




DRINKSTONE

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

NOVEMBER 2019

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Background to the Preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan	4
3.	How the plan was prepared and the consultation process	5
4.	Pre-Submission Consultation Responses	10
	Appendix 1 – First Drop-in Event Display Boards	11
	Appendix 2 – Feedback from September 2018 Drop-in event	15
	Appendix 3 – February 2019 Drop-in Event Display Boards	19
	Appendix 4 – List of Statutory Consultees notified of Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Consultation	24
	Appendix 5 - Letter used to notify Statutory Consultees	26
	Appendix 6 – Pre-Submission Plan Drop-in Event Display Boardts	27
	Appendix 7 - Pre-Submission Consultation Response Form	31
	Appendix 8 - Responses received to Pre-Submission Consultation and Responses to Comments	40
	Appendix 9 - Schedule of Proposed Changes to Pre-Submission Consultation Plan following Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation Stage	99

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan (DNP)
- 1.2 The legal basis of this Consultation Statement is provided by Section 15(2) of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:
- contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - explain how they were consulted;
 - summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- 1.3 The policies contained in the DNP are a result of extensive engagement and consultation with residents of Drinkstone as well as other statutory bodies. Work has involved a household survey, public meetings and consultation events at appropriate stages during the preparation of the plan.

2. Background to the Preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan

- 2.1 In 2017 Mid Suffolk District Council (MSDC) announced that there was no longer a five-year supply of available housing sites in the district. Consequently, their local plan policies for the location of new housing developments were deemed, under government planning guidelines, to be out of date. This resulted in speculative and unplanned housing proposals being submitted across the district, including in Drinkstone.

The local community wishes to:

- preserve the character of the village
- ensure that any future developments are commensurate with the level of services and facilities in the village
- protect and enhance the local landscape and biodiversity
- conserve and enhance the village's heritage assets

The decision to prepare a neighbourhood plan was taken to allow the community to bring a level control to this situation. At the time of writing MSDC has a five-year supply of land. The neighbourhood plan will supply evidence of the unique character of Drinkstone and its setting, its heritage, built and landscape character, all of which will inform the decision making of MSDC planners.

- 2.2 At the Annual Parish Meeting of 14th May 2018, a large majority (84 votes out of 87) decided that a neighbourhood plan should be prepared for Drinkstone under the auspices of the Parish Council. A steering group was set up in June 2018, and in September 2018, Places4People was appointed as planning consultant to assist and steer our way through the legal framework. All this work has been grant funded from the Government Neighbourhood Planning Grant Initiative via Locality, for which the Steering Group and the Parish Council are grateful.
- 2.3 The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared by a Steering Group representing Drinkstone Parish Council which, for purposes of the Localism Act, is the “qualifying body”. Preparation of the plan has been supported by Places4People Planning Consultancy.

3. How the plan was prepared and the consultation process

- 3.1 The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Government's Neighbourhood Planning Regulations and, in particular, has involved considerable local community engagement to gather evidence for the content of the plan and later inform the plan's directions and policies. The content of the Neighbourhood Plan has been generated and led by the community and shaped by results of surveys and drop-in events, to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the aspirations of the community.

Neighbourhood Area Designation

- 3.2 On 19th June 2018, in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, MSDC formally designated the whole parish as a Neighbourhood Plan Area. Details of the application, publication and designations can be viewed on the District Council's website under Neighbourhood Planning in Drinkstone. There are no other designated neighbourhood plan areas within this boundary and the Parish Council is the "qualifying body" responsible for the preparation of the neighbourhood plan for this area.
- 3.3 The designated area is illustrated on the map on the following page.



The Designated Neighbourhood Area

Publicity

First Public Drop-in Session - Saturday 29 September 2018

- 3.4 An initial residents' drop-in event was held in the Village Hall and attracted a recorded total of 61 residents. There was a presentation of the plan process using 15 information boards, on which residents were asked to put their views on any aspects of the plan, by means of post-it notes and sticky dots. This generated a valuable collection of views, which informed the household survey and fed into the plan itself. The display boards and a summary of the views collected can be found at Appendix 1. And the feedback is illustrated in Appendix 2.



Household Survey

- 3.5 This was the first chance for the community to have a considered influence on the formulation of the plan. It was conducted between 24 October and 11 November 2018 and was informed by comments made at the first public drop-in session. A paper questionnaire was delivered by hand to each household in the village, and was aimed at residents aged 16 or over. The completed questionnaires were collected individually over the course of the consultation period. Collectors went back several times over this period to ensure maximum completion. Residents also had the option of completing the form online, using a unique randomly generated identifier supplied with the questionnaire pack. In all we achieved an 83% response rate.
- 3.6 The questionnaires were totally anonymous, apart from a randomly generated ID. The forms were analysed via a bespoke highly secure software package developed by the Neighbourhood Plan IT Subgroup, which allowed us to produce the results in spreadsheet format and also by means of bar charts, and could accommodate free text input from respondents, which could also be analysed. The full report on the results of the Survey are available to view on the Neighbourhood Plan pages of the Drinkstone website <http://drinkstonevillage.co.uk>

Consultation with village youth groups - 2 November 2019

- 3.7 A member of the steering group and the youth groups leader held an interactive consultation session with the Junior and Youth Clubs in the Village Hall. A summary of their views is included in Chapter 3 of the Plan. During this session, the young people expressed their views and priorities by means of an illustration, which we have used on the cover of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Second Public Drop-in Session Saturday - 16 February 2019

- 3.8 This was held in the Village Hall and attracted a recorded total of 76 residents during the day. Display boards, reproduced in Appendix 3, summarised the work done to date, including the results of the

household questionnaire and of research into the village landscape, built character and building design. There was also information on the village footpaths and prominent views within the village. Attendees gave 100% approval to the proposed draft vision for Drinkstone, and strong approval also to the proposal that design principles should be respected in any future development. Proposed community actions (to be undertaken by the Parish Council) were ranked in order of priority.

Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation

- 3.9 On 18th July 2019 the formal Pre-submission Draft Plan was approved for publication by the Parish Council. A statutory consultation period of 8 weeks (to accommodate the holiday period) was initiated on 10 August 2019. The consultation ended on 4 October 2019. At the start of the consultation, all the statutory Regulation 14 consultees, as advised by Mid Suffolk District Council, were consulted. The full list of bodies consulted is shown in Appendix 4 and the letter used to notify them is included at Appendix 5.

How we publicised the consultation

- 3.10 The consultation period began with a drop-in session and exhibition held in the Village Hall on the 10 August 2019. At least 77 people attended the session. Display boards summarised the content of the Plan and provided details of all the planning policies and recommended community actions to deliver the objectives of the plan. Copies of the pre-submission draft display boards are shown at Appendix 6.
- 3.11 The Plan was made available on the Neighbourhood Plan pages of the Parish Council website together with the supporting documents that had been prepared to inform the content of the Plan. A list of these documents is included as an appendix to the Submission Neighbourhood Plan. A comments form, included at Appendix 7, was also devised and available for completion throughout the consultation period, either online or in paper format. With no shop or public house in the village, paper copies of the Plan and comments form were made available for those that did not have access to the Plan online. The publicity advised on how residents could borrow a copy of the Plan to view.
- 3.12 Details of the responses received during the pre-submission consultation period are detailed later in this Consultation Statement.

Ongoing publicity and community engagement

- 3.13 During the whole neighbourhood plan process, there has been regular publicity, awareness raising and community engagement.
- 3.14 There have been regular updates and alerts at Parish Council meetings, in the monthly Parish Magazine, taken by 70% of households, and via the village email alerting service "Jungle Drums" which is accessed by 76% of individuals. These have alerted people to drop-in sessions, to the consultation and encouraged them to attend. There are also regular updates on the progress of the Plan and, going forward, there will be a short series of "NP myth busting" articles to keep the plan in people's mind and dispel occasional common misconceptions which might still occur.
- 3.15 Volunteers have delivered leaflets to every household to publicise the drop-in sessions. They also delivered and collected the questionnaires from each household, which accounts for the high - 83% - response rate in the household survey.
- 3.16 As part of the Landscape Appraisal process, the Steering Group organised a village walk, where people could learn about the history, geology and biodiversity of the land around them. 33 people, plus dogs, walked the footpaths which was followed by tea in the Village Hall

Steering Group

- 3.17 The inaugural meeting of the DNP Steering Group was held on 23rd May 2018 in the Village Hall. All members had volunteered either at the initial Annual Parish Meeting where the idea of a neighbourhood plan for Drinkstone was floated, or subsequently out of interest.

Steering Group Members

Ian Cooper	Resident
David Craggs	Resident
Peter Holborn	Parish Councillor and Tree Warden
Jane Hill	Resident
Diana Hollins	Steering Group Secretary
Graham Todd	Resident
Jeremy Wiggins	Steering Group Treasurer
Daphne Youngs	Chair, Drinkstone Parish Council and Steering Group Chair

Members of sub-Groups (* = steering group member)

Natural Environment Sub-Group

Peter Holborn*	Chair
Lindi Belfield	Resident
Duncan Hannant	Resident
Lyn Hannant	Resident

Built Environment Sub-Group

Daphne Youngs*	Chair
Joe Stebbings	Resident
David Craggs*	Resident

IT and Publicity

Liz Schmitt	Resident
Tony Schmitt	Resident
Lynne Woodward	Resident

- 3.18 During 2018 and 2019 the Steering Group met to format the questionnaire, examine the results and write the plan based on the consensus views of the community. The notes of these meetings can be seen on Neighbourhood Plan pages of the Parish Council Website at:
<http://www.drinkstonevillage.co.uk>

4. Pre-Submission Consultation Responses

- 4.1 In total, 39 people or organisations responded to the Pre-Submission Consultation as listed below. The schedule of comments and the responses of the Parish Council are set out in Appendix 8 of this Statement. As a result, the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan has been appropriately amended as identified in the “changes made to Plan” column of the Appendix. Further amendments were made to the Plan to bring it up-to-date and Appendix 9 provides a comprehensive list of all the modifications to the Pre-Submission Plan following consultation.

The following individuals or organisations submitted comments:

Alan Laursen Jones	Ken White
Andrea Jarman	Linda Powell
Anglian Water	Liz Schmitt
Anonymous	Lyn Hannant
Bill and Rachel Smith	Merete Bland
Bradfield St George Parish Council	Mid Suffolk District Council
West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group	Natural England
Christine Harris	Nick Lane
Clifford Blackwell	Nigel Gale
Diana Dupree	Peter Holborn
Diana Hollins	Richard and Rachel Mutimer
Duncan Hannant	RK and PA Cilvert
Environment Agency	Roger Russell-Smith
Giles Youngs	S Lee
Gladman Developments Limited	Sarah Denniston
Historic England	Suffolk Preservation Society
June Harris	Trevor Watkin

Appendix 1 – September 2018 Drop-in Event Display Boards

1. WELCOME



Following discussion at the Annual Parish Meeting in May, the Parish Council has decided to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for the village so that we can influence where any new development goes over the next 20 years.
Today you have a chance to find out about Neighbourhood Plans and how you might help with Drinkstone's Plan.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

It is a new kind of planning document designed to allow local people to play an active part in planning their area. It can guide the development and conservation of the village.

It can, for example, also identify proposals for:

- Improving areas
- Providing new facilities
- Sites for new development
- Protecting sites of environmental or historic quality

When complete, it will form part of the statutory development plan for the area, meaning Mid Suffolk District Council and Planning Inspectors will have to take note of what it says when considering development proposals.

Why we're doing it

Our village is coming under increasing pressure for new development. Permission has been granted for four new homes in the last year. Mid Suffolk are having to find sites for around 8,000 new homes across the district over the next 20 years.

Preparing our own Neighbourhood Plan gives us the opportunity to shape the future by deciding how and where the village will grow and what is needed to support that growth. It also allows us to identify what we want to preserve and improve.



DRINKSTONE
Our village - Our choices



2. BACKGROUND



What a Neighbourhood Plan can and cannot do

A Neighbourhood Plan can...

- Decide where and what type of development should happen in the parish
- Promote more development than is set out in the Local Plan
- Include policies, for example regarding design standards. These take precedence over existing policies in the Local Plan for the parish. However, Neighbourhood Plan policies must not conflict with the strategic policies in the Local Plan.

A Neighbourhood Plan cannot...

- Conflict with the strategic policies in the Mid Suffolk Local Plan.
- Be used to prevent development that is included in the Local Plan.



Who prepares the Plan?

The Plan will be prepared by a Working Group that consists of Parish Councillors and volunteers from the village.

We will be assisted by Places4People Planning Consultants, who have considerable experience in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans.

If you would like to get involved then please let us know. We'll need people to distribute questionnaires, gather information and analyse surveys.



3. THE PLAN AREA



In order to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan, it is necessary to designate a "Neighbourhood Area".

Following general support being expressed at the Annual Parish Meeting, the Parish Council asked Mid Suffolk District Council to designate the whole of the parish, as shown below, as the Neighbourhood Area. This is the normal approach for villages preparing Neighbourhood Plans. The Plan Area was confirmed in June.



4. THE PROCESS






How it's prepared

There are a number of stages that have to be completed, as illustrated. Some of these stages are governed by the regulations for preparing Neighbourhood Plans and so there is no short cut. The Plan will be prepared by the Steering Group advised by specialists when necessary. We encourage YOU to get involved too, either with the Steering Group or at the various consultation stages like today.

At the end of the day, it's YOU who will decide whether the Plan should be approved.

Community involvement is a major part of the process and the Plan must be approved in a village referendum before it can be used.



[illegible][illegible]

MOST CHERISH *Live your life better by writing tomorrow's to-do list today.* **LIKE TO SEE IMPROVED**

The goal is to write to entry comments & collect data if you are **strong** with

LIKE TO SEE IMPROVED



Completed High Priority Actions			
Creating new village hall			
Phase the opening development of Clunary Tote after investigations and set up a youth committee to review for young people			
Continue to work to eliminate small town Rugby Force			
Outstanding High Priority Actions	Status	Still needed?	
		YES	NO
Reduce spending in the village and reduce spend levels	A grant to open a new village hall with sports facilities to help attract through school children		
Ensure parish plan is taken into account in planning decisions	The Parish Plan follows guidelines which all village centre planning decisions. The Parish Plan is taken into account of a 10% commitment Plan		
Work with Suffolk Police to achieve more visible police presence in village and quick response to incidents	The Police are supported and facilitated according to Request for Police for one of the village Police		
Lobby for further enhancement of planning decisions	The Parish Council can provide information and feedback required to inform the planning process and is prepared to engage with a Planning committee where these are needed		
Present Parish Plan to members to reinforce awareness of local issues	All the required reports for the Parish Plan and Plan		
Set up a youth unit	Reviewing membership by the Parish Council (Young People's Committee)		



Completed Medium Priority Actions		
Provide more dog tags		
Increase use of village bulletin - How website can come up to fulfill distribution of local (mostly activity of the place) competition (small village category)		
House furniture on high street and close at all times of the year - The first Council Party (house) has submitted "Adopt a Footpath" - a volunteer group to cut paths in the commons, and PC has purchased heavy duty armchairs for their use. More volunteers welcome		
Outstanding Medium Priority Actions	Status	Still needed?
Investigate feasibility of oil cooperatives	The idea will be up for second time in next 6 months to run it	YES
Investigate options for child care in village	Need for a response?	NO
Investigate again possibility of being weight maintenance (being interested)	The idea began to die with the working part of the village. The second issue is the village is not being well but a gradually reduced	NO
Strengthen neighbourhood watch	No action taken	NO
Lobby traffic (L) for getting off main bus route through village	Appears to be most likely?	NO
Establish better communication between PC and residents	The meeting was held in the village hall on the 1st of the year. The meeting was held in the village hall on the 1st of the year.	NO
Expand effective liaison between PC and neighbouring PCs	All in line of the plan. The PC will be working together to ensure the village hall is the best place for the village hall.	NO
Provide further information to residents about MDC planning decisions	All in line of the plan. The PC will be working together to ensure the village hall is the best place for the village hall.	NO



13. VILLAGE CHARACTER



Identifying Important Local Characteristics

The important characteristics of a village or town are its identity, its history, its culture, its landscape, its buildings, its people and its environment. These are the things that make a village or town special and give it its own character.

We are going to prepare a plan for the village and we need your help to identify the important characteristics of the village and its environment. Please let us know what you think is important and why.

Can you spare some time to help prepare these plans of ours?

CHARACTER APPRAISAL

Character Area 1 Village Centre

What features in Drinkstone do you think should be preserved and protected?

Use the red sticky dots for suggestions

Use the green sticky dots for suggestions



14. HOUSING GROWTH



What type of new homes do you think should be built over the next 20 years?

1-2 bedroom homes?

3-4 bedroom homes?

5+ bedroom homes?

Affordable homes to rent?

Are there any areas where new homes should NOT be built?
Use the red sticky dots for suggestions

Are there locations where new homes could be built?
Use the green sticky dots for suggestions



15. WHAT NEXT



Residents' Survey

Soon we'll be distributing a questionnaire to every household in the village. The information we gather today will help us draw up the questionnaire as well as statistical and environmental information gathered from other official sources.

Please help us by sparing the time to complete the questionnaire and returning it to us.

Information Gathering

We will also be gathering information about the village built as well as facilities, the natural and historic environment and other matters that might be raised today.

Vision and Options

The outcome of today's event, plus the information gathered through research and the Residents' Survey will help us prepare a vision for the Neighbourhood Plan and some draft options for its content. We'll hear these with you before we proceed to the next stage.

Possible Housing Site Identification

We will need to decide how to meet the housing requirements of the village and whether to identify a site or sites for housing. It is important that you are given information before the Plan is produced.

We'll hold further consultation events where you can give us your feedback on the suitability of any identified sites.

Draft Neighbourhood Plan

Once the above stages have been completed we'll start preparing the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Once complete, we'll undertake formal consultation for a period of six weeks. This will allow anyone to make comments before the Plan is amended and sent to P&C Suffolk for further consultation and then approved by an independent Examiner.

Can you spare some time?

We've established a small group to start the Neighbourhood Plan process but we need more people to help.

Could you spare a couple of hours a month to attend a meeting and also help out with specific tasks under the guidance of our professional Neighbourhood Planning consultants?

Please let us know.



