, woodpeckers and nightingales. It in not large, being some 1.5 acres. It also provides a green break in the built environment of that section of Church Road. I also understand that, during the 1970/80s, the then Parish Council decided that it was an important feature of Tattingsstone insofar as they saw fit to place TPOs on all of the mature trees therein.
	Anglian Water	This policy designates 8no. areas of Local Green Spaces (LGS) within the neighbourhood plan area – however, there is no specific policy test in relation to development or land use proposals. It is noted that

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>the supporting text states that the development is restricted to that which must be demonstrated as being essential for the site, in line with the 2024 version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). For the avoidance of doubt, it should be made more explicit within the policy that managing development within a LGS should be consistent with national policy for Green Belts as set out in paragraphs 104 – 107 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the inclusion in the supporting text that permitted development rights, including the operational requirements of infrastructure providers, are not affected by this designation is welcomed. Anglian Water may have network assets that intersect with these areas, and we do not consider that the policy should prevent any operational development that may be needed to manage, maintain or repair our assets.</p>
	Suffolk County Council	<p>SCC welcomes the designation of the eight Local Green Spaces, shown on Map 9 and the Policies Map, and the reference to the NPPF (this should read paragraph 106 as the new version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published on 19 December 2023.) – as this supports the ongoing work to make Suffolk the Greenest County.</p> <p>The Local Green Space Assessment is presented as supporting document on the village website, providing clear evidence through maps and tabular description, but no photos. The description do provide sizes of the proposed LGS.</p> <p>All sites proposed for LGS designation appear to fulfil the NPPF criteria.</p>
	Babergh District Council	<p>TATT 7 identifies 8 Local Green Spaces (LGS). Many are in private ownership. While privately owned land can be allocated as a LGS, there is an expectation that all reasonable efforts will have been made to contact the landowner(s) to bring the proposed allocation to their attention. During this R14 consultation exercise, we were contacted directly by one private landowner who voiced concerns that this was not the case and that some of the information provided in the LGS Appraisal was also inaccurate. The Parish Council should be mindful of any LGS comments submitted part of this consultation and we also remind them that a LGS should also be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>For LGS5, you should consider removing the hard tennis court area. Similar instructions have been applied to other neighbourhood plans.</p>



Name	Organisation	Comment
<b>Chapter 7 – Natural Environment</b>		
B Tilley	-	VERY important we do not loose existing trees and hedgerows, habitats for insects, birds and animals. We do have a variety of birds and insects which are rare, many species declining due to loss of habitat, nightingales being one , which we would not want to loose and is on the endangered list.
C Tilley	-	Important to protect Local Green Spaces from future development. Hedges and trees must be preserved and added to...Tattingstone is home to various birds, animals and insects that are becoming rare, so must be preserved for future generations.
D Connolly	-	This should read "If Yes, ....."
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	It looks as if Chedworth Place are surrounding themselves with green spaces for self interest!
S Sakal	Untied Pub Limited	N/A
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	7.10. Not sure how much help you'll receive from land owners, after trying to misappropriate their land.
	Suffolk Wildlife Trust 2	<p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust are happy to see that the plan references Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and deciduous woodland (a Priority Habitat). Within Section 7.13 the plan should include reference to County Wildlife Sites (CWSs); Paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that to protect biodiversity, plans should, "Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity [such as CWSs]; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation."</p> <p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust therefore suggest that reference to the CWSs in the parish is made alongside inclusion of these within Map 8. The Parish CWSs are Woodley Wood, Great Birch Wood, Buxton Wood, Buxton Wood Meadow, and Alton Water. Further detail on these, including their location, can be obtained from Suffolk Biodiversity Information Service</p> <p>A number of priority habitats also occur within the parish, including deciduous woodland, good quality semi-improved grassland, lowland dry acid grassland, and wood-pasture and parkland. Hedgerows meeting criteria for priority habitat are also present within the parish. These are shown clearly within Map 8</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>of the draft plan, and alongside the CWSs and nearby SSSIs offer an insight into how ecological networks of wildlife corridors and stepping stone habitat could be created.</p> <p>We are happy to see reference to the requirement to, “promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity” detailed within the NPPF.</p> <p>Figure 1, the Mitigation Hierarchy is well referenced, however omits the requirement to enhance. This is a key step in the process, with strong links to delivering net gains and promoting species recovery through improved and enhanced ecological networks. Enhancement is a key part of Biodiversity Net Gain but can also be delivered through species specific enhancements such as bird and bat boxes. These are separate to Biodiversity Net Gain but still a requirement.</p> <p>We also note the reference to measurable net gains, delivered as part of the Environment Act 2021. The plan makes reference to the statutory minimum of 10%. Suffolk Wildlife Trust highlight that it is important to remember that DEFRA’s own impact assessment stated that, “In simple terms, [10%] is the lowest level of net gain that [DEFRA] could confidently expect to deliver genuine net gain, or at least no net loss, of biodiversity and thereby meet its policy objectives.”</p>
	Babergh District Council	<p>Para 7.2 After ‘ ... Landscape Appraisal of the Parish’ suggest adding ‘(Alison Farmer Associates, March 2023)’ to both name the author and provide a date context. The latter is particularly relevant given that within Alison’s report, the local plan context chapter is now out of date.</p> <p>Para 7.13 Our Biodiversity Officer has commented that while mention is made of Great Birch Wood SSSI on the northern border of the parish [by this, do you mean Freston &amp; Cutler’s Woods with Holbrook Park SSSI?], no mention is made of County Wildlife Sites (CWS) within the parish. The entire area around Alton Water is designated as a CWS and some of the six or so other CWS’s within or partially within the parish match the priority habitat areas shown in Map 8. We also appreciate that, while accessing information on CWS’s is less than straightforward, there is a CWS map available via the Suffolk Biological Information Service website. See: <a href="https://www.suffolkbis.org.uk/sites/default/files/images/other/PS2_0.jpeg">https://www.suffolkbis.org.uk/sites/default/files/images/other/PS2_0.jpeg</a></p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>Map 8 We suggest a rethink about the colour palette being used on Map 8 to make it easier to work out what is what, especially given the shading used over the adjacent parishes.</p> <p>Figure 1 Our Biodiversity Officer has recommended that the word 'evade' is replaced with the word 'avoid' in the first box to ensure clarity. '<u>Avoid</u> or reduce biodiversity impacts through site selection and layout'</p>

