



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan
SD10 - Statement of Consultation



The Parish Of Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

Supporting Document SD10
Statement of Consultation

Updated: October 2020



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

SD10 - Statement of Consultation

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Statement of Consultation meets the requirements of Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. A more in depth consultation process has been undertaken than required within the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012), but the process has been proportionate to the size of the population of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Area and the range of policies that the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan has addressed.
- 1.2. A Neighbourhood Planning Committee was set up in December 2012. Invitations were made to local residents and groups to join the Committee. The broad terms of reference of the group were set out in the "application to designate a neighbourhood area" (Supporting Document SD16 refers).
- 1.3. It was agreed at that time that a parish councillor would chair the group which was further supported by our local district councillor and officers from Mid Suffolk District Council. The composition of the group has changed since its inception. It proved difficult for several members to give sufficient time to the project. Whilst this continual change has given some operational problems it has not been entirely negative and several short term members provided invaluable support for distinct phases of the project.
- 1.4. In fact the support that has been forthcoming from committee members has been so good that it has largely enabled us to avoid having to resort to external professional support.
- 1.5. Currently the committee comprises a chairman (a parish councillor), two additional parish councillors, two local residents and our local district councillor, plus significant administrative support from the Parish Clerk. We are able to call upon officers from Mid Suffolk District Council for additional support where necessary.
- 1.6. The area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan (the designated area) was proposed to Mid Suffolk District Council and formally agreed on 17th June 2013.
- 1.7. The Neighbourhood Planning Committee has maintained the focus on developing the Neighbourhood Plan and has kept the community informed, soliciting comment and support at appropriate times. Regular public meetings have taken place and the minutes made available.
- 1.8. Meetings have taken place (and continue) with the various groups, organisations and businesses in the parish to inform, feedback and solicit opinion.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

SD10 - Statement of Consultation

- 1.9. We have tried to ensure that all age groups have been kept informed and asked for their opinions. Two good examples of our communication with local residents were, firstly, the project with our local school (Mendlesham Community Primary School) to engage the children in a village design exercise where they could build (using small polystyrene blocks and a cardboard map) their view of the village design they would like. This in turn also alerted and reminded parents of the work involved in producing the Neighbourhood Plan. Secondly we attended one of our local churches (St. Mary's) to talk to the Sunday morning congregation, inform them of progress and findings and seek their opinion on the developing Neighbourhood Plan.
- 1.10. We have used our web site and our local e-News (e-Mail) service to keep the community informed of progress and important issues and dates. We used an online survey software package (SurveyMonkey) to solicit opinion from many of our residents and also to analyse the results obtained.
- 1.11. From 2013 until 2016 the Neighbourhood Plan Committee operated a stall at the annual Mendlesham May Fayre giving residents the opportunity to ask questions and committee members the opportunity to inform residents about progress to date.
- 1.12. In 2017 the decision was taken to produce a revised Neighbourhood Plan. The reasoning behind this decision was that the adopted Plan was weakened by the absence of any allocated sites for future development. Since that decision considerable work by both the committee members and external professional consultants has been undertaken to identify preferred sites together with detailed evidence supporting their selection.
- 1.13. In summary, since late 2017, work was undertaken to;
- Identify preferred sites for future development, including consulting with residents
 - Obtain supporting evidence for these sites that include
 - Professional opinion on the suitability of all available sites
 - Flood risk assessments
 - Historic environment review
 - Heritage assessment of potential sites
 - Habitats screening
 - Traffic report



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

2. Timelines of events during the project

Major timeline steps for the project

- 2.1. The following table identifies each of the major steps taken in setting up this project and consulting with our residents, businesses and organisations that deal with the parish of Mendlesham.

Date	Action
Dec 2012	Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan Committee set up.
17 Jun 2013	Neighbourhood Plan Area formally agreed by MSDC.
Oct 2013 - Feb 2014	Questionnaires (Household, Youth and Business) distributed to homes and businesses around the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Area.
Aug 2014	Additional short questionnaire distributed to homes around the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Area.
Nov - Dec 2014	Consultation with local residents over draft version 1.0 of Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan.
Jun 2015	Consultation with MSDC over draft version 2.1 of Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan.
Nov-Dec 2015	Informal consultation with external "interested parties" on version 2.2 of Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan
Jan 2016	Health check on version 2.2 of Mendlesham neighbourhood Plan carried out by NPIERS.
Apr 2016	Further consultation with MSDC on version 3.1 of Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan.
May 2016	Version 3.2 of Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan formally handed over to MSDC for it to consider and solicit responses.
Sep - Oct 2016	Version 3.2 of Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan given to Independent Examiner to review.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Oct 2016	Independent Examiner approves Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan for local referendum subject to a series of recommendations.
Nov 2016	The recommendations of the Independent Examiner are accepted and version 3.3 of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan is prepared for consideration by MSDC.
2 March 2017	Referendum held
23 March 2017	Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan formally adopted
Jun-Sep 2017	Research into specific development land allocation options
Oct 2017	Consultation with local residents over additional potential development sites
Nov 2017	Formal notification sent to MSDC stating intention to update the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan
Jan 2018 - Dec 2019	Evidence gathering for development site identification and promotion.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Neighbourhood Plan Committee meetings

- 2.2. Since the commencement of the project regular, formal, open meetings of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee have taken place. These meetings have been the focal point for discussion and agreement on planning and progressing the project. The dates of the meetings are shown below and all agendas and minutes are available. Temporary working parties were also convened to deal with individual areas of review as and when they were required.

Activity	Date
NP Committee meeting no. 1	04/12/2012
NP Committee meeting no. 2	08/01/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 3	23/01/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 4	28/02/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 5	12/03/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 6	17/04/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 7	01/05/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 8	20/05/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 9	20/06/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 10	10/07/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 11	14/08/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 12	26/09/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 13	16/10/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 14	13/11/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 15	18/12/2013
NP Committee meeting no. 16	15/01/2014



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

NP Committee meeting no. 17	05/02/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 18	24/03/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 19	16/04/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 20	30/04/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 21	25/06/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 22	23/07/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 23	20/08/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 24	15/09/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 25	08/10/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 26	29/10/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 27	26/11/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 28	17/12/2014
NP Committee meeting no. 29	04/02/2015
NP Committee meeting no. 30	04/03/2015
NP Committee meeting no. 31	27/04/2015
NP Committee meeting no. 32	01/07/2015
NP Committee meeting no. 33	01/10/2015
NP Committee meeting no. 34	06/01/2016
NP Committee meeting no. 35	01/03/2016
NP Committee meeting no. 36	20/04/2016
NP Committee meeting no. 37	16/06/2016
Adopted NP communications meeting	17/01/2017
NP Committee meeting no. 38	14/08/2017



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

NP Committee meeting no. 39	14/09/2017
NP Committee meeting no. 40	30/10/2017
NP Committee meeting no. 41	30/11/2017
NP Committee meeting no. 42	03/01/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 43	23/01/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 44	12/02/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 45	17/07/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 46	06/08/2018
NP Committee meeting no. 47	22/01/2019
NP Committee meeting no. 48	09/05/2019
Working party meeting with MSDC	21/05/2019
NP Committee meeting no. 49	17/07/2019
NP Committee meeting no. 50	21/08/2019
NP Committee meeting no. 51	13/01/2020
NP Committee meeting no. 52	17/02/2020
NP Committee meeting no. 53	26 May 2020
NP Committee meeting no. 54	30 July 2020



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Questionnaires for residents and businesses

- 2.3. A significant amount of consultation was done with residents and local businesses through four questionnaires. Residents were able to respond either via paper copies or online (using Survey Monkey software).
- 2.4. The timings of the setup, completion and analysis of the questionnaires was as follows.

Questionnaires		
Questionnaire (3) development	09/01/2013	31/12/2013
Briefing re volunteers	27/01/2014	27/01/2014
Questionnaire distributed	02/06/2014	13/02/2014
Questionnaire period	02/10/2014	16/02/2014
Collection Questionnaire	17/02/2014	23/02/2014
Questionnaire analysis	24/02/2014	04/07/2014
Short Questionnaire development	05/05/2014	23/07/2014
Short questionnaire consultation	01/08/2014	30/08/2014
Short questionnaire analysis	01/08/2014	20/08/2014

Views of residents and businesses

- 2.5. Three surveys, Household, Youth and Business were carried out during February and March in 2014. Respondents were able to enter their answers either into paper documents or on-line.
- 2.6. There was an exceptionally good response to the Household questionnaire with 404 returns representing around 65% of the total households (620) in the Parish.
- 2.7. There were 59 individual responses from our local youth and 29 responses from local businesses.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

- 2.8. In terms of those responding to the Household questionnaire it showed a ratio of more older people in the Parish with more than a third being aged 60 years and over. It also shows that people tend to stay in the Parish for a long time, on average over 20 years and relatively few expect to be moving in the next 5 years (and for those wanting to move, moving within Mendlesham is the most preferred option).
- 2.9. About one quarter of the responses identified one or more people in the household working in Mendlesham and one sixth identified one or more people working from home.
- 2.10. The question on development preferences showed overwhelming support for small scale and dispersed developments rather than large estate development. There were mixed views on the types of property and tenure and in most cases it seems the majority are willing to consider each proposal on its merits.
- 2.11. The possibility of a car sharing scheme was not well supported with only a quarter of the respondents willing to participate.
- 2.12. Less than 25% of respondents identified problems with public transport locally whereas almost 40% identified problems with local traffic.
- 2.13. There were very strong messages about the local environment where almost 70% of respondents saw it as “definitely important” and strongly supported the need to protect and enhance it.
- 2.14. The idea of a community managed renewable energy project was supported by over 70% of respondents.
- 2.15. In terms of sport and activities (for both youth and adults) the responses were surprisingly light and well over 60% of respondents appear not to participate in any sport or activities. Around 70% of respondents felt there is not a need for any more recreational facilities in the Parish. Having said that the Mendlesham footpaths and bridleways, woodland and Community Centre are very well supported by many residents.
- 2.16. The Parish magazine is the most referred to facility for finding out what’s happening in the Parish with over 88% of respondents reading it. “Talking to friends” was the next most popular method followed by the Parish notice boards.
- 2.17. Modern technology figures prominently in many people’s lives with well over 70% of respondents saying they use the Internet, mobile phones and e-Mail. Over 12% have used the Internet cafe in Mendlesham village.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

- 2.18. The final question on the Household questionnaire asked about how Mendlesham should grow over the coming years. Over 72% of respondents gave us their thoughts and the detailed analysis of their responses are shown in Supporting Document SD06 (Mendlesham household questionnaire analysis - Q42).
- 2.19. Overall it seems clear that people like Mendlesham as it is today and that growth needs to be carefully controlled to preserve the current rural image and its surrounding environment. People want to keep the current facilities, shop, pub, post office, school and health centre and we need to ensure that the growth in and around the parish will support that ideal.
- 2.20. There was a good mix (both in terms of age and gender) of responses to the Youth Questionnaire. Unsurprisingly the majority travel to school by bus or coach but the "mum and dad" transport service is in evidence particularly when sports and activities are involved.
- 2.21. The participation in activities and sports is surprisingly light with over 80% of respondents saying they do nothing within the parish. However around 63% participate in sports outside the parish and less than 30% in activities outside the parish.
- 2.22. In terms of local facilities the footpaths and bridleways are the most popular followed by Mendlesham woodland. There was significant comment about the state of Mendlesham Hard Court (Tennis area) and the need for refurbishment. There is also interest in helping to maintain and improve these local facilities.
- 2.23. Once again the Parish magazine was one of the two most quoted channels for keeping up with local news (the other being talking to friends). Around half the respondents had used the Internet cafe with the majority rating it as good and very good.
- 2.24. The idea of a Youth Council was very well supported with over 64% saying yes; just over 50% of respondents indicated an interest in helping to set up a Youth Council.
- 2.25. Finally 33 of the 59 respondents gave us comments on what changes and improvements they would like to see locally (and a skate park does get mentioned quite a few times!).
- 2.26. The Business Questionnaire attracted only 29 responses but they show what a diversity of businesses we have in the Parish (not just agricultural). A majority of the businesses appear stable with no particular aims to



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

expand although nearly a third are hoping for expansion in the next 5 years. These 29 businesses provide employment for people living in the Parish (66 people full time and 17 part time).