DRINKSTONE
Our village - Our choices

16. COMMENTS



Use this board to post any additional comments about the Neighbourhood Plan



DRINKSTONE
Our village - Our choices

Appendix 2 – Feedback from September 2018 Drop-in event

CHERISHED	green dot	Red dot	
Hedges, Woodland and verges and lack of herbicides and pesticides	10	0	
Peace and quiet and sense of community	23		
Footpaths	13		
No light pollution and tranquility	25		
The cows at Rookery Farm	5		
Tranquility and foot path walks	7		
Community spirit created by activities centred around the village hall, church and allotments	3		
Views from behind Hall Farm from the footpath towards Hessett	3		
IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED			
safer for cycling	4		
30 mph speed limit over whole parish not just in centre of village Yes!Yes!Yes!	12	1	
Improve problem with flood waters. Park Road, Drinkstone House, Woolpit Road	12		
Extend the footpath from Town Grove to Whitefield House on Park Road	1		
Any development should reflect the needs to ensure housing for younger generation and families	7		
How about some sheltered accommodation? There's no provision for the elderly	7		

Ensure that the village's sewerage, drainage and pumping station is fit for purpose	11		
Access for horse riding please	3		
More young people	3		
Cycle paths	2		
Could something be done about cars parked on the pavements			
More public transport	2		
PARISH PLAN OUTSTANDING ACTIONS			
Speed watch	30		
Parish Plan taken into account in planning decisions	16	1	
Suffolk Police	7		
Lobby for better planning enforcement	14		
Present Parish Plan to planners	8		
Set up youth web	3	4	
Oil cooperative	0	8	
Child care	4	3	
Lorry weight restrictions	7		
Gritting	1		
Better communication between PC and residents	4		
Effective liaison	1		
Better info about planning decisions	4		
Provide more dog bins	6		
alternative sources of energy for heating and water	6		
Mains gas supply	4	1	

Verge and road edge erosion	5		
Maintenance of hedges and trees in public areas	11		
Bridelways	9		
More recycling	1	1	
Better mobile phone reception and broadband	27		
More litter bins		1	
Street lighting, pavements and or cycle paths	1	22	
ASPIRATIONS			
Need to be a mixed community, so more low cost housing	11		
As charming and peaceful as it is	12		
More affordable housing for local Drinkstone families	6		
Housing for families not necessarily from Drinkstone	0	0	
Housing for older downsizers, so that can stay in the community	14		
Self sufficient for energy and food	1		
Fewer cars and more cycles	5		
Similar to now	4		
WHAT FEATURES SHOULD BE PRESERVED AND PROTECTED			
Small grass fields surrounded by tall hedges and trees	21		
Public footpaths	21		
Mixture of housing, 2,3,4,5 beds, say 30-40 houses throughout the village	0	0	

Bridges and traditional fencing/barriers. Vistas	6		
Continued access for riding horses	3		
Church and churchyard	2		
Veteran and other significant trees	15		
HOUSING GROWTH			
1-2 bed	21		
3-4 bed	12	5	
5+ bed	3	14	
Affordable to rent	13		
COMMENTS			
broadband needed for young people to access the internet for study	4		
Better than 2008 please			
Our children do not want to live somewhere with poor wifi ever again	3		
I sincerely hope that the Planning Authorities take notice of Drinkstone community's views			

Appendix 3 – February 2019 Drop-in Event Display Boards

1. Welcome

DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2018-2034

Drinkstone's Neighbourhood Plan will give us a real say in how our village develops over the next 20 years

The story so far

- ✓ We held a drop in event in October to show what it's all about
- ✓ A Steering Group has been formed of volunteers from the village to prepare the Plan
- ✓ We've completed a Household Survey
- ✓ We've secured the services of professional town planner to provide advice and assist with the Plan
- ✓ We've been given Government funding to help cover our costs
- ✓ We've been given Government "Technical Support" to assist with more complex studies

Today we'd like to update you on progress and get your feedback on what the Steering Group has been doing.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

It is a plan that sets out how the village should develop over the next 20 years. It gives the community a say in how the village is developed. It is a plan that sets out how the village should develop over the next 20 years. It gives the community a say in how the village is developed.

Drinkstone Green – Then and Now



Did you know?

- Drinkstone Green was once a village of 100 houses
- It was a village of 100 houses
- It was a village of 100 houses
- It was a village of 100 houses

Did you know?

- The church is the oldest building in the village
- The church is the oldest building in the village
- The church is the oldest building in the village
- The church is the oldest building in the village

2. Household Survey Results


DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2018-2034

In November we delivered a questionnaire to every household in the village. A total of 247 were delivered, and 205 were returned, a response rate of 83%.


Thank you to everyone who completed the survey

Today we are showing you the key results of section one of the questionnaire. The full results, minus free text comments, will be available on the Neighbourhood Plan Section of the Village website.


What do you think are the positive features of our community?




What do you feel are problems in the community?



Do you use the following parish amenities?






Please tell us if you agree or disagree with the following statements



3. Household Survey Results


DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2018-2034




4. Household Survey Results

DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2018-2034


In your opinion, how many new houses should be built in the village in the next 20 years?



What types would you prefer any future developments to be?




Should new housing be phased over the 20 year plan period or built in one go?



If new homes are to be provided in the parish, which type of dwellings are needed?



How and where should any building development be located?



 DUNILTON
 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
 2015-2034

The Steering Group was very impressed by the awareness of the village's children of the benefits of living in a rural setting that is peaceful and quiet and offers ready access to the countryside, and also by their sensible suggestions for improvements (most of which are Community Actions rather than planning issues).

The map shows a village layout with the following features and callouts:

- Top Left:** A callout box says "This is the village of the future".
- Top Center:** A callout box says "This is the village of the future".
- Top Right:** A callout box says "This is the village of the future".
- Left Side:** A callout box says "This is the village of the future".
- Center:** A callout box says "This is the village of the future".
- Right Side:** A callout box says "This is the village of the future".
- Bottom Left:** A callout box says "This is the village of the future".
- Bottom Center:** A callout box says "This is the village of the future".
- Bottom Right:** A callout box says "This is the village of the future".

[illegible]


DUNROBIN
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2019-2034

¹ The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant Number 0001000, and the support of the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant Number 0001000, and the support of the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant Number 0001000.

[illegible]

The two Suffolk Group (C) and Type 1000, the former with distinctive longhead, the latter with short head, rounded and tapering and also with a tendency to have been cultivated, according to their land use history, respectively, are found in some fairly extensive areas of open parkland, but they are also found in some of the more sheltered areas of the park.

For her work on the film, she was awarded the Best Actress Award at the Cannes Film Festival. The film also won the Golden Globe Award for Best Foreign Language Film.

[illegible]

Local Livelihood Character Area

10. *Myrica Pentlandii*
11. *Myrica Pentlandii*
12. *Myrica Pentlandii*
13. *Myrica Pentlandii*
14. *Myrica Pentlandii*
15. *Myrica Pentlandii*

[illegible]

 DORCHESTER
 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
 2015-2034

Sensitivity

Spice industries across have been developing in Mid-South States. Cinnamon development first has a tradition of years. They tend to select to historic soils and the effect of other area of cultivating. Nephrolepis and other species are particularly beneficial. Increased carbon to produce an area of special habitats and quality in control in the same intervals. Based on some specific areas and Phlogoths have been removed. In Old States this means the Dark Brown soils and the northern side edge of the full range valley to the west of the Drakensberg. Road and boundary standards and guidelines.

The boundary has been defined as a result of limited field survey work to follow physical features on the ground such as hills, boundaries, and to trace the gaps in the SIA work of the Seabird Ring which shows the same language (misunderstood or used to mean one thing but, known by jargon, fish, haggard and haggard) was used with various parties of small woodland and sea birds. The new class of local language (boundary) also encompasses the pasture and reactive areas around Ditchford Green and Ditchford Street, which gives it an 'air' of the character of the area extending the pasture to the sea.

The site at Ratbury Farm, around Crookston Mill, has been progressively restored in recent years and now forms part of the parkland landscape of the Blackthorn Valley and this too is included in the new Area of Local Nature Significance.

The steel section of 0.4 million lbs. barbed-grip stockings sent to the A-4 has been shifted to 1 no larger than the class 100.

Do you agree with this proposal?
Please provide comments on your
level of agreement.

Designating an Area of
Red H also means that development has

Designating an Area of Local Landscapes Sensitivity does not in itself stop development taking place in the area, but it does mean that development has to pay attention to the impact that it will have on the landscape and proposals will need to identify how any impact would be described.



 DORCHESTER
 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
 2015-2034

[illegible]



**DIRECTOR'S
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2015-2034**

DRINGTHORPE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2015-2034

☐ I agree with these proposals.

**DRINKITOPH
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2019-2034**

13. Built Character

DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2018-2034

The Meadows and Cherry Tree Road



Neighbourhood	- The Meadows is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Character	- The Meadows is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Design	- The Meadows is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Notes	- The Meadows is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.

Cross Street



Neighbourhood	- Cross Street is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Character	- Cross Street is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Design	- Cross Street is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Notes	- Cross Street is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.



14. Built Character

DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2018-2034

Bartholomew Road south of Cross Street

Neighbourhood	- Bartholomew Road is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Character	- Bartholomew Road is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Design	- Bartholomew Road is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Notes	- Bartholomew Road is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.



15. Built Character

DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2018-2034

Drinkstone Street

Neighbourhood	- Drinkstone Street is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Character	- Drinkstone Street is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Design	- Drinkstone Street is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.
Notes	- Drinkstone Street is a rural village. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses. - It is a rural village with a mix of residential and commercial uses.




16. Design Assessment

DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2018-2034

Analysis carried out by independent consultants AECOM

This part of the Neighbourhood Plan aims to develop design guidelines for future development, to retain and enhance the character of the village and protect the rural, tranquil character and some beauty of the area as a whole.

Use red and green dots to identify whether you agree or disagree with these criteria.



The design of new buildings should blend in with the scale, density and position of existing buildings in relation to streets and plots	Agree	Disagree
They should enhance local distinctiveness without limiting originality and innovation	Agree	Disagree
Development proposals should avoid the loss of trees, hedgerows or woodlands and should clearly consent to replace any vegetation lost	Agree	Disagree
Any development should conserve and protect heritage assets	Agree	Disagree
Where new domestic access points are required, small scale features such as hedges, walls, fencing and entrance gates should reflect the local style and setting to promote and enhance local distinctiveness	Agree	Disagree
Proposals to alter historic buildings should show a thorough understanding of the history and design elements of the buildings, with limiting originality and innovation	Agree	Disagree



17. Design Guidelines



- Review or establish guidelines on the ADO Design Review panel as a number of guidelines appear to be outdated or require to be updated.
- The aim is to ensure all proposals are clearly understood by the panel and to ensure that the panel can provide a clear assessment to the developer.
- The relevant panel members should provide an assessment to the developer as to whether the design is acceptable or not.

Using the Design Review panel, indicate which you think is the most important and least important criteria.

Development Proposals and Design should:	Most Important	Least Important
1. Integrate with existing paths, streets, circulation networks and patterns of activity		
2. Reinforce or enhance the established village character of streets, greens and other spaces		
3. Respect the local character of areas and gaps		
4. Enhance and enhance existing architecture in terms of physical form, architecture and land use		
5. Relate well to local topography and landscape features, including prominent ridge lines and long distance views		
6. Reflect, respect, and reinforce local architecture and historic character		
7. Relate and incorporate impact and existing features into the development		
8. Respect surrounding buildings in terms of scale, height, form and massing		
9. Adopt contextually appropriate materials and details		
10. Provide adequate open space for the development in terms of both quantity and quality		
11. Incorporate necessary services and drainage infrastructure without causing unacceptable harm to sensitive features		
12. Ensure all components e.g. buildings, landscapes, access routes, parking and open space are well related to each other		
13. Make efficient provision for sustainable waste management (including facilities for kerbside collection, waste separation and minimisation where appropriate, with out vehicle impact) on the street scene, the local landscape or the amenity of neighbours		
14. Positively integrate energy efficient technologies		



18. Community Actions



The responses to the questionnaire have highlighted issues, problems, or suggestions for improving life in the village. Many of these can't be addressed directly by the policies which will come forward in the Neighbourhood Plan, but can be highlighted and included as "Community Actions".

What do you think you should do next?
 (Please tick the relevant boxes) - Tick box or write in your own words

1. To create a plan for the village (including a plan for the village)	☒
2. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
3. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
4. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
5. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
6. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
7. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
8. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
9. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
10. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
11. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
12. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
13. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
14. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
15. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
16. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
17. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
18. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
19. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
20. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
21. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
22. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
23. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
24. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
25. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
26. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
27. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
28. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
29. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
30. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
31. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
32. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
33. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
34. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
35. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
36. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
37. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
38. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
39. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
40. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
41. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
42. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
43. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
44. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
45. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
46. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
47. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
48. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
49. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
50. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
51. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
52. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
53. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
54. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
55. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
56. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
57. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
58. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
59. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
60. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
61. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
62. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
63. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
64. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
65. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
66. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
67. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
68. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
69. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
70. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
71. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
72. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
73. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
74. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
75. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
76. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
77. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
78. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
79. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
80. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
81. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
82. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
83. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
84. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
85. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
86. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
87. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
88. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
89. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
90. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
91. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
92. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
93. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
94. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
95. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
96. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
97. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
98. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
99. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒
100. To look at the village and address the issues in the village (including the village)	☒



19. Vision and What's Next



If Drinkstone's Neighbourhood Plan is effective and successful, in 2036 Drinkstone will be a place which has developed so that:

- it still has its own character and individuality
- it is a place where people of all ages can live in a vibrant and friendly community
- the natural landscape has been protected and enhanced

Do you agree with the Vision?

Use a green dot for YES or red dot for NO

YES NO

Please add comments to the feedback form and post-it in the box on the way out

WHAT NEXT

After today's event we'll be completing the following projects:

1. Finalising the Character Appraisal
2. Asking AECOM to assess sites that have been suggested for development. They will consider the following:
 - Background information:
 - Site location and size
 - The context and planning history
 - Suitability:
 - Site characteristics
 - Environmental considerations
 - Strategic considerations
 - Community facilities and services
 - Other key considerations (e.g. flood risk, agricultural land, tree preservation orders)
 - Site Availability
3. Organising a further consultation event to help us decide which, if any sites we should identify for development to meet our housing need for the Plan period (to 2026)
4. Write the Draft Neighbourhood Plan
5. Consult you and all Drinkstone residents on the Draft Plan



Appendix 4 – List of Statutory Consultees notified of Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

Title	Given Name	Family Name	Position	Company / Organisation
Ms	Jo	Churchill MP	MP for Bury St Edmunds	
Cllr	Jane	Storey	County Cllr to Thedwastre North Division	Suffolk County Council
Cllr	Penny	Otton	County Cllr to Thedwastre South Division	Suffolk County Council
Cllr	Penny	Otton	Ward Cllr	Rattlesden Ward
Cllr	Helen	Geake	Ward Cllr	Elmswell & Woolpit
Cllr	Sarah	Mansell	Ward Cllr	Elmswell & Woolpit
Cllr	Harry	Richardson	Ward Cllr	Thurston
Cllr	Wendy	Green	Ward Cllr	Thurston
Ms	S	Brown	(Temp) Parish Clerk.	Tostock Parish Council
Mrs	Peggy	Fuller	Parish Clerk	Woolpit Parish Council
Mr	D	Reed	Parish Clerk	Rattlesden Parish Council
Ms	Gilly	Morgan	Chairman	Gedding Parish Meeting
Mrs	Catherine	Hibbert	Parish Clerk	Bradfield St George Parish Council
Mr	M	Clay	Parish Clerk	Hessett Parish Council
Mrs	Pat	Lamb	Parish Clerk	Beyton Parish Council
Mr	Paul	Bryant	Neighbourhood Planning Officer	Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils
			SCC Neighbourhood Planning	Suffolk County Council
Mr	Graeme	Mateer	Transport Policy	Suffolk County Council
Mr	Neil	McManus	Planning Obligations Manager	Suffolk County Council
Ms	Sonia	Docherty	HR Manager - SOR, Children and Young People	Suffolk County Council
Ms	Nhi	Huynh-Ma	Area Manager, Norfolk & Suffolk Team	Homes & Communities Agency (HCA)
			Land Use Operations	Natural England
			Essex, Norfolk & Suffolk Sustainable Places Team	Environment Agency
			East of England Office	Historic England
			East of England Office	National Trust
Mr	Steve	Taylor	Town Planning Team	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
				Highways England
			Stakeholders & Networks Officer	Marine Management Organisation
				Vodafone and O2 - EMF Enquiries
Mr	Alex	Jackman	Corporate and Financial Affairs Department	EE
Ms	Jane	Evans		Three

Title	Given Name	Family Name	Position	Company / Organisation
	Chris	Crisell	Estates Planning Support Officer	Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG & West Suffolk CCG
				Transco - National Grid
Ms	Lucy	Bartley	Consultant	Wood Plc (obo National Grid)
Mr	Howard	Green	Infrastructure Planner	UK Power Networks
Mr	Stewart	Patience	Strategic and Spatial Planning Manager	Anglian Water
Mr	Martin	Lunn		Essex & Suffolk Water
Mr	Peter	Mercer MBE		National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
	Jo	Richardson		Norfolk & Suffolk Gypsy Roma & Traveller Service
				Diocese of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich
Mr	John	Dugmore	Chief Executive	Suffolk Chamber of Commerce
Mr	Iain	Dunnett	Senior Growing Places Fund Co-ordinator	New Anglia LEP
	Marie	Finbow	Strategy Manager	New Anglia LEP
Mr.	Philip	Pearson	Conservation Officer	RSPB
Mr	Mark	Nowers	Conservation Officer (Essex, Beds & Herts)	RSPB
Mr	Philip	Raiswell	Senior Planning Manager	Sport England (East)
Mr	Leigh Gareth	Jenkins		Suffolk Constabulary
Mr.	James	Meyer	Senior Conservation Adviser	Suffolk Wildlife Trust
Mrs	Fiona	Cairns	Director	Suffolk Preservation Society
Ms	Linda	Cockburn		Suffolk Preservation Society
Ms	Sunila	Osborne	Community Development Officer – Rural Affordable Housing	Community Action Suffolk
Mrs	Sarah	Mortimer	Senior Manager Community Engagement	Community Action Suffolk
				Dedham Vale Society
Ms	Paula	Booth	AONB Officer (Joint AONBs Team)	Suffolk Coast & Heath AONB
Mr	Tim	Baker	Woolpit Business Park	
			Planning Policy Section	West Suffolk Council

Appendix 5 - Letter used to notify Statutory Consultees

Drinkstone Parish Council

Dear

**DRINKSTONE (SUFFOLK) NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION
CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14)**

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2015 (as amended), Drinkstone Parish Council is undertaking a Pre-Submission Consultation on the Draft Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan. As a body/individual with whom we are required to consult, we are hereby seeking your views on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The full plan and supporting documents can be viewed [here](#) together with information on how to send us your comments.