### Policy TATT 8 - Design Considerations

S Hammond	Wickford Development	I would wish to see a policy that does not preclude aspirational design not seen within the local vernacular. The local vernacular is disparate and the heritage listings of any buildings will protect those buildings from less than substantial material harm being caused to the setting of those buildings. The emphasis of building design should be on quality and the aspiration of building net carbon neutral homes or at least to The Future Homes standard 2025.
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	Smaller properties
	Anglian Water	<p>As a region identified as seriously water stressed, we encourage plans to include measures to improve water efficiency of new development through water efficient fixtures and fittings, including through rainwater/storm water harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling.</p> <p>Our revised draft water resources management plan (WRMP) for 2025-2050 identifies key challenges of population growth, climate change, and the need to protect sensitive environments by reducing abstraction. Managing the demand for water is therefore an important aspect of maintaining future supplies.</p> <p>The Defra Integrated Plan for Water supports the need to improve water efficiency and the Government's Environment Improvement Plan sets ten actions in the Roadmap to Water Efficiency in new developments including consideration of a new standard for new homes in England of 100 litres per person per day (l/p/d) where there is a clear local need, such as in areas of serious water stress. Given the proposed</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		national approach to water efficiency, Anglian Water would encourage this standard to be included in the neighbourhood plan using a fittings-based approach.
<b>Policy TATT 9 - Non-Designated Heritage Assets</b>		
S Hammond	Wickford Development	I would hope the stakeholders affected have been engaged and evidence on this gathered.
S Turnbull	-	Very pleased to see this included. They are an important part of the village.
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	A/the Village Hall is vital to the/our community, however, the actual building in question is far from ideal, and possibly, long term needs replacing, not protecting. I assume you have made no formal contact with the owners of properties put forward as "Non-Designated Heritage Assets." Not something you can rectify/change now!
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	Listing by stealth. I assume you will need to supply evidence that these are heritage assets?
	Suffolk County Council	Overall, the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) are pleased to see that heritage has been given thought and consideration in the plan.  The NP group may wish to consider whether the information from the Suffolk Farmsteads Project would help with Policy TATT 9 in identifying non-designated heritage assets. In addition, the NP group might wish to consider the potential impacts of the conversion of historic rural buildings some of which could be non-designated heritage assets.
<b>Community Action 2 - Tattlingstone History Trail App</b>		
E West	-	Please don't spend my council tax money on this. If a local teenager wants to do it for a school project then fine and fabulous. I see no reference to this in the survey and I am not sure what it has to do with planning policy. Perhaps a more appropriate Community Action would be "clear the drainage ditches of brambles" (TATT 10) or "encourage people to turn off their outside lights when they go to bed" (TATT 11).
M Alston	-	I support the development of a history trail, but creating an app seems like a gimmick and a potentially costly one. A simple web site could convey the same information.
R Hobson	-	Not too sure about this being a good investment
	Anglian Water	We note that under Community Action 2 Tattlingstone History Trail App, there is an intention of the Parish Council to work with others, including Anglian Water, to create a mobile phone app for the Tattlingstone

Name	Organisation	Comment
		History Trail. It is suggested that contact is made with the Alton Park team regarding further discussions on this initiative
<b>Community Action 3 - Reducing Overhead Wires</b>		
E West	-	Not in favour of the wires, but sometimes burying them underground causes huge environmental damage. If additional reference was made in the document to considering this then I would support it.
Anonymous	-	Realistically, undergrounding of overhead lines is not likely to be undertaken by the relevant utilities without financial assistance. - which is not available at present.
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	(Providing common sense prevails.)
<b>Policy TATT 10 - Flooding and Sustainable Drainage</b>		
M Slattery	-	Reference to Alton Water
	Anglian Water	<p>It is welcomed that Policy TATT 10 seeks to ensure new development incorporates sustainable drainage schemes (SuDS), providing for on-site drainage and water resources to be managed to avoid surface water and fluvial flooding issues. These can provide multi-functional benefits when designed to be integral to green/ blue infrastructure provision. SuDS also provide an opportunity for rainwater harvesting and reuse to improve the water efficiency of new developments. This can be delivered for individual dwellings or on a community scale for larger developments.</p> <p>It is the Government's intention to implement Schedule Three of The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to make SuDS mandatory in all new developments in England in 2024. However, we welcome this policy to ensure SuDS are incorporated in new developments, until the Schedule is formally implemented and the necessary measures are in place.</p> <p>As a minor point, Policy BRET 10 should take account of the different types of development and not only scale when referring to proposals being required to submit such schemes. An amendment to the policy should be made to reflect this.</p>
	Environment Agency	Based on a review of environmental constraints for which we are a statutory consultee, we find that there are areas of fluvial flood risk and watercourses within the neighbourhood plan area. In particular, we note that the boundary does extend into areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 though this is largely confined to the Alton Reservoir there is a section along the Welsh.

Name	Organisation	Comment
		On the basis that future development is steered away from the sensitive aspects of the environment highlighted, we do not consider there to be potential significant environmental effects relating to these environmental constraints. Nevertheless, we recommend the inclusion of relevant policies to cover the management of flood risk. Allocation of any sites and any windfall development delivered through the Plan period should follow the sequential approach. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 167 sets this out.
	Suffolk County Council	<p>SCC, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, has the responsibility for managing flood risk arising from surface water, ground water and ordinary watercourses. The Environment Agency has the responsibility for managing flood risk from main rivers and the coast.</p> <p>Policy TATT 10 – Flooding and Sustainable Drainage  No development shall be proposed in areas at risk of any form of flooding either current or future. Sustainable Drainage Proposals for all new development, will be required to submit proposals that are appropriate to the scale of the proposed development and shall demonstrate how surface water drainage and water resources will be managed so as not to cause increase flood risk elsewhere.</p>
<b>Policy TATT 11 – Dark Skies</b>		
Anonymous	-	There may have to be some compromise to allow the installation of intermittent PIR-controlled security lighting for domestic and other premises.
S Drane	-	Wholeheartedly approve if dark skies. Human bodies need natural cycles of dark and light. People who misguidedly think they are helpful by erecting streetlights on their boundaries should consider the impact of it shining into neighbours bedrooms all night.
J Clavey	-	The street lighting that we have at present near the Lemons Hill bridge is very bright and intrusive. There doesn't seem much need for lighting in this area.
	Suffolk County Council	SCC welcomes the dark skies policy
<b>Chapter 8 – Built Environment</b>		
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	8.18/8.19 I assume you have made no formal contact with the owners of properties put forward as "Non-Designated Heritage Assets." Not something you can rectify/change, irreparable damage if you ask me.

Name	Organisation	Comment
	Suffolk County Council	<p>Section 8 clearly and effectively states the importance in protecting listed buildings and buildings identified by the NP group of local heritage significance. It is good to see that Policy TATT 9 specifically covers the identified non-designated heritage assets. SCC Archaeological Service have been reviewing Farmsteads throughout Suffolk, as part of a project funded by Historic England. Entries from the project can be seen via the Suffolk Heritage Explorer.</p> <p>It is good to see that the section 8.13 highlights the need for developments to take heritage assets into consideration and that section 8.16 points out the need for heritage statements to be submitted with planning proposals. We would suggest that the subtitle of Built Heritage on p25 be changed to Historic Environment as this more suitably covers both built and below-ground heritage. In addition, this section would benefit from adding a statement regarding below-ground heritage assets. I would encourage the addition of a note within this section along the lines of:  <i>Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) would advise early consultations of the Historic Environment Record (HER) and assessment of the archaeological potential of any potential development site at an appropriate stage in the design stage, in order that the requirements of NPPF and West Suffolk Local Plan are met. SCCAS as advisors to Babergh and Mid Suffolk Council would be happy to advise on the level of archaeological assessment and appropriate stages to be undertaken.</i></p> <p>Having something along the lines of the above would provide clarity to developers for any future development sites and. In addition to this, the plan could also highlight any level of public outreach and public engagement that might be aspired from archaeology undertaken as part of a development project, as increased public understanding of heritage sites is an aspiration of the NPPF.</p>
	Babergh District Council	<p>Para 8.2 properly introduces the AECOM prepared Design Guidelines &amp; Codes document. As an important part of the NPs evidence base it is disappointing to see that nobody saw the very specific reference to Colchester Councils draft Local Plan on page 6. When AECOM do update the Design Guide, they should also ensure that any NPPF references are also updated.</p> <p>Para 8.3  The Design Guide identifies four Character Areas, the Village, the White Horse, the Heath, and the Wonder. Para 8.3 says that there are 'three character areas'. Assuming that 'the Wonder' will remain in the Design Guidelines, you should consider adding a footnote to explain that there is a fourth character area (the Wonder) that is not specifically covered in this chapter (Chapter 8).</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>Para 8.18 / NdHA Assessment The inclusion of a photograph(s) of each of the NdHAs in the Assessment would be a helpful visual addition, and act as useful 'point in time' reference.</p> <p>Para 8.25 Grammar. The word 'proposal' is used twice in the second sentence. Could one of these be replaced with 'scheme' (or similar) to avoid repetition?</p>

