

## Comments Log and Responses 2017 – Residents and Land Owners

Every attempt has been made to draw the key points raised in each response, and wherever possible in the words of the respondent. Any additional wording used for clarity is shown within [ ].

All comments relating to editing of the draft document will be comprehensively addressed by the working group when preparing the document for full submission, and have not been listed in this document.

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS - Residents and Land Owners</b> <b>A. Draft Document</b>			
R2	I was most impressed by the professional way the Neighbourhood Plan was presented and many thanks to you and your Committee for all your hard work.	Thank you	None
R15	As the neighbourhood Plan goes forward through the final consultation stage and beyond, I believe that, without major adjustment, it will safeguard the village for the future and its chances of retaining...the unique and special character of the built and natural environment. The plan has my full support.	Thank you	None
R22 R23	We want to say how impressed we are with the thoroughness and scrupulous attention to detail of the Neighbourhood Plan. We can imagine that no Neighbourhood Plan will ever please everyone in a village, but although we may not agree with every little thing we wholeheartedly endorse the recommendations provided in the plan. In general, this is clearly a plan for the future potential growth of Hartest, while ensuring the built and natural environment are in keeping with the visual and emotional feel of the village. We think you have done a superb, thoughtful and professional job.	Thank you	None
R25	Thank you to everyone who has played a part in the collection and correlation of information contained in this document. It makes very interesting reading.	Thank you	None
R26	All aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan are excellent, thoroughly researched and well presented. The committee should be congratulated on their work.	Thank you	None
R28	I would like to congratulate the team for all its hard work producing a comprehensive and detailed plan, although I must	Thank you	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	admit that for the uninitiated it is quite heavy going, but that will probably always be the case in order for it to meet the needs of all interested parties.		
LO1	I have read the draft Neighbourhood Plan, studied the proposals map and reviewed the Character Assessment. I think all 3 of these documents are well produced, well written and commendable. Also the graphics and layout of the plan itself are unusually clear and legible which is particularly welcome given the complexity of this piece of work. I would like to generally give my support to the proposals shown in these documents.	Thank you	None
LO2	I am very impressed by the draft NP that you and you group members have made. Having read the professional plan I appreciate being in the undulating ancient farmland even more.	Thank you	None

<b>B. The Planning Process</b>			
R9 R10	In relation to the draft plan we are concerned that it could appear that some members of the parish council or the committee working to draw up the plan, on behalf of the council, may have some self-interest in the current proposals being approved. It is important that village residents are able to see documentary evidence that council and committee members have disclosed an interest where appropriate, that expected codes of conduct for parish councils have been followed to ensure objectivity and probity and that there are no procedural irregularities. We would expect that all the above have already been considered as part of the accountability and corporate governance of the Parish council. It would be helpful to have clarity about the above before the village plan is considered further.	The Hartest Neighbourhood Plan Working Group is neither a committee nor a sub-committee of Hartest Parish Council. It is a 'working group' that is advisory only to the Parish Council, it is the Parish Council that makes all formal decisions in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan. As a working group that does not take formal decisions, it is not required to advertise meetings and agendas, take minutes or have a formal process to identify conflicts of interest. It was agreed, however, at an early stage, that all meetings of the working group would be advertised, minutes of the meetings taken and published, and all parties asked to declare any conflicts of interest at the start of each meeting. Minutes from the meetings are available to view on the Neighbourhood Plan page of <a href="http://www.hartest.com">www.hartest.com</a> It is also important to note that the working group is non selective, and has been open to any residents of Hartest Parish at all times during the process. On a number of occasions individual members of the working group	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
		<p>have either withdrawn from meetings, or indeed all activities of the group, where a conflict of interest was identified.</p> <p>Hartest Parish Council has an established register of interests and a formal process for dealing with conflicts of interest. The Chairman of the parish council can be contacted for further information if required.</p>	
R3	<p>I am not convinced that this has been a democratic process using sensible logic with the village's good future truly at heart.</p>	<p>The Hartest Neighbourhood Plan Working Group is neither a committee nor a sub-committee of Hartest Parish Council. It is a 'working group' that is advisory only to the Parish Council, it is the Parish Council that makes all formal decisions in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan. As a working group that does not take formal decisions, it is not required to advertise meetings and agendas, take minutes or have a formal process to identify conflicts of interest. It was agreed, however, at an early stage, that all meetings of the working group would be advertised, minutes of the meetings taken and published, and all parties asked to declare any conflicts of interest at the start of each meeting. Minutes from the meetings are available to view on the Neighbourhood Plan page of <a href="http://www.hartest.com">www.hartest.com</a> It is also important to note that the working group is non selective, and has been open to any residents of Hartest Parish at all times during the process. On a number of occasions individual members of the working group have either withdrawn from meetings, or indeed all activities of the group, where a conflict of interest was identified.</p> <p>Hartest Parish Council has an established register of interests and a formal process for dealing with conflicts of interest. The Chairman of the parish</p>	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
		council can be contacted for further information if required.	