This Pre-Submission Consultation runs for a period of just under 8 weeks, between 10 August and **4 October** inclusive.

We look forward to receiving your comments.

Hilary Workman

**Clerk & RFO
Drinkstone Parish Council**

Appendix 6 – Pre-Submission Plan Drop-in Event Display Boards

1. Welcome

The story so far
In 2018 the Parish Council agreed to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. Since that time a Steering Group has, with the aid of professional support, undertaken background research and consultation on what the Plan should cover.

We've now reached an important stage in its preparation and are consulting on the Draft Plan.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan?
It is a new kind of planning document designed to allow local people to play an active part in planning their area. It can guide the development and conservation of the village. It can, for example, also identify proposals for:
• Improving areas;
• Providing new facilities;
• Sites for new development;
• Protecting sites of environmental or historic quality.

When complete, it will form part of the statutory development plan for the area, meaning Mid Suffolk District Council and Planning Inspectors will have to take note of what it says when considering development proposals.

Community involvement is a major part of the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan and it must be approved in a local referendum before it can be used.

Over the next 6 weeks you have an opportunity to read the Plan and submit your comments.

The boards that follow provide information about all the Planning Policies in the Plan.

WE NEED YOUR VIEWS

DRINKSTONE

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

(2016-2026) - 10 YEARS

How it is prepared
There are a number of stages that have to be completed, as illustrated. Some of these stages are governed by the regulations for preparing neighbourhood plans and so there is no short cut.

Establish Steering Group
• Designate Neighbourhood Plan Area

Gather Evidence

Identify Key Issues
• Prioritise Issues and Themes
• Write the Plan
• Consult on Plan

Amend Plan and Submit to Mid Suffolk District Council

Independent Examination

Community Engagement
• Consultation on Evidence
• Consultation on Plan

WE'RE HERE
• Community Engagement
• Consultation on Evidence
• Consultation on Plan

Final Consultation by Mid Suffolk District Council
• Mid Suffolk District Council
• Approval of the Plan

VILLAGE REFERENDUM

Mid Suffolk District Council Approval

2. The Plan

Contents

1. Introduction and how the Plan was Prepared
2. Defining Characteristics of Drinkstone
3. Current Issues
4. Planning Policy Context
5. Vision and Objectives
6. Spatial Strategy
7. Housing
8. Natural Environment
9. Built Environment and Design
10. Infrastructure and Services

Supporting Documents

- Landscape Character Assessment
- Built Character Assessment
- Design Guidance
- Natural Environment and Local Green Space Assessment

The Plan contains:

Planning Policies
These will be used to supplement the Local Plan when decisions on planning applications are made

and

Community Actions
Local proposals that are not necessarily town planning related but could improve life or facilities in the village

WE ESPECIALLY WANT YOUR COMMENTS ON THE PLANNING POLICIES AND COMMUNITY ACTIONS

PLEASE ALSO TELL US IF YOU SUPPORT THE PLAN

DRINKSTONE

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

(2016-2026) - 10 YEARS



3. Vision & Objectives

Arising from the outcomes of the research and surveys, the Plan's over-arching Vision is:

In 2036 Drinkstone will be a place that has developed so that:

- it still has its own character and individuality;
- it is a place where people of all ages can live in a vibrant and friendly community;
- the natural landscape has been protected and enhanced.

The Vision is supported by four topic areas, each with objectives that will contribute to the delivery of the Vision.

Housing Objectives

1. Ensure that Drinkstone's housing growth is commensurate with the level of services and facilities in the village.
2. Deliver housing that is tailored to meet the needs of local residents.

Natural Environment Objectives

3. Protect the important green spaces, woodland and countryside and public rights of way.
4. Protect important views and links to the wider countryside.
5. Deliver net gains to the extent and quality of natural habitats.

Built Environment and Design

6. Conserve and enhance the village's heritage assets.
7. Ensure that new development is designed in a way that reflects local character.
8. Reduce the impact of new development through the incorporation of measures that reduce their environmental impact.

Infrastructure and Services

9. Ensure that the scale of development is at a level and in a location that the local infrastructure and services can support.
10. Protect and improve the range of existing community facilities and services.

DRINKSTONE

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

(2016-2026) - 10 YEARS

4. Planning Strategy

THE PLAN

- ✓ Identifies the amount of housing growth in the village up to 2036
- ✓ Focuses development to within defined Settlement Boundaries around the main built-up areas of the village
- ✓ Enables the building of new and affordable housing to meet local needs to be built
- ✓ Protects important open spaces in Local Green Space
- ✓ Protects and maintains features of Landscape and Biodiversity Value
- ✓ Identifies important views that should be protected from the impact of development
- ✓ Protects the landscape outside the built-up areas
- ✓ Seeks to maintain the building characteristics
- ✓ Identifies buildings that aren't listed but that are important to the character of the village

Location of development

The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared taking into account the context of both the National Planning Policy Framework and the adopted local plan documents for Mid Suffolk.

The current local plan defines Settlement Boundaries for Drinkstone Green and Drinkstone Green.

The Neighbourhood Plan has revised the Settlement Boundaries to take account of recent changes and planned locations for development referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Proposals for development outside these boundaries will be treated as being in the countryside and will have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in order to be allowed.

Policy DM1 – Spatial Strategy

The Neighbourhood Plan will accommodate development within the settlement boundaries as a Core Urban Village in the adopted Core Strategy and emerging design plan as a service in the Local Plan.

The focus for new development will be within the Settlement Boundaries of Drinkstone and Drinkstone Green as defined in the Policy DM1.

Requests for development located outside the Settlement Boundaries will only be permitted if they are shown to be essential for the operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, tourism, recreation and other essential services.

It can be satisfactorily demonstrated that there is an identified local need for the proposal and it cannot be satisfactorily serviced within the Settlement Boundaries.





DRINKSTONE

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

(2016-2026) - 10 YEARS

DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY?

DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
OUR VILLAGE • OUR VISION

While ensuring that new developments are treated in terms of occupant and vehicle safety, still takes care to be preferred over aesthetics. Any future national lighting system should take a holistic impact on the environment, increasing light pollution and adverse effects on wildlife impact to improve safety for people, protect biodiversity in groups, and nearby. Scheme should reduce the consumption of energy by increasing efficient lighting technology, lowering the light level when dark and unnecessary.

The Foster Council will approach the Landowner and Woodpecker Park Council about the possibility of agreeing and controlling/planting appropriate and sympathetic screening to reduce the impact of external lighting on Woodpecker Park.

The following Local Green Spaces are designated in this Plan and identified on the Policy Map:

1. All Saints Churchyard
2. Albert Home memorial and green
3. Bowdler Road Cemetery
4. Cherry Tree Farm
5. Green Close
6. The Gravel
7. Park Road verges
8. Bowdler Road verges
9. Parkside Road allotments and path to house 10
10. Black Birch woods

- The organization should only be used:
 - when the green share is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves
 - when the green area is demonstrably essential to a local community and not a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, character or value, including as a playing field, hangout or haven for the wildlife, and
 - when the green area concerned is used as a pleasure and is well as an extensive tract of land
- Separate Local Urban Space Appraisal has been conducted and those areas that are considered to be identified as Public Open Space.



DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2015-2020

Writing a planning proposal offers a "bridge" asset. If used, it can be incorporated by the Heritage Statement identifying, as a minimum, the significance of the asset, and a assessment of the impact of the proposed heritage work. The use of Article 17(1) Heritage Statement should be appropriate to the significance of the asset and the works proposed and sufficient to understand the potential impact of its removal on the conservation of the asset.

DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
OUR VILLAGE • OUR VOICE

DRINKSTONE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2013-2015

Appendix 7 - Pre-Submission Consultation Response Form

Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan

PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

This form should be completed in conjunction with the draft of the Neighbourhood Plan – August 2019.

We would prefer receiving responses via the online feedback form as it will make the task of collating views much easier. However, if this is not possible then please complete this form.

Further copies of this form are available from:

- Daphne Youngs, Copsey Cottage, Rattlesden Road, Drinkstone, IP30 9TL;
- Graham Todd, Elm Tree Cottage, Gedding Road, Drinkstone, IP30 9SZ;
- Jane Hill, The Old Rectory, The Street, Drinkstone, IP30 9SR

Please submit your completed form in one of the following ways:

- Drop off or post to the contacts above
- Email as an attachment to drinkstonechair@gmail.com or graham_todd@btinternet.com

Please ensure your response is received by Friday 4 October

NAME	
ADDRESS	
ORGANISATION / CLIENT YOU'RE REPRESENTING (Where applicable)	
EMAIL (optional)	
Data Protection Notice: All information collected and processed by the Parish Councils at this stage is by virtue of our requirement under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended). <i>Please note: All comments received will be made publicly available and may be identifiable by name / organisation. All other personal information provided will be protected in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018.</i>	
CONSULTATION RESPONSE <i>Please continue on a separate sheet if the box isn't big enough</i>	
1. Do you support the content of Chapters 1 – 4?	YES / NO / No opinion
Comment (please specify chapter and paragraph number)	
2. Do you support the Vision and Objectives in Chapter 5?	YES / NO / No opinion

Comment (please specify Objective number if appropriate)

3. Do you support Policy DRN1 – Spatial Strategy?

YES / NO / No opinion

If No, please state what changes you would like

4. Chapter 6. Not including Policy DRN1, do you support Chapter 6?

YES / NO / No opinion

Comment (please specify paragraph number)

5. Do you support Policy DRN2 – Housing Development?

YES / NO / No opinion

If No, please state what changes you would like

6. Do you support Policy DRN3 – Housing Allocations

YES / NO / No opinion

If No, please state what changes you would like

7. Do you support Policy DRN4 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
8. Chapter 7. Other than Policies DRN2, DRN3 and DRN4, do you support the remaining contents of Chapter 7?	YES / NO / No opinion
Comment	
9. Do you support Policy DRN5 – Protection of Important Views?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
10. Do you support Policy DRN6 – Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	

11. Do you support Policy DRN7 – Dark Skies?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
12. Do you support Community Action 1?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
13. Do you support Policy DRN8 – Local Green Spaces?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
14. Do you support Policy DRN 9 – Biodiversity?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	

15. Do you support Community Action 2?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
16. Do you support Community Action 3?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
17. Chapter 8. Other than Policies DRN5, DRN6, DRN7, DRN8 and DRN9, do you support the remaining contents of Chapter 8?	YES / NO / No opinion
Comment	
18. Do you support Policy DRN10 – Buildings of Local Significance?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	

19. Do you support Policy DRN11 – Heritage Assets?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
20. Do you support Policy DRN12 – Design Considerations?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
21. Do you support Policy DRN13 – Sustainable Construction practices?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
22. Chapter 9. Other than Policies DRN10, DRN11, DRN12 and DRN13, do you support the remaining contents of Chapter 9?	YES / NO / No opinion
Comment	

23. Do you support Community Action 4?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
24. Do you support Community Action 5?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
25. Do you support Community Action 6?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	

26. Do you support Community Action 7?	YES / NO / No opinion
If No, please state what changes you would like	
27. Do you support the contents of the Policies Maps?	YES / NO / No opinion
Comments	

Thank you for providing your feedback. We will take your comments into account in deciding whether amendments are required to the Neighbourhood Plan.

A Consultation Report for the Neighbourhood Plan will be published when the Plan is submitted to Mid Suffolk District Council.


Appendix 8 - Responses received to Pre-Submission Consultation and Responses to Comments

The graphs on the following pages illustrate the answers received to the “Yes/No” questions on the comments form. They illustrate an overwhelming support of the proposed planning policies and community actions in the Neighbourhood Pan.

The tables that follow the graphs set out the full comments that were received during the Pre-Submission Consultation Stage, the responses to those comments from the Parish Council and the changes made to the Plan as a result of the comments. The table is laid out in Plan order with the general comments following the comments on the policies. Comments received on the Community Actions are set out at the end of the table.

Online Comments Form – Responses to questions

1. Do you support the content of Chapters 1 – 4?




2. Do you support the Vision and Objectives in Chapter 5?



3. Do you support Policy DRN1 – Spatial Strategy?



4. Chapter 6. Not including Policy DRN1, do you support Chapter 6?



5. Do you support Policy DRN2 – Housing Development?



6. Do you support Policy DRN3 – Housing Allocations



7. Do you support Policy DRN4 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites?



8. Chapter 7. Other than Policies DRN2, DRN3 and DRN4, do you support the remaining contents of Chapter 7?



9. Do you support Policy DRN5 – Protection of Important Views?




10. Do you support Policy DRN6 – Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity?



11. Do you support Policy DRN7 – Dark Skies?



12. Do you support Community Action 1?



13. Do you support Policy DRN8 – Local Green Spaces?



14. Do you support Policy DRN 9 – Biodiversity?



15. Do you support Community Action 2?



16. Do you support Community Action 3?



17. Chapter 8. Other than Policies DRN5, DRN6, DRN7, DRN8 and DRN9, do you support the remaining contents of Chapter 8?




18. Do you support Policy DRN10 – Buildings of Local Significance?



19. Do you support Policy DRN11 – Heritage Assets?



20. Do you support Policy DRN12 – Design Considerations?



21. Do you support Policy DRN13 – Sustainable Construction practices?



22. Chapter 9. Other than Policies DRN10, DRN11, DRN12 and DRN13, do you support the remaining contents of Chapter 9?



23. Do you support Community Action 4?




24. Do you support Community Action 5?



25. Do you support Community Action 6?



26. Do you support Community Action 7?



27. Do you support the contents of the Policies Maps?



Responses received to Pre-Submission Consultation, Responses to Comments and Proposed Changes

The tables in this appendix set out the comments that were received during the Pre-Submission Consultation Stage and the responses and changes made to the Plan as a result of the comments. The table is laid out in Plan order with the general comments following the comments on the policies. Comments received on the Community Actions are set out at the end of the table.

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Chapter 1 - Introduction				
Anonymous		chapter 1 para 1.3 EU regulations	The Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions refer to EU Obligations	No change
Peter Holborn		Chapters 1-4 Excellent introduction and situation analysis. The whole document and supporting evidence reads very well and is a thoroughly professional body of work.	Noted and thank you	None
Ken White		Chapter 1 para 1.3 Compatibility with EU regulations - relevance post Brexit?	Until revoked by the British Government, these regulations will apply to neighbourhood planning.	None
Lyn Hannant		Chapter 1 laid out clearly the mission and purpose of preparing a neighbourhood plan - p6 1.3. 1.4 and 1.5 explain how the plan was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Government's Neighbourhood Planning Regulations with regard to evidence gathering. 1.6 gives an explanation of how the area covered was identified - the District Council formally designated this. The settlement map on p7 clearly shows the area under consideration.	Noted and thank you	None
Roger Russell-Smith		Ch 1: Appears to have been adequate consultation, and the four themes for focus (1.10) are sensible.	Noted and thank you	None
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Insert line space between para's 1.7 and 1.8	Agree	Insert line space between para's 1.7 and 1.8
Alan Laursen Jones		A considerable amount of work/commitment is evident in this report. Very professional and informative. 10 out of 10.	Noted and thank you	None
Bill and Rachel Smith		A well thought out overview of the village.	Noted and thank you	None
Chapter 2 - Defining Characteristics of Drinkstone				
Peter Holborn		Chapters 1-4 Excellent introduction and situation analysis.	Noted and thank you	None
Trevor Watkin		Section 2.22. Says "the junction of Gedding Road and Beyton Road", I think that should be "the junction of The Street and Beyton Road".	Agree. Delete reference to Gedding Road and replace with "the Street"	Amend paragraph 2.22 as follows: namely: the junction of Gedding Road The Street and Beyton Road....

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Liz Schmitt		Para 2.18. By the time the plan goes to the next stage this paragraph may need to be updated regarding the provision (or lack) of bus services	Agree. Amend paragraph 2.18 to bring up-to-date in respect of bus services.	Amend paragraph 2.18 as follows: <u>Up until September 2019, Drinkstone is was served by two bus routes, to Bury St Edmunds and to Stowmarket. However, the operator terminated the contract with the County Council and, at the time of preparing this Plan, no replacement services had been introduced meaning that residents have little option but to rely on the car to access services and facilities in larger villages and towns. Together they operate three buses to Bury St Edmunds and two to Stowmarket six days a week (Monday-Saturday). There are no evening nor Sunday services. One service, the 377, runs once a day at times suitable for commuting to work in Bury St Edmunds town centre in normal working hours. Both services are currently under review by Suffolk County Council and are at risk of having their subsidy removed, increasing the likelihood that they will be cancelled altogether. In the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire, 66% of respondents stated that they never use the bus services, with only 7% using them "often or very often".</u>
Ken White		Chapter 2 para 2.19 "the lack of pavements & street lights". The wording suggests a disadvantage or shortcoming rather than a beneficial characteristic of the village. "the absence of" would be better wording.	Agree. Amend paragraph 2.19	Amend first sentence of paragraph 2.19 as follows: A further feature of the village is the lack <u>absence</u> of pavements and street lighting.