### Community Action 4 - Community Facilities

Anonymous	-	There have been two attempts to bring back a community shop to Tattingstone, both of which were frustrated for various reasons. Other neighbouring villages have been successful. We have missed opportunities and it is extremely unlikely that a village shop will ever return to our village.
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	village shop is a pipe dream not viable . We had a shop in the best possible location right opposite the village school which was also a public house and a post office. The shop failed though lack of support. The changing facilities upgrade and the improved play equipment is already an on going project.
L Brown	-	The previous village shop/post office/public house failed through lack of support so pointless as neighboring village shops are struggling
R Hobson	-	We seem incapable of providing a community shop which I favour and cafe in this village, I am not sure it is worth pursuing further. The last team effort failed after a concerted effort by some unhappy individuals which drove a big wedge through this community. We have some good farm shops.

### Chapter 9 – Services and Facilities

E West	-	9.8 I wonder if it would be sensible to stop talking about "a shop" and/or "a cafe" and to look at what it is people actually want to do and will "pay" for. Some people see these as a means of socialising and others see it as a means of mitigating the loss of a viable bus service to the existing shops. Clearly neither a shop nor a cafe is a viable commercial proposition for a village of our size with little passing trade and even if the service was 100% subsidised by the Parish Council and staffed by volunteers it still has a "cost" to the community, as well as a potential benefit.
B Tilley	-	Recreation ground, children's play area needs attention, broken equipment needs replacing.



Name	Organisation	Comment
Anonymous	-	Outdoor gym to cater for a wider age range of participants. Playing field buildings to become more multifunctional. Introduction of a playing field car park.
K Cook	-	The heart of local villages are their shops/cafes; we should have these in Tattingstone too. The play area and field should be improved with new facilities and trees.
S Turnbull	-	Bus times don't facilitate my child going to college. It must be impossible for those who work.
M Paxman	-	The Church and School will not survive without sensible housing policies where we can grow the village in a sustainable way. We have already lost the local bus service what will be next.
J Marcus	-	The Community Shop project should be revived - if not in the church (though that was very viable) then a location should be made available for it.
C Clavey	-	It is a pity that the community shop project was derailed. A small shop/cafe in the village would be useful.
E Bradley	-	Would be great to see improved playground facilities at the recreation ground- the swings could definitely do with updating. Would be great to get a community shop - I know the church was being looked at - think some buildings are now needed to serve multiple purposes.
J Clavey	-	I would particularly like to see the community shop/cafe come into being. We need more facilities that do not entail driving and allow people to shop locally and get out to socialise. It makes sense for the Church to be put to much wider use.
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	9.5 bullet points are not a correct descriptive of what the areas proposed as green space ( both pubs PRIVATE LAND) actually are. By stopping any potential business growth or re- development on these areas, you are putting the future of these important services ( as per 9.2 + 9.3) at risk.
M Dan	-	We need some sort of public transport even if 2/3 times a week
	Babergh District Council	Para 9.18 Formatting. Check for a carriage return at the end of the first sentence.
<b>Policy TATT 12 - Public Rights of Way</b>		
J Clavey	-	Whilst footpaths are plentiful, it seems that sections of bridle paths are quite disjointed, not going anywhere or sometimes just ending at a section of busy road so not of any great use for horse riding.
	Suffolk County Council	Policy TATT 12 is welcomed although it potentially conflates two aspects: improving the Public Rights of Way (PROW) network; and creating biodiversity corridors.

Name	Organisation	Comment
		Please note that the primary function of the PROW network is to provide opportunities to access the countryside and the policy should focus on improvements that enable easier access into that countryside for all. While improvements to the PROW network can also provide benefits to wildlife and biodiversity, improvements to the network should not be conditional on biodiversity. Indeed, in the case of hedgerow planting, these can be detrimental to the PROW network if they create corridors where the vegetation overshadows the path, restricting air movement and direct sunlight on the path, and thereby preventing the path from drying out after inclement weather which can discourage, or even prevent, year-round use.
<b>Community Action 5 - Public Rights of Way Warden</b>		
E West	-	10.5 is this person to be from Tattingstone? I think it would be too difficult for one person who lives in the village to put themselves potentially at odds with landowners, particularly if they're not earning money from the work. In most cases I expect neglected footpaths etc are just because the landowner has too many other things to do rather than because they actually want to exclude people from their land - though some previous hand-made signs have been rather aggressive in tone. Perhaps it would be better to encourage people who already walk or ride the routes to report issues to the Parish Council and make it easy for them to do so. The landowners should be able to do likewise (people cycling on footpaths, ignoring requests to keep dogs on leads, etc). The PC can then decide on appropriate action, which may include "reporting" to Suffolk CC or may include a more local action, eg getting some volunteers to mend a stile or hack back the nettles. We need to avoid this waiting for PC meetings though otherwise it would be three months before anything is done.
S Hammond	Wickford Development	Completely unnecessary. Public Rights of Way are protected and maintained usually by the Highway Authority or Local Authority. Allow the bodies with the enforcement powers to manage. There are reporting mechanisms to assist this enforcement. Members of the public should report issues with PROW's using these online tools.
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	Unnecessary as already covered by highways
L Brown	-	Already protected by the Highway why do we need another person
R Hobson	-	Good idea
	Suffolk County Council	Community Action 5 – Public Rights of Way warden is also very welcome and SCC's PRoW team would be very happy to support this action with advice, training and assistance.

Name	Organisation	Comment
	Babergh District Council	Layout: Consider reorganising this page so that Community Action 5 appears before the Parking Provision sub-heading.
<b>Policy TATT 13 – Parking Standards</b>		
S Hammond	Wickford Development	There should also be a visitor parking requirement for new developments to avoid on street parking which is becoming problematic in the village. Suffolk Highways provides guidance on this. <a href="https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/asset-library/Suffolk-Guidance-for-Parking-v5.1.pdf">https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/asset-library/Suffolk-Guidance-for-Parking-v5.1.pdf</a> .
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	One of the biggest problems we have is that Green Lane was never built for cars it was a Lane like Back Lane which is basically one vehicle wide .
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	Sorry, last sentence regarding new builds having an electrical charging point, I disagree with this, I believe we are a long way off regarding whether Electric Vehicles are really "the way to go".
J Clavey	-	New developments should provide parking spaces with a porous surface.
M Alston	-	While I am in favour of EV charging points, requiring one per parking space instead of one per dwelling seems like overkill. I would suggest one per dwelling.
	Anglian Water	Anglian Water recognises the need to manage parking arrangements within Tattingstone. We recommend that off-street parking encourages permeable surfaces and green infrastructure to minimise surface water run-off from the introduction of hard-standing areas, including a cross reference to those other policies covering surface water run-off e.g., Policies TATT 8 and 10.
	Suffolk County Council	Paragraphs 10.9 and 10.11 refer to the Suffolk County Council Parking Guidance (2019) which is welcomed, however this should be the 2023 version.
	Babergh District Council	Policy TATT 13 is similar in many ways to Policy WTD 14 in the adopted Wherstead NP. While the settlement pattern in Tattingstone may not readily lend itself to proposals where 'parking court or on-street parking' is a practical or viable option, the Parish Council should consider including text similar to the last paragraph in Wherstead Policy WTD 14 to cover off such an eventuality.
<b>Community Action 6 - Electric Vehicle Charging Points</b>		
E West	-	Though I noticed that the survey showed people were not interested in this. Perhaps they should be local chargers for local people...otherwise won't the village hall car park fill up with electric cars avoiding the Alton Water parking charges?
S Gipps	-	I dislike the idea of charging points for electric cars in public places.