R5-R10	<p>The Hartest Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) is commendable and assists in providing an important framework for the future sustainable development of Hartest. Many people have devoted considerable time and energy to this document and this is greatly appreciated.</p> <p><b>[Comments from Residents R5-R10 were included in a report prepared by Portland Planning and is detailed as a separate table below titled 'Comments and Responses Portland Planning Report']</b></p>	Thank you	None
R14	Should there not be reference to the relevant parts of the NPPF [National Planning Policy Framework] as the overarching planning framework.	Section 3 of the Plan makes reference to the NPPF but, given that the whole of the NPPF is relevant and applies to all planning proposals, it is probably not appropriate to reference the detail of the NPPF.	None
R15	It is clear that the Working Group has ensured that the plan has been generated democratically and shaped by a consensus of the views and opinions of the residents.	Thank you	None
R20 R21	We appreciate the huge amount of work put in by the neighbourhood plan team, in particular the leadership.	Thank you	None
R24	I have read the plan with great interest, but most interesting to me, and others, is the fact that at least of the members of the working group have a development background. Have any of the planning group had to declare an interest, in respect that they might at some future time want to submit a planning application of their own, on land identified by them as development land in this plan? This of course would cast a shadow of suspicion over their motives for joining the group in the first place. I hope this is not the case. Would such a scenario lead to a legal challenge? If so, who would be held accountable, the Parish Plan group or the Parish Council?	<p>There is no land identified as “development land” in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Hartest Neighbourhood Plan Working Group is neither a committee nor a sub-committee of Hartest Parish Council. It is a ‘working group’ that is advisory only to the Parish Council, it is the Parish Council that makes all formal decisions in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan. As a working group that does not take formal decisions, it is not required to advertise meetings and agendas, take minutes or have a formal process to identify conflicts of interest. It was agreed, however, at an early stage, that all meetings of the working group would be advertised, minutes of the meetings</p>	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
		<p>taken and published, and all parties asked to declare any conflicts of interest at the start of each meeting. Minutes from the meetings are available to view on the Neighbourhood Plan page of <a href="http://www.hartest.com">www.hartest.com</a> It is also important to note that the working group is non selective, and has been open to any residents of Hartest Parish at all times during the process. On a number of occasions individual members of the working group have either withdrawn from meetings, or indeed all activities of the group, where a conflict of interest was identified.</p> <p>Hartest Parish Council has an established register of interests and a formal process for dealing with conflicts of interest. The Chairman of the parish council can be contacted for further information if required.</p> <p>The accountable body in any legal challenge to a neighbourhood plan would be the District Council as the authority adopting the Plan.</p>	
R17	I support and thank the Neighbourhood Plan group for all their labours.	Thank you	None
	<b>HARTEST SPACIAL STRATEGY - Section 6</b>		
R1	<p>I object to the Neighbourhood Plan as drafted. I refer to the Core Strategy Policy CS11 and the supporting criteria as well as the Neighbourhood Plan Objectives (1): Protect and Enhance the landscape.... and (2): Protect and Enhance the historic environment. However I do not see that these policies/objectives are secured in the spatial proposals of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The focus of future housing provision should be close to the centre of the village.</p>	<p>The Plan has taken a sequential approach to the identifying the location of new housing and is in conformity with Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Plan does not preclude development in the centre of the village. The BUAB provides a</p>	Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.6 have been amended to reinforce the rationale of the Core Strategy as it relates to the Neighbourhood Plan.