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Ken White		Chapter 2 para 2.21 Contrary to AWA comments Chapel Lane residents suffer sewage problems through outdated sewers with insufficient capacity - documented evidence is available.	Noted. Amend Para 2.21 to note local issues highlighted.	Amend paragraph 2.21 as follows: During the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan we have ascertained from UK Power Networks and Anglian Water that there is ample electricity capacity in the sub-station for new houses. In addition, Anglian Water stated and that the sewage system's <u>pumping station's</u> capacity could cope with more houses, although there may be issues with the processing capacity of the system outside the village's boundaries <u>and possibly also within the village, depending on the scale and location of any further development. However, there is a record of serious local capacity / flooding problems in the sewerage system, particularly in Chapel Lane.</u> Anglian Water has stated that there is in place a set procedure for developers to be required to contribute to the costs of expanding infrastructure should their developments necessitate it.
Ken White		Chapter 2 para 2.22 It is noted that flooding occurs at the junction of Chapel Lane and Gedding Road. It is not noted, but of greater significance, that flooding of certain homes in Chapel Lane occurs under extreme weather conditions when the stream overflows its banks – photographic evidence is available. The Environmental Agency currently designate Chapel Lane as a medium to high risk flood zone.	Agree. Insert additional sentence to note locally identified issues.	Amend paragraph 2.22 as follows: ...and Park Road. <u>The Government Flood Risk map also indicates that properties in Chapel Lane are in an area where there is a high risk of surface water flooding.</u>

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Lyn Hannant		Chapter 2 starts with a brief history of the origins of Drinkstone. Map 2 on p11 is helpful in illustrating the main features of the village. Population and demographic data are given. 2.12 - landscape setting described. 2.13 - built character assessment described. 2.14 - services and facilities described in detail. Roads and access - 2.18 is now out of date as information in the press suggests that the bus services are about to be axed. p15 - useful map of the public footpaths, numbered to facilitate planning walks.	Noted and thank you Amend paragraph 2.18 to bring up-to-date in respect of bus services.	Amend paragraph 2.18 as follows: <u>Up until September 2019, Drinkstone is served by two bus routes, to Bury St Edmunds and to Stowmarket. However, the operator terminated the contract with the County Council and, at the time of preparing this Plan, no replacement services had been introduced meaning that residents have little option but to rely on the car to access services and facilities in larger villages and towns. Together they operate three buses to Bury St Edmunds and two to Stowmarket six days a week (Monday-Saturday). There are no evening nor Sunday services. One service, the 377, runs once a day at times suitable for commuting to work in Bury St Edmunds town centre in normal working hours. Both services are currently under review by Suffolk County Council and are at risk of having their subsidy removed, increasing the likelihood that they will be cancelled altogether. In the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire, 66% of respondents stated that they never use the bus services, with only 7% using them "often or very often".</u>
Roger Russell-Smith		Ch2: Good to emphasise in 2.7 the gradual loss of facilities/amenities since 1990. Poor transport infrastructure noted in 2.9 but not sure if this is a 'positive card"! Doubt if potential capacity at the sewage pumping station (very nearby!) would be adequate to deal with much additional 'bums on seats'.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating any additional sites for housing over and above those that have planning permission. Any proposals that do come forward will need to satisfy the relevant authorities that	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response sewage can be satisfactorily dealt with.	Changes made to Plan
Clifford Blackwell		paragraph 2.7 states that the village hall is the centre of the community. paragraph 3.10 states that the community make very little use of the facilities. These extracts seem to contradict one another.	Noted. We do not believe that these statements are contradictory but propose to amend paragraph 3.10 to clarify meanings.	Amend paragraph 3.10 to clarify usage of village amenities as follows: Many village residents make little or no use of the village's amenities. <u>For example, usage of the village hall either often or very often is marked, but few use the allotment. The implication here is that many people do not require such amenities for their lifestyle in Drinkstone.</u> Almost nine respondents in ten.....
June Harris		Why is the village hall classed as boundary as a measurement to Woolpit?	Geographically, the Village Hall is central to the village and has therefore been chosen as the measuring point.	None
Christine Harris		Don't understand why the village hall is classed as a measurement to Woolpit?	Geographically, the Village Hall is central to the village and has therefore been chosen as the measuring point.	None
Merete Bland		2.1 to 2. Interesting read 2.18 Bus services have now been withdrawn 2.22 Should that not read 'junction of The Street and Beyton Road'?	Noted. Amend paragraph 2.18 to bring up-to-date in respect of bus services.	Amend paragraph 2.18 as follows: <u>Up until September 2019, Drinkstone is served by two bus routes, to Bury St Edmunds and to Stowmarket. However, the operator terminated the contract with the County Council and, at the time of preparing this Plan, no replacement services had been introduced meaning that residents have little option but to rely on the car to access services and facilities in larger villages and towns. Together they operate three buses to Bury St Edmunds and two to Stowmarket six days a week (Monday-Saturday).</u>

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
				There are no evening nor Sunday services. One service, the 377, runs once a day at times suitable for commuting to work in Bury St Edmunds town centre in normal working hours. Both services are currently under review by Suffolk County Council and are at risk of having their subsidy removed, increasing the likelihood that they will be cancelled altogether. In the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire, 66% of respondents stated that they never use the bus services, with only 7% using them "often or very often".
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Para 2.11: Typo? Suggest the word 'of' be deleted mid-paragraph so it reads "... implying an additional of 15 four-person households."	Agree	Delete the word 'of' in mid-paragraph so it reads "... implying an additional of 15 four-person households."
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Para 2.13: Suggest second sentence be reworded to read: "This led to the identification of seven distinct character areas of the built-up areas of the within the parish , as identified on the maps opposite."	Agree	Amend para 2.13 as follows: "This led to the identification of seven distinct character areas of the built-up areas of the within the parish, as identified on the maps opposite."
		Should these maps [page 13] be numbered? If so, consequential amendments to other maps / text references to these will need to be made.	Agree	Insert map number and titles to maps on page 13 as follows: Map 3A – Character Areas – Drinkstone Green Map 3B – Character Area – Drinkstone Street
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Map 3 Page 15: Is there a key to the numbered footpaths?	The numbers relate to the Definitive Public Rights of Way records	Amend Map title as follows: Map 3 – Public Footpaths (the numbers relate to the <u>Definitive Public Rights of Way records</u>)
RK and PA Cilvert		Para 2.18 All buses have now ceased Para 2.22 Lower end of Chapel Lane has been known to flood	Noted and thank you	Amend paragraph 2.18 as follows:

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
			Amend paragraph 2.18 to bring up-to-date in respect of bus services.	<u>Up until September 2019, Drinkstone is was served by two bus routes, to Bury St Edmunds and to Stowmarket. However, the operator terminated the contract with the County Council and, at the time of preparing this Plan, no replacement services had been introduced meaning that residents have little option but to rely on the car to access services and facilities in larger villages and towns. Together they operate three buses to Bury St Edmunds and two to Stowmarket six days a week (Monday-Saturday). There are no evening nor Sunday services. One service, the 377, runs once a day at times suitable for commuting to work in Bury St Edmunds town centre in normal working hours. Both services are currently under review by Suffolk County Council and are at risk of having their subsidy removed, increasing the likelihood that they will be cancelled altogether. In the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire, 66% of respondents stated that they never use the bus services, with only 7% using them "often or very often".</u> None
Linda Powell		I do not agree with the statement about the village hall being the centre of the community to measure the distance of nearest facilities in Woolpit	Geographically, the Village Hall is central to the village and has therefore been chosen as the measuring point.	
Diana Hollins		2.18 Withdrawal of bus service – now a reality	Noted Amend paragraph 2.18 to bring up-to-date in respect of bus services.	Amend paragraph 2.18 as follows: <u>Up until September 2019, Drinkstone is was served by two bus routes, to Bury St Edmunds and to Stowmarket. However, the operator terminated the</u>

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
				contract with the County Council and, at the time of preparing this Plan, no replacement services had been introduced meaning that residents have little option but to rely on the car to access services and facilities in larger villages and towns. Together they operate three buses to Bury St Edmunds and two to Stowmarket six days a week (Monday-Saturday). There are no evening nor Sunday services. One service, the 377, runs once a day at times suitable for commuting to work in Bury St Edmunds town centre in normal working hours. Both services are currently under review by Suffolk County Council and are at risk of having their subsidy removed, increasing the likelihood that they will be cancelled altogether. In the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire, 66% of respondents stated that they never use the bus services, with only 7% using them "often or very often".
Chapter 3 – Current Issues				
Diana Dupree		3.16/3.17: as the parent of a young child who does not attend the youth club, I would like to echo the need for additional play equipment on the cricket. Any of the suggestions would be good but the see saw and zip wire ideas in particular. We've seen this in Rattlesden and its fab.	Noted	None
Liz Schmitt		Para 3.4 - may need to be noted that since the questionnaire results were compiled, Fibre Broadband is being rolled out within the village	Agree. Amend paragraph as suggested.	Amend paragraph 3.4 as follows: Aspects that caused concern are in the 2018 village questionnaire were the lack of fast broadband services (since improved), speeding.....
Liz Schmitt		Para 3.5 - suggest the addition of 'the majority of residents' in line 3	Agree. Amend paragraph as suggested.	Amend second sentence of paragraph 3.5 as follows:

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Liz Schmitt		Para 3.8 - suggest 'respondents' rather than 'people' in the last sentence	Agree. Amend paragraph as suggested.	The questionnaire results indicate that <u>the majority of residents are</u> were not opposed.... Amend final sentence of paragraph 3.8 as follows: Nearly nine in ten people-respondents want new development to be phased over the next 20 years.
Lyn Hannant		Chapter 3 - current issues Neighbourhood questionnaire described in detail, with the emphasis on the fact that the information was taken directly from parishioners' responses. With a view to future villagers, children's views were sought and documented.	Noted	None
Roger Russell-Smith		Ch3: Fast broadband now largely available (if prepared to pay for it)? 3.8 a most important point.	Agree. Amend paragraph as suggested.	Amend paragraph 3.4 as follows: Aspects that caused concern are <u>in</u> the 2018 village questionnaire were the lack of fast broadband services <u>(since improved)</u> , speeding.....
Clifford Blackwell		paragraph 2.7 states that the village hall is the centre of the community. paragraph 3.10 states that the community make very little use of the facilities. These extracts seem to contradict one another.	Noted. We do not believe that these statements are contradictory but propose to amend paragraph 3.10 to clarify meanings.	Amend paragraph 3.10 to clarify usage of village amenities as follows: Many village residents make little or no use of the village's amenities. <u>For example, usage of the village hall either often or very often is marked, but few use the allotment.</u> The implication here is that many people do not require such amenities for their lifestyle in Drinkstone. Almost nine respondents in ten.....
Merete Bland		Para 3.16 to 3.17: Pleased to see that the view of the children were included	Noted and thank you	None
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Insert line space between para's 3.13 and 3.14. There also seems to be some variation in font size across this page.	Agree	Insert line space between para's 3.13 and 3.14.

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
RK and PA Cilvert		Para 3.4 Speeding traffic is a serious problem particularly at the junction of Chapel Lane and Gedding Road	Agree	Review font size on page 18
Linda Powell		Para 3.10 First part of this paragraph supports my statement above (see under Linda Powell Para 2.7)	See our response above	None
Chapter 4 – Planning Policy Context				
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Para 4.4: Suggest first sentence ends: "... as illustrated on Maps 4A and 4B." [NB: see also comment above re para 2.13 and map numbering]	Agree. Map numbers will change as a consequence of other amendments.	Amend Para 4.4 as follows: The 1998 Local Plan defines Settlement Boundaries for the village as illustrated below <u>on Maps 5A and 5B.</u>
Chapter 5 – Vision and Objectives				
Liz Schmitt		Objective 5 - how might this be done? Could an example be added?	The chapters that follow the Visions and Objectives section identify, through planning policies or community actions, what is to be done to deliver the Objectives.	None
Nigel Gale		Any development should not markedly increase the volume of traffic in the village.	The development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan would not markedly increase the volume of traffic in the village.	None
Lyn Hannant		Objectives under the headings Housing, Natural Environment, Built Environment and design, Infrastructure and services are clearly laid out and easy to understand. There is emphasis on meeting the needs of local residents.	Noted and thank you	None
Clifford Blackwell		It is stated that "it is a place where people of all ages can live in a vibrant and friendly community;" How can a pace of all ages if the current housing stock is in the higher bracket of the market place. In the "objectives" it is stated " Deliver housing that is tailored to meet the needs of local residents" Surely, the local residents have the housing that they require, it's NEW residents that are needed and that requires lower cost housing.	Existing residents may need housing because, for example, they're living with residents or because they're existing property no longer meets their needs. The Neighbourhood Plan will allow for the construction of affordable housing to meet an identified local need, should research back this up during the Plan period.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
June Harris		Need to build more affordable homes as younger generation will not be able to stay in the village as housing costs too expensive.	The Neighbourhood Plan will allow for the construction of affordable housing to meet an identified local need, should research back this up during the Plan period.	None
Christine Harris		Needs to be more affordable housing to be able to keep the younger generation possibly born in the village able to stay. Go back to grass roots a bit. Expensive housing will bring outsiders (no connection to Suffolk at all) or second home brigade.	The Neighbourhood Plan will allow for the construction of affordable housing to meet an identified local need, should research back this up during the Plan period.	None
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Para 5.1: Suggest adding 'Vision' as a title to the relevant text box. In para 5.1, suggest last sentence be worded more positively, i.e., without the word 'if'.	Agree that it would help to distinguish the Vision from the remainder of the text.	Amend by including "Vision" within the grey box and before "In 2036 Drinkstone....."
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Objective 8: The Councils Heritage Team propose that Objective 8 should ideally read 'Reduce the impact of new development through the incorporation of measures that reduce their impact upon the built environment .' This would clearly identify this objective as related to the built environment specifically. Alternatively, an additional objective could be added following the environmental impact point, which solely refers to the 'historic built environment impact.'	Disagree. As currently worded the Objective seeks to reduce the impact on the environment, whether it's the historic built or natural environment.	None
Linda Powell		Under Objectives – Housing point 2, more housing for children of residents, i.e. affordable and social housing.	The Neighbourhood Plan will allow for the construction of affordable housing to meet an identified local need, should research back this up during the Plan period.	None
Bill and Rachel Smith		Agree with all the objectives in Chapter 5.	Noted and thank you	None
Policy DRN1 – Spatial Strategy				
Lyn Hannant		Yes, if only MSDC stop moving the goalposts.	Noted	None
Roger Russell-Smith		100% in agreement	Noted and thank you	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Nick Lane		the report says 1. villagers not opposed to more housing 2. there is support for affordable housing 3. Infrastructure can cope with more houses 4. We have an increasing population of over 45's and decreasing population of under 45's 5. low on the list of issues was volume of traffic. Despite noting that we have 2 groups and allotments and the proximity of Woolpit business park (noted under dark skies section). You still maintain a push for Drinkstone to be classified as a Hamlet therefore ignoring all the comments above. For example it will never be possible for Drinkstone to have 2 bed properties as allowance for properties will only be 0.44 per year. Hence it would take 4.5years for every pair of semi detached house to be built	Drinkstone has been assessed by Mid Suffolk District Council against a range of criteria including the availability of existing services. The assessment concludes that the village, in planning terms, falls within their "hamlet" classification. We cannot change what Mid Suffolk call such settlements. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for additional housing to be developed within the overall strategy set by the Local Plan. The Plan does not preclude affordable housing being developed to meet an identified local need.	None
Clifford Blackwell		Drinkstone should not be classed as a "Hamlet" I feel that services will suffer if this classification is allowed to remain i.e. road repairs, ditch clearing etc.	Drinkstone has been assessed by Mid Suffolk District Council against a range of criteria including the availability of existing services. The assessment concludes that the village, in planning terms, falls within their "hamlet" classification. We cannot change what Mid Suffolk call such settlements. The classification is used solely for the purposes of planning policy and the consideration of planning applications and should not have an impact on the statutory duties of other public bodies.	None
June Harris		Should not be classed as a hamlet. The village should be able to build some properties to bring more people to Drinkstone. Attended Drinkstone school and has never been classed as a hamlet before.	Drinkstone has been assessed by Mid Suffolk District Council against a range of criteria including the availability of	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
			existing services. The assessment concludes that the village, in planning terms, falls within their "hamlet" classification. We cannot change what Mid Suffolk call such settlements. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for additional housing to be developed within the overall strategy set by the Local Plan.	
Christine Harris		Never ever heard Drinkstone been classed as a hamlet before. Should be able to build some appropriate homes.	Drinkstone has been assessed by Mid Suffolk District Council against a range of criteria including the availability of existing services. The assessment concludes that the village, in planning terms, falls within their "hamlet" classification. We cannot change what Mid Suffolk call such settlements. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for additional housing to be developed within the overall strategy set by the Local Plan.	None
	Mid Suffolk District Council	To aid clarity, suggest the last paragraph be reworded as follows: "Proposals for development located outside the Settlement Boundaries will only be permitted where: i) it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that there is an identified local need for the proposal; ii) it cannot be satisfactorily located within the Settlement Boundaries; or iii) it is essential for the operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other exceptional uses.	Noted. In order to achieve consistency across neighbourhood plans in the district, it is proposed that the following criterion is added to the Policy: iii) it is essential for the operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other exceptional uses for which it can satisfactorily be demonstrated that it needs to be located there	Add the following criterion to the end of the Policy: iii) <u>it is essential for the operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other exceptional uses for which it can satisfactorily be demonstrated that it needs to be located there or meets the requirements of other development plan policies.</u>