Name	Organisation	Comment
S Hammond	Wickford Development	The Parish needs to engage with the DNO - District Network Operator (UK Power Networks). There are a few serious concerns regarding the potential of 22kW fast charging stations. Putting this simplistically, due to load and prospective fault current it would mean that each road or location may require a small substation. It's critical that feasibility studies consult with the DNO at the earliest stage. Consideration also needs to be given to those vehicle owners visiting the Parish. This may be an opportunity to generate funds for the Parish Council to enable future reinvestment on community infrastructure. The current draft neighbourhood plan has not explored this opportunity.
M Paxman	-	it is not up to local ratepayers to provide such facilities when we all have to buy them for our own use. I can see no benefit to residents.
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	Village Hall committee are looking to install Two electric car parking charging points on Hall car park!
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	Think it's too early to be investing/spending tax-payers money on charging points, rather unsure of the long term future of Electric Vehicles
L Brown	-	The village hall committee are already looking into installing charging points.
R Hobson	-	Great idea
	Suffolk County Council	10-13 – Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2023 and Building Regs Part S include guidance and requirements for electric vehicle charging provision for new and improved developments.

## Community Action 7 - Cycling Provision

S Hammond	Wickford Development	Again the policy is ambiguous and lacks research. A cycle path into Ipswich? Policies to be adopted need to be evidence based and deliverable.
D Brown	Village Hall and Playing Field Chairman	On the narrow road's around the peninsular it is almost impossible to give a cyclist the required amount of overtaking room unless they pull over.
L Brown	-	The roads are not wide enough to accommodate cycle lanes and the road is unsafe for cyclists with the heavy traffic
M Slattery	-	Issue of safe routes especially via A137 needs expanding
R Hobson	-	Another great idea
	Suffolk County Council	10.14 – Fully support the objectives and recommends this references DfT's LTN1/20 (Cycle Infrastructure Design) with regard to good design. We also recommend that it references Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2023 with regard to secure cycle storage.

Name	Organisation	Comment
	Babergh District Council	<p>Although our 'Local Cycling &amp; Walking Infrastructure Plan' (LCWIP) does not identify any schemes/projects within Tattingstone, it does aspire to improving cycling connectivity between the peninsula as a whole and Ipswich. This aligns with Community Action 7. [See: <a href="https://www.babergh.gov.uk/sustainable-travel">https://www.babergh.gov.uk/sustainable-travel</a>] To strengthen the advocacy of this, we suggest amending para 10.14 as follows:</p> <p>'Alton Water and the lanes and bridleways around the Parish are regularly used for recreational cycling. In addition, the Neighbourhood Plan Survey identified some support for safer cycle routes towards Ipswich. <u>This ambition is also captured within Babergh District Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, reflected by suggested schemes and routes to improve cycling connectivity on the whole of the Shotley Peninsula and into Ipswich.</u> <del>but</del> This would be a matter for the County Council to implement. The Parish Council can play a role in liaising with landowners and the County Council to improve provision.'</p>

## Policies Map and Inset Maps

E West	-	The Heath / Map 4 and my query about the impact on my residential amenity - see above. Why does The Heath not have any Visually Sensitive Landscape? Are we the scruffy end of Tattingstone? Or is it just we don't have enough pretty trees? It's not our fault we're flat.
D Connolly	-	See attached hard copy, and comments above. The settlement boundaries need discussion and amendment.
S Hammond	Wickford Development	There are too many fundamental issues that need addressing in the draft neighbourhood plan for this to go to the examination stage.
A Moore	-	Removal of 6 & 8 green spaces
S Sakal	Untied Pub Limited	See comments on LGS's.
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	The proposed Settlement Boundaries need totally readdressing; Existing properties should surely be included in boundaries, eg. Pond Hall Farm (and the relating property further down the bridal way), the terrace houses behind the White Horse & properties at the South end of The Heath. Splitting The Heath in two is totally ridiculous! Settlement boundary is to "formally define where the built up area ends" Including half of someone's property and not the other is also unfathomable, i.e. The Wheatsheaf and Pear Trees (both Church Rd.) Strongly disagree with Local Green Space Allocation, especially 1,6&8, aka 1 5&7?! On the Inset maps; the Local Green Space allocated numbers are different to those on the Local Green Space Map 9, the view points on these maps are also not entirely consistent with those on Map 7.
J Clavey	-	It seems an omission that there are no visually sensitive areas on the north bank of Alton Water or from the fields in that area.

Name	Organisation	Comment
M Alston	-	Please see other responses above.
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	Settlement boundaries inadequate. Green spaces need reassessment with appropriate consultation and discussion with those affected.
	Babergh District Council	On the White Horse Inset Map (page 36) and the Heath Inset Map (page 37) the LGS numbering does not match Map 9.
<b>Appendices</b>		
D Hawes	-	Typo error in Appendix 2. Sanford should read Samford.
	Suffolk County Council	Sections 1 and 2: New development road layouts should generally accord with Suffolk Design: Streets Guide.  Section 10: Recommend referencing Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2023 regarding vehicle parking and manoeuvring plus secure cycle storage provision.
	Babergh District Council	Appendix 2 To future proof Appendix 2, and in common with instructions given by Examiners on other neighbourhood plans, we recommend that you include the following sentence (or similar): 'Up to date information on listed buildings and other heritage assets should be sought from Historic England or another reliable source.' This could appear as a standalone sentence or be added on to one of the two existing paragraphs.
<b>General comments</b>		
S Harley	Suffolk county council	I applaud the work that has been done to create this excellent plan
E West	-	Thank you to everyone who has put work into it - I'm sorry I wasn't in a position to help when the working group was set up.
-	Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service	Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service has considered the plan and are of the opinion that, given the level of growth proposed, we do not envisage additional service provision will need to be made in order to mitigate the impact. However, this will be reconsidered if service conditions change.  As always, SFRS would encourage the provision of automated fire suppression sprinkler systems in any new development as it not only affords enhanced life and property protection but if incorporated into the design/build stage it is extremely cost effective and efficient.