- 2.27. Over 80% of the businesses need Broadband for their operation and just over half of those felt the service was unsatisfactory. Just under half of the businesses have their own web site.
- 2.28. On the question of the help needed for business growth there was mention of the need for good support both from Mid Suffolk District Council and local people (buying local products and produce) and the need for a better Internet connection to support their growth.
- 2.29. The Internet is a theme that arises in responses from all three questionnaires and it is clearly evident that we all have an increasing reliance on it.
- 2.30. The analysis of results for the Household questionnaires is shown in the following supporting documents;
 - SD05 Mendlesham Household questionnaire analysis (February 2014)
 - SD06 Mendlesham Household questionnaire analysis - Q42 (February 2014)
 - SD09 Mendlesham Additional Short questionnaire analysis (August 2014)
- 2.31. The analysis of results for the Youth questionnaire is shown in the following supporting document;
 - SD07 Mendlesham Youth questionnaire response analysis
- 2.32. The analysis of results for the Business Questionnaire is shown in the following supporting document;
 - Mendlesham Business questionnaire analysis (February 2014).
- 2.33. In February 2020 a limited consultation was undertaken with the residents of the recently completed development known as Station Fields (Previously the G&R warehouse site). The consultation sought their views on how the site had been developed and what the achievements and challenges were. Their views will be used to inform future developments around the parish. The resultant report is included as Supporting Document SD31 - Residents Survey 2020: Station Fields.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

3. Other events

- 3.1. The Neighbourhood Plan Committee sought to engage local residents and businesses as frequently as possible to ensure that all remained aware of the work to develop a Neighbourhood Plan and also that as much comment and opinion were captured as possible.
- 3.2. Examples of the continuing information gathering and feedback work are the continued attendance of the Neighbourhood Plan group at the Mendlesham annual street fayre where the Neighbourhood Plan stall always has lots of people to discuss all aspects of the future of the parish. Time was also spent in church talking to the congregation at Sunday service and soliciting their opinions and also at school where the pupils were given the opportunity to plan their changes to the village.
- 3.3. The events that the Neighbourhood Plan Committee arranged and participated in are as follows;

Activity / Event	Start date	End date
Neighbourhood Forum Application submitted to Mid Suffolk District Council	21/01/2013	21/01/2013
Presentation to Mendlesham Annual Parish Meeting	23/04/2013	23/04/2013
Consultation event at Mendlesham Street Fayre	06/05/2013	06/05/2013
NP area determination finalised by MSDC	17/06/2013	17/06/2013
Presentation to Mendlesham Community Council	25/03/2013	25/03/2013
Presentation to Annual Parish Meeting	23/04/2013	23/04/2013
Presentation to Mendlesham Ramblers	11/06/2013	11/06/2013
Presentation to School parent sharing assembly, Mendlesham Primary School	24/05/2013	24/05/2013
Mendlesham Street Fayre	05/06/2013	05/06/2013
Presentation to Mendlesham Primary School	24/05/2013	24/05/2013



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Access and movement workshop with Ramblers	09/07/2013	09/07/2013
Presentation to Mendlesham Primary School	16/07/2013	16/07/2013
Mendlesham Primary School model making	22/11/2013	22/11/2013
Presentation to the Forge	22/04/2014	22/04/2014
Business consultation	24/04/2014	24/04/2014
Annual Parish Meeting	29/04/2014	29/04/2014
Presentation to Over 60s	30/04/2014	30/04/2014
Mendlesham Street Fayre	05/06/2014	05/06/2014
Presentation to St Marys Church Mendlesham	05/11/2014	05/11/2014
Presentation to Mendlesham WI	20/05/2014	20/05/2014
Presentation to Worlingworth Parish Council	28/05/2014	28/05/2014
Presentation to Mendlesham School	06/05/2014	06/05/2014
Presentation to Neighbouring Parish Councils	07/04/2014	07/04/2014
Planning training MSDC Head of Planning	18/08/2014	18/08/2014
Community Consultation	29/11/2014	21/12/2014
Mendlesham Street Fayre	04/05/2015	04/05/2015
MSDC consultation	01/6/2015	01/6/2015
Interested parties and community consultation	30/10/2015	21/12/2015
NPIERS Health Check	21/12/2015	2/01/2016
Annual Parish meeting	26/04/2016	26/04/2016
Mendlesham Street Fayre	02/05/2016	02/05/2016
Consultation on future development sites	01/10/2017	30/10/2017



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

SD10 - Statement of Consultation

4. Continuing consultation

- 4.1. At the end of 2014, in mid 2015 and again at the end of 2015 we issued revised drafts of the Neighbourhood Plan and sought feedback from local residents, businesses and MSDC (this was done through e-communications and also making paper copy available at key locations). All feedback (see Appendices 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 at the end of this document) was documented and discussed and used to make further revisions to the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4.2. Throughout the project we have made use of a variety of communication methods to get the messages across and also to solicit feedback from local residents and businesses. These included,
 - word of mouth (e.g. speaking at meetings),
 - e-mail (using the Parish Council e-News system),
 - local newsletter (that is delivered to all dwellings in the parish),
 - printed copy made available at key locations,
 - internet (making information available via the Parish Council's web site), and
 - telephone (NP committee members spend a lot of time discussing issues with (not only) residents but businesses and a variety of other "interested parties").
- 4.3. In October 2015 we carried out pre-submission publicity and consultation (stage 3) contacting a range of "interested parties" and also offering residents another opportunity to comment on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. A drop in morning was arranged at the Mendlesham Old School Room where residents could attend and discuss any aspects of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Following this exercise 12 responses were received from residents and interested parties; only one of these responses was negative.
- 4.4. In October 2017 a consultation with local residents was carried out to gain local opinion on the suitability of four local sites around Mendlesham Village. The details and conclusions arising from that consultation are contained in the report, Consultation with local residents (Supporting Document SD23).



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

SD10 - Statement of Consultation

5. Project conclusion

- 5.1 A referendum was held on 2 March 2017. On a turnout of 36.7% (417 voters) 94.25% (393) were in favour of adopting the plan.
- 5.2 The plan was formally adopted by Mid Suffolk District Council at the full Council meeting on 23 March 2017.

6. Further work

- 6.1 It became apparent in mid 2017 following a ministerial statement and policy change that change would be needed to the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan. The existing Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan never made reference to any specific future development sites around Mendlesham village. A central Government directive received early in 2017 indicated that Neighbourhood Plans should identify specific future development sites particularly if a district council did not have a 5 year development land supply.
- 6.2 Accordingly the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan Committee was re-convened to look into how the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan might best be updated. This work coincided with a consultation from Mid Suffolk District Council to review potential new development sites in all of the larger villages.
- 6.3 This gave Mendlesham Parish Council the opportunity to consult with its residents on the various parcels of land around Mendlesham village identified by Mid Suffolk District Council as possible future development sites. The consultation was also part of a wider project being carried out by Mid Suffolk District Council to update its Local Plan (work that was being done in conjunction with Babergh District Council).
- 6.4 This opportunity has proved both beneficial and problematic. It has provided the opportunity for Mendlesham Parish Council to update its Neighbourhood Plan and identify suitable site(s) for future development. However the Draft Joint Local Plan makes it quite clear that changes will be made to the way villages are classified and the quantity of development that they will be expected to absorb. The precise methodology that will be used and numbers involved have only recently been confirmed (albeit still only in draft).. The current draft of the



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Joint Local Plan does provide guidance to the likely numbers of new dwellings (currently minimum of 161 new dwellings for the period 1 April 2018 until April 2037) that will be required and the revised Neighbourhood Plan aims at meeting those figures.

- 6.5 Local residents were consulted during October 2017 and information was sent out using the local monthly newsletter and also through local e-news channels. Two drop-in sessions were arranged, one in the local school and the other in a local meeting room in the heart of the village. At both sessions residents were able to leave short notes on any aspects of the sites that were put forward. All of this information was then collated and it gave the Parish Council clear guidance on where the residents preference lay.
- 6.6 Supporting Document SD23 contains the report on the consultation and its outcomes.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

6. APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 - Comments received in respect of consultation of Draft Version 1.0 of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan - December 2014

APPENDIX 2 - Comments received from MSDC on Draft Version 2.1 of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan - 1 June 2015

APPENDIX 3 - Comments received from informal consultation with residents and "interested parties" and responses made re draft version 2.2 - November - December 2015

APPENDIX 4 - Issues raised by the NPIERS "health check" Examiner re Mendlesham Neighbourhood plan draft version 2.2 and responses made - January 2016

APPENDIX 5 - Issues raised by MSDC on Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan draft version 3.1 and responses provided - April 2016



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

APPENDIX 1 - Comments received in respect of consultation of Draft Version 1.0 of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan - December 2014

Item No.	Comment from Residents and Landowners	Response
P01	Mr AN (local resident) queried whether 2 local businesses could be identified on one of the maps?	Response was that we did not intend to try to identify the map location of all individual businesses.
P02	Mr BS (local resident) queried the description and status of Mendlesham Green and raised concerns about HGV traffic through Mendlesham and Mendlesham Green.	Response that Mendlesham Green was not a Key Service Centre (as is Mendlesham Village) and that it would be treated as a countryside village. Traffic concerns noted.
P03	Mr DL (local resident) supported controlled and sustainable expansion of Mendlesham village. He is concerned that Mendlesham does not become a dormitory for long distance commuters and we should encourage local business opportunities for people to live and work locally. He asked that all new developments were provided with adequate off road parking facilities.	Response that the comments were noted.
P04	Mr RD (local resident) queried the comments about the siting of parks and playing fields and asked if there were any plans to redevelop sites or encourage growth adjacent to them.	Response that there are no plans currently to redevelop or encourage growth adjacent to them.
P05	Mr RH (land agent representing a local land owner) advised caution with the proposed size of development sites stating they may not provide the necessary levels of affordable housing that Mendlesham may require. Other supportive comments were made about the draft Neighbourhood Plan and he felt that his clients were well placed to offer Mendlesham the types of development that it is looking for.	Response that the comments were noted.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	Comment from MSDC	
M01	Policy MP1 – discussion took place on whether it was intended to redefine the village boundary and if not how “visually important open spaces” around the village could be defined in order to safeguard them from development while directing future proposals to more appropriate location actions. Further technical evidence is required to support the suggested 20 dwelling threshold.	Comments noted
M02	Policy MP2 – there is a District wide duty to house people in need. The wording of the policy regarding affordable housing therefore creates a potential difficulty. A further suggestion was made that the policy could usefully be worded along the lines ‘On open market housing developments a proportion of dwellings up to 35% shall be provided as affordable dwellings’. In addition wording to the effect that ‘New housing shall include a mix of dwelling types to meet current and future housing needs’ would be appropriate.	Comments noted and adjustments to the text as suggested will be implemented
M03	Policy MP3 – discussion took place on the possible need for this policy. The first sentence might be better placed in MP1. Further description needs to be added to make it clear that additional development will be phased with the capacity of local infrastructure. The inclusion of specific numbers for possible development sites needs to be reassessed. The last two paragraphs do not appear to be necessary.	Comments noted, further discussion needed.
M04	Policy MP4 – this policy requires clarification. It was suggested the policy could be refined to refer to employment uses that are compatible with residential amenity. The second component repeats the need for high speed broadband which is also promoted by Policy MP6.	Policy will be reworded. Repetition concerning high speed broadband will be removed.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

M05	Policy MP5 – this policy could be amended to refer specifically to housing areas and make reference to functional green spaces ‘that reflect the rural character of the village’.	Comments noted, changes to the text will be made.
M06	Policy MP6 – it may be clearer to make this policy reference all development proposals. Strengthen this requirement by using the word ‘shall’ rather than ‘should’ in paragraph 2. The note section (paragraph 3) would be better placed within the explanatory text.	Comments noted, changes to the text will be made.
M07	Policy MP7 – the inclusion of this policy is to exert influence over the design and appearance of new development. Better and more detailed information needs to be provided on what is distinctive about Mendlesham in terms of its character, the pallet of materials and architectural treatments? Conversely what does not reflect Mendlesham? This will considerably strengthen this policy and provide clear guidance to prospective developers.	Comments noted, we will discuss this further to consider how best the text may be improved.
M08	Section 8 – Open Space. It was agreed that a further policy is added to define “visually important open spaces” and to indicate how development proposals in these areas are likely to be considered.	Comments noted, additional reference to visually important open spaces will be made.
G01		<p>The NP committee noted that, “In particular further research is need in the areas of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the capacity the of local infrastructure to cope with housing expansion, • affordable housing, • defining the character of Mendlesham village and its architecture, • defining visually important open spaces and the access to them (particularly noting the possible effect of adjacent developments).