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response or meets the requirements of other development plan policies.	Changes made to Plan
	Gladman Developments Limited	Policy DRN1 identifies a settlement boundary for Drinkstone and states that land outside of this defined area, will be treated as open countryside, where development will be carefully controlled. Gladman object to the use of settlement boundaries if these preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that sustainable development should proceed. Use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements does not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework and is contrary to basic condition (a). As currently drafted, this is considered to be an overly restrictive approach and provides no flexibility to reflect the circumstances upon which the TNP is being prepared. Greater flexibility is required in this policy and Gladman suggest that additional sites adjacent to the settlement boundary should be considered as appropriate. Gladman recommend that the above policy is modified so that it allows for a degree of flexibility. The following wording is put forward for consideration: "When considering development proposals, the Neighbourhood Plan will take a positive approach to new development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Applications that accord with the policies of the Development Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan will be supported particularly where they provide: New homes including market and affordable housing; or Opportunities for new business facilities through new or expanded premises; or Infrastructure to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the neighbourhood area. Development adjacent to the existing settlement will be permitted provided that any adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development."	Disagree. The Framework states that "housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities." The Plan meets its identified housing requirement in full and there is, therefore, no need to allow further developments outside the boundary except in specified circumstances, as it will not meet an identified local need. Disagree. As worded the Policy is in conformity with the adopted Local Plan and the Framework The Framework states that "housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities." The Plan meets its identified housing requirement in full and there is, therefore, no need to allow further developments outside the boundary as they will not meet an identified local need.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		Indeed, this approach was taken in the examination of the Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph 4.12 of the Examiner's Report states: "...Policy GMC1 should be modified to state that "Development ...shall be focused within or adjoining the settlement boundary as identified in the plan." It should be made clear that any new development should be either infill or of a minor or moderate scale, so that the local distinctiveness of the settlement is not compromised. PM2 should be made to achieve this flexibility and ensure regard is had to the NPPF and the promotion of sustainable development. PM2 is also needed to ensure that the GNP will be in general conformity with the aims for new housing development in the Core Strategy and align with similar aims in the emerging Local Plan."		
Linda Powell		Not to be classed as a hamlet. I feel that the village will suffer as a result of hamlet classification.	Drinkstone has been assessed by Mid Suffolk District Council against a range of criteria including the availability of existing services. The assessment concludes that the village, in planning terms, falls within their "hamlet" classification. We cannot change what Mid Suffolk call such settlements. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for additional housing to be developed within the overall strategy set by the Local Plan.	None
Richard and Rachel Mutimer		I would question the validity of the village being classified as a hamlet and do not agree with the proposal regarding development outside the settlement boundary; in my opinion, every application should be considered on its own merits.	Drinkstone has been assessed by Mid Suffolk District Council against a range of criteria including the availability of existing services. The assessment concludes that the village, in planning terms, falls within their "hamlet" classification. We cannot change what Mid Suffolk call such settlements.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
			The Neighbourhood Plan allows for additional housing to be developed within the overall strategy set by the Local Plan. Applications are treated on their own merits but, in accordance with national planning policy, the starting point for making such assessments is the adopted development plan which will include the Neighbourhood Plan once adopted. Allowing uncontrolled development outside the Settlement Boundary could result in further ribbon development along roads leading out of the village and additional housing development that would be contrary to the strategic policies of the adopted development plan, with which the Neighbourhood Plan must conform.	
Chapter 6 – Spatial Strategy: General Comments				
Liz Schmitt		Para 6.3. Suggest that the addition of words 'as shown on the maps on pages 46 & 47' as it is not intrinsically clear that these maps are the settlement boundaries without reference to the key on page 44	Agree	Amend para 6.3 as follows: Settlement boundaries are defined for the main built-up areas of the village, as defined on the Policies Map at the rear of the Plan, in order to manage.....
Lyn Hannant		The preparation of the Plan was based on Mid Suffolk Plan from 1998, the Core Strategy (2008); the final Joint Local Plan was produced in July 2019, moving the goalposts significantly, as Drinkstone went from Hinterland to Hamlet, which could have a significant effect on development.	Noted	None
Clifford Blackwell		Paragraph 6.2 With my limited knowledge of planning considerations I do not recall	Mid Suffolk District Council has not previously had the benefit of	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		when the planning department have declined permission due to the loss of a "view". A case in point is the development of Cherry Tree Rise in Drinkstone, no account was taken of the loss of privacy and view of residents in Gedding Road. It seemed that MSDC wanted the development regardless of residents concerns, and other residents wanted a new hall regardless of the implications as the overlooked properties were mainly "social housing"	the detailed character assessments that have been prepared in support of the Neighbourhood Plan. The loss of views from residents' properties are not normally a matter taken into account in determining applications, rather it is loss of amenity. Detrimental impact of development on the character and setting of an area is a material consideration if there is robust evidence to support that assessment. This will be the case if the Neighbourhood Plan as written is adopted.	
June Harris		When did planning take into consideration the building of houses at cherry tree rise overlooking houses along gedding road.	Mid Suffolk District Council has not previously had the benefit of the detailed character assessments that have been prepared in support of the Neighbourhood Plan. The loss of views from residents' properties are not normally a matter taken into account in determining applications, rather it is loss of amenity. Detrimental impact of development on the character and setting of an area is a material consideration if there is robust evidence to support that assessment. This will be the case if the Neighbourhood Plan as written is adopted.	None
Christine Harris		What consideration if any took place in the building of the homes in cherry tree rise that are now quite intrusive to people living on gedding road.	Mid Suffolk District Council has not previously had the benefit of the detailed character assessments that have been prepared in support of the Neighbourhood	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
			Plan. The loss of views from residents' properties are not normally a matter taken into account in determining applications, rather it is loss of amenity. Detrimental impact of development on the character and setting of an area is a material consideration if there is robust evidence to support that assessment. This will be the case if the Neighbourhood Plan as written is adopted.	
	Mid Suffolk District Council	The Councils Heritage Team suggest this policy should reference the potential requirement for Listed Building Consent as well as planning permission when discussing the conversion of barns / outbuildings.	Disagree. This is a matter of planning law rather than policy	None
Linda Powell		Para 6.2 When have the planning department taken views of landscape into consideration? Look at the Cherry Tree development; the new properties are overlooking the existing homes on Gedding Road.	Mid Suffolk District Council has not previously had the benefit of the detailed character assessments that have been prepared in support of the Neighbourhood Plan. The loss of views from residents' properties are not normally a matter taken into account in determining applications, rather it is loss of amenity. Detrimental impact of development on the character and setting of an area is a material consideration if there is robust evidence to support that assessment. This will be the case if the Neighbourhood Plan as written is adopted.	None
Policy DRN2 – Housing Development				
	Mid Suffolk District Council	To aid clarity, suggest inserting line space between bullet 'iii.' and the next paragraph which starts with "In addition ..."	Agree	Insert line space between bullet 'iii.' and the next paragraph which starts with "In addition ..."

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Nigel Gale		Having had 8 planning applications granted in the village in the past 2 years, it seems highly optimistic that there will only be 10 more in the next 17 years. Therefore, I would like to see a statement as to the policy to be adopted once the next 10 applications have been granted.	The provision for 10 dwellings includes those with planning consent but is referenced as "around" as there may be proposals come forward that comply with the criteria in Policy DRN2. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set ceilings to housing development.	None
Lyn Hannant		I do have reservations about (iii) as I feel that it could be open to abuse, as some householders might try to circumvent the 'exceptional circumstances' element by creatively interpreting, say, 'outdoor recreation'.	There are very stringent tests by which such applications would have to comply in order to be approved.	None
Roger Russell-Smith		Disappointing that recent or agreed developments (Gedding Road next to allotments, Abbots Lodge) appear to ignore this.	Noted	None
Duncan Hannant		This is changed now because of "Hamlet" designation?	The policy is in conformity with the Local Plan Hamlet designation	None
Clifford Blackwell		A change of the settlement boundary to allow residents outside of the current boundary the opportunity to help sustain and progress Drinkstone	This approach would mean that the Plan would not be in general conformity with the Local Plan and would potentially fail at the examination stage. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for development outside the Settlement Boundary in specific circumstances, as identified in Policy DRN2.	None
June Harris		Why is the boundary excluding some residents moving the boundary is a change I would like to see.	This approach would mean that the Plan would not be in general conformity with the Local Plan and would potentially fail at the examination stage. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for development outside the Settlement Boundary in specific circumstances, as identified in Policy DRN2.	None
Christine Harris		Don't like the idea of some residents being excluded due to the boundary. Boundary needs to be changed.	This approach would mean that the Plan would not be in general	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
			conformity with the Local Plan and would potentially fail at the examination stage. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for development outside the Settlement Boundary in specific circumstances, as identified in Policy DRN2.	
Sarah Denniston		No development	Noted	None
Linda Powell		Changes to the settlement boundaries: to allow village residents outside of these existing boundaries the chance to develop Drinkstone.	This approach would mean that the Plan would not be in general conformity with the Local Plan and would potentially fail at the examination stage. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for development outside the Settlement Boundary in specific circumstances, as identified in Policy DRN2.	
Richard and Rachel Mutimer		As per comments on DRN1. In my opinion, 10 additional dwellings over such a long period is unreasonable, as over the 17 year period the village will need more capacity and some expansion might actually benefit the village.	The Neighbourhood Plan does not preclude further development over the period to 2036 if the proposals meet the criteria set out in the Plan.	None
Policy DRN3 – Housing Allocations				
Liz Schmitt		What does 'well-related' to the settlement boundaries mean? is it another way of saying 'adjacent'? Is it worth updating the number of dwellings for land adjacent to Greyfriars to 2?	Well-related generally does mean that the sites in question adjoin the former settlement boundaries. The Plan will be updated to take account of a second dwelling being approved at Greyfriars in August 2019.	Add footnote below Policy DRN3 as follows: Following the publication of the Pre-Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan in August 2019, a further dwelling was granted to planning consent adjacent to Greyfriars, Rattlesden Road.
Lyn Hannant		I have reservations about (v) having planning permission. This site is clearly in open countryside. Also (ii) as the access will potentially be very dangerous and it is also in the garden is a listed building.	Planning consent on this site (Beyton Road) has already been granted and the Neighbourhood	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Roger Russell-Smith		See comment for Q5 [Disappointing that recent or agreed developments (Gedding Road next to allotments, Abbots Lodge) appear to ignore this.]	Plan cannot revoke planning permissions. Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan was not in place when these developments were granted permission.	None
Clifford Blackwell		More affordable housing to help Drinkstone thrive and not dwindle as a hamlet.	Policy DRN4 provides a mechanism for the delivery of affordable housing should a local need be demonstrated during the lifetime of the Plan.	None
June Harris		More affordable housing	Policy DRN4 provides a mechanism for the delivery of affordable housing should a local need be demonstrated during the lifetime of the Plan.	None
Christine Harris		Affordable housing.	Policy DRN4 provides a mechanism for the delivery of affordable housing should a local need be demonstrated during the lifetime of the Plan.	None
	Anglian Water	We note that it is proposed to allocate sites for residential development which currently have the benefit of planning permission. Anglian Water has no objection to the principle of residential development on the sites identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. More affordable housing	Noted	None
Linda Powell			Policy DRN4 provides a mechanism for the delivery of affordable housing should a local need be demonstrated during the lifetime of the Plan.	None
Richard and Rachel Mutimer		This is too restrictive.	The policy conforms with the current adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan and the emerging Joint Local Plan.	None
Policy DRN4 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites				
Liz Schmitt		The final paragraph of this policy could easily end up as a mechanism for developers to build market homes with the promise of affordable	This approach is in line with paragraph 77 of the NPPF and	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		homes on land that would not otherwise be available for development. Developers are well known to find loopholes to enable them renege on agreements to build the defined number of affordable homes.	applicants will need to identify, through a viability assessment, that some market housing is the only way to deliver the affordable housing scheme.	
Ken White		Affordable homes by definition will be cheaper to build and are therefore unlikely to meet the design standards set for open market housing and, in consequence, especially in a rural setting, would make it impossible to contribute to the character of the area.	Affordable housing schemes are assessed in the same way as any other application for development. An affordable housing scheme in Norwich has recently won the Stirling Prize for Architecture.	None
Nigel Gale		Further clarity is needed on the 'viability assessment' of the balance between 'affordable and market housing'. Who would carry out such an assessment and who would have approval? Would the Parish Council have the final say to prevent developers from fixing the figures to increase the proportion of 'market houses'?	The Viability Assessment would be submitted with a planning application by the Housing Association proposing the development and would be assessed by the District Council, who may call in external expertise to assess the viability of a scheme. Exception site affordable housing is often delivered in conjunction with the Parish Council, but it must be acknowledged that the District Council will be making the planning decision.	None
Lyn Hannant		I feel this could lead to abuse of the brief by unscrupulous developers. We do have affordable houses in Cherry Tree Rise, none of which are occupied by villagers. This contravened point (iii) unless it can be demonstrated that the houses were indeed offered first to villagers.	The "rural exceptions" policy is different to those scheme where affordable housing is delivered as a percentage of a larger development. In those instances the affordable housing is open to anyone on the housing register that qualifies whereas affordable housing on exceptions sites is to meet a locally identified need.	None
Roger Russell-Smith		Include stipulations of services such as water and sewage to avoid overloading	These are matters that are assessed for all applications and it	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Suggest the following: - insert line space between second and third para's, i.e., those starting "These restrictions ..." and "To be acceptable ..." - merge the two paragraphs starting "To be acceptable ..." and "Any application for ..." - insert line space between the penultimate and last paragraph.	Agree is not necessary to include such requirements within this policy.	Amend Policy DRN4 as follows: - insert line space between second and third para's, i.e., those starting "These restrictions ..." and "To be acceptable ..." - merge the two paragraphs starting "To be acceptable ..." and "Any application for ..." - insert line space between the penultimate and last paragraph.
Giles Youngs	Mid Suffolk District Council	The Councils Heritage Team suggest that this policy should refer to the impact of schemes on the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets, including setting, as a relevant constraint. The parish needs more family-friendly low cost housing for sale and for rent.	Disagree. This matter is adequately dealt with elsewhere in the NPPF and the development plan. Noted. Policy DRN4 enables such housing to be provided should a need be demonstrated.	None None
Chapter 7 – Housing: General Comments				
Liz Schmitt		It is difficult to separate the remaining contents from the policies referred to as the wording is to expand upon, and justify the policies. I have therefore answered Yes, but with the same caveat as to the potential loophole referred to above which is discussed in some detail in para 7.14	Noted	None
Ken White		With the exception of paras 7.12, 7.13 & 7.14 for the reasons given in section 7.	Noted	None
Lyn Hannant		The data were obtained from the results of the Questionnaire which gave villagers a chance to put their views forward.	Noted	None
Policy DRN5 - Protection of Important Views				
Liz Schmitt		This section contains a potential contradiction as I see it. View 9, towards Drinkstone Green from footpath 10, surely looks across the land designated for development adjacent to Greyfriars. As that development has been agreed, does it make sense to suggest that the view should be protected? and this brings into question what does the protection of a view actually mean? Perhaps it should be defined as	Key view 9 from Footpath 1 is across open grass fields towards a number of residential properties in Rattlesden road that are partially screened and framed by mature trees. The importance of this view	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		ensuring that any new development does not exceed the height of any existing development that can be seen within that view?	is not narrowly confined to the building plot adjacent to Greyfriars and the conditions that were attached to the planning permissions for two individual detached houses require the retention of existing mature trees and the implementation of landscaping schemes that include the planting of new native trees and strengthening the hedge on the site's eastern boundary. The granting of planning permission for the construction of these two houses is therefore not considered to seriously detract from the quality of this Key View.	
Clifford Blackwell		"views" in my opinion are subjective.	The views have been assessed in accordance with published guidelines and consulted upon during the preparation of the Plan	None
Alan Laursen Jones		Agree. More information required on future of "Proposed Deletion Area next to A14"!!"	Noted. There are no known proposals for development in this area.	None
S Lee		In my opinion, the most important part of the whole exercise. Absolutely agree with protection of views.	Noted	None
Policy DRN6 - Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity				
Ken White		1. I don't disagree with the aim to protect these sensitive areas but it is hard to reconcile how any new development can protect or enhance an existing area of landscape sensitivity. 2. If an agricultural need is justified then "design & siting" can only mitigate any negative impact. It is surely being rather fanciful to expect "to harmonize within the setting".		
Andrea Jarman		We are not happy that the new area of local landscape sensitivity has been created to include people's private land, particular private gardens. This seems to penalise those on the very edges of the settlement boundary.	Noted. It may not be clear as to the consequences of designating the Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity. The designation does	Insert new paragraph 8.9 as follows and re-number the consequent paragraphs in chapter 8:

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		An example is our garden at the Willows, Chapel Lane. The red settlement boundary line is drawn through the middle of our garden which we can't change however we would request that the area of local landscape sensitivity boundary is moved out of our garden. Whilst we have no plans to build we bought the house without such restrictions in place. I believe ideally the area shouldn't just follow the settlement boundary but should be restricted to fields and non domestic land. I also believe it's unfair to add such restrictions to Chapel Meadows which are used for equestrian purposes and i would agree with the owners concerns that I believe they have raised independently.	not stop development taking place but is a recognition of the distinct importance of this landscape in the setting of the village. An additional paragraph is to be inserted in the Plan, following paragraph 8.8 to provide clarification on the implications of the designation.	8.9 <u>The implication of designating land as an Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity is that proposals that otherwise satisfy the other policies of the development plan are not ruled out by this designation. It does, however, require that they protect and enhance the landscape qualities and are designed to harmonise with the landscape setting.</u>
Richard and Rachel Mutimer		Text of a letter dated 17 September 2019 to the Drinkstone Parish Council: We have considered the Neighbourhood Plan and are concerned by the proposed inclusion of our property in the new Special Landscape Area. We set out below our reasons for not supporting Policy DRN6. We feel strongly enough about the issue to have sought legal advice on the matter which supports our views set out below. We own approximately three acres of land known as Chapel Meadow which is at the end of Chapel Lane. The property comprises paddocks, stable, barn and yard. It is shown edged in red on the attached plan. We believe that the assessment resulting in our property being included is flawed for various reasons, including: 1. We have not been directly consulted in relation to the inclusion of our land.	Noted Noted There is no legal requirement, other than at the Pre-Submission Consultation stage of preparing the Plan and at subsequent stages, to consult on proposals in the Plan. However, the proposed area of Local Landscape Sensitivity was identified in a display of the emerging content of the Neighbourhood Plan at a widely	

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		2. We have seen no evidence that a suitably qualified body has undertaken the technical assessment. The policy lacks credibility in this regard as on the face of it the assessment appears little more than a joining up exercise to link the two existing Special Landscape Areas in the parish. 3. The plan suggests that the refined boundary is the result of detailed field study work. If this is so, the report showing the findings of the field study should be shared and this should show the various constituent parts of the new SLA have been properly rated on a scale of sensitivity with all relevant issues having been taken into account.	publicised drop-in event on 16 February 2019 and 22 June 2019. A Local Landscape Appraisal was undertaken and published alongside the draft Neighbourhood Plan as part of the Pre-Submission consultation and will be submitted as part of the examination of the Plan by an independent Examiner. The appraisal sits within a hierarchy of National and Suffolk Landscape Character Assessments and follows the same principles used in those studies. The Landscape Appraisal was carried out by the Natural Environment Sub-Group led a retired Landscape Architect, former member of the Landscape Institute (LI) and past Chairman of the LI Admissions Panel. He worked for Suffolk County Council for over 30 years as Senior Landscape Officer and Environment Manager. He was responsible for the preparation of the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment and is an authority on landscape characterisation. The Landscape Appraisal explains how the Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity was refined as a result of detailed field work to follow physical features on the ground such as field boundaries. The new Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity incorporates the	

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
			meadows and paddocks around Drinkstone Green and Drinkstone Street which give rise to so much of the character of the area adjoining the settlement boundaries. Chapel Meadow clearly shares the same landscape characteristics of small to medium sized fields bounded by species rich hedgerows and hedgerow trees. The Landscape Appraisal also identifies 13 key views, one of which is the view towards Drinkstone Green from Park Road near Whitefield House; The hedgerows and mature hedgerow trees in and around Chapel Meadow form part of this view. Hard copies of the Landscape Appraisal were made available at the public drop in sessions and can be viewed on the Neighbourhood Plan section of the Drinkstone Website. The public benefit of individual parcels of land is not one of the criteria that inform whether a landscape is an Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity. We do not feel that we can support these reasons and that the Plan should not be amended. However, it may be that the	Insert new paragraph 8.9 as follows and re-number the consequent paragraphs in chapter 8: <u>8.9 The implication of designating land as an Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity is that proposals that otherwise satisfy the other policies of the development plan are not ruled out by this designation. It does, however, require that they protect and enhance the landscape</u>
		Our land is secluded and not accessible to the public and cannot be viewed by anyone other than the few private landowners who abut our property. As such, there is no public benefit in classifying this land as a sensitive area. For the above reasons, we should be grateful if you would please omit our land from the proposal.		