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>All of the significant community facilities are located centrally in the village and the historic pattern of development is that of a nucleated settlement around a central green.</p> <p>Cross Green cluster is a loosely drawn envelope around the hamlet. Apparently ignoring the fact that is also a conservation area and includes a number of listed buildings and SLA area.</p> <p>The Cross Green envelope is drawn to encompass potentially relatively extensive sites. One particular site represents the major part of the of proposed potential development sites in the parish over the plan period so that growth would be directed here.</p> <p>To maintain the historic settlement pattern the hamlets/existing settlement clusters should be allocated growth in proportion to that allocated to the core village. Infilling between Cross Green and the main village should be avoided.</p> <p>To be more sustainable, growth should actually be concentrated in the core village... placing more housing in Cross Green at a distance from the services is less sustainable than allocating a higher proportion in the core village.</p> <p>In general, I consider that the existing LP provides a more balanced approach to development than does the proposed NP.</p>	<p>presumption in favour of residential development within it.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the identification of the cluster on the map caused some misunderstanding concerning the intent of Policies HAR1 and HAR3.</p> <p>Draft Policy HAR3 states that proposals for new housing will take the form of one dwelling or a pair of semi-detached dwellings on an undeveloped plot <u>within</u> a closely knit 'cluster' as defined in Policy HAR1 adjacent to or fronting an existing highway. The policy does not encourage development outside a cluster or development that is larger than that specified.</p> <p>The Plan does not allocate any sites for development and the Policies for clusters restricts new development to one dwelling or a pair of semi-detached dwellings within a closely knit 'cluster'.</p> <p>The gap between the main village and Cross Green is identified as a settlement gap to be protected as defined in Policy HAR12.</p>	<p>The maps in the document and the Proposals Map have been amended to remove the red dotted line that identified the clusters in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Policy HAR3 has been amended to clarify what development might be suitable within a cluster including restricting the size of the dwellings and requiring such sites to be adjacent or fronting an existing highway.</p>
R3	<p>In ringing the cluster at the top of Hartest Hill there is clearly only 1 site that could be developed so you may as well have put a flag in the middle of it.</p> <p>3 of the 4 [cluster] sites suggested by your committee appear totally illogical In my opinion future development should take place within, or as close as possible, the defined built up area. To my mind, there are a number of far more suitable sites to those recommended by your group. Would it not be logical to work with people who are already looking to develop on their land and</p>	<p>The Plan does not recommend any sites for development and any proposal will need to conform with the policies of the neighbourhood plan as well as the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>find a suitable compromise rather than ' earmark' sites where the land owner has not considered development?</p> <p>In pinpointing pockets of land you are effectively writing land owners a blank cheque in terms of land value.</p>		
R4	<p>I feel very frustrated that sites within the main core of the village have been overlooked for totally unsuitable ones in the proposed clusters. 3 of the 4 areas proposed have no pedestrian access to the village and 2 of them are outside the preferred maximum walking distance to public transport.</p> <p>As 2 of the [cluster] areas, Mill House and Fosters, are on the Shimpling Road, I feel any future development in these areas will be unsuitable because road and verges are already unable to cope with the volume of traffic. On-road parking, on-going drainage problems and proximity to listed buildings are also issues. Within the Neighbourhood Plan there are several references that a village shop is needed. As the garage site has been mentioned [by residents] if it ever became available as a potential site for a shop, surely this is another reason why development should take place nearer to the centre of the village and not in the clusters.</p>	<p>The Plan does not overlook sites within the main core of the village. The retention of the BUAB means that there is a presumption in favour of development within it. No specific sites have been allocated in the Plan but, instead, it sets out criteria by which proposals for new housing will be considered.</p> <p>The Plan does not preclude development in or near the centre of the village, but it is recognised that the significance of the heritage and landscape characteristics would mean that achieving satisfactory development will be a challenge.</p>	Paragraph 6.6 has been amended to reinforce the role of the BUAB in allowing appropriate development within it.
R12 R13	The concept of clusters seems a little elastic in some places [for example] the Pear Tree Farm and Cross Green clusters.	<b>The wording of Policies HAR1 and HAR3 specifically defines what form and nature of new housing development will be permitted in the within clusters.</b>	Policies HAR1 and HAR3, the supporting paragraphs and the Proposals Map have been amended to clarify what development can take place within clusters.