Name	Organisation	Comment
		SFRS will not have any objection with regard access, as long as access is in accordance with building regulation guidance. We will of course wish to have included adequate water supplies for firefighting, specific information as to the number and location can be obtained from our water officer via the normal consultation process.
B Tilley	-	Think it is well thought out and I believe covers just about anything local residents would require in this amazing village.
D Connolly	-	There needs to be more consultation on two key areas, Settlement Boundaries and Designated Green Spaces. There should then be a second draft produced for further comment.
S Gipps	-	The settlement boundary goes through my back garden, please amend this to incorporate the whole of my property
S Hammond	Wickford Development	The current draft of the Local Neighbourhood Plan does not the basic conditions as stated in Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The consultation of the community of Tattlingstone has not been extensive enough to enable this plan to have any merit to advance to the next stage, alternatives have not been evidenced on several issues. I am personally disappointed that the Parish have not been advised of elementary principles of development control to be able to produce a Local Neighbourhood plan that benefits the community and that is deliverable. I am also of the opinion that contained within the draft polices self interests have been covertly proposed. We can do much better than this! The LNP Committee needs to step back from the current proposal and seek professional advice as to how the soundness of the LNP can be improved. This is an opportunity to do this.
S Drane	-	<p>There's no mention of public transport, our 16-18 year olds have to attend compulsory education but no public transport is available to get them to our nearest post 16 education provider (or any other) in time for lessons to start. Parents have to change jobs/working hours in order to drive them. There are very few job opportunities for young people within safe walking or cycling distance so earning the considerable cost of learning to drive, buy and insure a car is almost impossible. If education is compulsory shouldn't transport to it also be?</p> <p>Luckily a neighbour told me about this plan and the opportunity to be involved otherwise I wouldn't have known anything about it. It seems like a lot of effort and work has gone into it so it's a shame for it to be hidden from residents through lack of publicity and communication. How effective can asking for comment and feedback be if no one knows this even exists?</p> <p>I haven't had time to give feedback on everything as I've found out quite late.</p> <p>Thank you for your efforts to maintain and improve our lovely village</p>
S Turnbull	-	It's extremely thorough and well thought out. I think the balance of progressive measures and preservation is just about right.
M Paxman	-	Please read all my previous comments.

Name	Organisation	Comment
C Clavey	-	An excellent plan, professionally presented. Thanks to all involved.
S Sakal	Untied Pub Limited	The land owners do not live in Tattingstone. Discussion with land owners of the White Horse is desirable. The NP came to the attention of the land owners via a third party by chance.
A Durance	Wheatsheaf	<p>The Designated Open Green Spaces; these need reviewing, who selected these? Have they ever been to Tattingstone? There are many phrases from various government documents that need pulling out here "It is recognised that the designation of Local Green Spaces should not be used simply to block development."</p> <p>"Demonstrably special".</p> <p>"particular local significance, beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife;"</p> <p>...to name but a few.</p> <p>The inconsistencies regarding selection are ridiculous, there are some fantastic parcels of land that if really necessary could have been put forward that have been omitted, two that come to mind are; The land East of The Close, this has a footpath going right through it, and not quite so ideal but still more sensible an option than the land belonging to the Wheatsheaf &amp; the White Horse Inn, the land just south of Lemons Hill Bridge (the West side of the road), adjacent to what's know as the Paupers Graveyard.</p> <p>The Local Green Spaces numbered 1, 6 &amp; 8 I feel are exceptionally inappropriate (4&amp;5 are areas that obviously need protecting, however, I thought these already would be, areas 2 and 3 I know very little about, but, would be interested to know how the owners of these areas feel... or do they not know?!!)</p> <p>Area 1 is in essence, the front garden of those living at Chedworth Place, it is not in anyway considered land belonging to the local community, (neither demonstrably special, with no local or historic significance, and no richness in wildlife.)</p> <p>Area's 6 &amp; 8, land belonging to the White Horse Inn, and land belonging to the Wheatsheaf are; not land belonging to the local community, are not demonstrably special, not pretty or tranquil, they have no local or historic significance, and no richness in wildlife. The designation of these two areas potentially threatens the future growth &amp; development of these two businesses. Your very own NP questionnaire, completed by the residents of Tattingstone recognised both pubs as valuable assets to the Parish. Over 80% of respondents referred to both pubs as being highly valued or at least valued... over 80%! Yet the Neighbourhood Plan is then threatening the future of both businesses! This is not acceptable, in fact it is disgraceful, an embarrassment, and I would say brings into question the validity of this Neighbourhood Plan. The Licensing &amp; Hospitality Trade is currently under severe pressure to continue, thousands of pubs closing every year, and here you are, ready with nail &amp; hammer to drive into the coffins of what have been described as a highly valuable assets to your community.</p>



Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>I don't feel you can be sneaking in new settlement boundaries in the process of the NP, these need looking at in far more detail, but while I'm here, these suggestions are also ridiculous, (you may as well go back to earlier comments.)</p> <p>You have made no formal contact with landowners and property owners directly affected by your propositions (of Green Spaces &amp; Non-Designated Assets).</p> <p>Regarding The Wheatsheaf and the White Horse Inn, if the message is not yet clear, I give you;</p> <p>Human Rights Considerations: The nature of the restrictions and their impact on the property rights or other fundamental rights leave us to believe that the NP infringes upon the human rights under the European Convention on Human Rights or other relevant legislation. European human rights law, specifically the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), provides protections for property rights.</p> <p>Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the ECHR states:</p> <p>"Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.</p> <p>No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law."</p> <p>Do you really not want at least the option to knock down and replace the Village Hall with a bigger, better, shinier option in the future?</p> <p>What about new changing rooms or pavilion on the playing field? surely your various magic designations would hinder either of these future positive developments.</p> <p>The NP has proposed keeping all three sections of the village separate, despite not one person in the survey suggesting this, in fact the only feedback was in suggesting the opposite... read your survey results... I have.</p> <p>I have a feeling there was much more, but this has exhausted me of all will remaining.</p>
L Brown	-	Several items need to be looked at far more closely