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
			Independent Examiner will come to a different conclusion.	qualities and are designed to harmonise with the landscape setting.
Policy DRN7 - Dark Skies				
Ken White		Comment: The title as shown in the Neighbourhood Plan for this policy is "Open Skies". Should it not be "Dark Skies" as shown here?	Agree. This is a typographic error	Amend Policy title to Dark Skies
Nigel Gale		Developers should be forced to adhere to the policy during their build phase.	The District Council is known to use conditions attached to planning permissions to avoid disturbance during the construction phase of development.	None
Roger Russell-Smith		However, do not believe Woolpit Business Park's light emanation to be a serious issue	Noted	None
Duncan Hannant		Only to draw attention to the Policy Number DRN7 is for "Open Skies" and not "Dark Skies"	Agree. This is a typographic error	Amend Policy title to Dark Skies
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Typo: Policy title should read "Dark Skies" (not "Open Skies").	Agree. This is a typographic error	Amend Policy title to Dark Skies
Alan Laursen Jones		Agree. I'm sure that, if the owner ?Mr Baker – could be approached for some screening.	Noted	None
S Lee		Again, a very important aspect of the plans.	Noted	None
Policy DRN8 - Local Green Spaces				
Liz Schmitt		Should it not refer to Cherry Tree Rise verges in keeping with Park Road and Gedding Road verges?	Agree	Amend Policy DRN8 as follows: 4 Cherry Tree Rise <u>verges</u>
Nigel Gale		We'd like to see the Policies map numbered to identify the location of each Green Space.	Agree	Amend Policies Map to include Local Green Space reference numbers
	Gladman Developments Limited	Policy DRN8 identifies 10 tracts of land as potential Local Green Space designations. The designation of land as Local Green Space (LGS) is a significant policy designation and effectively means that once designated, they provide protection that is comparable to that for Green Belt land. As such, the Parish Council should ensure that the	It can hardly be considered that an area of 0.58 hectares could be termed an "extensive tract of land" within the meaning of paragraph 100 of the Framework.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		proposed designations are capable of meeting the requirements of national policy if they consider it necessary to seek LGS designation. The Framework 2018 is explicit in stating at paragraph 100 that 'Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space'. With this in mind, it is imperative that the plan makers can clearly demonstrate that the requirements for LGS designation are met. The designation of LGS should only be used: • Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; • Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and • Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. Gladman further note §015 of the PPG (ID37-015) which states, '§100 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently, blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. Gladman do not believe that DNP supporting evidence is sufficiently robust to justify the proposed allocation of 9) Rattlesden Road allotments and parish meadow as LGS, given that it is an extensive tract of land. The issue of whether LGS meets the criteria for designation has been explored in a number of Examiner's Reports across the country and we highlight the following decisions: • The Sedlescombe Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report³ recommended the deletion of an LGS measuring approximately 4.5ha as it was found to be an extensive tract of land.	As such, there is no need to review the evidence that supports the Local Green Space designations in the Plan.	

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		- The Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan Examiners Report⁴ recommended the deletion of an LGS measuring approximately 5ha and also found this area to be not local in character. Thereby failing to meet 2 of the 3 tests for LGS designation. - The Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report⁵ identifies both proposed LGS sites 'in relation to the overall size of the Alrewas Village' to be extensive tracts of land. The Examiner in this instance recommended the deletion of the proposed LGSs which measured approximately 2.4ha and 3.7ha. Highlighted through a number of Examiner's Reports set out above and other 'made' neighbourhood plans, it is considered several sites have not been designated in accordance with national policy and guidance and subsequently are not in accordance with the basic conditions. Gladman suggest that the Parish Council review the evidence supporting the proposed designations and ensure compliance with all the above requirements. Whilst the Parish Council have sought to undertake some form of evidence base it does not overcome the failure to meet the specific policy requirements set out above with regards to the scale of land to be designated, particularly in relation to '9) Rattlesden Road allotments and parish meadow' which appears to form an extensive tract of land. In terms of meeting the second test there is no evidence base to support this designated LGS being 'demonstrably special to a local community.' In relation to its beauty, it is of no particular scenic quality. The Policy has not therefore been made in accordance with basic conditions (a) and (d). Gladman recommend that the LGS Policy be revisited to ensure the designations are compliant in their entirety. ⁴ https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/doclib/1382.pdf ⁵ https://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/Council/Planning/The-local-plan-and-planning-policy/Neighbourhoodplans/Downloads/Alrewas-Alrewas-Neighbourhood-Plan-Examiners-Report.pdf		
Alan Laursen Jones		Is there access to Bridge Farm Wood?	No. It is private land.	None
Policy DRN9 – Biodiversity				

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Liz Schmitt		I would find it difficult to think, without further explanation, what form the benefits of the development proposal might be such that they would outweigh the impact of damaging trees, hedgerows or ponds. I suggest that additional wording 'in terms of....' be added after 'proposal'. If such benefits can't be defined then the emphasis should be put solely on mitigation measures.	We note the concern. The National Planning Policy Framework defines three strands of sustainable development, namely, economic, social and environmental. It will be for the applicant to demonstrate why the "benefits" outweigh any detrimental impacts.	None
Ken White		Fine words and good intentions indeed, but it is hard to see who will ensure any mitigation proposals will be carried out. In my personal and professional experience local authorities rarely follow up on any landscaping conditions applied to a new development especially those local and /or of small scale. Rarely do you see any retrospective enforcement action taken where landscape conditions have been ignored or violated	Conditions are attached to planning permissions and are subject to enforcement by the District Council.	None
Nigel Gale		Does the wording of the last paragraph need amending? It could be inferred that an application would be supported if it included, say, a new pond in the garden despite breaking other policies.	When making decisions on planning applications, the whole of the Plan and other relevant planning policies have to be taken into account. The fact that a pond would be provided in an otherwise unacceptable development would not make a proposal acceptable.	None
Roger Russell-Smith		Very important!	Noted	None
	Environment Agency	Fisheries, Biodiversity and Geomorphology We have noted the hedgerow surveys and attention given to the areas of deciduous woodland in the area which will have a positive impact on wildlife and biodiversity. Further seeking to connect areas of woodland and hedgerow together to make 'green corridors' to extend areas of habitat would provide further benefits. Resisting the removal of hedgerows in proposed new developments (Para: 8.18), and mitigating for their loss, will not only preserve the character of the area but retain this important habitat for wildlife. Maintaining the integrity of the two settlement boundaries and preserving the dark skies of the surrounding countryside which you have included as a policy in your plan would also benefit wildlife and biodiversity. Reference to net gains for the environment achieved from development is also welcomed in your plan	Noted	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		for the parish. We are satisfied that your efforts in compiling policy DRN9, Biodiversity, represents a positive contribution to enhancing the natural environment in and around the parish of Drinkstone. It is clear that the environment is at the heart of your neighbourhood plan and the works to begin achieving tree preservation orders and the hedgerow surveys show that this resource is being valued. Water voles are known to be present on the Black Bourn and are afforded full protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). We would encourage the promotion and protection of this nationally rare species by protecting and enhancing their required habitats. Any enhancements to habitats along the River Black Bourn would also benefit this protected species. We welcome that this is recognised in your plan (para: 8.17). The plan identifies the local wildlife sites in the area such as; Drinkstone Meadow, Pumping Station Meadow, Bridge Farm Wood and Buck's Wood. The British Standards Biodiversity Code of practice for planning and development, BS42020:2013, provides direction to assist those concerned with ecological issues as they arise through all stages of the planning process. The standard should be followed to integrate biodiversity into all stages of the planning, design and development process.	Noted	
Chapter 8 – Natural Environment: General Comments				
Liz Schmitt		It's hard to answer this as the remaining contents expand upon the policies and I am not clear as to what I would be agreeing to in answering Yes.	Noted	None
Ken White		1. With the minor exception in para 8.9 where the wording "lack of street lighting" is again used - see reason as given previously in Chapter 2 . Paras 8.14, 8.15 & 8.18 point out the value & benefits to both biodiversity and to the character of Drinkstone that hedgerows bring, yet they have no protection laid down by statute. Even historic hedgerows, which do have some theoretical protection, are not immune from grubbing up as that in Chapel Lane proved, despite efforts to prevent. Para 8.5 - The view south from Drinkstone Road, east of the Park Road junction, is especially worthy of note with splendid uninterrupted views and should be included here.	Noted	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Alan Laursen Jones		Sensitive hedge cutting essential	Noted	None
Policy DRN10 - Buildings of Local Significance				
Liz Schmitt		Not as currently worded. The last part of the first paragraph 'will be secured' should indicate how this is to happen and what it actually means. If it means that it cannot be demolished or harmed then the second paragraph contradicts this statement. The second paragraph says that proposals which might lead to the loss of, or substantial harm to, those buildings should be supported by an analysis etc. This then suggests that as long as that analysis and explanation is acceptable (and if so on what does the term 'of public benefit' actually mean?), that building could be lost. Does 'substantial harm' mean just to that actual building, or does it include its immediate surroundings? The owners of these buildings may not take kindly to the imposition of restrictions upon them given that the buildings are not listed and I wonder whether these conditions could be enforced. As it is mentioned in the text that the registration of these buildings as Heritage Assets is to be pursued, I suggest that statement should be included in Policy DRN10	It would be secured through conditions attached to a planning permission which should consequently be enforced by the District Council. Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states: <i>Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss,</i>	None
Ken White		This policy appears to be wrongly numbered. Logically it should be DRN11 to follow the chapter paragraph order viz 9.2	Noted	None
Nigel Gale		... but could there also be a map in the appendix showing the building locations cross-referenced to a list.	Agree	Add a plan to Appendix C
	Mid Suffolk District Council	We suggest the following: - amend the end of the first para' to read: "...local interest must to appropriately secured." - Amend para' 2 to read as follows: "Proposals for any works that would lead to the loss of, or substantial harm to affect a building of local significance should be supported by an appropriate analysis of the significance of the asset together with an explanation of the wider public benefits of the proposal to enable a balanced judgement to be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset."	Agree The Neighbourhood Plan has sought to achieve a consistent approach to policies across neighbourhood plans where it is appropriate to do so. In this instance, the policy replicates Policy B&R 13 of the referendum	Amend first paragraph of policy as follows: "The retention and protection of local heritage assets and buildings of local significance, including buildings, structures, features and gardens of local interest, will <u>must</u> be <u>appropriately</u> secured."

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		NPPF para' 189 highlights that the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal should be detailed regardless of the level of harm. Para' 193 highlights that the level of 'less than substantial harm' is still a high bar and that "great weight" should still be given to an asset's conservation when this level of harm is identified. Para' 194 makes clear that "any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset ... should require clear and convincing justification," and not just an 'explanation' of the associated public benefits.	version of the Botesdale and Rickinghall Neighbourhood Plan.	
	Suffolk Preservation Society	We are particularly impressed that you have identified and drafted a policy for the protection of Non Designated Heritage Assets. You are one of small minority of plans in Suffolk to date that has recognised the importance of this area of heritage management from the outset and we applaud you for your insight.	Noted with thanks	None
	Historic England	We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, in particular its inclusion of a list of locally significant heritage assets that you wish to protect, as well as consideration of local character in terms of informing the design of future developments. We would suggest that the list of local heritage assets is underpinned by a robust set of criteria, which will enable you set out in detail what is special about each asset and any contribution its setting makes, in order that these features are better protected by the policy included in your plan. For more guidance regarding this please see our Good Practice Advice Note 7: Local Heritage Listing.	Noted. The assessment has been based on Historic England's Advice Note	None
Alan Laursen Jones		Action on Drinkstone Windmills!	Noted	None
Policy DRN11 - Heritage Assets				
Liz Schmitt		Not as currently worded. I can't see the relevance of the final sentence of point f as it refers to 'non heritage' assets in chapter on 'heritage assets'. It is the wording used in para 9.2 on the previous page and I wonder if it has been pasted in here by mistake. With that correction I support this policy.	Non-designated heritage assets is a term used by Historic England and they are generally included in the wider definition of "heritage assets" albeit that they are not listed buildings or scheduled monuments.	None
Ken White		This policy is wrongly numbered. Logically it should be DRN10 to follow the chapter paragraph order viz 9.1	Noted	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
	Mid Suffolk District Council	As with policy DRN10 above it is noted that the wording used is similarly to other Neighbourhood Plans that have recently been through the examination process. While each Plan should not simply be a copy some consistency in policy wording may be beneficial to the decision-making process. On that basis, and to address concerns raised by the Heritage Team re what constitutes harm, we suggest point f be reworded as follows: "provide clear justification, through the submission of a heritage statement, for any works that would lead to harm to a heritage asset yet be of wider substantial public benefit." Also, delete current sentence in point f which begins "A balanced judgement" and insert as a new paragraph between the reworded point f. and the final para' ("Where a planning proposal ...") the following: "Proposals will not be supported where the harm caused as a result of the impact of a proposed scheme is not justified by the public benefits that would be provided."	The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to deliver consistent policies where appropriate in order to achieve a level of uniformity across the District. On that basis, it is agreed that the policy should be amended as proposed.	Amend Policy DRN11 as follows: f. provide clear justification, through the submission of a heritage statement, for any works that could <u>would lead to harm to a heritage asset yet be of wider substantial public benefit, through detailed analysis of the asset and the proposal.</u> A balanced judgement will be taken having regard to the scale of any harm or loss to a non-designated heritage asset in relation to significance. <u>Proposals will not be supported where the harm caused as a result of the impact of a proposed scheme is not justified by the public benefits that would be provided.</u> Where a planning
Alan Laursen Jones		See comments on Windmills	Noted	None
Policy DRN12 - Design Considerations				
Liz Schmitt		Not as currently worded. Point C of this policy advocates against the loss of gardens whereas in Policy DRN2, small windfall sites to include infill plots within the settlement boundary are listed as acceptable. Is this not contradictory? I also think that the condition in point b, i.e. to avoid cul de sac developments, is not meaningful or appropriate given the number of cul de sac developments already in existence i.e. Green Close, The Meadows, Church Meadows and Cherry Tree Rise. It could be argued that these developments in themselves make a contribution to the local character.	No, such an approach is not contradictory. Infill plots do not necessarily have to result in the loss of gardens. Noted.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
	Gladman Developments Ltd	Policy DRN12 sets out a list of design principles that development proposals will be expected to adhere to. Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high-quality design, planning policies and the documents sitting behind them should not be overly prescriptive and need flexibility in order for schemes to respond to sites specifics and the character of the local area. There will not be a 'one size fits all' solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles. Gladman therefore suggest that more flexibility is provided in the policy wording to ensure that a high quality and inclusive design is not compromised by aesthetic requirements alone. We consider that to do so could act to impact on the viability of proposed residential developments. We suggest that regard should be had to paragraph 126 of the Framework which states that: "To provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, plans or supplementary planning documents should use visual tools such as design guides and codes. These provide a framework for creating distinctive places, with a consistent and high quality standard of design. However their level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances in each place, and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified."	Disagree. It is considered that sufficient flexibility is included to enable "a high quality and inclusive design" in new development.	None
Policy DRN13 - Sustainable Construction practices				
	Mid Suffolk District Council	- This policy should ideally mention heritage assets as a relevant constraint. - Points c. is a repetition of point a. except that the former includes the word 'the' when referring to building orientation. Choose whichever you prefer and re-index the criteria accordingly.	Disagree. Other policies in the Plan cover matters relating to the detrimental impact of development on heritage assets and there is no need to repeat those in this policy Agree. Delete criterion a and re-order accordingly.	Delete criterion a and re-order accordingly.
Diana Hollins		Points (a) and (e) are identical	Agree. Delete criterion a and re-order accordingly.	Delete criterion a and re-order accordingly.

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Chapter 9 – Built Environment and Design: General Comments				
Liz Schmitt		Other than in clarification of what 'plot rationalisation' in para 7.4 means. Is it the sub division of a larger plot into smaller plots? If so this statement conflicts with the basic premise of Policy DRN12	It is not considered that these statements are contradictory.	None
Ken White		1. This is a very muddled chapter indeed - using as an umbrella term "Heritage Assets" to pool together historic buildings, i.e those listed, with those so called "local buildings of significance" in which they are only differentiated by the descriptors of designated and non-designated. . The two policies DRN10 & DRN11 similarly are ambiguous in their wording. Listed buildings are historic buildings designated as such by English Heritage and are protected by statute. Little, if any, coverage of this is mentioned in the plan. And no listed buildings are shown on the map whereas the "buildings of local significance" are all shown and separately identified. 2. With the exception of the Mill on page 36, the relevance of the photographs on pages 38 & 39 are not clear. What aspect of policy are these properties examples of? Suggest titles are shown under all photographs	Non-designated heritage assets is a term used by Historic England and they are generally included in the wider definition of "heritage assets" albeit that they are not listed buildings or scheduled monuments. There is no need for the Plan to provide details of Listed Buildings and other designated Heritage Assets as these are available elsewhere and do, form time-to-time, change. The photographs illustrate design and building features typical of Drinkstone as identified in the Drinkstone Design Guidelines prepared by AECOM in support of the Neighbourhood Plan referred to in paragraphs 9.5 & 9.6.	None
Roger Russell-Smith		9.8: Mains gas could be a future possibility?	It is considered unlikely and not necessarily sustainable.	None
	Mid Suffolk District Council	The Councils Heritage Team welcomes the thorough consideration that has been given to the historic built environment as part of this Neighbourhood Plan and offer some additional thoughts / comments on para 9.2 and policies DRN10 to DRN13 which are set out separately below.	Noted	None
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Para 9.2: Should refer to a 'Local List' in recognising 'Local Heritage Assets' as described.	Noted. Amend paragraph as suggested.	Amend fourth sentence of paragraph 9.2 as follows: We will pursue their registration <u>on a Local List</u> with the District Council.