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

		Report from NP Committee dated 12 January 2015 refers
--	--	---

APPENDIX 2 - Comments received from MSDC on Draft Version 2.1 of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan - 1 June 2015

Ref No.	NP Page	NP Section	MSDC comments	Response	Actions
1	General	General comment	At present there are a number of aspirations that need to be revisited to assess whether they can be translated into meaningful planning policies; in other words how can the plan 'add value' to the existing planning policy framework. Reliance upon the existing Mid Suffolk Local Plan may not be sufficient as many of the policies were adopted some time ago and are due to be replaced. These could be important to Mendlesham and while it is not possible to duplicate them (they will be removed by the Examiner if you do) a reinterpretation of some of them for your own purposes would be helpful and provide the plan with a real sense of purpose.	This needs to be revisited once the new (next) version of the NP is produced and that content can be re-assessed to see if we have fully addressed the concerns.	Review and revise document for edit version 2.2.
2	General	General comment	The Plan also needs to be reordered; the Vision and Objectives actually derive from information later in the Plan, which leaves the reader wondering about their derivation. Section 3 'Challenges and Opportunities' and Section 4 'Vision and Objectives' need to follow on from the	Agree	We will move sections 5 and 6 to immediately before section 3.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			descriptions of the village. This then places housing and business descriptions at the beginning, setting the scene and providing the facts from which the challenges and opportunities follow.		
3	General	General comment	We are concerned that with Strengths and Weaknesses some of this material may be anecdotal and not driven by gathered facts. It is important to show more evidence for this.	This needs to be revisited once the new (next) version of the NP is produced and that content can be re-assessed to see if we have fully addressed the concerns.	Review and revise document for edit version 2.2.
4	General	General comment	The objectives might be better expressed as policies as they are locally distinctive issues, but there are concerns these are driven by anecdotal evidence or 'wish lists'. The ability to fulfil these objectives should also be discussed. More critically any requirements in a plan must be capable of delivery.	Not all objectives translate directly into policies. With regard to anecdotal evidence MSDC has not read all of our supporting documentation.	We will add more cross-reference pointers to where evidence can be found.
5	General	General comment	Government guidance requires that there is a presumption in favour of Sustainable Development. We do not expect the neighbourhood planning group to provide an elaborate definition as to what it means locally but sustainability needs to be a central thread to your plan-making. An explanation of what it means for Mendlesham at the beginning of the document would therefore be useful.	Sustainable development for Mendlesham involves its dwellings, its transport facilities, its environmental impact, direct and indirect energy usage, its social linkages and access to services. As a rural location access to work and required services often involves significant journeys and inefficient transport usage. We must aim to minimise our use of resources and where possible use resources that are replaceable and not degradable.	We will state our aims in existing section 5 under a heading of sustainable development.
6	General	General comment	How can Mendlesham be more 'sustainable'? There are a lot of potential initiatives that can be considered such as	See comments directly above. Plus	See comments directly above



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			the use of renewable energy, the southerly alignment of buildings to achieve solar gain, green roofs, the use of water butts and additional woodland planting to name a few.	There has been a significant (hundreds) amount of tree planting over the past 15 years plus the creation of a new hedge around the perimeter of the extended playing field to the rear of the Community Centre (2014).	
7	General	General comment	We have previously discussed the merits or otherwise of identifying sites or broad locations for development within the neighbourhood plan. The choice is yours however if the plan is to provide real value and add to the planning policy framework as alluded to above it is worth considering the matter again.	This has been discussed frequently and the view is that we do not want to select sites. There are pro's and con's to all sites and we are agreed that we will leave it to developers to put forward proposals guided by or NP. We believe we would have great difficulty in identifying and defending a list of preferred sites. We have given a broad location in that any site directly adjacent to the current village boundary would be considered.	No action
8	General	General comment	Finally the policy numbering appears to have got out of sequence. It is not clear whether this is intention to highlight possible changes to the earlier draft.	Agree, the number 5 is out of sequence following previous suggestions to re-order the document.	This will be corrected in the next draft.
9	General	General comment	A Proposals Map is also required.	What is a proposals map and what should it contain? And how would this assist us with a non-allocated site NP? This is the first time this has been mentioned.	Clarification needed from MSDC
10			Section 1 third paragraph; ' <i>rather than live with inappropriate and uncertain development pressure</i> ' is a rather negative and hostile statement. Bearing in mind the NPPF presumption in favour	Agree	Replace this paragraph with "We chose to adopt our own Neighbourhood Plan because while we support the need for local



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			of growth this could be reworded to say something like; 'we support the need for local growth but want a larger say in where and when etc.'		growth we want a say in the design of what is built and where." We also want to contribute to the debate on how many homes may be built at any one time as it is important to the vast majority of residents that the rural setting of Mendlesham village is maintained.
11			Page 5, second bullet – the document will also need also to conform with the Joint Planning Policies for Babergh and Mid Suffolk once they are adopted.	Not agreed	Current wording is sufficient and accurate. NOTE: We can only deal with policies that are in operation today, we do not want to make commitment to policies that may, with unknown content, come along in the the future.
12			Page 10 'There are regular bus services ...' can we have more detail on this and a map somewhere in the document?	Agree; we will include a pointer to the supporting document where further information can be found.	Change text to "There are daily bus services (not Sundays) to Ipswich, Stowmarket, Diss and the surrounding villages". Additional text to be inserted in Supporting Document 13 as follows; "Mendlesham and Mendlesham Green are



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

					currently served by routes 113, 114 and 456 that operate between Diss and Stowmarket. Monday to Friday there are five bus trips in each direction and on Saturdays one. There are no services on Sunday"
13			Page 10 'There is a strong community spirit with local groups and clubs' – can have more information on the nature of these groups and clubs? Do we know how many people take part (e.g. 10% of the population or 80%)? Is there a lot of voluntary work?	Agree, we will include a pointer to the supporting document where further information can be found.	Insert list of village organisations as listed in the parish magazine into Supporting Document 13. "Ancient Order of Foresters, Beaver Scouts, Bowls Club, Brownies, Carpet Bowls, Cub Scouts, Football, Friends of Mendlesham School Association, History Group, Over 60's club, Mendlesham pre school, Mendlesham Toddler Group, Mendlesham Walking Group, Rainbows Scouts, Village recorder, Women's Institute, Community Centre,



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

					Community Council, St Mary's Parish Church, St Mary's Church Council, Trustees of charities, United Reform Church, Friends of Mendlesham Health Centre".
					Additionally we have small support groups mobilised to deal with maintenance issues in and around the village; including minor works in and around the Community Centre, grass and verge cutting, woodland and pathway clearance and support at events organised by the Community Council, e.g. the annual May Fayre.
14			Page 10 'There is a good green infrastructure of footpaths' – a footpath is not really Green Infrastructure, it may provide a link to Green Infrastructure, but most paths tend to be across a field of monoculture with very low biodiversity value. A careful look at the OS maps suggests that Mendlesham is poorly linked to nearby settlements, its Rights of Way network frequently leads you to a road if you want to go anywhere or do a circular walk. We would suggest the	Agree, we will include a pointer to the supporting document where further information can be found.	Change text to 'There is a good linked infrastructure of footpaths'. Add text to Supporting Document 13. "The footpath network is monitored by the Mendlesham Walking Group which also liaises with Suffolk County Council over footpath,



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			<p>footpaths could do with some linkages being created to provide circularity and better opportunities for walking perhaps through permissive footpaths if landowners are willing.</p>		<p>bridleway and byway issues. In conjunction with SCC the group also carries out limited maintenance of the local footpaths.</p> <p>The group holds regular walks around the parish and has identified and documented three circular walks that can be used by ramblers.</p> <p>Footpaths and bridleways are used primarily for leisure purposes, rambling, dog walking and horse riding and there is no identified requirement for other purposes.</p>
15			<p>A Playing Field is listed, is this publicly accessible or in private ownership – it is helpful to specify how it is used. There are no details on the community wood either, its size and location and its uses (nor indeed why it is a 'community' wood as opposed to a normal wood). Is there any scope to enlarge it or to create wildlife linkages or stepping stones (which are suggested in Green Infrastructure guidance)?</p> <p>Is there any other green infrastructure in Mendlesham that is not listed? It is possible the parish could have a shortfall</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Playing field is publicly accessible and has recently been extended to include a second football pitch.</p> <p>The Community wood has recently been enhanced by the provision of a good footpath link from the village to it. At the centre of the wood lies the vicarage occupied by the vicar for St Mary's Church.</p> <p>We have not identified a shortfall of green facilities around the parish.</p>	<p>Insert a community assets map. (Including visions and evidence.)</p> <p>We will list our community assets including other green infrastructure; cemeteries, allotments and playing fields and include them in Supporting Document 13 together with suitable pointers from the main NP document.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			that you might want to address. Has there been a loss of hedgerows which are important for wildlife in the last twenty years? Has there been a loss of woodland, or is there a need for more?	Significant amounts of hedgerow planting has taken place in recent years and we have had no loss of woodland.	
16			Mapping existing green infrastructure will help shape future growth and provide opportunities for the creation of new habitats. It could be worth carrying out a survey in line with best practice guidance, in particular the 'Planning for a healthy environment – good practice guidance for green infrastructure and biodiversity' by the Town and Country Planning Association or 'Green Infrastructure Guidance' by Natural England.	Disagree re survey The Walking group met with Suffolk CC re walking and health and gained some funding for the production of leaflets regarding walks around the Parish.	See above No further surveys required
17	Page 10		'Strengths' 'a diverse range of local business and employers,' - a listing together with details of the numbers employed would be helpfully support the statement. Is there any evidence from your business surveys to find out what the companies like and dislike about Mendlesham, what would make them stay, whether they are planning to leave and why.	I direct you to Supporting document SD08 which will provide you with detailed information about our local businesses	We will include a reference to the source of this information in the text.
18	Page 10		'Weaknesses' 'There is a lack of diversity of the mix of existing housing stock for families and the elderly' – where is the evidence for this statement? It needs to be referenced. This can be a crucial	I direct you to Supporting Document 01 page 29 which shows that Mendlesham has a far higher supply of detached houses and a far lower supply of smaller terraced	We will include a reference to the source of this information in the text.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			issue in discussions with prospective developers.	houses when measured against the national average.	
19	Page 10		'Some residents have a negative local perception of new development' – again we ask is this anecdotal or has a survey been carried out of local people's views and opinions? How many said this in percentage terms?	I direct you to Supporting Document SD06 where 16.38% of residents do not want to see any growth	We will include a reference to the source of this information in the text.
20	Page 10		'The Community Centre . . . is in need of modernisation'. This is a throw away statement which leads nowhere. Is that information here because the Parish Council want to do something about it?	The Parish Council took over the running of the Community Centre in 2010 when the previous steering committee disbanded. Since then it has become clear that the building is in need of repair and modernisation (now being some 30 years old). In particular the roof structure is in urgent need of repair something that could lead a bill of up to £50,000	We will add a section to Supporting Document SD13 to describe the current situation of the Community Centre and the challenges it faces in the future.
21	Page 10		'There is pressure on the local road network . . .' this is a somewhat vague statement without more evidence - either traffic count information from the County Council or some local survey work carried out by the Parish Council. Details on the nature of the problem and location are required to explain a statement like this.	The roads in and around the parish were never designed lorry or coach traffic. Mostly they can just about take two lanes of single file traffic but there are places where it is not possible and larger vehicles may have to back up to enable traffic flow. All of which leads to a lot of damage to road surfaces and verges. Only recently there has been a concerted campaign of repair around the parish to deals with the enormous number of potholes and verge subsidence that have occurred during the Winter.	We will insert more information about this into Supporting Document SD13 and include pointers to it from the main NP document.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