R14	<p>[As a hinterland village] the emphasis on limited development is paramount – individual or small clusters 2-3 houses: NOT an estate. The current infrastructure (roads and sewerage in particular) are further limiting factors.</p> <p>Para 6.8 In relation to the Pear Tree Farm cluster, if the farm buildings became redundant then as a brown field site it may be appropriate for a limited development.</p>	The Neighbourhood Plan does not propose estate development.	None
R15	I find the plan to make consummate sense with its emphasis on small developments on a few houses focused on the cluster areas identified. Over many years the village has grown 'organically' and in response to immediate housing need (e.g. Labourer's	Noted	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>Cottages adjacent to farms). This has been coupled with some infill building. This pattern needs to be replicated as far as possible in the future if the village is to retain its physical integrity charm and uniqueness as well as its cohesiveness as a community.</p> <p>In contrast to this, there are some individuals who would advocate estate(s) of houses being built. It would appear that these proposals also involve the estate(s) being constructed on tracts of land other than in the location of the clusters, for instance close to the Built-Up Boundary. This makes no sense whatsoever.</p>		
R27	<p>[The plan states that] Development proposals within the Hartest built up area boundary, as defined on the policies map, will be permitted provided they accord with other provisions of the adopted development plan. There is a level of ambiguity here that could be addressed. In particular, 'visually important gaps' are quite specific, 'Defined Clusters' are not in some cases. This would not seem to be in keeping with this policy, could the plan be more specific when defining areas? Currently they look fairly vague. It would provide confidence to the local community and prevent confusion or ambiguity in the future.</p>	<p>Agree that there is a level of confusion and ambiguity caused, particularly, by the dotted lines around the clusters on the draft Plan.</p>	<p>Policies HAR1 and HAR3, the supporting paragraphs and the Proposals Map have been amended to clarify what development can take place within clusters.</p>
R28	<p>I would like to particularly offer my support for the proposals for additional housing needs, and would wholly concur with the suggestion that any developments should, wherever possible, be within the detailed clusters and then limited to 3 or 4 dwellings in order to maintain the architectural mix that currently benefits the general appearance of the village.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
LO1	<p>I support the Fosters cluster proposal (along with the principle of the other clusters), as I think this makes welcome sense in terms of land planning to strengthen these historic settlement clusters, whilst protecting and clearly vitally defining the agricultural land between.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
LO3	<p>I am unclear about how the group has moved from its early position of wanting to deny the presumptive favour of CS11 for development adjacent to the BUAB [Build-Up Area Boundary]</p>	<p>Policy CS11 is a strategic policy in the Local Plan Core Strategy against which the Neighbourhood Plan must conform. The Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>The Proposals Map has been amended to remove dotted lines that identify clusters.</p>



ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	and seek policies that would enable dispersed proposals that had no negative impacts on the landscape and views. The draft plan does not seem to restrict CS11 and has introduced new lines on the map around the proposed clusters.	<p>provides much more detail in the way that it identifies natural features and important gaps that are currently not present in a local plan document and which will ensure that the historic and natural environment can be protected.</p> <p>The lines around the clusters were drawn to identify the location of the clusters rather than development boundaries. The Plan has been amended to clarify this and to remove the lines.</p>	
	<b>HOUSING – Section 7</b>		
R4	I feel that 3-4 bedroom properties or bigger are totally unacceptable as surely there is a need for smaller properties for the village to thrive.	The Neighbourhood Plan identifies that there is a need for smaller dwellings and this is reinforced by the content of Policy HAR4.	None
R12 R13	Recent (post war) buildings are not aging well. New developments should be more heterogeneous with sympathetic design and materials, but unfortunately with more ‘affordable’ schemes these will be the first 2 things to go.	The Neighbourhood Plan, together with other local and national policies provide a framework to achieve high quality design and materials.	None
R14	<p>Para 7.2 Why were the years 2007-2015 chosen for the statistic of 11 new homes in the 8 year period?</p> <p>Para 7.8 The [Babergh] core strategy does not identify the minimum number of homes that Hartest should contribute to the overall need. In other words, there is no requirement to build any houses in Hartest to satisfy the Babergh Local Plan.</p> <p>Para 7.9 On local housing needs, this seems to be a list of wishes rather than needs. How many of the respondents absolutely need to live in Hartest? Hartest will never again be a major centre of employment.</p>	<p>This was the only data available at the time of preparing the Plan. We now have details for completions between 2001 and 2017 (20 homes).</p> <p>The Plan does not provide a specific level of growth but recognises that there is a need for smaller homes, in particular, to meet the needs of small families and provide opportunities for a younger population that will support the use of the school.</p> <p>Housing need can be reflected in many ways but are normally considered in relation to family connections and/or employment within the village.</p>	Paragraph 7.5 has been amended with more up-to-date and longer-term housing completions

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	The need for more houses is most cited by developers and others with an interest in housing stock. Actually it fulfils their needs more than it does the village's!	The population of the UK, and Hartest, continues to grow. Hartest grew by nearly 5% between the 2001 and 2011 Census with the proportion aged over 65 doubling as people live longer. A continuation of this level of growth to 2036 would result in around 50 more people living in the village.	