Name	Organisation	Comment
C Orr	Dentist	Thank you to all concerned for all the work on our behalf.
M Slattery	-	Not at this point. Preservation of existing character and ambiance of village is key
M Alston	-	As a part-owner of the White Horse, I was very surprised that we received no notification about the significant proposals involving the pub and the field adjoining it. I attended a parish council meeting where councilors were told that interested parties would be contacted, but we have had no formal or informal notice at all and I write this at 8:45pm on the final day of the consultation period.
J Sanderson	-	as stated earlier the neighbourhood plan seems overly complex, bureaucratic and restrictive. Surely current planning restrictions can suffice without adding unnecessary levels of bureaucracy and possibility of negative unintended consequences.
K Jackson	The Wheatsheaf	Start again, with adequate involvement of those affected by this plan.
A Abbott	-	I do not agree with parish neighbourhood plan. On garden land to rear of no.4 Heath Tattingstone IP1 2LX, this land has never had an agricultural holding number. When a valuation was done for probate 2010. Land Registry HMRC would not accept a valuation as agricultural as they regarded it as garden land. Speaking with Andrea Mendel at the Open Event I was assured by herself Parish Council had no input to Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore I hope to have backing of Parish Council to have this included to Neighbourhood Plan. I include map with highlighted area shown
	Suffolk Wildlife Trust 1	<p>Thank you for consulting Suffolk Wildlife Trust regarding the Tattingstone NP. Engaging with communities is a key part of Suffolk Wildlife Trust's work, and here in the Planning and Advocacy Team, we are particularly keen to engage in Neighbourhood Plans. Previously we have done this through standard consultation, as well as community workshops designed for parishes in the early stages of plan development, and biodiversity audits undertaken via our commercial arm, 'Wilder Ecology'.</p> <p>We believe that Neighbourhood Plans have great potential to push for greater biodiversity delivery, for instance suggesting that Biodiversity Net Gain could deliver beyond the statutory level of 10%. Therefore, I wanted to reach out to you and ask whether the Parish would be interested in hearing more about this, and whether there could be scope to change Policy TATT 6 to deliver more for nature?</p> <p>Tattingstone has fantastic and diverse wildlife habitats, which could be further enhanced and deliver even more for nature. If there is interest, I'd be happy to supply some more information or talk to Parish Council about this. In addition, Suffolk Wildlife Trust will of course provide comment on the Regulation 14 consultation, showing our support for the Tattingstone NP alongside evidence of where we believe the plan could deliver even more to bring nature back.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
	Suffolk Wildlife Trust 2	Thank you for sending us details of the Tattingstone Neighbourhood Development Plan. We are pleased to see that the draft Tattingstone Neighbourhood Plan recognises the importance of biodiversity and greenspaces and proposes measures to protect and enhance these within Policy TATT6. We believe that these policies could be strengthened to offer an even greater benefit to biodiversity. Please see our comments below: [attributed to relevant policies and sections above]
	Anglian Water	<p>Thank you for inviting comments on the Tattingstone Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission (Reg 14) consultation. Anglian Water is the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for the neighbourhood plan area and is identified as a consultation body under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Anglian Water wants to proactively engage with the neighbourhood plan process to ensure the plan delivers sustainable development for residents and visitors to the area, and in doing so protect the environment and water resources.</p> <p>It is noted that the draft neighbourhood plan does not allocate any new sites for housing or other commercial development. The following comments and observations are made in relation to ensuring the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to sustainable development and has regard to assets owned and managed by Anglian Water.</p> <p>Anglian Water has produced specific guidance note on the preparation of NPs found using this link under our Strategic Growth and Infrastructure webpage - Strategic Growth and Infrastructure (<a href="http://anglianwater.co.uk">anglianwater.co.uk</a>). The guidance also has sign posting/ links to obtaining information on relevant assets and infrastructure in map form, where relevant.</p> <p><b>Alton Water</b></p> <p>Anglian Water is pleased to note the acknowledgement in the neighbourhood plan of the contribution that Alton Water makes in terms of water supply and as an important landscape and recreation area. Our reservoirs are vital infrastructure, providing our 4.3 million customers with high quality drinking water, but they're also valued open spaces supporting health and wellbeing within the local communities. Alton Water has been supplying vital water resources to a large part of Suffolk for almost 50 years and the water treatment works, built in 1987, (outside the neighbourhood plan area) treats around 10 million gallons of water a day.</p> <p>The reservoir has continued to achieve a Green Flag Award, and for the first time in 2022, the site has been awarded the Green Heritage Site Accreditation, supported by Historic England, and is the only site in</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>Suffolk that has achieved this coveted status. The Green Flag scheme is recognition of high standards of management for customers and the environment. We welcome the recognition in the draft neighbourhood plan that Alton Water provides a major regional leisure facility that attracts many visitors to pursue a range of activities on our site as well as being the destination for major events. It also hosts a park run for every Saturday morning.</p> <p>Overall, we are supportive of the policy ambitions within the neighbourhood plan, subject to the proposed amendments. We hope that the information provided is helpful to the future iteration of the plan and wish you every success in taking this forward to the next stage. We look forward to being consulted on the submission version in due course.</p>
	Environment Agency	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the pre-submission plan for the Tattingstone Neighbourhood Plan. For the purposes of neighbourhood planning, we have assessed those authorities who have “up to date” local plans (plans adopted within the previous 5 years) as being of lower risk, and those authorities who have older plans (adopted more than 5 years ago) as being at greater risk. We aim to reduce flood risk and protect and enhance the water environment, and with consideration to the key environmental constraints within our remit, we have then tailored our approach to reviewing each neighbourhood plan accordingly.</p> <p>A key principle of the planning system is to promote sustainable development. Sustainable development meets our needs for housing, employment and recreation while protecting the environment. It ensures that the right development, is built in the right place at the right time. To assist in the preparation of any document towards achieving sustainable development we have identified the key environmental issues within our remit that are relevant to this area and provide guidance on any actions you need to undertake. We also provide hyperlinks to where you can obtain further information and advice to help support your neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Environmental Constraints We have identified that the Neighbourhood Plan Area will be affected by the following environmental constraints:</p> <p>Water Resources Being in one of the driest areas of the country, our environment has come under significant pressure from potable water demand. New developments should make a significant contribution towards reducing water demand and mitigate against the risk of deterioration to our rivers, groundwater and habitats from</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>groundwater abstraction. We recommend you check the capacity of available water supplies with the water company, in line with the emerging 2024 Water Resources Management Plan which is due to be published in 2023. The Local Planning Authorities Water Cycle Study and Local Plan may indicate constraints in water supply and provide recommendations for phasing of development to tie in with new alternative strategic supplies.</p> <p>New development should as a minimum meet the highest levels of water efficiency standards, as per the policies in the adopted Local Plan. In most cases development will be expected to achieve 110 litres per person per day as set out in the Building Regulations &amp;c. (Amendment) Regulations 2015. However, a higher standard of water efficiency (e.g. 85 l/p/d) should be considered, looking at all options including rainwater harvesting and greywater systems. Using the water efficiency calculator in Part G of the Building Regulations enables you to calculate the devices and fittings required to ensure a home is built to the right specifications to meet the 110 l/p/d requirement. We recommend all new non-residential development of 1000sqm gross floor area or more should meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption.</p> <p>Developments that require their own abstraction where it will exceed 20 cubic metres per day from a surface water source (river, stream) or from underground strata (via borehole or well) will require an abstraction licence under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991. There is no guarantee that a licence will be granted as this is dependent on available water resources and existing protected rights. The relevant abstraction licencing strategy for your area provides information on water availability and licencing policy at Abstraction licencing strategies (CAMS process) - GOV.UK ).</p> <p>We encourage you to seek ways in which your neighbourhood plan can improve the local environment. For your information, together with Natural England, Historic England and Forestry Commission, we have published joint guidance on neighbourhood planning, which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: How to consider the environment in Neighbourhood plans - Locality Neighbourhood Planning</p> <p>Source Protection Zones Your plan includes areas which are located on Source Protection Zones 3. These should be considered within your plan if growth or development is proposed here. The relevance of the designation and the potential implication upon development proposals should be considered with reference to our Groundwater Protection guidance: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection">https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection</a></p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
	Historic England	<p>Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment on the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Draft of this Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, in particular policies which seek to protect and promote the historic environment, but do not consider it necessary for Historic England to be involved in the detailed development of your strategy at this time. We would refer you to our advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/</a>.</p> <p>For further specific advice regarding the historic environment and how to integrate it into your neighbourhood plan, we recommend that you consult your local planning authority conservation officer, and if appropriate the Historic Environment Record at Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.</p> <p>Please do contact me, either via email or the number above, if you have any queries.</p>
	National Highways	<p>Thank you for your correspondence, received on 22 January 2024, for inviting National Highways' comments on the above.</p> <p>National Highways is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England on behalf of the Secretary of the State. In the area within and surrounding of the Neighbourhood Plan, we have responsibility for the trunk road A14.</p> <p>The area and location that are covered by this current consultation, Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft Plan, is remote from the SRN. Consequently, for the proposed draft Neighbourhood Plan, it is unlikely to have an impact on the operation of the trunk road.</p> <p>Therefore, National Highways offers No Comment.</p>
	Natural England	Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 22 January 2024.

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.</p> <p>Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species .</p> <p>Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission standing advice.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.</p> <p>Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.</p>
	Suffolk County Council	Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council (SCC) on the Pre-Submission version of the Tattingstone Neighbourhood Plan.