				The presence of a bus and coach company and two HGV yards close to Mendlesham Village means that there is continual pressure on our local road network.	
22	Page 10		'The lack of superfast broadband may deter potential businesses...' - how big a problem is this? Has the Parish Council any evidence that an employer chose not to move to Mendlesham because of this? Later on you say it is due to be installed this year. Will the problem be resolved?	Much of Mendlesham village now has the ability to connect to high speed broadband but we still await delivery dates for the rest of the parish I refer you to Supporting Document SD08, Q's 9, 10, 21, 23, 24.	We will update the content of Supporting Document SD13, section 7 and include a pointer to it from the main NP document.
23	Page 10		'There may be insufficient places in Mendlesham School . . .' again is this evidence based? Could extra classrooms be accommodated? If so, this simply needs to be a factor to be aware of when planning growth.	Disagree The school has stated in writing that it will have only 3 spaces available from this September. It also should be noted that one extra classroom was built last year.	The evidence is included as part of the text, see document, (version 2.1) p11.
24	Page 10		Opportunities '...expansion opportunities for the existing health centre' this is an unclear statement, are the Parish Council saying the Health Centre needs to expand now, or would need to expand to accommodate residents with new growth? What is the nature of the opportunity you are talking about? We would consider this 'potential' rather than an opportunity as stated; unless you say new growth will provide an opportunity to expand the health centre and its facilities. However would it need to? Is there any evidence?	The increased density of people may also give opportunity for more services to be offered from the Health Centre (a community dentist would be a good example).	The evidence is included as part of the text, see document, (version 2.1) p11.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

25	Page 10		What is the expansion opportunity for 'transport connections'? Are you saying public transport provision needs to be improved or is it something else? Again this is an unclear statement, and if transport is a problem it needs to be discussed in the earlier section under 'weaknesses within the Parish.'	Transport connections should be removed from this list.	Remove text "transport connections,"
26	Page 10		Expansion opportunities for retail outlets – again is this actually a 'potential'? There is no opportunity, unless there is growth bringing extra custom. This statement also lacks clarity, and without specifying what is available an Examiner will be unable to make an assessment.	There is no doubt that an increase of 75 or more dwellings would bring an increased spending base into the village that will provide more commercial opportunity for goods and service providers.	Due to growth of village/dwellings the expansion opportunities will be presented Ref: list of current business
27	Page 10		Opportunities - 'There are well established bus connection' was stated in strengths, how is it also an opportunity?	In a rural area like Mendlesham it is important to have existing services as it is extremely unlikely that new, additional, services could be justified. We may have an ability to vary these services if we can make a suitable case, however the services are not heavily used. I refer you to Supporting Document SD05 Q19 where 23% of respondents said they had problems with public transport. Also Supporting Document SD06 where 16.72% of respondents said they had problems with transport links.	No change.
28	Page 10		Opportunities - 'There are good existing community open spaces' – where? What are they? It then states; '(good existing) leisure facilities' what are they? There has been no mention of any facilities in	I refer you Supporting Document SD13	We will insert a community assets map (Including visions and evidence) and enhance the existing text in



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			the Plan. What is the (good existing) 'social provision for the community'? These rather general statements are not supported by facts.		Supporting Document SD13.
29	Page 10		Opportunities - '25% funding from the Community Infrastructure levy....' have you any idea on what or where this money would go? Modernising the Community Centre perhaps or something else?	The Parish Council has already indicated formally to MSDC that S106 monies will be directed to the maintenance or replacement of the existing Community Centre that is shared with Mendlesham Community Primary School. This was agreed at the Parish Council meeting 8 April 2015.	Reference Parish Council policy on the refurbishment or new build of a new community centre- as listed in document, section 4.3 page 15
30	Page 10		Threats - 'Inappropriate, non-phased, large scale development,' is this threat real or just a concern? If it is a 'threat' then what is the nature of the threat because if there is a recognised need to 'grow further' as stated earlier than this is hardly a threat. The two statements contradict each other.	I refer you to Supporting Document SD05, Q.14 where 88% of respondents wanted small scale and dispersed developments. I also refer you to Supporting Document SD09 Q.3 where 45% of respondents wanted no more than 10 dwellings on a site and 35% wanted no more than 20.	We will remove the word "inappropriate".
31	Page 10		Threats - 'Lack of investment in community infrastructure' – is this an historic lack of investment; because the preceding text in the Plan suggests that all is well? Or is this concern about growth with no accommodating infrastructure? If the latter what investment is required?	Agree	We will remove this text from SWOT
32	Page 10		Threats - 'Growing elderly population' – is this a threat? A weakness perhaps, but this makes it sound like something more drastic.	Amend	We will replace "Growing elderly population" with "Lack of appropriate housing for single people,



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

					growing families and the elderly”
33	Page 11		Threats ‘The growth of Mendlesham has been gradual...’ – it might be better to rephrase this point. Are you trying to say that the slow rate of growth over the past decade is a weakness?	This is listed under weaknesses not threats. The growth of Mendlesham has been stepped over the past 65 years’ Largely there have been 3 district steps that are shown on the map in Section 3, 3.1.	We will remove this text from SWOT
34	Page 11		Threats ‘it is widely recognised that being a key service centre...’ Is it more a case that the need to grow is not widely recognised and that most people would rather not have any further housing? The point being made here could be expressed more succinctly.	Agree	We will remove the reference to ‘Key Service Centre’.
35			If there are concerns (somewhat different to threats but a valid thing to have) then the actual nature of the concern needs to be better articulated to demonstrate what will be accepted? Even a threat would need to be countered with an acceptable solution.	Noted	No action required.
36	Page 13		Vision ‘As these key facilities and services come under more threat’ – this is a curious statement that possibly contradicts the previous sentence. What is the nature of the threat that is growing? Are shopkeepers and services struggling, in which case this is hardly a strong and vibrant community as stated in the plan? At a guess the threat is the viability of businesses in small rural	Agree	We will change “As these key facilities and services come under more threat,” to, “Without growth these key facilities and services become less viable and face the threat of closure”.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			locations - is it more a reduction of customers using services? The statement requires further clarification.		
37	Page 13		Vision – third paragraph – it is perhaps misleading to suggest that a vision was set out at the inauguration of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee. It might be better to express this as your stated intentions or aspirations. The intentions in the second and third bullet points are very similar and could be merged into one.	Disagree I direct you to Supporting Document SD16 paragraph 5.	Include reference to the formal NP application as part of this introduction paragraph.
38		Social Objectives SO4	How exactly will you allow the population to grow and become more balanced? Are you looking for homes that are suitable for younger and local people? Clarity is needed here which should be reflected in your housing policies.	Agree We are looking to redress the imbalance in the types of homes in the parish. I direct you to Supporting Document SD03 and the sections on Housing and Future Development. I direct you to Supporting Document 01 page 29 which shows that Mendlesham has a far higher supply of detached houses and a far lower supply of smaller terraced houses when measured against the national average.	Reference the appropriate supporting document
39		Social Objectives SO5	The previous pages have not mentioned any need for a range of high quality community and sports facilities and therefore the objective seems to spring out of nowhere. A policy may also be required.	I refer you to Supporting Document SD13, section 5. I also refer you to Supporting Document SD05 Q's 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38.	We will include reference to this supporting information.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

40		Environmental Objectives EO2	We refer to earlier comments on Rights of Ways.	I refer you to Supporting Document SD05 Q.22	We will include reference to this supporting information.
41		Environmental Objectives EO3	What exactly are the rural characteristics you want to protect? Clarity is definitely needed here (and are these characteristics actually under threat or being lost?). A policy may be needed here.	The Parish of Mendlesham is largely a rural area, positioned on the plateau at about 60 metres at its highest, It is known as high Suffolk with shallow valleys made up of tributaries of the river Dove in the North of the parish and the source of the river Gipping in the South with long views across fields and big skies. It is peaceful and quiet with no heavy industry. Many people move here for the views and the peaceful nature of the area. I refer you to Supporting Document SD05 Q.21 where 68% of respondents cited the "The rural environment" as being "definitely important" to them.	We will include reference to this supporting information.
42		Environmental Objectives EO4	To maintain our existing rural views. From where exactly do you want to maintain these views? When growth happens it is almost inevitable that someone will lose a rural view. Are there specific views whose loss would irretrievably diminish Mendlesham? If it is the latter then have these been mapped and a justification for their protection given? These would also need to be supported by a Policy. Please note that if you do map these views the justification needs to be robust and must	Agree A map has been produced. I refer you to Supporting Document SD19 as a whole and the map concerned is on page 8.	We will include reference to this supporting information- and insert an appropriate map highlighting the key views, our methodology in assessing these and any mitigation steps we would expect if these were to be effected through development.

Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			not appear to sterilise large areas of land from potential development.		
43		Environmental Objectives EO6	This is a good idea, but again the earlier text did not suggest there is a need for new planting projects (which is another way of saying Green Infrastructure). Therefore it needs to be discussed and an explanation given somewhere before bringing it forward as an action to undertake. Policy support could make this more robust. What additional footpaths and bridleways are needed? Have potential cycle routes been mapped and are they feasible? Is there support to provide them? A wish list needs to try and demonstrate feasibility, if there is no available funding then this would need to be sought through other channels.	Agree I refer you to Supporting Document SD05 Q.22 where 54 % of respondents felt that community planting projects could assist in protecting and enhancing the local environment.	We will reference to this supporting information
44	P14	Environmental Objectives EO7	Do you mean settlement not settlements? 'Vitality' and 'dynamism' is more an urban concept, suggesting a lot of activity that conflicts with a 'rural image.'	Rural development should not necessarily preclude 'vitality'.	Amend to "To have distinctive and flourishing settlements that exhibit community vitality"
45	P15	Business and Economic Objectives BO2	Is the amount of land really so large as to merit this objective in Mendlesham? It reads like an urban objective where there are a lot of derelict sites sitting around? How exactly are these 'opportunities' going to happen, what is it that the Parish Council going to 'provide'? There are existing national policies which prioritise the use of brownfield sites; are they not sufficient for your purposes?	Agree	Amend BO2 to read "To support the diversification of suitable redundant agricultural brownfield and previously used sites."



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

46		Business and Economic Objectives BO3	Does this mean that the parish is currently unattractive? Do you have facts to support this implied statement? How will you make it more attractive; through the allocation of land for commercial use? Or would you encourage barn conversions for small scale use??	Clarify statement. Our business survey listed the range and quantity of businesses operating within the parish; highlighting a gap between those operated from home and larger, established businesses with their own premises. Our evidence suggests an opportunity to provide accommodation for expanding smaller businesses. BO3 links directly with BO2	Edit BO3 to "To make the parish an appealing location for small businesses and entrepreneurs, by supporting suitable development sites for business start-ups; expanding the local economy including local employment opportunities."
47	P15	Paragraph 4.3	'Future initiatives' followed by 'our immediate concerns' seems to be a contradiction in terms.	Agree	Edit 4.3 to "Our main areas of focus for now and the near future are;"
48			'Resolving the issues of maintenance and management of the shared Community Centre' comes out of the blue; this needs to be discussed somewhere, and recorded as either a threat or weakness.	Agree	We will include this in our SWOT analysis. Further information will be included in Supporting Document SD13 section 5. It will also be included in our assets map (to be produced and included in Supporting Document SD13. We will insert new text to section 3 (3.2), challenges and opportunities.
49		Paragraph 4.3	The fourth bullet point is good but elsewhere the plan says say there is a good green infrastructure of footpaths, so clear up the apparent contradictions.	Agree There is a good infrastructure of paths but they need maintenance and, on occasions there is need to reconsider routing options.	We will reword to "continual monitoring of the local paths and bridleways with