R17	HAR 3/HAR 4 these are of paramount importance in providing protection of the essential heritage of the village from multi-property style development by limiting the number of houses per site while allowing for future needs for affordable housing stock. Not one of us would enjoy having a large over-developed site on our door step, ill befitting the village. I believe it absolutely right that the Plan sets out to allow small but widely distributed future residential development outside the Built-Up area of the village, and that this will achieve the most empathetic results.	Noted	None
R18	HAR 3 We feel that landscape visual impact assessments should be extended to include developments within the clusters. Because of the higher elevation of the clusters, the buildings in the clusters are visible from considerable distances away: for example, properties in the old Mill cluster can be seen from both Somerton Hill and Chadacre.	Agree.	Policy HAR3 has been amended to include a requirement for Landscape Visual Impact Assessments to accompany planning applications for new homes within clusters.
R19	HAR1 - HAR6 I feel that whilst the draft NP [Neighbourhood Plan] sets out a good direction and intent for the future, it seems somewhat unrealistic given current development trends, opportunities and planning applications in the area.... [to provide] sufficient homes, jobs, services, facilities and infrastructure to enable local people to live and meet their day to day needs in the local area.	Noted. We recognise that it is not possible to provide everything in the village but residents have indicated support for some growth of jobs and services that would meet day-to-day needs.	None
R22 R23	In particular we feel that the issue of housing has been very sensitively addressed.	Thank you	None
R19	Section 6... the Neighbourhood Plan identifies the need for small low-cost or affordable housing, especially for young people. This is not currently available nor in the current planning applications and direction seems achievable.	Noted	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
R28	Any large-scale or estate type development would only have a detrimental effect, overwhelm the infrastructure, and could substantially change the nature and charm of the village.	Agreed	None
	<b>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</b> – Section 8		
R1	Placing development on land of a lower elevation (i.e. the core village) would help minimise its impact on the wider landscape by reducing the visual envelope.	The Plan does not preclude this but requires that development proposals outside the BUAB should be supported by a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment.	Policy HAR3 has been amended to include a requirement for Landscape Visual Impact Assessments to accompany planning applications for new homes within clusters.
R2	<p>I particularly support your emphasis on not spoiling the beautiful countryside with unsympathetic out-of- scale development and retaining views and the rural nature of Hartest. Sadly certain areas at the top and bottom of Hartest Hill start to look rather suburban caused as much by inappropriate landscaping and lightings as by the buildings.</p> <p>[This response expresses concern about possible development at the top of Hartest Hill that would impinge negatively on their property.] Depending on where it was sited, such development could adversely affect my views, peace and calm, enjoyment of my property and its value.</p>	Noted	None
R3	I fail to see how you can influence a privately owned green space [at the pub]. I would suggest that the land marked at Fosters could be deemed as an equally important green space.	The Working Group has assessed green spaces in accordance with national planning guidance. The identified local green space, which is in a conservation area and adjacent to listed buildings, provides a positive feature within the village as well as a location for events. It therefore satisfies that national criteria. No other spaces in the parish, that don't already have statutory protection, have been identified that would satisfy these criteria	None
R11	Regarding local potential building clusters as depicted within the Hartest Neighbourhood Plan and related to the protection of important views from public vantage points. At the start of Pilgrims Lane one is afforded (facing East) a much commented on	Policy HAR11 seeks to protect important views and Policy HAR3 is being amended to require proposals for new housing within a cluster to be accompanied by a Landscape Visual Impact assessment.	Policy HAR3 has been amended to include a requirement for Landscape Visual Impact Assessments to accompany planning applications for new homes within clusters.

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	and photographed view by numerous ramblers. The prospect of a potential cluster build is causing me great concern.		