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>SCC is not a plan making authority, except for minerals and waste. However, it is a fundamental part of the planning system being responsible for matters including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Archaeology</li> <li>Education</li> <li>Fire and Rescue</li> <li>Flooding</li> <li>Health and Wellbeing</li> <li>Libraries</li> <li>Minerals and Waste</li> <li>Natural Environment</li> <li>Public Rights of Way</li> <li>Transport</li> </ul> <p>This response, as with all those comments which SCC makes on emerging planning policies and allocations, will focus on matters relating to those services.</p> <p>Suffolk County Council is supportive of the vision for the Parish. In this letter we aim to highlight potential issues and opportunities in the plan and are happy to discuss anything that is raised.</p> <p>Where amendments to the plan are suggested added text will be in <i>italics</i> and deleted text will be in strikethrough.</p> <p><b>Education</b></p> <p>SCC, as the Education Authority, has the responsibility for ensuring there is sufficient provision of school places for children to be educated in the area local to them. This is achieved by accounting for existing demand and new developments. SCC, therefore, produces and annually updates a five-year forecast on school capacity. The forecast aims to reserve 5% capacity for additional demand thus the forecasting below may refer to 95% capacity. The information below is to inform the Neighbourhood Planning Group's understanding of educational provision in the Plan Area and does not need to be included in the Plan.</p> <p>Primary Education</p> <p>The primary education catchment area for Tattingstone Parish is Tattingstone CEVCP School. The school is not currently forecast to exceed 95% capacity during the forecast period.</p> <p>Secondary Education</p>



Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>The secondary education catchment area for Tattingstone Parish is Holbrook Academy. The school is forecast to exceed 95% capacity during the current forecast period. There may be a possible need for expansion of local secondary accommodation in the future, but this will be regularly monitored and reviewed.</p> <p>Early Years Care As there is no additional housing proposed as part of this plan, there would not be any impact on Early Years places.</p> <p><b>Libraries</b> Provision of a library service is a statutory duty. The Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 (c. 75) is an act of the United Kingdom Parliament. It created a statutory duty for local authorities in England and Wales "to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service for all persons". The catchment library for Tattingstone is Capel St Mary Library which is currently 23% of the modal size for the population of the catchment. This is supplemented by a mobile library service which has two stops in the area. Any development in the area would increase demand on these services and we would seek investment to mitigate the additional provision required.</p> <p><b>Transport</b> SCC, as the Local Highway Authority, has a duty to ensure that roads and footways are maintained and safe as well as providing and managing flood risk for highway drainage and roadside ditches. SCC Transport Strategy aim to procure highway safety and sustainable travel improvements from new developments wherever possible.</p> <p><b>General</b> SCC notes that an updated version of the NPPF was published late December 2023. As such, some of the paragraph numbers referred to in this plan will need to be reviewed and amended, in particular in relation to the criteria of Local Green Spaces, formerly paragraph 102 now 106.</p> <p>I hope that these comments are helpful. SCC is always willing to discuss issues or queries you may have. Some of these issues may be addressed by the SCC's Neighbourhood Planning Guidance, which contains information relating to County Council service areas and links to other potentially helpful resources.</p> <p>The guidance can be accessed here: <a href="#">Suffolk County Council Neighbourhood Planning Guidance</a>.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>If there is anything that I have raised that you would like to discuss, please use my contact information at the top of this letter.</p>
	<p>Babergh District Council</p>	<p>This response is made for and on behalf of Robert Hobbs (Corporate Manager for Strategic Planning at Babergh &amp; Mid Suffolk District Councils).</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on Regulation 14 Pre-submission draft Tattingstone Neighbourhood Plan. This attractively presented plan contains an expected suite of policies that seek to add value at the local level.</p> <p>We do have some comments to make. These are set out in the appended table. For the most part, these relate to matters of clarity but we draw your attention in particular to our comments on policies TATT 5 (Protection of Important Views) and TATT 7 (Local Green Spaces). See also our comments linked to paragraphs 8.2 and 8.3 re an error in the AECOM Design Guidelines &amp; Codes document which means that this will need to be amended and re-issued.</p> <p>Some natural updating of your Plan will also be necessary as it progresses, particularly to parts of the introductory chapter. We trust that this has already been programmed in.</p> <p>If you wish to discuss any of the points raised, then please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>Please note we have no comment to make at this time on the following policies: TATT 2, TATT 4, and TATT 8 to TATT 12.</p> <p><b>Joint Local Plan references</b></p> <p>References are made throughout to the 'Local Plan'. To avoid confusion between the superseded Babergh Local Plan (adopted 2014), the now adopted 'Joint Local Plan', and the 'Development Plan' in general, we recommend that you make the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 1.5 (5th line): ' ... Babergh and Mid Suffolk <u>Joint</u> Local Plan Part 1 (JLP1) ...'</li> <li>• Para 3.4 (1st sentence): 'At a more local level, the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in the context of the current Babergh <del>Local Development</del> Plan, which comprises the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan – Part 1, adopted in November 2023'</li> <li>• Para 3.6 (2nd sentence): 'It <del>will</del> <u>is likely to</u> identify a settlement hierarchy for the two districts, ...'</li> </ul> <p><b>NPPF references</b></p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>Para 3.2 correctly notes that the latest NPPF was issued in December 2023. Some NPPF cross-references now refer to incorrect paragraph numbers. See:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para’s 7.20 &amp; 7.21 should both refer to NPPF paragraph 106 [not 102]</li> <li>• Para 9.27 should now refer to NPPF paragraph 191 c) [not 185 c)]</li> </ul> <p>In para 8.24, please check and amend the NPPF reference, as necessary. Qstn: Is this a reference to paragraph 166 in the July '21 / Sept '23 NPPF, or to paragraph 166 in the Dec '23 NPPF?</p> <p>Also, in the Glossary, update the NPPF hyperlink to direct readers to the latest version. Better still, suggest the link read as follows: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2</a></p> <p>Para 1.12 &amp; 7.11, Map 7, TATT 5, and the Policies Maps There is information missing and what appears to be discrepancies between the information that is presented (the various maps) that make it difficult to come to a conclusion at this stage on the 'Important Views'. This needs to be addressed prior to submission of the Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 1.12 lists an 'Appraisal of Views' document as being available on the PC website during the R14 consultation period. We could not find it.</li> <li>• Para 7.11 states that the Landscape Appraisal identifies a number of important views and that these are shown on Map 7. The views are not numbered or otherwise described which makes cross-referring them difficult.</li> <li>• It is unclear whether all of the views shown on Map 7 have a corresponding map plot in the Landscape Appraisal, especially in Tattingstone Village and Tattingstone Heath.</li> <li>• Similarly, some of the views plotted on the Policies Maps do not appear to correlate well with Map 7.</li> </ul>

## Focused Local Green Space Consultation

A follow-up focused consultation with known owners and occupants of the Local Green Spaces proposed in Policy TATT 7 was carried out by writing to them.

The table below reproduces the comments received.