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			<p>This work probably needs to be carried out with the County Council’s ROW team, and we would suggest it is undertaken as a short term objective as the new routes might influence the shape of development.</p>	<p>There is now a good link between the Mendlesham Walking Group and Suffolk County Council (which co-ordinates all work required).</p>	<p>recommendations for repair and improvements, where now opportunities are presented.”</p>
50	Page 18		<p>Recent work with Lavenham suggests that stating a requirement for sites of 10-20 dwellings will not be acceptable. Their recent Health Check says the following on their Policy for a maximum of 24 houses per site (we have highlighted the key part); ‘... it is evident that there is strong community support for housing development to be made up of smaller schemes and opposition to larger scale development. The supporting text refers to this being the most appropriate solution in order to achieve the plan’s overall vision and objectives. This conclusion needs further amplification however to justify why only small scale sites can meet the plan’s objectives and offer the most sustainable option for future development. Even with this a specific figure is difficult to justify in the policy. A more appropriate wording would be to set out more clearly the tests for development that have led to the conclusion that, in most circumstances, only smaller scale schemes are likely to be acceptable.</p>	<p>I refer you to Supporting Document SD05 Q.14 and Q.16; also to Supporting Document SD09 where we have clear guidance from residents as wanting small scale dispersed developments. I also refer you to the map in Section 3 figure 3.1 that shows the growth of Mendlesham where it is apparent that there were 3 distinct phases that took place over a considerable period of time. Mendlesham has only 621 dwellings currently and the additional minimum of 75 dwellings represents a 12% increase.</p> <p>This is the key element of the plan; we have been given a clear guidance that Mendlesham only seeks small and dispersed growth. See: The approved and adopted, Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan, (Cheshire West and Chester) Policy 1.</p>	<p>We will include pointers for this reference information.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Any proposed development would clearly have to justify that the capacity existed on existing services (school, health centre) as well as our other policies.</p> <p>We would argue that Mendlesham has similarities to Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan and will refer to this as a precedent.</p> <p>We will however edit section 5.7 Managing Growth- substituting phasing with ‘managing’.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			<p>However it is arguable that this statement seems to throw decision making back at the development industry, whereas one of the reasons for having a Neighbourhood Plan is to have the say in where key growth will go (and a reasoned justification for that decision) which may need to include landowners support.</p>	<p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan Policy 1 states that "proposals involving up to 30 homes will be allowed within or immediately adjacent to the built-up part of Tattenhall village over the period 2010 to 2030". Barratt and Wainhomes have submitted applications to build 68 and 137 homes respectively on land in Tattenhall, and these applications therefore do not comply with Policy 1.</i></p>	
51			<p>It needs to be pointed out that scattering smaller schemes could end up with a more incremental approach that actually works against some of your objectives; a larger scheme is likely to provide a better supply of affordable homes and more CIL funding in one go. It can also ease negotiations on other contributions, for example school and health service expansion.</p>	<p>Noted We already have an approved outline Planning Application for 56 dwellings and another on hold for circa 25 dwellings, so it seems unlikely that this may be a significant issue?</p>	<p>No action</p>
52			<p>Policy MP1 is a very large policy; it might be better to split it into the various components with some supporting paragraphs to explain the rationale for each section. Is the village settlement boundary defined somewhere?</p>	<p>Agree We point out that this was amalgamated into the current single policy following advice from MSDC. However we can see the sense in splitting of the affordable housing section into a separate policy. With regard to the village boundary, this is shown as the black perimeter line on the map in Section 3, figure 3.1.</p>	<p>We will split policy MP1 into two parts; Housing , and Affordable housing</p>
53			<p>The specification of a maximum number of dwellings will not be supported by the Examiner. The policy requires revision to refer to a minimum number in line with</p>	<p>Noted/agree The logic for the total of 100 is shown in section 5.4.</p>	<p>We will amend the text in the fifth paragraph under section 5.4 and remove</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			Government's stated intentions that Neighbourhood Plans should provide positively for growth. Greater clarity is also required to distinguish your approach to development within the existing built-up area, edge of built-up area locations and the use of brownfield sites.	If we are to quote a minimum then we will use the figure of 75 dwellings. We will still reference the target of MSDC for 750 dwellings over the next 15 years across all 10 Key Service Centres. It would be interesting to see the percentage increase in dwelling for each key service centre using the average of 75 dwelling each.	the figure of 100 dwellings.
54			Policy MP1 also says 'exception sites will be supported where they satisfy sustainability criteria' – but what are these criteria? This refers back to the need for some wording on sustainability at the beginning. Developers will have their own interpretation but what does it mean for you (make sure they are feasible and not contained in other policies)?	Agree: elaborate on the housing objectives sections 5.1-5.3	We will state our aims in existing section 5 under a heading of sustainable development.
55		Section 6	Business and the rural community. This chapter is clumsy; it talks about perceptions someone might have, then says things were more vibrant in 1986, then says well actually we have more employment now than then. So is it less vibrant or more vibrant, have services declined but jobs improved? Later on it says that actually we should have more jobs per head (so you are in actual fact less vibrant than the past?). We think you will realise the narrative here is messy. Also the Business Survey on Page 23 does not tell us if these jobs are	Agree We will review this section. I refer you to Supporting Document SD08 that contains a lot more information about the local businesses.	A complete review of this section will be undertaken.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			locally employed people or those commuting into Mendlesham, and if they are commuting into the village then does this link up with the need for local homes identified in another chapter (or not)?		
56	Page 26		Text at the top of the page 'Mendlesham has a history of encouraging the building of light industrial units' this suggests a need at the beginning of the document to list where all these businesses are located. Also, how many light industrial units are there, and when were they built? The phrasing suggests an ongoing process. How has Mendlesham been 'encouraging' them, was it supportive when planning application/s came in? Would it as part of this 'history of encouraging' ask for more units like this as well as the incubator units mentioned in Paragraph 6.4?	Agree We will review this section.	A complete review of this section will be undertaken.
57			Have you any evidence that businesses are starting at home in Mendlesham for want of incubator units? Also after stating the need for incubator units you fail to develop this into a Policy on the next page.	Agree We will review this section.	A complete review of this section will be undertaken.
58			As you rightly acknowledge entrepreneurial hubs seem to develop in areas where there is existing expertise. While your aspirations are noted, is it realistic to expect some form of hub to be established in a small village with limited facilities? Is it a practical	Agree We will review this section.	A complete review of this section will be undertaken.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			suggestion? You may wish to consider the deletion of this section.		
59		Policy MP2	Policy MP2 does not follow on from the statements made about 'encouraging light industrial units' which suggests you no longer want them. We imagine this is not your intention. The policy therefore requires revision. The policy also needs to state its support for the development of incubator units if that is your intent (once justification and evidence is provided within the text). At present no definition has been provided to give an indication as to the size of the proposed business hubs. Furthermore is it realistic to expect that isolated residential properties will be converted to businesses given the marked differences in values? Are you perhaps trying to achieve something else here?	Agree We will review this section.	A complete review of this section will be undertaken.
60		Section 7	Design; this is a very comprehensive chapter however it contains a considerable amount of generic advice and guidance which is perhaps more suited to an urban environment than a rural village. What will it actually mean for Mendlesham? Are you referring to residential or business development or both? We are assuming housing from what is being said and therefore within the introductory paragraphs more emphasis is required on what makes Mendlesham so distinctive in terms of	Review this chapter. Design guidance from MSDC and SCC is limited and outdated; we want to ensure that Mendlesham has high quality development- (learning lessons from the past of poorly designed developments) and that our NP sets out some of the key criteria we expect developers to achieve.	Clarify wording to state: All development (business and residential) Add more emphasis on what makes Mendlesham distinctive in terms of design and need for good local vernacular inspired design and place making. Edit section to be more concise.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			design, this then flows into the need for good local vernacular inspired design and place making.		
61		Paragraph 7.3	Paragraph 7.3 - policy GP1 in the Mid Suffolk Plan will eventually be replaced. It might be better to refer to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which are similar in intent.	Review and reference NPPF	Substitute text from 7.3 with NPPF section 55, p14 "To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; or ● where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

					heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or ● the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling. Such a design should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; -- reflect the highest standards in architecture; -- significantly enhance its immediate setting; and -- be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area."
62	P29	Paragraph 7.4	Paragraph 7.4 – a full design appraisal or site analysis is not necessarily needed on every occasion and may not in any event achieve your unstated intentions (using poorly designed areas to establish a baseline is not a good starting point).	Agree and clarify. It is commonly assumed that context appraisals are designed and based on the positive elements of the surrounding context- a context appraisal which	Edit para 7.4; Clarify positive context Edit the bullet point list by deleting 7, 8, and 11.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			<p>The bullet points appear to relate more to an urban context rather than a rural village. It is possible that only points 1, 2, 3, 6, 10 and 12 are relevant. In any event rather than leaving it to applicant to determine it would be better if the plan could set out what it is you want to achieve without being overly prescriptive or unrealistic.</p>	<p>considered negative design cues from the local context would surely not be approved during any pre-application meeting with MSDC or Mendlesham Parish Council.</p> <p>Without direct site allocations it will be impossible to plan out what we want to achieve- (hence this approach to context appraisal)</p>	
63			<p>Commentary on your preferred building types and attitude to barn conversions would also be helpful (perhaps supported by photographs). You may also wish to delete the threshold (0.1ha) for the application of the appraisal requirements which could lead to some poorly designed infill plots.</p>	<p>Clarity</p> <p>Infill sites will still need to undertake a built form and spatial context appraisal- The threshold is related directly to the development we expect to see over the plan period- Mendlesham has very few infill development opportunities.</p>	<p>Insert more wording/ photos on preferred building types and attitude to barn conversions</p>
64	P32	Policy MP5	<p>Policy MP5 – it is questionable whether an Examiner would support the imposition of a building height restriction without sufficient justification. What about other development types rather than just dwellings? It might be better to say that the height, scale and mass of all new development shall reflect local distinctiveness. Government is redefining energy performance requirements for new development which might make the final part of this policy redundant. In any event it might be better to include requirements such as this in a separate sustainability policy as discussed earlier.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Edit to state; building height, mass and scale shall reflect local distinctiveness.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

65		Paragraph 7.5	Paragraph 7.5, Green Infrastructure – this section is not very effective due to the fact local green infrastructure and opportunities for enhancement have not been mapped.	This section (7.10) is about protecting an existing field hedgerow, or wood coppice or green link between green areas through a considered planning and design approach.	We intend to map these opportunities
66	P30	Paragraph 7.6	Paragraph 7.6, Connectivity – is it realistic to place all new development near public transport routes (i.e. bus stops) in a village location?	(7.7) Mendlesham village is a compact settlement; the 'Connectivity' section seeks to avoid sprawling disconnected development. We will clarify the wording to address this comment.	Remove second paragraph.
67	P33	Policy MP3	Policy MP3 – is this policy intended to apply to single plots as well as larger housing proposals? Greater distinction is required.	Yes (note this in NP5)	No change.
68		Paragraph 7.10	Paragraph 7.10 – Green Infrastructure - the section on water management strategies; is flooding an issue in Mendlesham? Did it once have wetland habitats that could be restored? Is there any landowner interest in doing this?	No	No change. Explore a SuDS (Sustainable urban drainage systems) policy
69		Paragraph 7.10	Paragraph 7.10 – Context Appraisal and green space within Mendlesham – what are the green spaces and habitats? Have they been identified and mapped? Are they fragmented? They should be identified on the Proposals Map and referred to in a green infrastructure section.	What is the Proposals Map?	MSDC to confirm
70	Page 34		Having raised 'The lack of superfast broadband may deter potential businesses' earlier in the document you now say it is likely to be installed by the	Agree We will amend Supporting Document SD13.	SD13 section 7 will be updated.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			end of 2015. This apparent contradiction needs to be rectified. If Broadband is installed within the next seven months the first part of the policy would seem to be superfluous but the second half could be retained and strengthened by including your expectations as set out in the second part of the footnote.		
71	P36	Section 8	Section 8 – visually important open space; you are proposing small scale additions to a village, therefore the tone of this design material seems more suited to large scale urban developments. For example ‘all public areas, whether squares, streets, pedestrian links or parking courts’ reads more like a major development site.	Agree; this section could be tightened up with more relevant terminology to Mendlesham rural context.	Edit section 8
72	P36		‘Public open space’ and ‘greener environment creating important environmental, social and economic benefits in small development’ and ‘green space provide important recreational benefits’ and ‘community resource’ etc, etc. Again this seems more related to a larger scheme such as a town extension, where there is scope to provide open spaces of the scale and function you are discussing. With small village extensions there is unlikely to be much open space, if indeed there is any at all.	Noted; these are positive outcomes for any development not simply strategic development sites. The GR application included public open space, green community resource within a ‘green environment’ but still required 3+ attempts to get this right. We are trying to avoid developments that fail to provide green amenity within and green rural setting.	Edit section 8 to include points raised.
73			How realistically can you design a scheme around a landscape structure if	Noted; Mendlesham is a small settlement in relative terms but protecting an existing	Edit wording to be more specific to what we mean by ecology ‘locally’



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

			you are only proposing small scale developments?	field hedgerow, or wood coppice or green link between green areas is our aim.	
74			Is there likely to be much threat to existing ecology and natural habitats in the urban edge of Mendlesham? Most development is likely to be farmers' fields, a ditch and a hedge, which has value, but is not a major feature and will be difficult to enhance within small extensions.	This point relates specifically to ecology/wildlife corridors or connecting wildlife routes between, around and within Mendlesham. Noted; Mendlesham is small in relative terms but protecting an existing field hedgerow, or wood coppice or green link between green areas is our aim.	Edit wording to be more specific to what we mean by ecology locally
75			The 'wealth of community spaces' needs to be mapped, and we refer to comments on Green Infrastructure mapping.	Agree	We will insert a community assets map into Supporting Document SD13. (Including visions and evidence.)
76	Page 37	8.3	8.3 Visually Important Open Space – we really need more information on this, and also a map. At Lavenham the Health Check was critical of this concept which seemed to be an attempt to try and sterilise large swathes of land from development. We are sure this is not your intention. You will be required to justify these spaces, and the Examiner will need to be convinced of the reasoning and arguments.	Done. I refer you to Supporting Document SD19.	No action
77			'There is a well-used network of paths and bridleways' – see our earlier comments. In the plan you are suggesting improvements, and this needs to be discussed here?	Cannot see this in 8.3 but we have agreed to deal with this matter already.	