R12 R13	Broadly we support the stated objectives of the plan. The plan should be absolutely unequivocal in protecting amenity woodland and green field sites within the conservation area.  We support an extension of the Special Landscape Area	Noted.	None
R14	The plan has much in its favour in particular:... The importance of the special views into and from the village and its outlying clusters.  Fig. 8.2 – an absurd use of relative vertical to horizontal scale for the geography of the area.	Noted	None
R27	HAR 11 has been informed by the expressed wish of local people to place the protection of the special landscape around the village at the heart of the NP. Distinctive views from public vantage points either within or into the built-up areas and clusters, or out of built-up areas or clusters to the surrounding countryside should be maintained.	Noted	None
R28	The importance of maintaining the various important views cannot be underestimated for the benefit of all existing and intended residents.	Noted	None
R25	I have particular concern for the green and its trees and would like to support any plans to care for trees in the present and in planning for its future.	Noted	Paragraph 8.14 has been amended to refer to this
<b>HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT AND DESIGN – Section 9</b>			
R1	It is possible to have development in proximity to a conservation area and/or listed building that does not detract from the historic asset, although it would require a higher standard of design than seems to have been accepted of late.	Agree. The Plan does not preclude such development.	None
R2	[Concern expressed that the Old Mill Cluster] has become quite suburban with all the new building	The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to retain the rural qualities of the village by only allowing limited and sympathetically designed development in appropriate locations.	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
R3	The area marked [Old Mill Cluster] is adjacent to a grade 2 listed building and opposite another.	The Plan does not preclude development in the proximity of listed buildings. Historic England seeks that development should not result in harm to the setting of listed buildings.	None
R12 R13	We support the preparation of a local listing exercise.	Noted	None
R14	The major attraction of Hartest is its historic buildings as special views as epitomised by the Green and its surrounding houses; Hartest does not need to grow.	Hartest as a village has grown over many years and no significant growth is planned in the Neighbourhood Plan. There are, however, needs to provide a better mix of housing in order to achieve a more balanced population profile.	None
R16	Many of the houses [within the Mill House cluster] are listed properties and we believe additional housing would be a detriment to them and their surroundings.	The Plan does not preclude development in the proximity of listed buildings. Historic England seeks that development should not result in harm to the setting of listed buildings.	None
R19	High quality design should be key for low-density requirements within or near to the conservation area, for example, sensitive conversion of existing farm or historic buildings into more than one unit could [see] achievable quotas delivered without a drastic increase of the massing of buildings or visual intrusion.	Noted. The Plan does not preclude high quality sympathetic design within the conservation area.	None
R14	The plan has much in its favour in particular:... The emphasis it places on the special character (conservation area and heritage assets of Hartest)	Thank you	None

<b>LOCAL ECONOMY – Section 10</b>			
R3	The future of the businesses of the village [the garage and butchers] is down to their individual owners. It is not for you or I to tell them how they should run their business, and they should not have to financially justify themselves to your committee if they no longer wish to do so.	The Neighbourhood Plan content echoes the strategic policies in the current Babergh Local Plan that seek to retain viable employment opportunities and services in villages rather than, for example, allowing closure and conversion to a more profitable residential use.	None
R12 R13	Although economic growth seems an attractive proposition, in practice it tends to mean industrialisation and property speculation, neither of which we would welcome. We would want to see a very cautious approach to any plans that sacrificed the tranquillity or character of the village for putative future	The Plan, in conjunction with the Babergh Local Plan, proposes a cautious approach to the consideration of all development proposals.	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	economic benefits that may never materialise or indeed stay in the village.		
R20 R21	<p>HAR 16 We feel it is important for Hartest to be a sustainable village.</p> <p>Opportunities for economic growth should be considered at all times as a priority, particularly when a local interest is expressed.</p> <p>Whilst acknowledging that environmental and conservation issues are important (e.g. views), we do not feel this should preclude innovation and change.</p> <p>We feel too many restrictions can ultimately inhibit growth of both business opportunities and population in Hartest. Not all situations can be anticipated, therefore all new ideas and applications should be considered on their own individual merits and in reaction to the applications unique situation.</p>	As with many planning decisions, it will be important that Babergh District Council take a balanced view when considering the economic benefits of a development versus the potential environmental impact.	None
	<b>FACILITIES AND SERVICES – Section 11</b>		
R14	<p>P.19 CS11 Point (v) Is there really need for a village shop or is this a fanciful wish? It is unlikely to be viable.</p>	Noted. There is an ongoing high level of support for a shop in the village as identified in the original Parish Plan and the surveys undertaken in preparing the Neighbourhood Plan. Community run shops are successful in a number of Suffolk villages and the Parish Council continues to seek to opportunities to identify a way forward in Hartest.	None
R20 R21	<p>HAR 17 Since the original report came out, the school has moved forward considerably, with a... new, enthusiastic head teacher, who, has already increased numbers on role and formed strong links with stakeholders. Proposals to make available both the school swimming pool and play area for our local community are already underway.</p>	Noted.	Paragraph 11.4 has been amended to reflect the comment.