Name	Organisation	Comment
A Durrance		<p>We are all fully aware that public houses are well and truly on their knees, and their business continues to suffer during these challenging times. The intention to impose restrictions on the Wheatsheaf, and also The White Horse, can only be seen as detrimental to the survival of both pubs. It is vital that all business options remain open to the owners of these, and their grounds. We strongly oppose the inclusion of the The Wheatsheaf and The White Horse in the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and Local Green Spaces (LGS) proposal. Our reasons are as follows:</p> <p>1. Conflict with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): The restrictions in the NP must conform to the policies set out in the NPPF. We believe the designation as a Green Space are in conflict with national policies. The NPPF in the UK provides guidance for local planning authorities in making decisions regarding planning policies and applications. It emphasizes the importance of engaging with communities and stakeholders in the planning process, including landowners. There was no direct contact and consultation with the land owners of The Wheatsheaf, The White Horse, and presumably the same can be said for the other sites put forward. If the local parish council wishes to impose restrictions on privately owned land without consulting the landowners, it could potentially contravene the NPPF, particularly in terms of the requirement for meaningful engagement with affected parties.</p> <p>Mr Poole of Places4People has been paid a large sum of money by us tax payers to execute this work. He has copy &amp; pasted many paragraphs over the years, for many Neighbourhood Plans. The procedural errors leading to the designation is a massive error on his part. It can't really be blamed on you at Tattingsstone PC, you can't be expected to know the rules, however, you should really know better. Presumably you had some involvement, you have plastered your name all over the relevant documents, so you do have to take some responsibility. Hence, we can not help but take it a little personally that the Village Parish Council has happily stabbed a knife in the back of two of the most vital amenities of the village community. Trying to remedy such a mistake, after us landowners have pointed out your error is simply not possible, the damage has already been well and truly done.</p> <p>2. Procedural Impropriety: We believe that Mr Poole, on behalf of the Tattingsstone Parish Council, did not follow the proper procedures in developing the NP or in consulting stakeholders, and therefore we believe we have grounds to challenge the validity of the restrictions. It is important to note that while the NPPF encourages consultation with landowners and stakeholders, the specific circumstances of the case would need to be considered to determine whether Mr Poole and the Parish Council's actions are in compliance with the framework. Factors such as the nature of the restrictions being imposed, the reasons for them, and any legal obligations or planning considerations involved would all be relevant.</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>3. Disproportionate Impact: We would further argue that the restrictions unfairly target our land, and that of The White Horse, and the same could be said for some of the other proposed Green Spaces. There is no clear and meaningful analysis for implementing a LGS initiative at the Wheatsheaf and The White Horse, or the other recommended LGS'. (In many cases, assessing whether a policy or action has a disproportionate impact requires careful analysis of data and consideration of the broader social, economic, and historical context.)</p> <p>4. Lack of Evidence or Justification, we argue that they are arbitrary and not based on sound planning principles. Who actually selected these suggested LGS's, was it Mr Poole, Alison Farmer, the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group, or the Parish Council? We would be rather interested to know, as I am sure would the other landowners affected. Both documents, The Local Green Space Assessment and the Landscape Appraisal have not provided sufficient evidence or justification for selecting our, or the other parcels of land. I feel what detail has been included has in places been deliberately made misleading, for example in The Local Green Space Assessment : Our land was referred to as "Land at corner of Church Road and A137 Tattingsstone Heath" it has been reported to us that many of the Tattingsstone residents presumed this was referring to the small triangle of land containing the Oak Tree (not belonging to us), which itself would be accurately described as "Land at corner of Church Road and A137 Tattingsstone Heath"! It would have been far more obvious if it had been referred to as "Land belonging to the Wheatsheaf" "Paddock/Meadow/Field belonging to the Wheatsheaf" or something to that effect. It also quoted "Amenity land owned by The Wheatsheaf pub", Amenity Land IMPLIES so many aspects that simply aren't true, this link says it all really, well, it points out all that we are not!  <a href="https://www.getagent.co.uk/blog/diy/amenity-land">https://www.getagent.co.uk/blog/diy/amenity-land</a></p> <p>In the Local Green Space Assessment, attempting to justify the land under the 'Beauty' criteria, it is described as 'important open space at the entrance of the settlement' I do not understand how being important equates to being beautiful. This justification also contradicts the Tattingsstone Parish Landscape Appraisal written by Alison Farmer. On page 19 para 2 she states 'However the gateway into the settlement is not reached until development starts on both sides of the road, south of the junction with Station Road and Church Road' This clearly excludes the Wheatsheaf land as being an important gateway.</p> <p>In the original Residents Survey, no question was asked regarding recommendations of Local Green Spaces and no "comments added" were made by any residents regarding the matter, so again, where did these suggested allocations come from</p> <p>The Local Green Space Assessment has "Tattings Parish Council" placed on the front of the document, how much input did they give to this document? Had they even read it prior to the draft being published?  May I quote Paragraph 105 of the NPPF The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>5. Human Rights Considerations: The nature of the restrictions and their impact on our property rights or other fundamental rights leave us to believe that the NP infringes upon our human rights under the European Convention on Human Rights or other relevant legislation. European human rights law, specifically the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), provides protections for property rights.</p> <p>Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the ECHR states:  "Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.  No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law."  This means that while we have a right to the peaceful enjoyment of our property, the parish council may interfere with this right if it's in the public interest and subject to certain conditions, such as being provided for by law and being necessary in a democratic society.</p> <p>If the parish council is seeking to place restrictions on our private land, they would need to demonstrate that such restrictions serve a legitimate public interest, such as environmental protection, public safety, or urban planning. However, any restrictions imposed must also be proportionate to the aim pursued and must not disproportionately interfere with our property rights. We believe that the restrictions proposed by the parish council are disproportionate or violate our rights under the ECHR, and we may have grounds for a legal challenge to them. We may consider seeking legal advice to assess our options and determine the best course of action based on the specific circumstances of our case. Additionally, we may explore any domestic legal remedies available to us.</p> <p>6. Economic Considerations: It has been our desire to at some point in the future develop our field to include some rather basic camping facilities which we would like to think would increase our valuable contribution to the local economy and tourism industry. We therefore argue that the restrictions could have negative economic consequences for the village if developing the land for the survival of the pub is not an option.</p> <p>7. Employment Opportunities: Both The Wheatsheaf and The White Horse offers local employment opportunities both directly and indirectly. Should the pub be forced to close because of restrictions placed on it, these opportunities would be lost. The pub requires staff for various roles such as management, maintenance, and customer service. Additionally, they create opportunities for local businesses to supply goods and services. Restricting any future development of the paddock for the survival of the pub would result in job losses and reduced income for workers and suppliers in the area.</p> <p>8. The intention of the NP, as it stands, is detrimental in providing support to both the Wheatsheaf and The White Horse and could well signal the demise of such fundamental cornerstones of the Tattingstone community. It is imperative that</p>

Name	Organisation	Comment
		<p>the full scope of business opportunities is retained by the owners of both these Public Houses without local parish council restrictions being placed on it.</p> <p>We have been deeply saddened by the manner in which we have been treated regarding the selection of Open Green Spaces, and we are clearly not the only ones. As for Mr Paul?! Shameful! If I were him, I'd be taking those allotments back with immediate effect. But, our grievance is with this OGS debacle, not the Village Plan as a whole. The body that needs to take responsibility is the person employed to carry out this work, not you the Parish Council, however, I am rather concerned regarding the clear lack of knowledge &amp; understanding the P.C. seem to have regarding the entire matter.</p> <p>You now have an essay listing the many reasons why we feel both The Wheatsheaf and the White Horse should be removed from the OGS suggestions in the NP. I would like to think this will bring this matter to a close, leaving us Pub Landlords happy with the result. Mistakes have clearly been made, mistakes are made by us all, but we are adults of sound mind so we move on with no ridiculous need for pitch forks, leading a hate campaign.</p>
S Paul		<p>It has recently come to my attention that Tattingstone Parish Council has undertaken a report on Local Green Space Assessment. Within your plan you have identified, Allotments Tattingstone White Horse, I make it very clear that this land, The Allotments, is owned by me and at no time have I consented to the said land to be included within your Report/Plan. Furthermore I find the Parish's failure to even make contact with myself most unprofessional and indeed not very neighbourly. If at some point the Parish Council has the decency to make contact I will only respond with professional advice, who's cost I will expect the Parish Council to cover.</p>