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

78	Page 38		<p>Page 38 – last paragraph – ‘In order to avoid domination by back fences ... countryside edges should be fronted by houses’, this suggests that all new housing would face outward across fields, which seems a good idea until you need to add another extension to the village. This may need a little more thought.</p>	<p>This is an aspiration - designing layouts that make the best use of the site, settling and landscape. There may be instances where development will limit this; however we are not imagining large quantities of housing growth in a fashion that this would be an issue.</p>	<p>Edit this paragraph to include the summary from our visual analysis and key views of Mendlesham which refers to the mitigation of the impact of development.</p>
79	Page 39		<p>It might be better to have landscaping around the new settlement edges to soften the appearance; this will one day form a barrier between the next wave of housebuilding beyond 2015 and an ecological habitat too. This seems a better way of approaching it than the third paragraph on page 38 which is a muddled statement; if ‘care needs to be taken with the design of development site boundaries’ then a line or cluster of houses facing outwards as suggested in paragraph 7 does not seem a good solution. Indeed in Policy MP6 you require ‘boundary and screening planting’ which contradicts the suggestion for a line of houses facing outwards.</p>	<p>Site boundaries will not be limited to landscape planting. Fences, walls combined with planting will be more likely. When arranging development proposals to front onto streets or open spaces, boundary treatments will need to respond to this in a positive way, including appropriate landscape and edge treatment. The paragraph could be tightened up to avoid misunderstanding.</p>	<p>Change text to clarify this point and apparent contradiction with MP6.</p>
80		Policy MP6	<p>Policy MP6 could be broken up into several Policies as it is quite wide ranging. The last point about the use of ROW’s is covered in other legislation.</p>	<p>Agree We will break this up into three separate policies.</p>	<p>From the existing MP6 Policy Paragraphs 1 and 4 will be combined into a separate policy. Paragraphs 2 and 3 will be combined into a separate policy.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

					Paragraph 5 will be a separate policy.
81			Finally the plan ends with no concluding comments. Some kind of vision or description of what Mendlesham will look like in 2030 would be a good thing to have when drawing up conclusions, e.g. more homes for locally employed people, better footpaths, more woodland etc – this is your Parish and village to describe and we do not want to tell you what to put here. Also there would need to be some evidence that this future vision is a community one and not that of just the Parish Council members.	Agree We will produce a new section after section 8 that will be the vision for 15 years time (2030), what will have been achieved and how we see the village at that point in time.	New section to be included.

Appendix 3 - Comments received from informal consultation with residents and “interested parties” and responses made re draft version 2.2 - November - December 2015

Consultation period: 29 November 2015 - 21 December 2015		
Responder	Comments made	MPC response
Resident - MR P.G.	Queried a reference to an HGV depot in the NP. Given it now has outline planning permission does this reference need updating?	No need for any change to the text at present.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	Queried a reference to a shop identified as a hairdressers but currently houses an Estate Agency.	Text amended to show the current occupation of the shop.
Resident - Mr M.E.	Suggested enhancements to the text describing the Mendlesham Conservation Area.	This section of text was rewritten and further detail added.
	Identified that there is no traffic policy within the NP. Queried whether there should be more effort to improve current crossing points in Mendlesham Village.	Noted, but no textual changes made.
	Affordable housing. Suggested this may need further thought if Central Government policies to sell off units persists.	Noted, but no textual changes made.
	Managing housing growth. Queried the meaning of the wording "steady growth". Queried the clarity of the wording "Close attention will need to be paid to the capacity of local key services ...".	This section of text was rewritten and further detail added.
	Policy MP1. Suggested the word "permitted" should be changed to "supported".	This change was made.
	Weaknesses within the parish. Suggested some additional wording relating to lack of parking be added.	Noted, but text was left unchanged.
	Section 7 - Design Suggested that within the third paragraph, the description of the roads making up the Mendlesham Conservation Area should have "and part Chapel Road" added.	This change was made.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Resident - Mrs C.T.	Complimenting everyone involved in the construction of the NP for their hard work and hoping it will help to secure Mendlesham's future.	No response required.
Resident - Mr J.W.	This resident wrote to say that he felt the current NP is unsound and open to challenge for five reasons, as follows:	
	Mendlesham Parish Council had supported an outline planning application for 56 dwellings when residents had clearly shown a preference for small developments of around 10-20 dwellings	Comment noted but not supported.
	Key views in and around the parish are incomplete and the weightings assigned are inadequate. This has "resulted in a flawed unsound result and is therefore open to challenge".	Comment noted but not supported.
	The sections on site context and development massing are felt to be draconian and will deter small builders.	Comment noted but not supported.
	The draft NP does not appear to support housing development on brownfield sites; does this therefore mean that the plan actually supports housing development on the green fields surrounding Mendlesham?	Comment noted but not supported.
	Suggested that the wider parish (particularly Mendlesham Green) is being ignored for new development	Comment noted but not supported.
	This resident then added a sixth reason that could leave the current draft NP open to challenge; as follows;	



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	<p>The current NP supports new housing development where it involves redundant brownfield and previously used land. Suggested that this contravenes the NPPF which states “limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) whether redundant or in continuing use”.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Changes have been made to the text to align it with the NPPF.</p>
Historic England	<p>Suggested that the Historic Buildings Officer at MSDC could provide assistance in developing the NP.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>Suggested consideration be given to the addition of a specific policy aimed at protecting Mendlesham’s historic environment.</p>	<p>Noted. It is felt that the current arrangements for the protection of historical assets and in particular those within the Mendlesham Conservation Area are adequate and do not require enhancement. This is not an issue that has been raised by residents. We have, following these and other comments, rewritten the text describing the historic environment to note its importance to the local area.</p>
	<p>Suggested contact is made with staff at Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service for advice on archaeological matters.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Highways England	<p>No issues raised.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Bidwells (on behalf of a local resident)	<p>This response was made on behalf of one of our local residents (a local landowner) and contained the following comments.</p>	
	<p>Housing The view is that Mendlesham could support more than the 75 houses over the next fifteen years described in the NP.</p>	<p>Noted. Also noted that the 750 dwellings across 10 Key Service Centres target set by MSDC is already being reviewed. Further work (more detailed text) has been carried out to give more clarity to the quantification of future housing requirements.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	Village boundary. Growth around the outside edge of the existing village boundary is supported.	Noted.
	Development size. Disagreement with the preference for small development sites of 10-20 dwellings. Suggested that medium sized sites of around 50 dwellings would be preferred.	The 10-20 dwelling units size is the overwhelming preference of residents and we would not change that. However we also recognise that each case has to be judged on its individual merits and there is not a blanket restriction on sites above 20 units.
	Textual changes to Policy MP1 were suggested, along with increasing the minimum figure of 75 dwellings over the next 15 years to 100 dwellings.	Noted. Textual changes have been made to Policy MP1 to improve its clarity. No changes will be made to the 75 dwelling minimum figure until MSDC completes its review of its overall housing requirements.
	Business and the rural economy. Support given to this section and noted that the residents land would have a site suitable for small business development.	Noted.
	Visually important open spaces. (VIOS_ Concern that the current wording around VIOS may inhibit future development. A new Policy MP7 is suggested that would give better clarity to the role of VIOS.	Noted. Policy has been rewritten and should deal with the concerns raised.
Mid Suffolk District Council	Policy MP1 Map to clearly identify the NP area is required. Would "development plans" be better described as "development proposals"?	Map enhanced. Wording changed.
	Policy MP3 (small business hubs) MSDC is supportive of the policy	Noted.
	Policy MP4 Height restriction to two storeys maybe found as overly prescriptive?	Height restriction removed.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	Para 7.9 Parking Suggest consideration be given to an additional policy for parking.	Text improved. No additional policy to be included.
	Para 7.11 Sustainable development Suggested that the content of this paragraph may require review?	Noted. No changes proposed.
	Para 8.3 Suggested that more detail is needed about the landscape importance of each area.	This detail is already available in Supporting Document SD19.
	Policy MP8 Some revisions required to make it more compatible with the provisions of the NPPF.	Policy rewritten taking into account the suggested changes.
Natural England	No issues raised.	Noted.
Environment Agency	No issues raised.	Noted.
Suffolk County Council	Education SCC provided a rationale for its school places provision.	Noted.
	Landscape Assessment Policy MP7 - suggested that if the Parish wishes to retain MSDC Local Plan saved policy SB33 then it should be explicitly saved within the NP.	Noted.
	Public Rights of Way Policy MP9 is welcomed but it could be enhanced and suggested text is provided.	Policy rewritten and expanded taking account of suggestions.
	Transport Guidance in 7.9 is welcomed; better reference would be to "Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2014 (as amended),	Guidance text altered as suggested. The parish will align to the county wide guidance.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

<p>Suffolk Preservation Society</p>	<p>Queries why the historic built environment of Mendlesham Village is not given more prominence in the NP.</p>	<p>We have taken note of several comments about the apparent shortage of comment on the village’s historic environment. It is felt that the current arrangements for the protection of historical assets and in particular those within the Mendlesham Conservation Area are adequate and do not require enhancement. This is not an issue that has been raised by residents. We have, following these and other comments, rewritten the text describing the historic environment to note its importance to the local area.</p>
	<p>Suggests that this could be a good time to identify the non-designated heritage assets that contribute to the village’s distinctive character.</p>	<p>We would prefer not to pursue this as part of the NP but is something that could be set up as a project in the near future.</p>
	<p>Sections on design principles and landscape appraisal are well researched and written. Suggested that we make a requirement for development within or affecting the setting of the conservation area to adhere to the local design context as outlined in the 2007 Conservation Area Appraisal.</p>	<p>The Mendlesham Conservation Area appraisal (Supporting Document SD22) is now included as a supporting document for the NP and reference is made to it by the policy.</p>



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

APPENDIX 4 - Issues raised by the NPIERS "health check" Examiner re Mendlesham Neighbourhood plan draft version 2.2 and responses made

	Each of the issues raised within the Examiner's report was assigned a code (e.g. GQ1, to clearly identify it) and the issue deal with separately as shown below.	
General questions	General issues raised by the NPIERS Examiner	Response
GQ1	There is robust evidence within SD03-Mendlesham-issues-objectives-and-evidence.pdf. analysis of questionnaires, If this were referenced within the Plan it would be easier for the flow of the 'story' for the reader / examiner. The strength of the evidence is currently not apparent in the statements within the Plan	Stronger reference to SD03 will be included.
GQ2	The Vision, at Sections 6 and 9 will be better amalgamated. They could be more beneficially placed closer to the beginning of the document. The Vision and objectives states the reason for doing the Plan in the first place and the steps taken to achieve this will include the Policies that follow afterwards.	An Executive summary will be included at the front of the NP document and a new policy list will be included. Current sections 6 & 9 will be amalgamated and placed towards the front of the NP document. A "conclusion" will be added at the end of the document commenting on the longevity and changeability of the NP.
GQ3	I have suggested areas where data needs to be quantified or the source cited, otherwise it could seem as if figures used are chosen at random. These may of course already be in the Basic Conditions Statement and if so can be brought into the supporting text of the Plan. Such detailed work will strengthen the Plan to make it more precise therefore simpler to enforce and robust to challenge.	Noted Improvements will be made to references to supporting documents



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

GQ4	The policies are clear and seem to reflect most of the community's aspirations, although I note gaps in community assets and green spaces that could be managed through additional policies, as detailed below. Policies do however require rephrasing to ensure they are sufficiently supportive of new development and that the criteria for acceptable development is clear and measurable.	Fig 2.2 will be upgraded to show community assets
GQ5	It will be helpful to have a list of policies at the beginning of the document.	Will be done; see GQ2
GQ6	To help navigation, policies should be identified with a name as well as numbers, e.g. MP1 Housing. Page numbers are necessary and paragraph numbers, once the document is finalised, will help in navigation and referencing.	Page and paragraph numbering is now present. Policies are named.
GQ7	I note that certain things highlighted as being precious to the community are not covered in policy terms. The community assets, listed as such as the community centre, playing fields, Millennium woodland, health and education establishments. These could be protected through policy as assets of community value. Useful information is provided here: http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06366#fullreport	Will be reviewed but not as part of the NP