ID	<b>COMMUNICATIONS – Section 12</b>		
R3	<p>The location [in the Mill Hill Cluster] is on a blind bend on what is primarily a single track lane. Surely this creates an inverse impact on the highway safety?</p>	Any proposals for development in this area will need to satisfy the County Highways Department's	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>Hartest Hill, is already in a terrible mess, the ditches and drainage are blocked and cannot cope. The road is crumbling into the ditches and potholes and becoming bigger and deeper.</p> <p>There are no footpaths for residents to walk safely to the amenities within the village, or for children to walk safely to and from school.</p> <p>Parking is already an issue here: cars are parked on the road and in lay-byes thus making the road even more dangerous</p>	<p>requirements in terms of site access and impact on the highway capacity.</p>	
R12 R13	<p>The balance of comment in the plan seems heavily weighted towards the static components of development (buildings and views). Perhaps more could be said about the infrastructure and traffic generated by additional housing. It is not unrealistic to assume that any new household will come with at least 1 car per person and the cumulative impact of this factor is bound to be negative in the context of the village.</p> <p>We support underground cabling</p>	<p>Any proposals for development in this area will need to satisfy the County Highways Department's requirements in terms of site access and impact on the highway capacity. Traffic volumes in the village are relatively low and there is generally little congestion. The amount of development likely to come forward during the course of the Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to have any significant impact on the road network.</p>	None
R16	<p>We have serious concerns over housing proposals on Shimpling Road. The road is already extremely busy, very narrow and already struggles with traffic. Increased traffic will make this increasingly difficult. The road also has major problems with drainage. The bridge at the bottom of the hill is another contentious issue.</p> <p>There also no paths to and from the village [from the Mill House Cluster], making it less accessible for the amenities. It does seem apparent that there are other areas that have wider roads, less traffic, fewer properties around and nearer to the amenities, such as Somerton Road.</p>	<p>Any proposals for development in this area will need to satisfy the County Highways Department's requirements in terms of site access and impact on the highway capacity. Traffic volumes in the village are relatively low and there is generally little congestion. The amount of development likely to come forward during the course of the Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to have any significant impact on the road network.</p>	none
LO4	<p>Communty Action 10 Boxted Estate in 2015 made a site proposal for a mobile phone mast to serve both Hartest and Boxted, which was under the then Government Scheme to improve mobile phone signal coverage within the region. The site was approved by Babergh District Council the site was on</p>	<p>Residents decided at the time that the site put forward was wholly unsuitable. Should an alternative mast design that would be acceptable to residents come forward then the Parish Council would be happy to consider it.</p>	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>the hill behind the school at Hartest and was rejected by Hartest Parish Council. The site was outside the currently proposed purple dotted conservation area outlined on the proposals map. Boxted Estate will continue to have the site available, or any other suggestions, should Hartest village really want to have improved signals. However, the fact that they previously rejected one site will mean that any lobbying they plan to do will be extremely difficult to justify based on their reluctance to accept a site less than 2 years ago.</p> <p>The Boxted Estate will help wherever possible to secure better mobile phone coverage.</p>		
R2	<p>Parking outside my property [at the top of Hartest Hill] is already very unsatisfactory bordering on dangerous and further development could make this worse</p>	Noted	None

### Comments Log and Responses 2017 – Portland Planning Report

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
2	<p>As Hartest is designated a “hinterland village” in Babergh Core Strategy it is right and proper that development is encouraged but only in the context of a close functional relationship with existing patterns of development. This is stated on page 17 of the Hartest Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) and it is rightly a central theme to the document.</p>	Noted	None
2	<p>..the overriding impression is that the HNP comes to the (unsupported) conclusion that there is little or no option for further development within or adjacent to the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) of the village and, instead, intimates that further development would be preferred in several “clusters” which are not well defined and inconsistently allocated. Given existing planning policies it is considered inappropriate to have a HNP plan which <b>does not recognise, in detail and with justification, opportunities to develop in and around the</b></p>	<p>Clusters recognise existing and historic pattern of development acknowledged in the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>Policy CS11 of the Babergh Core Strategy is a strategic policy that allows development outside the Built Up Area Boundary and the Neighbourhood Plan cannot be in conflict with this. The HNP does not dismiss development adjacent to the BUAB but paragraph 6.6 of the consultation</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.6 have been amended to reinforce the rationale of the Core Strategy as it relates to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The maps in the document and the Proposals Map have been amended to remove the red dotted line that identified the clusters in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Policy HAR3 has been amended to clarify what development might be suitable within a cluster</p>



Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<b>BUAB as a priority</b> as it provides housing close to the village amenities with maximum safety and access for the residents.	plan acknowledges that the high landscape and historic environment qualities would restrict opportunities to develop sites that would have a detrimental and unacceptable impact.	including restricting the size of the dwellings and requiring such sites to be adjacent or fronting an existing highway.