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Welcome the creation of a local list and extend an offer to work with the Parish Council to ratify this in line with guidance published by Historic England.	Noted	None
	Mid Suffolk District Council	End of first sentence should read “ amenity of nearby residents.”	Agree	Amend end of first sentence of paragraph 9.8 as follows: “and the amenity <u>of</u> nearby <u>of</u> residents.”
Chapter 10 – Infrastructure and Services				
	Environment Agency	Flood Risk A Main River, known as Sapiston/Pakenham Stream runs north from Drinkstone. There are areas of this main river which we maintain and access is required for this to take place. We comment on fluvial flooding although we note the comments and community actions relating to surface water flooding in the plan. We welcome this reference to flooding although further comment regarding fluvial flood risk in the plan area would be advisable. Modelling Further upstream this is an 'ordinary watercourse' as it flows north-easterly from Drinkstone Park. There are areas of flood zone 3 and 2 identified in Drinkstone itself, although it is important to note that the flood zone maps are formed of national generalised modelling, known as JFLOW, which was used in 2004 to create fluvial floodplain maps on a national scale. This modelling was improved more recently, using a more detailed terrain model for the area. This modelling is not a detailed local assessment, it is used to give an indication of areas at risk from flooding. JFLOW outputs are not suitable for detailed decision making. Normally, in these circumstances, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will need to undertake a modelling exercise in order to derive flood levels and extents, both with and without allowances for climate change, for the watercourse, in order to inform the design for the site. Without this information, the risk to developments from fluvial flooding associated with the ordinary/main watercourse is unknown. Advice for Developments All development proposals within the Flood Zone (which includes Flood Zones 2 and 3, as defined by the Environment Agency) shown on the Policies Map and Local Maps, or	Noted. Paragraph 2.2 of the Plan notes the risk of fluvial flooding from the River Black Bourn.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		elsewhere involving sites of 1ha or more, must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) The Neighbourhood Plan should apply the sequential test and use a risk based approach to the location of development. The plan should be supported by the local Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and should use the NPPF Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The PPG advises how planning can take account of the risks associated with flooding and coastal change in plan-making and the planning application process. The following advice could be considered when compiling the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure potential development is sequentially sited or if at flood risk it is designed to be safe and sustainable into the future. Sequential Approach The sequential approach should be applied within specific sites in order to direct development to the areas of lowest flood risk. If it isn't possible to locate all of the development in Flood Zone 1, then the most vulnerable elements of the development should be located in the lowest risk parts of the site. If the whole site is at high risk (Flood Zone 3), an FRA should assess the flood characteristics across the site and direct development towards those areas where the risk is lowest. The neighbourhood plan could contain a policy to state that the sequential test should be applied to proposals, as is required by the NPPF. Climate Change Our guidance, 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances' should be used to inform the spatial distribution of growth and the requirements of Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) for individual applications. The National Planning Practice Guidance provides advice on what is considered to be the lifetime of the development in the context of flood risk and coastal change. The 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances' guidance provides allowances for future sea level rise, wave height and wind speed to help planners, developers and their advisors to understand likely impact of climate change on coastal flood risk. It also provides peak river flow and peak rainfall intensity allowances to help planners understand likely impact of climate change on river and surface water flood risk. For some development types and locations, it is important to assess a range of risk using more than one allowance. Please refer to this guidance. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-		

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		allowances. This advice updates previous climate change allowances to support NPPF and may result in flood extents being greater than they have been in the past. This does not mean out flood map for planning has changed, as these maps do not consider climate change, but fluvial flood maps that may have been produced as part of SFRAs and other flood risk studies may be out of date. FRAs submitted in support of new development will need to consider the latest climate change allowances. Environmental Permit for Flood Risk Activities An environmental permit for flood risk activities may be required for work in, under, over or within 8 metres (m) from a fluvial main river and from any flood defence structure or culvert or 16m from a tidal main river and from any flood defence structure or culvert. Application forms and further information can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits. Anyone carrying out these activities without a permit where one is required, is breaking the law. The Neighbourhood Plan should consider this when allocating development sites adjacent to a 'main river'. A permit may be required and restrictions imposed upon the work as a result in order to ensure the development does not have a detrimental impact upon the environment and flood risk.		
RK and PA Cilvert		Para 10.2 Some form of traffic calming/speed restriction at junction of Chapel Lane and Gedding Road. Para 10.3 Proper clearing of drains by Suffolk CC would seriously reduce some flooding problems.	Noted	None
Policies Map				
Liz Schmitt		There are too many aspects of this map, including 9 separate policies, to give one single answer to this question.	Noted. The Policies Map has to identify all aspects of the policies that relate to specific sites or areas of land.	None
Ken White		Listed buildings, so called designated heritage assets (?) in the plan, are omitted from all the maps, yet Buildings of Local Significance are individually identified in the key and on all maps. Why the prominence given to the latter and omission of the former?	Listed Buildings are already statutorily designated and there is no need to identify them on a Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map. The Buildings of Local Significance are a proposal in the Neighbourhood Plan and	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
June Harris		Not enough housing boundary settlement not large enough.	therefore must be identified on the Policies Map. The Plan meets the identified requirements for housing (at least 1 dwelling between 2018) as identified in the Draft Joint Local Plan.	None
Christine Harris		Not enough affordable housing Boundary settlement not large enough.	Affordable housing sites delivered under Policy DRN4 should not specifically be allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan.	
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Is it possible to improve on the quality / sharpness of these maps?	Yes. Amended base maps to be prepared	Amended base maps for Policies Maps to be prepared.
Richard and Rachel Mutimer		As per DRN6 and attached letter.	Noted and responded to above.	None
General Comments				
Chris Chrisell	West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group	Thank you for communicating with West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) regarding the Drinkstone Parish Council's proposal to create a Neighbourhood Plan (NP). It is clear to see that the community have great affection for the village. To maintain a primary care service for the residents of Drinkstone the CCG has been working with Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils on their Local Plan and producing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Although the NP does not look for any development, it does recognise the possibility of windfall developments occurring but this is not likely to impact health facilities in vicinity. The survey results in the Neighbourhood Plan clearly show that the majority of residents are satisfied with the primary care services they are provided, this is great news. Despite very positive feedback we will continue to evaluate capacity issues in and around local surgeries so that the standard is maintained going forward. We would welcome the addition of a simple statement, to confirm that Drinkstone Parish Council will support West Suffolk CCG in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Drinkstone. West Suffolk CCG would not have any issues supporting the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan as the proposed	Noted and thanks	None
			Agree. A new paragraph will be added to Chapter 2.	Add new paragraph to Chapter 2 as follows: <u>2.23 The nearest health centre is a Woolpit, which has recently expanded. As the population of the</u>

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		development would not have any significant impact on primary healthcare. If you have any queries or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me		<u>wider area continues to grow, so Drinkstone Parish Council will support West Suffolk CCG in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of Primary Healthcare services is available for the residents of Drinkstone and that they can be easily accessed for those that do not have access to a car.</u>
Nigel Gale		The Neighbourhood Plan is an excellent, high-quality document and many congratulations are due to the team that has invested so much time to create it. The village is so lucky to have many skilled people who are prepared to invest their valuable time for the benefit of future generations. Very many thanks to all of you! Whilst it has been created for specific planning needs I believe it should also be considered as a document of potential significant future interest to Social and Family historians: think of it as a sort of 'Drinkstone Domesday Book 2020'. As such, separate maps indicating the precise locations for the significant buildings in the appendices would be worthwhile. Also, maybe the title page should be 'Drinkstone, Suffolk'.	Noted with thanks	Add map to Appendix C to identify the location of Buildings of Local Significance.
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Thank you for consulting Mid Suffolk District Council on the Pre-Submission Draft version of Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan. We have sought the views of colleagues and this letter represents our formal response. Generally, we are of the view that this Plan has been well prepared and presented. Our comments, which are set out in the attached table, are therefore limited and relate mostly to points of clarity. We would also reasonably expect that as this Plan progresses, some natural updating of the text will occur to ensure that it remains relevant, e.g. the flow chart on page 6, and Chapter 4 which sets out the wider planning policy context. The Parish Council are also reminded that, should they feel it necessary to make substantive changes to this current draft Plan, it may be necessary to re-consult on the revised document for the required period prior to formally submitting the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan to Mid Suffolk District Council.	A map is to be added to Appendix C Noted with thanks. Substantive changes have not been made to the Plan and it is not necessary to re-consult.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
	Mid Suffolk District Council	Contents Page: While it appears that the aim has been to be to keep the contents list to a single page we suggest the supporting documents be named rather than just provide a weblink.	We note the comments and have actually decided to delete the reference to the evidence documents on this page.	Delete "EVIDENCE DOCUMENTS" and hyperlink from Contents Page
	Suffolk Preservation Society	I am writing on behalf of the Suffolk Preservation Society (SPS), the only countywide amenity society dedicated to protecting and promoting the special historic and landscape qualities of Suffolk. We also represent the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England in Suffolk and work closely with parish and town councils and other bodies who share our objectives. As Neighbourhood Plans offer the opportunity for protecting or improving the heritage and landscape character of an area, SPS are supportive of plans being drawn up in Suffolk, particularly where they are centred on historic settlements such as Drinkstone distinctive by its rich architectural heritage and landscape quality. Having read the draft plan we would like to make the following observations. [see also <i>comment on Policy DRN10 above</i>] We congratulate the Neighbourhood Plan team on the outstanding draft document and the thorough assessment work that has been undertaken in particular on landscape, design and heritage. The SPS strongly endorse the efforts to safeguard the special heritage and landscape qualities of Drinkstone. We also consider that the identification of Local Green Spaces, Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity, views to be protected and the production of the development design checklist will help to guide and promote appropriately located and high quality design going forward. The Society fully supports the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted with thanks	None
	Bradfield St George Parish Council	Thank you for your recent letter inviting Bradfield St George PC to comment on the above pre-submission consultation. The Council considered this letter at its meeting on 11th September 2019 and resolved that it had no comments to make at this stage.	Noted with thanks	None
	Natural England	Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the	Noted with thanks	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made. Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.		
	Historic England	Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment on the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Draft of the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan. We do not wish to make any further comments at this time. We would refer you to our detailed guidance on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/. For further advice regarding the historic environment and how to integrate it into your neighbourhood plan, we recommend that you consult your local planning authority conservation officer, and if appropriate the Historic Environment Record at Suffolk County Council. To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.	Noted	None
	Environment Agency	Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the 12 August 2019 for comments on the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan. We have reviewed the documents as submitted and have the following comments to make regarding the plan. Background Our principal aims are to protect and improve the environment, and to promote sustainable development, we; • Act to reduce climate change and its consequences • Protect and improve water, land and air • Work with people and communities to create better places • Work with businesses and other organisations to use resources wisely.	Noted	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		You may find the following two documents useful. They explain our role in the planning process in more detail and describe how we work with others, they provide; • an overview of our role in development and when you should contact us. • initial advice on how to manage the environmental impact and opportunities of development. • signposting to further information which will help you with development. • links to the consents and permits you or developers may need from us. Building a better environment: Our role in development and how we can help: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289894/LIT_2745_c8ed3d.pdf Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/environmental-quality-in-spatial-planning-supplementary-files/ Contaminated Land There is a historic landfill site at Rookery Farm: this could cause pollution. We note that no development is proposed on this sensitive site although we will be consulted by the local planning authority if it is. For development on land that may have been affected by contamination as a result of its previous use or that of the surrounding land, sufficient information should be provided with the planning application to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF for dealing with land contamination. This should take the form of a Preliminary Risk Assessment (including a desk study, conceptual model and initial assessment of risk), to provide assurance that the risk to the water environment is fully understood and can be addressed through appropriate measures. Informatives Please note that the view expressed in this letter is a response to the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan only and does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning or permit		

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		applications that may come forward. We reserve the right to change our position in relation to any such application. Please contact me on the details below should you have any questions or would wish to contact any of our specialist advisors. Please continue to keep us advised on the progress of the plan. We trust this advice is useful.		
	Gladman Developments Ltd	Legal Requirements Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in §8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the DNP must meet are as follows: (a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order. (d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. (e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area). (f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations. (g) The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Revised National Planning Policy Framework On the 24th July 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) published the revised National Planning Policy Framework. The first revision since 2012, it implements 85 reforms announced previously through the Housing White Paper. On 19th February 2019, MHCLG published a further revision to the NPPF (2019) and implements further changes to national policy. §214 of the revised Framework makes clear that the policies of the previous Framework will apply for the purpose of examining plans where they are submitted on or before 24th January 2019. Clearly, submission of the DNP will occur after this date, and the comments below reflect the relationship between Neighbourhood Plans and the National Planning Policy Framework adopted in 2018 and corrected in February 2019.	Noted. The Parish Council, as Qualifying Body, and its Steering Group that has prepared the Plan are well aware of the requirements that have to be met in producing a neighbourhood plan. We do not feel that it is necessary for the respondent to include them in responding to neighbourhood plan consultations.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance On 24th July 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) published the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF2018). This publication forms the first revision of the Framework since 2012 and implements changes that have been informed through the Housing White Paper, The Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places consultation and the draft NPPF2018 consultation. On 19th February 2019, MHCLG published a further revision to the NPPF (2019) and implements further changes to national policy. The Revised Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements of the preparation of neighbourhood plans within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced. Crucially, the changes to national policy reaffirm the Government's commitment to ensuring up to date plans are in place which provide a positive vision for the areas which they are responsible for to address the housing, economic, social and environmental priorities to help shape future local communities for future generations. In particular, paragraph 13 states that: "The application of the presumption has implications for the way communities engage in neighbourhood planning. Neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies." Paragraph 14 further states that: "In situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided all of the following apply: - The neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made; - The neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement;		

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		c. The local planning authority has at least a three-year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five year supply requirement, including the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73); and d. The local planning authority's housing delivery was at least 45% of that required over the previous three years." The Revised Framework also sets out how neighbourhood planning provides local communities with the power to develop a shared vision for their area in order to shape, direct and help deliver sustainable development needed to meet identified housing needs. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in Local Plans and should not seek to undermine those strategic policies. Where the strategic policy making authority identifies a housing requirement for a neighbourhood area, the neighbourhood plan should seek to meet this figure in full as a minimum. Where it is not possible for a housing requirement figure to be provided i.e. where a neighbourhood plan has progressed following the adoption of a Local Plan, then the neighbourhood planning body should request an indicative figure to plan taking into account the latest evidence of housing need, population of the neighbourhood area and the most recently available planning strategy of the local planning authority. In order to proceed to referendum, the neighbourhood plan will need to be tested through independent examination in order to demonstrate that they are compliant with the basic conditions and other legal requirements before they can come into force. If the Examiner identifies that the neighbourhood plan does not meet the basic conditions as submitted, the plan may not be able to proceed to referendum. Planning Practice Guidance Following the publication of the NPPF2018, the Government published updates to its Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on 13th September 2018 with further updates being made in the intervening period. The updated PPG provides further clarity on how specific elements of the Framework should be interpreted when preparing neighbourhood plans. Although a draft neighbourhood plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan, it is	We are aware of the requirements concerning the examination of neighbourhood plans.	

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		important for the neighbourhood plan to provide flexibility and give consideration to the reasoning and evidence informing the emerging Local Plan which will be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested against. For example, the neighbourhood planning body should take into consideration up-to-date housing needs evidence as this will be relevant to the question of whether a housing supply policy in a neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Where a neighbourhood plan is being brought forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place, the qualifying body and local planning authority should discuss and aim to agree the relationship between the policies in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, the emerging Local Plan and the adopted Development Plan¹. This should be undertaken through a positive and proactive approach working collaboratively and based on shared evidence in order to minimise any potential conflicts which can arise and ensure that policies contained in the neighbourhood plan are not ultimately overridden by a new Local Plan. It is important the neighbourhood plan sets out a positive approach to development in their area by working in partnership with local planning authorities, landowners and developers to identify their housing need figure and identifying sufficient land to meet this requirement as a minimum. Furthermore, it is important that policies contained in the neighbourhood plan do not seek to prevent or stifle the ability of sustainable growth opportunities from coming forward. Indeed, the PPG emphasises that; “A wide range of settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas, so blanket policies restricting housing development in some types of settlements will need to be supported by robust evidence of their appropriateness”² Relationship to Local Plan To meet the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in the adopted Development Plan. That relevant to the preparation of the DNP is the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (MCS) which was adopted 2008 and sets out the strategic planning policy framework for the district until 2027. The Core Strategy Focussed	We are of the opinion that the Neighbourhood Plan does this. In particular it is in conformity with the adopted and emerging policies of the Local Plan, having regard to the minimal level of services in Drinkstone and its remoteness from sustainable transport services. Mid Suffolk District Council has not raised any fundamental objections to the strategy and proposals in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.	