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Specific questions raised by the NPIERS Examiner

Specific questions	Issue Raised	Response
SQ1	<p>With regard to securing the future of the Parish Council owned Mendlesham Woodland known as Millennium Woodland. I suggest it can be protected using the provisions of NPPF 76 and 77 for recreation and Green space.</p> <p>Each green space highlighted in S.8.2 of the Plan will need to have its own justification against the NPPF criteria and be named within a new Green spaces designation policy. In terms of the phrase 'extensive tracts of land' within NPPF, the woodland by comparison to its surroundings does not come under this proviso in my view.</p>	Section 8.3 will be enhanced to include these comments
SQ2	With regard to concerns over the development of the vicarage, permission is required to demolish a dwelling therefore the local plan and other policies in the MNDP will have control over the replacement.	Noted



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Part 1 - Process questions raised by the NPIERS Examiner

		Criteria	Source	Response/Comments
PQ1	1.1	Have the necessary statutory requirements been met in terms of the designation of the neighbourhood area?	Mid Suffolk District Council website	Yes. In January 2013, the Parish Council submitted a NDP Area Designation Application The publication period began on 27th February 2013 and closed on 10th April 2013. Mid Suffolk District Council confirmed the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area on 17th June 2013. NFA (No Further Action)
PQ2	1.2	If the area does not have a parish council, have the necessary statutory requirements been met in terms of the designation of the neighbourhood forum?		N/A NFA
PQ3	1.3	Has the plan been the subject of appropriate pre-submission consultation and publicity, as set out in the legislation, or is this underway?		This is underway NFA
PQ4	1.4	Has there been a programme of community engagement proportionate to the scale and complexity of the plan?	Parish Council website and supporting documents, including outline in the NDP	Yes NFA
PQ5	1.5	Are arrangements in place for an independent examiner to be appointed?		Yes (with MSDC) but no action necessary to date TBA (To Be Arranged)



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

PQ6	1.6	Are discussions taking place with the electoral services team on holding the referendum?		Not yet TBA (To Be Arranged)
PQ7	1.7	Is there a clear project plan for bringing the plan into force and does it take account of local authority committee cycles?		MPC has its Project timetable (a copy of which is posted on the web site). It will be adjusted to take account of committee cycles as each stage commences TBA (To Be Arranged)
PQ8	1.8	Has an SEA screening been carried out by the LPA?	NDP para 2.4	SEA completed by MSDC. Done and SD20 refers TM to ensure a detailed reference is included in the NP final draft
PQ9	1.9	Has an HRA screening been carried out by the LPA?		Yes, completed by MSDC



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Part 2 - Content questions raised by the NPIERS Examiner

		Criteria	Source	Response/Comments
SQ1	2.1	Are policies appropriately justified with a clear rationale?		Not all policies. See full text for details. Noted (TM)
SQ2	2.2	Is it clear which parts of the draft plan form the 'neighbourhood plan proposal' (i.e. the neighbourhood <i>development plan</i>) under the Localism Act, subject to the independent examination, and which parts do not form part of the 'plan proposal', and would not be tested by the independent examination?		MPC view is that it is clear. However, 6.3 Work already in hand will be better described to show that these are separate projects and not part of the current NP.
SQ3	2.3	Are there any obvious conflicts with the NPPF?		MPC discussed this with NPIERS examiner and possible conflicts are dealt with later on this document
SQ4	2.4	Is there a clear explanation of the ways the plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development?		NDP para 3.6 states how the plan is expected to contribute to the achievements of sustainable development NFA
SQ5	2.5	Are there any issues around compatibility with human rights or EU obligations?		None found NFA
SQ6	2.6	Does the plan avoid dealing with excluded development including		Yes
DONE				NFA



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

		nationally significant infrastructure, waste and minerals?		
SQ7	2.7	Is there consensus between the local planning authority and the qualifying body over whether the plan meets the basic conditions including conformity with strategic development plan policy and, if not, what are the areas of disagreement?		MPC does not believe that there is any disagreement. A copy of the Health Check was sent to MSDC and no issues were raised.
SQ8	2.8	Are there any obvious errors in the plan?		The Examiner's comment was "This Plan is well put together. Nevertheless the purpose of the Healthcheck is to highlight gaps. Therefore the errors in the Plan are highlighted in the main text at the beginning." Noted
SQ9	2.9	Are the plan's policies clear and unambiguous and do they reflect the community's aspirations?		The Examiners comments were "The policies are clear and reflect the community's aspirations." and, "They do however require rephrasing to ensure they are sufficiently supportive of new development and that the criteria for acceptable development is clear." The rephrasing work has been carried out.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

Textual suggestions from NPIERS Examiner

	Document reference	Issue Raised	Response
TS1	Para. 1.1. Objectives:	Change 'adopt' for 'create'. NDP's are not 'adopted'.	Done
TS2	Fig. 1.1	Make the parish boundary line thicker so the extent of the NDP Area is clear	Done
TS3	2.2 The project	Change for 'development of the NDP'	Done
TS4	Fig 2.1 and 2.2	Also number or letter the community assets, in addition to the colour coding to make it clearer and to have a reference	Done
TS5	3.1.	62 responses said they might want to move in the next 5 years – where? Inside or outside the NDP area?	Household Questionnaire Q6 refers, Reference will be added
TS6	3.2	Parish household questionnaire (ref to para 3.9?)	A reference to Q42 (Household Questionnaire) answers will be added to improve readability and also a reference to content in section 3.9
TS7	3.3	Rationale is needed for 'schemes of more than 6 dwellings'?	Remove the reference to 6 dwellings. This was due to a "failed" piece of legislation that no longer applies.
TS8	3.4	Rationale is needed for 'sites of circa 10-20 dwellings'. How was this number arrived at? Is this because of a local development pattern or successful new developments?	Rationale is there Improvements will be made to the wording and references to evidence.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

SD10 - Statement of Consultation

TS9	3.9	Refer back to para 3.2	See TS6 above
TS10	Policy MP 1	Requires detail in the supporting text (and Basic Conditions Statement) of the reasons for choosing this number 'a minimum of 75 new homes'	Quantified in 3.4 The section for quantification of new dwelling requirements will be rewritten and better explanation and evidence included.
TS11	4.1	Need date/source for the Rural Business Statistics. The arrival of high speed broadband into Mendlesham' – has this already happened? Is this para superseded?	Source of stats has been included. Broadband implementation throughout Mendlesham parish is not yet complete.
TS12	5.1 Challenges	reorder	Text will be improved, including use of bullet points.
TS13		The main challenge facing the parish is future development and there are two major considerations; 1.Mendlesham village 2.Mendlesham Green, Tan Office and other settlements 1. Mendlesham village Over the past four decades, Mendlesham village has expanded into the surrounding agricultural land to meet its requirements for growth. Etc.	The presentation of this section has now been improved to remove the confusion.
TS14	Fig. 5.1	Number the major housing periods as well as colour code to make this clearer 'Strengths of the Parish'	Final copy is colour coded Text improved



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

		<p>Quantify the specific support for MNDP at County, national and European level' Opportunities for the Parish' and 'Weaknesses within the Parish' Refer to the Consultation Statement</p> <p>Is there still a lack of superfast Broadband?'</p> <p>Threats to the Parish' – need to explain the ways in which non-phased, large scale development is a threat.</p> <p>Instead of 'the elderly' use the phrase 'older people'</p>	<p>Text improved</p> <p>Reference made</p> <p>Yes, to some areas</p> <p>Better text added, e.g. "If is is not well designed and suitable for the context in the village". Also "Our surveys with village residents have shown the following ...".</p> <p>Text changed as suggested</p>
TS15	6.2 Objectives	Can these be related to Policies?	<p>See section 3 in SD11</p> <p>A table has been added to the NP showing which objectives are met with which new policies.</p>
TS16	6.3 Work already in hand	Do these comprise projects, i.e. not policies?	These are separate projects not directly related to the NP and not being pursued within the NP.
TS17	7.8 Material use	insert 'have a range of locally specific facing materials'	Wording amended and improved
TS18	7.9 Parking requirements.	Quantify the 'correct parking amount'. Cite the source of the garage size, otherwise this could appear a random size.	As set out in the Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2014
TS19	Fig. 8.1 Principal views in and around Mendlesham	These should be numbered to enable referencing within the supporting text.	"Arrows" will be numbered and the reference number to included in SD19



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

SD10 - Statement of Consultation

TS20 DONE	Section 9: The 15 year Vision	this should really be at the very beginning of the document. It sets the tone and the policies will be judged against whether they fit with this vision	To be done
TS21	Figure 5.1		Could each site have a numbered flag to improve readability in black and white? The diagram is colour coded but B&W copies may be available. PD to action?
	Policy recommendations		
PR1	MP1: Housing sites	Remove reference to 'redundant' in brownfield and previously used land. Otherwise this policy will be contrary to NPPF 89. The supporting text to this policy has given the rationale for the figure of the minimum of 75 new homes and the policy reads well.	NPPF 89 relates to green belt Reference should be to NPPF 111. Reference removed
PR2	MP2: Affordable housing	This policy could be split in two as the first part seeks to control occupation and the other to provide supply. It is difficult to see anything Mendlesham-specific in the second part of this policy and, as it currently duplicates a lot of the Mid Suffolk district wide planning policies (Mid Suffolk Local Plan Alteration (July 2006) altered Policy H4), it should be removed.	The policy will be split into two as suggested.
PR3	MP 3: Business	Alter text to read: supported subject to their conforming to the policies of Mid Suffolk District Council within this Plan.	The change will be made
PR4	MP 4: Design	Development will be supported where:	

Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

		<p>All building design and materials used shall be sympathetic to the local area and adjacent buildings.</p> <p>The selection of proposed materials should be directly influenced by the surround context and clearly justified through the analysis of its surrounding context.</p> <p>Reflect local characteristics in terms of topography, ridge heights, layout, plot size</p> <p>The size of dwellings and their plots shall be sympathetic to those in the immediate vicinity, particularly to avoid the impression of dwellings being “shoe horned” in. New dwellings shall be no greater than 2 storeys similar in height to the local buildings that are mostly maintain the local character of buildings</p> <p>in the parish. All new development proposals with the exception of historic listed buildings should seek to have a minimum energy efficiency standard equivalent to level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (DCLG 2006) or in line with current national standards. (WMS March 25 2015 states that optional new technical standards can now only be required through Local Plan policies, this includes any energy requirements such as CSH 4)</p> <p>Contextual design analysis shall be proportionate to the proposed development. This aspect would be suitable as a project to encourage the LPA to include in its local validation lists.</p>	<p>The suggested additions and deletions have been incorporated.</p> <p>The suggested sentence will be included</p>
PR5	MP 5: Green space contributions	More positive phrasing such as 'Development will be supported where it and subject to	More positive phrasing has been included.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

		other policies in this Plan. This policy needs to be more specific. At the moment it is too open ended and could deter development. This fails to meet the Basic Conditions.	
PR6	MP 6: Broadband provision	is this policy still required? The phrasing is not as a land use policy and would be better suited as a project if it is to stay in.	Still required, policy to stay
PR7	MP 7: Visually important open spaces	<p>Visually important open spaces – is this views? Refer to Fig. 8.1 in the Policy. Further quantification is required in terms of the criteria used for the degrees of 'significance'.</p> <p>Are these national or district wide criteria? Or were they set by local people through the consultation process?</p> <p>Views need to be numbered and properly described.</p>	<p>8.1 ref to be made</p> <p>Section 8 heading will include "views"</p> <p>Reference numbering will be included</p>
PR8	MP 8: New development in the conservation area	Rephrase policy so that it is more positive. What criteria is to be used to assess whether a development is 'in keeping' and within sight? At the moment this policy lacks precision and is too restrictive.	Improved wording introduced.
PR9	MP 9: Footpaths	Footpaths – rephrase to the positive and quantify any particular footpaths.	More positive wording introduced to include reference to connections to existing footpaths



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

APPENDIX 5 - Issues raised by MSDC on Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan draft version 3.1 and responses provided - April 2016