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		Review was adopted 2012. The Core Strategy determined that Mid Suffolk would be required to deliver 8,525 dwellings between 2007 and 2027. The Council is currently consulting on the Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk Local Plan (JBMSLP) 2014 to 2036 to which Gladman will submit detailed representations. This version supersedes that used to inform the current consultation version of the DNP and it is important that policies contained in the DNP allow for flexibility so that they are able to respond positively to changes in circumstance that may arise over the course of the plan period. This degree of flexibility is required to ensure that the DNP is capable of being effective over the duration of its plan period, so it is not ultimately superseded by the emerging Local Plan as s38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that: "if to any extent, a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approached, or published (as the case may be)." Drinkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan This section highlights the key issue that Gladman would like to raise with regards to the content of the DNP as currently proposed. It is considered the requirements of national policy and guidance are not always reflected in the plan. Gladman have sought to recommend a modification to ensure compliance with basic conditions. [see below] ¹ PPG Reference ID: 41-009-20160211	Paragraphs 4.9 – 4.11 note the up-to-date status of the merging Joint Local Plan. We disagree and consider that the Plan does reflect national policy and guidance, as demonstrated in the Basic Conditions Statement.	
	Gladman Developments Ltd	Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the DNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the strategic policies for the wider area.	The Basic Conditions Statement to be submitted with the Plan to the local planning authority demonstrates that the Plan meets the basic conditions.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
		Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic condition (a) in its conformity with national policy and guidance and is contrary to (d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development for the reasons set out above. Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.	No comment	
Community Action 1				
No comments received				
Community Action 2				
Nigel Gale		 but could we include a map showing all the existing TPOs in the village (including the address and tree species).	It is not appropriate to include a map of TPOs as it could soon become out of date as new Orders are confirmed.	None
Duncan Hannant		Only to note that this doesn't consider trees which of high amenity value but not necessarily threatened by development. For example, how can we stop someone chopping down a valued tree if it's on their land and they don't have a TPO for it?	It is not possible to stop a tree being felled if it is not covered by a TPO, within a Conservation Area or required to be retained by a condition in a planning permission.	None
Community Action 3				
Duncan Hannant		Need to say somewhere that there are some "free" schemes or assistances that are available, because they should help to encourage take-up.	Noted	None
Community Action 4				
Lyn Hannant		Praise is due to the broadband warriors who fought for years to get a decent broadband speed, in spite of foot-dragging by BT and OpenReach.	Agreed, but there remain some areas in the village where high-speed broadband is not available.	None
June Harris		Already got it.	There remain some areas in the village where high-speed broadband is not available.	None

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
Christine Harris		Already have this	There remain some areas in the village where high-speed broadband is not available.	None
Linda Powell		Already completed!	There remain some areas in the village where high-speed broadband is not available.	None
Community Action 5				
Nigel Gale		We'd like to see a further point added, namely..... Work with the County Council to extend the pavement on Gedding Road as far as the Village Hall to improve the safety of pedestrians (especially the young and old) from speeding vehicles.	Noted. We believe that this is covered in general in criterion a.	None
Merete Bland		I totally agree with traffic calming. my only concern is with 'gateways'. The roads are narrow and there needs to be sufficient width for large agricultural machinery and vehicles to get through.	Agree.	None
Alan Laursen Jones		Must try harder. Blacksmith's Corner is a traffic hazard, better signs, road markings (non-existent). Look at the progress in Beyton. The Drinkstone straight is another area of concern, particularly when the reach the bend at 'Goldstaub's by-lane'.	We believe that Goldstaub's by-lane' is also known as Hill Farm Lane. We agree that areas of the village need better traffic calming measures but it is the County Council Highways Department that makes the decision on whether to carry out improvements.	None
S Lee		Emphasise danger of excess speed on Park Road and Woolpit Road near "The Windmills".	Noted	None
Richard and Rachel Mutimer		From my experience these schemes such as 'speedwatch' do not work and have little effect. You need police catching speeders and Police to prosecute them through the courts.	Noted. The ability to have more Police in the village is out of our hands.	None
Community Action 6				
Ken White		Flooding areas as noted are mostly an inconvenience to many, but in Chapel Lane it is much more a disaster as certain homes have been flooded with water and raw sewage on several occasions - photographic evidence is held by those affected. This lane is a medium to high risk flood zone as designated by the Environmental Agency	We agree. Amendments are proposed to Chapter 2 to reflect these problems.	Amend paragraph 2.21 as follows: During the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan we have ascertained from UK Power Networks and Anglian Water that there is ample

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
				electricity capacity in the sub-station for new houses. In addition, Anglian Water stated and that the sewage system's pumping station's capacity could cope with more houses, although there may be issues with the processing capacity of the system outside the village's boundaries <u>and</u> possibly also within the village, depending on the scale and location of <u>any further development</u> . However, there is a record of serious local capacity / flooding problems in the sewerage system, particularly in Chapel Lane. Anglian Water has stated that there is in place a set procedure for developers to be required to contribute to the costs of expanding infrastructure should their developments necessitate it.
S Lee		Another very important issue	Noted	None
Community Action 7				
Lyn Hannant		There are many horse riders in the village, all of whom would like to keep off the roads.	Noted	None
June Harris		Have enough footpaths and bridleways I believe 17 in total.	Noted	None
Christine Harris		17 footpaths and bridleways feel this is enough.	Noted	None
Alan Laursen Jones		Particularly around Drinkstone Lakes.	Noted	None
Glossary				
	Mid Suffolk District Council	A definition is given for [business] Use Classes but there does not appear to be a specific mention of this within the Plan text. If so, suggest this be deleted from the glossary.	Agree.	Delete as follows:

Name	Group / Organisation	Comments (as submitted)	Neighbourhood Plan Response	Changes made to Plan
				Use Classes: The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) puts uses of land and buildings into various categories known as 'Use Classes'.
Appendix B				
	Mid Suffolk District Council	With reference to a proposed modification made elsewhere, suggest that a sentence be added to Appendix B which encourages readers to seek the most up to date information available, i.e.: "This appendix reflects information that was correct at the time of writing this Plan. Up to date information should be sought from the Local Planning Authority, the Parish Council or appropriate statutory body."	Agree, but the Parish Council would not necessarily be the best source of information on Listed Buildings.	Insert the following sentence before Hill Farm Lane Area " <u>This appendix reflects information that was correct at the time of writing this Plan. Up to date information should be sought from the Local Planning Authority or appropriate statutory body.</u> "

Appendix 9 - Schedule of Proposed Changes to Pre-Submission Consultation Plan following Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation Stage

The table that follows contains details of all the changes made to the Pre-Submission Plan to form the Submission Plan. The changes include those required in response to comments received and those to bring the Plan up-to-date.

Deletions are struck through eg deletion		Additions are underlined eg <u>addition</u>	
Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
Cover		Insert and amend as follows: SUBMISSION PLAN AUGUST-NOVEMBER 2019	To bring the Plan up-to-date
Inside front cover 4	Bottom of page Last paragraph – Community Engagement	Add names of child that drew picture on front cover Amend from third sentence as follows: Further opportunities for consultation, including consultation on this document, will now be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the government regulations for the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. At the end of the consultation period on the draft Neighbourhood Plan, comments will be assessed by the Steering Group, required amendments will be made and This version of the Plan has been amended to take account of comments and to bring it up-to-date following an eight weeks “pre-submission” public consultation held between 10 August and 4 October 2019. The Plan and supporting documents will be have been submitted to Mid Suffolk District Council to complete the preparation process. This will include.....	For sake of completeness To bring the Plan up-to-date
5	Contents Page	Amend as follows: <u>Appendix E – List of Evidence Documents</u> <u>EVIDENCE DOCUMENTS</u> (see http://www.drinkstonevillage.co.uk/parishcouncil-under-Drinkstone-Neighbourhood-Plan)	To provide a complete list of the Evidence Documents produced in support of the Plan in an Appendix rather than provide a hyperlink to where they can be found in the Contents page.

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
6	Process Diagram	Bring Diagram up-to-date to identify that the Plan is at the "further Consultation" stage which will be the next stage in the publication of the Plan.	To bring the Plan up-to-date
8	1.7 & 1.8	Insert line space between paragraphs	Typographic amendment
8	1.9	Insert the following at the end of the paragraph: Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Consultation The formal consultation on the Draft Plan took place between 10 August and 4 October 2019. The commencement of the consultation was marked with a widely publicised drop-in event at the Village Hall at which 77 people attended. Display boards illustrated the main content of the Plan including all the policies and hard copies of the document were also available for inspection. The Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents were made available on the Parish Council website and other bodies were also consulted as noted in the separate Consultation Statement.	To bring the Plan up-to-date
10	2.5	Amend final sentence as follows: Gainsborough also painted several rural scenes around the village, the most famous of which is "Drinkstone Park" is currently in the Sao Paulo Museum in Brazil.	Factual correction
12	2.11	Amend as follows: Remove brackets from around third sentence that starts "(Over	Typographic amendments
12	2.11	Fourth sentence – If those trends continue, Drinkstone would have 697 inhabitants in twenty years' time, implying an additional of 15 four-person households.	Typographic amendments
13	Maps	Insert Map numbers and Titles as follows: Top map – Map 3A – Character Areas. Drinkstone Green Bottom map – Map 3B – Character Areas. Drinkstone Street	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
14	2.18	Amend paragraph 2.18 as follows: Up until September 2019, Drinkstone is <u>was</u> served by two bus routes, to Bury St Edmunds and to Stowmarket. <u>However, the operator terminated the contract with the County Council and, at the time of preparing this Plan, no replacement services had been introduced meaning that residents have little option but to rely on the car to access services and facilities in larger villages and towns.</u>	To bring the Plan up-to-date

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
14	2.19	Together they operate three buses to Bury St Edmunds and two to Stowmarket six days a week (Monday-Saturday). There are no evening nor Sunday services. One service, the 377, runs once a day at times suitable for commuting to work in Bury St Edmunds town centre in normal working hours. Both services are currently under review by Suffolk County Council and are at risk of having their subsidy removed, increasing the likelihood that they will be cancelled altogether. In the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire, 66% of respondents stated that they never use the bus services, with only 7% using them "often or very often". Amend first sentence of paragraph 2.19 as follows: A further feature of the village is the lack <u>absence</u> of pavements and street lighting. Amend paragraph 2.21 as follows: During the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan we have ascertained from UK Power Networks and Anglian Water that there is ample electricity capacity in the sub-station for new houses. In addition, <u>Anglian Water stated</u> and that the sewage system's <u>pumping station's</u> capacity could cope with more houses, although there may be issues with the processing capacity of the system outside the village's boundaries <u>and possibly also within the village, depending on the scale and location of any further development. However, there is a record of serious local capacity / flooding problems in the sewerage system, particularly in Chapel Lane.</u> Anglian Water has stated that there is in place a set procedure for developers to be required to contribute to the costs of expanding infrastructure should their developments necessitate it.	In response to comments received
14	2.21	Amend paragraph 2.21 as follows: During the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan we have ascertained from UK Power Networks and Anglian Water that there is ample electricity capacity in the sub-station for new houses. In addition, <u>Anglian Water stated</u> and that the sewage system's <u>pumping station's</u> capacity could cope with more houses, although there may be issues with the processing capacity of the system outside the village's boundaries <u>and possibly also within the village, depending on the scale and location of any further development. However, there is a record of serious local capacity / flooding problems in the sewerage system, particularly in Chapel Lane.</u> Anglian Water has stated that there is in place a set procedure for developers to be required to contribute to the costs of expanding infrastructure should their developments necessitate it.	In response to comments received
14	2.22	Amend paragraph 2.22 as follows: and Park Road. <u>The Government Flood Risk map also indicates that properties in Chapel Lane are in an area where there is a high risk of surface water flooding.</u>	In response to comments received
14	Following 2.22	Add new paragraph to Chapter 2 as follows: <u>2.23 The nearest health centre, which has recently been expanded, is at Woolpit. As the population of the wider area continues to grow, Drinkstone</u>	In response to comments from West Suffolk CCG


Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
		Parish Council will offer appropriate support to West Suffolk CCG to ensure suitable and sustainable provision of Primary Healthcare services is available for Drinkstone residents, including access for those that do not have access to a car.	
15	Map 3	Amend title as follows: Map 3-4 – Public Footpaths (numbers refer to Definitive Rights of Way Footpath Numbers)	To provide greater clarity plus consequential amendment to Map number
17	3.4	Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.4 as follows: Aspects that caused concern are in the 2018 village questionnaire were the lack of fast broadband services <u>(since improved)</u> , speeding.....	In response to comments received
17	3.5	Amend second sentence of paragraph 3.5 as follows: The questionnaire results indicate that <u>the majority of residents are</u> were not opposed....	In response to comments received
17	3.8	Amend final sentence of paragraph 3.8 as follows: Nearly nine in ten people respondents want new development to be phased over the next 20 years.	In response to comments received
18	3.10	Amend paragraph 3.10 to clarify usage of village amenities as follows: Many village residents make little or no use of the village's amenities. However, usage of the village hall either often or very often is marked. but few use the allotment. The implication here is that many people do not require such amenities for their lifestyle in Drinkstone. Almost nine respondents in ten.....	
18	3.13 / 3.14	Insert line space between para's 3.13 and 3.14. Review font size on page	Typographic amendment
19	3.17	Seek to get whole paragraph in one column.	Typographic amendment
20	4.4	Amend Para 4.4 as follows: The 1998 Local Plan defines Settlement Boundaries for the village as illustrated below on Maps 5A and 5B.	In response to comments received
21	4.9	Amend paragraph as follows:	To bring the Plan up-to-date

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
		In July 2019 the District Council agreed to consulted on the "Preferred Options for the draft <u>Joint Local Plan</u> regard for the content of the emerging <u>Joint Local Plan</u> , the policies.....	
21	4.10	Amend as follows: The emerging <u>Joint Local Plan</u> identifies a hierarchy of settlements according to their level ,of services and function within the District. <u>For the purposes of the Joint Local Plan only</u> , Drinkstone is proposed to be categorised as a Hamlet.....	Factual correction
21	4.11	Amend the paragraph as follows: The precise wording of the final policy will evolve over the course of the preparation of the <u>Joint Local Plan</u> and	Factual correction
21	Maps 4A and 4B	Amend Maps numbers to Maps 5A and 5B	Consequential amendment.
22	5.1	Shaded box: Insert " <u>Vision</u> " above "in 2036.....	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
23	Policy DRN1	Add the following criterion to the end of the Policy: iii) it is essential for the operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other exceptional uses for which it can satisfactorily be demonstrated that it needs to be located there or meets the requirements of other development plan policies.	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
23	6.3	Amend first sentence as follows: Settlement boundaries are defined for the main built-up areas of the village, <u>as defined on the Policies Map at the rear of the Plan</u> , in order to manage.....	In response to comments received
24	7.2	Amend second sentence as follows: ...A more up-to-date indicative figure has been <u>was</u> included in the Preferred Options Joint Local Plan document that is undergoing consultation. Policy SP04 of the consultation document identifies <u>identified</u> a need for just one additional dwelling in Drinkstone between 2018 and 2036.	To bring the Plan up-to-date.
24	7.4	Amend first sentence as follows:	To provide clarification on the housing provision in the Plan.

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
25	Policy DRN2	However, although no additional <u>sites allocations</u> are <u>identified</u> made , it is acknowledged that there will..... Insert line space between bullet 'iii.' and the next paragraph which starts with "In addition ..."	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
25	Policy DRN3	Add footnote below Policy DRN3 and outside grey box, as follows: Following the publication of the Pre-Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan in August 2019, a further dwelling was granted planning consent adjacent to Greyfriars, Rattlesden Road.	In response to comments received and to bring the Plan up-to-date
27	Policy DRN4	Amend Policy DRN4 as follows: - insert line space between second and third para's, i.e., those starting "These restrictions ..." and "To be acceptable ..." - merge the two paragraphs starting "To be acceptable ..." and "Any application for ..." Insert line space between the penultimate and last paragraph.	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
32	Following 8.8	Insert new paragraph 8.9 as follows and re-number the consequent paragraphs in chapter 8: <u>8.9</u> The implication of designating land as an Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity is that proposals that otherwise satisfy the other policies of the development plan are not ruled out by this designation. It does, however, require that they protect and enhance the <u>landscape qualities</u> and are <u>designed to harmonise with the landscape setting</u> .	In response to comments received
33	Policy DRN7	Amend Policy title to Dark Skies	Typographic amendment
34	Policy DRN8	Amend Policy DRN8 as follows: 4 Cherry Tree Rise <u>verges</u>	In response to comments received
36	9.2	Amend fourth sentence of paragraph 9.2 as follows: We will pursue their registration on a <u>Local List</u> with the District Council.	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
36	Policy DRN10	Amend first paragraph of policy as follows: "The retention and protection of local heritage assets and buildings of local significance, including buildings, structures, features and gardens of local interest, will <u>must</u> be <u>appropriately</u> secured."	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
37	Policy DRN11	Amend Policy DRN11 as follows: f. provide clear justification, through the submission of a heritage statement, for any works that <u>would lead to harm</u> to a heritage asset yet be of wider substantial public benefit; through detailed analysis of the asset and the proposal. A balanced judgement will be taken having regard to the scale of any harm or less to a non-designated heritage asset in relation to significance.. <u>Proposals will not be supported where the harm caused as a result of the impact of a proposed scheme is not justified by the public benefits that would be provided.</u> Where a planning	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
40	Policy DRN12	Amend Policy DRN12 as follows: d. i. any historic character, architectural or archaeological heritage assets of the site and its surroundings, including those locally identified heritage assets listed in Appendix C <u>and subject to Policy DRN10</u> f. produce designs that respect the character, scale, <u>height</u> and density of the locality;	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
41	9.8	Amend end of first sentence of paragraph 9.8 as follows: "...and the amenity <u>of</u> nearby of residents."	Typographic amendment
41	Policy DRN13	Amend Policy DRN13 as follows: e. incorporate sustainable design and construction....and grey water recycling/rainwater harvesting <u>and recycling.</u>	In response to comments from Anglian Water
41	Policy DRN13	Amend Policy DRN13 as follows: Delete criterion a and re-order accordingly.	Typographic amendment
45, 46 & 47	Policies Maps	Amend Policies Map to include Local Green Space reference numbers	In response to comments received

Page in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Para No / Policy in Pre-Submission Consultation Plan	Modification	Reason
45,46 & 47	Policies Maps	Improve on the quality / sharpness of these maps	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
Glossary		Delete as follows: <u>Use Classes: The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) puts uses of land and buildings into various categories known as 'Use Classes'.</u>	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
Appendix B		Insert the following sentence before Hill Farm Lane Area <u>"This appendix reflects information that was correct at the time of writing this Plan. Up to date information should be sought from the Local Planning Authority or appropriate statutory body."</u>	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC
Appendix C		Add map to Appendix C to identify the location of Buildings of Local Significance.	In response to comments received
Following Appendix D		Insert new Appendix E as follows: Appendix E – Evidence Documents The following documents were prepared to support the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and are available to view and download on the Neighbourhood Plan pages of the Drinkstone website www.drinkstonevillage.co.uk/parishcouncil/drinkstone-neighbourhood-plan/ Natural Environment and Local Green Space Assessment - November 2019 Character Appraisal - November 2019 Landscape Appraisal - August 2019 Drinkstone Design Guidelines - April 2019 Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Questionnaire Responses – December 2018 Neighbourhood Plan Village Walk - September 2018 Drinkstone NP Draft Census Data – August 2018	In response to comments from Mid Suffolk DC



DRINKSTONE

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

CONSULTATION STATEMENT