Id	MSDC comment	Mendlesham response
GC1.1	The NP is written primarily in future tense whereas it would read better if it was written as if it were complete. In other words, not "will" but "does" or "have".	Noted. Text will be adjusted.
GC1.2	There is a lot of repetition throughout the document and further editing, as suggested in this review, will help reduce the overall size and improve the flow of the document.	Noted.
GC1.3	Reference is made throughout the document to "Supporting Document SDxx". It might help the reader/user if the title of the Supporting Document was also included?	Noted. A full list of all Supporting Documents is provided in Section 10, Appendices, Supporting Documents.
ES1.1	The inclusion of the "original agreed objectives" to the first time reader suggests that these are the objectives of the NP. However, it is clear from page 8 that these are now superseded and, as such, does their inclusion here help or hinder?	Text to be rewritten to provide a link between the original objectives and their more detailed derivatives.
ES1.2	The sentence before the policy list would be better reworded as: <i>To this end, the Neighbourhood Plan contains eleven new local policies which, together with those adopted nationally and locally, will be used to determine proposals for new development in Mendlesham.</i>	Agreed. Text to be reworded.
CP1.1	It is suggested that the Policy number and titles are included in the contents at their appropriate location. This will help the user navigate around the Plan.	Agreed. New Policies will be shown on Contents page.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

SC1.1	Needs a title "Introduction" rather than "1. Introduction" as it feels like there will be a 2. and 3. in Section 1.	Noted. Title changed to Vision and Objectives.
SC1.2	Traditionally, this section would take the reader through the story of how the NP came about and setting its context. A brief overview of each stage from designation through to draft plan (and the stages beyond it that can be amended in the final "made" version).	Agreed. Text to be added to better describe the outline life cycle of the project.
SC1.3	It's a bit disjointed in that it goes straight into a vision, but not THE vision, which is set out in paras 1.18 to 1.31.	Agreed. Text changed from "vision" to "objectives".
SC1.4	Paras. 1.9 and 1.10 feel like objectives	Noted.
SC1.5	Reference is made in Objectives table (1.16) to Policy MP12. I can find no MP12. This table needs reviewing to make sure that the policies and objectives link.	Agreed. MP12 references removed. All objectives vs policies linkages rechecked and verified.
SC1.6	None of the objectives in 1.16 mention meeting housing needs.	Agreed. Text describing SO1 improved to reflect the housing objective.
SC1.7	The Vision appears to spread across paras. 1.18 to 1.31. This is a very long vision and could probably be tightened up.	Agreed. Individual paragraphs changed to bullet points.
SC1.8	The Vision statements contain a number of actions (such as the new scout hut and the bigger school). These would normally be contained within the various sections of the NP.	Noted. No action.
SC1.9	Notwithstanding the Healthcheck, the "parallel projects" could usefully be located within the relevant policy sections of the NP. This would help to join up the plan and could be listed distinctly as "Community Actions". See Boston Spa draft NP as an example	Noted. No action.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

	http://www.bostonspapc.org.uk/Boston-Spa-Parish-Council/UserFiles/Files/BS_PLAN_WEB.1_28.pdf	
SC2.1	Title – Insert “Plan” between Neighbourhood and Area	Agreed. Change made.
SC2.2	2.5 – first bullet point. Suggest shift neighbouring parishes details to end of para 2.3	Agreed. Change made.
SC2.3	Should Tan Office be a new bullet point?	Agreed. Change made.
SC2.4	Suggest paras 2.7 to 2.9 should be moved to the Introduction section.	Agreed. Change made.
SC2.5	I’m not sure that the “proposals maps” referred to in 2.16 are what Planners would call Proposals Maps. There is usually only one Proposals Map in a NP that would identify proposals relating to policies. I think these plans are “Community Assets Maps”?	Agreed. Two asset maps will be produced and two proposals maps will also be produced.
SC3.1	Para 3.2 needs the source identifying.	Agreed. Source included.
SC3.2	Para 3.7 – it might be helpful if information on the numbers of 2, 3, 4 etc bedroom homes was identified given the reference later to having house sizes that reflect the local context.	Noted. Will check if relevant stats are available.
SC3.3	Suggest move para 3.10 to para 3.22	Noted. Will move “Housing objectives” heading to immediately before para 3.10.
SC3.4	Suggest moving “Housing Objectives” to after “Quantifying Growth”	Noted. See SC3.3 above.
SC3.5	It would be useful to identify what the 56 new homes referred to in 3.13 are and where they’re being built	Agreed. G&R site data is included.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

SC3.6	Para 3.17 - capacity issues appear to be addressed in 5.4 – 5.9?	Agreed. Text added to cross reference para 3.17 to paras 5.4 to 5.9.
SC3.7	Para 3.18 – Not sure how helpful this is? There’s an overlap in the first two rows of figures and what’s happened since 2000? Do you have details of the number of new homes completed since then?	Noted. No action.
SC3.8	Para 3.21 – Is this over and above the 56 in the pipeline? You’ll need to add “at least” between of and 75	Noted. Text amended to say “... at least 75 ...”. NOTE: the 56 are part of our target of at least 75.
SC3.9	Para 3.23 – I understand the NP is not allocating sites for new homes, but the para talks about dispersing sites around the village. I can’t see anything that would stop a large site of, say, 50 homes coming forward.	Noted. No action.
SC3.10	Para 3.25 – I think the statement starting “new dwellings designed” should be a bullet point? All of these bullet points feel like policy.	Agreed. Para 3.26 header removed.
SC3.11	Para 3.28 – Growth target of 100? Planning policy documents do not allow targets. Does this need changing to at least 75?	Agreed. Text amended to say “... at least 75...”.
SC3.12	Paras 3.34 – 3.38. These paras repeat Objectives and are not necessarily housing related?	Agreed. Paras removed.
SC3.13	Para 3.41 – Suggest deleting “Local housing need is defined for the purposes of the Local Plan as” as the sentence before it says enough.	Agreed. Repetition removed.
MP1.1	Suggest reword first sentence as follows: Development or redevelopment <u>Proposals for new dwellings.</u>	Agreed. Change made.
MP1.2	Delete “county”.	Agreed. Deleted.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

MP1.3	Need to define "small sites" in second para.	Agreed. "20 or less" text added.
MP1.4	Reference is made to the planning policies of Mid Suffolk and Mendlesham PC. Need for consistency here – not PC but Neighbourhood Plan.	Agreed. Change made.
MP1.5	Need to define "small scale" and "exception sites" in third para.	Agreed. Text changed to reflect "...20 or less". Exception site wording changed.
MP1.6	Suggest moving last sentence "A minimum etc" to become the first sentence to provide the setting for the rest of the policy	Agreed. Change made. Note on base starting figure added.
MP1.7	Is brownfield housing allowed anywhere in the parish?	Agreed. Paragraph removed.
MP2.1	We would suggest that this policy is swapped with MP3 in that MP3 currently sets the policy for delivery and then MP2 (as is) would set the criteria for occupation of that housing.	Noted. No action
MP2.2	This policy needs careful consideration by the Planning Policy team at Mid Suffolk and the Strategic Housing Team.	Noted. No action.
SC4.1	Para 4.7 first sentence doesn't read well.	Agreed. First sentence adjusted to improve readability.
SC4.2	Does the village wish to retain this employment in the village? It might be appropriate to designate these sites as employment sites and seeking their retention. This is especially the case given the brownfield statement in Policy MP1.	Noted. No action.
MP4.1	It is very unlikely that it would be viable to convert housing in the rural area to less valuable employment uses.	Noted. No action.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

MP4.2	Need to define what is meant by "suitable isolated"	Agreed. Word "isolated" removed.
SC5.1	This whole section should be in Section 2 to provide the context and background for the NP.	Agreed. Section moved to within Section 2. Section 5 therefore is deleted.
SC5.2	Much of this information is already elsewhere in the NP – eg housing completions data.	Noted. No action.
SC5.3	Mention is made of 100 new homes over the 15 year period throughout the Section. Needs clarification and consistency.	Agreed. "100" changed to "75".
SC5.4	Para. 5.8. Is the outcome of this SCC work known?	Noted. Wording changed. Do not believe a "master plan" has been released.
SC5.5	The section doesn't mention sports pitches and other community facilities. New development as proposed would generate a need for additional sports pitches and other indoor and outdoor facilities. It's important that we know what's there at present and whether there's a need. For example, should the parish seek to provide additional land for sports pitches or allotments or other facilities?	Noted. No action.
SC6.1	There is a lot of commentary on design, materials and distinctiveness but the policy (MP6) needs more strength	Noted. Will review.
SC6.2	Para 6.21 – the sentence feels like it's missing something? Perhaps insert after "materials <u>used in the village include</u> red stock bricks"?	Noted. Wording changed to "used locally".
SC6.3	Need to understand Mid-Suffolk's approach to the parking standards. Are they accepted a "advisory" standards which allow some flexibility in areas where parking provision would have a detrimental impact on the build environment (conservation area)?	Noted. No action.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

SC6.4	Para 6.29 & 6.30. Mid Suffolk have an SPD Open Space provision. Need to understand its status in the light of CIL adoption.	Noted. No action.
SC6.5	The Sustainable Development paragraphs talk about a sustainability strategy for every development but this is not supported by a policy.	Noted. Wording changed in 6.33 to "maximise sustainability opportunities for every development".
MP7.1	Need to understand what this policy is trying to achieve. The policy as worded may not be CIL / S106 regs compliant as it talks about development providing green spaces for existing residents.	Noted. No action.
MP8.1	What constitutes "provision" and "suitable"?	Noted. No action.
MP8.2	The Note should be removed	Agreed. Note removed.
MP8.3	It is possible to provide a policy for provision of broadband connection infrastructure within a development – example to be provided	Noted. No action.
SC6.6	The reference to existing policies would be better placed in the Background / Context Section. It feels out of context here.	Agreed. Paras 6.35-6.36 removed
SC7.1	If the background work has identified important views, amenity open areas, trees and hedgerows, then the supporting paragraphs (and possibly a policy?) should reflect that and require proposals to have regard to that evidence and to not have a detrimental impact on those features.	Noted. Will rely on policy MP10.
SC7.2	There are statements within the paragraphs of this section that are not backed up by policy. Policies in the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998) remain relevant and Policy GP1 would provide a policy framework for the NP. Given the age of the policy, it might be worth considering whether the policy should be reviewed and included in the NP?	Noted. Will include mention of the Conservation Area in MP10.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

SC7.3	Para 7.7. The NPPF rules out development ON designated Green Spaces whereas the paragraph suggests that any proposed impact proposed development anywhere might have on these spaces will not be supported. Suggest re-word to say that development on these green spaces will have a detrimental impact on the setting on the village and the amenity of residents and will not be supported.	Noted. No action.
SC7.4	Para 7.8 and 7.17 are very similar and should perhaps be combined?	Agreed. Para 7.8 added to para 7.17.
SC7.5	Para 7.13 and 7.16 are very similar.	Agreed. Paragraphs amalgamated.
SC7.6	Para 7.18 refers to retaining MSDC Local Plan Policy SB3 but then repeats it. Need to clarify between MSDC Planning Strategy team and NP team the status of the Local Plan policy.	Agreed. Wording changed to improve clarity.
MP9.1	Many of these are designated playing pitches which are protected under Para 74 of the NPPF.	Noted. No action.
MP9.2	The designated areas need to be identified on the Proposals Map. And the opening sentence should be amended to say: "The following areas, <u>as identified on the Proposals Map</u> , are designated ...".	Agreed. Wording changed to include a reference back to the Proposals map shown earlier in the NP.
MP10.1	Have these "visually important open spaces" been identified? If so, perhaps they should be identified on the Proposals Map?	Yes they have been identified and will be shown on the Proposals maps.
MP10.2	It might be appropriate to designate these as Local Green Spaces?	Noted. No action.
MP11.1	Suggest last sentence deleted and replaced with: " <i>Any proposed diversion of a Public Right of Way within a development site should not result in an adverse impact on residential amenity or the safety of the general public.</i> "	Agreed. Wording changed.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

SC8.1	Suggest this section is renamed "Monitoring and Delivery"	Agreed. Heading changed.
SC8.2	<p>In Para 8.3 mention should be made as to the mechanism for review. Maybe a policy such as this used elsewhere might be appropriate:</p> <p><i>This NDP has been developed to plan sustainable growth for a period of up to 15 years. A formal review process in consultation with the community and Local Planning Authorities should be undertaken at a minimum of every 5 years, to ensure the Plan is still current and a remains a positive planning tool to deliver sustainable growth.</i></p>	Agreed. Wording included.



Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan SD10 - Statement of Consultation

END OF DOCUMENT