2	It is important to recognise that families that purchase properties in a village (BUAB) do so in order to benefit from its amenities. This necessarily results in higher housing density in such areas, and residents make a modest sacrifice of privacy for the benefits obtained through the nearby infrastructure and facilities. In contrast, families that purchase houses outside of the village (whether in a “Cluster” or not) do so explicitly for the benefits of being surrounded by open spaces and green fields. It is therefore inappropriate to focus new developments in to these outlying countryside areas (as a preference to the area adjacent to the BUAB) as this unfairly adversely affects those residents who have opted, specifically, to live in a rural setting.	The HNP does not identify a preference to outlying countryside rather than adjacent to the BUAB. A sequential approach to identifying the potential for new housing development has been used in accordance with Policy CSI 1 of the Babergh Core Strategy.	Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.6 have been amended to reinforce the rationale of the Core Strategy as it relates to the Neighbourhood Plan.
2	<p>There are large swathes of open land adjacent to the BUAB that would permit, at some time in the scope of the HNP, building of small, low-rise, low-cost buildings of the type identified as the main requirement for the village which could benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not impinging aesthetically on the core of the village</li> <li>- Providing the type of low-cost housing required by the village as a priority</li> <li>- Reinvigorating the core of the village with younger families with children</li> <li>- Providing easy access to village amenities like the school</li> <li>- Providing pedestrian access to these new developments will reduce car use, congestion and increased safety to all road users</li> <li>- Having access to mains services and utilities</li> </ul> <p>It is therefore recommended that the HNP includes the explicit statement (Policy HAR 2) that <b>”proposals for appropriate and sensitive developments to provide homes within and adjacent to the BUAB that are consistent with the</b></p>	There is no evidence to support that this housing would be ‘Low-rise’. The HNP provides an opportunity for local needs affordable housing in such circumstances (HAR6). In other circumstances the Plan (and the Local Plan) provides the criteria for considering such suggested development proposals.	None  Policy HAR3 has been amended to clarify the location and scale of development that would be

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p><b>requirements of the village will be acceptable in principle. Sites outside or not adjoining the BUAB will be considered as open countryside.</b></p>	<p>This request is covered in Policy HAR1 and HAR3</p>	<p>permissible adjoining the built up area boundary and within clusters.</p>
3	<p>Section 6 Item (iii) of CS11 Criteria states (page 18) that there “are <b>limited opportunities for acceptable development within and adjacent to the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB)</b>”.</p> <p>While development around the immediate environs of the Green have to be meticulously controlled, it would be beneficial to identify (on a map in the HNP) those areas within and adjacent to the BUAB that may be available for development, as planning guidelines direct development priorities to such core areas.</p> <p>The draft HNP does not address potential BUAB flood risk in any detail, but public data from the Environment Agency shows that only small areas of the BUAB are regarded as having a significant risk (Item 6.3(i), page 17).</p> <p><b>Of the ~68 acres potentially available for development adjacent to the BUAB, see map provided below in relation to Policy HAR 2), only 6.5% is affected by flood risk</b> as specified by the Environment Agency map.</p>	<p>This is not appropriate for the HNP.</p> <p>Circumstances will change through the lifetime of the plan and opportunities not identified now would become opportunities at a later date. The Working Group / Parish Council took an early decision not to identify specific sites for allocation in the Plan. Identifying those areas within and adjacent to the BUAB that may be available for development would effectively be allocating sites for development.</p> <p>The outcomes of the community engagement provided a clear manifesto to prepare an environmentally led Plan that enabled new development to take place that had regard to Hartest’s distinct and special historic and natural environment.</p> <p>68 acres equates to approximately 25Ha. If a standard density of between 20-30 dwellings to the hectare was applied to these sites it could mean that between 540 and 810 homes would be developed. This would quadruple the size of the village. Flooding constraints are only one criteria by which development proposals are considered. There are many other considerations that need to be taken into account including the impact on the natural and historic environment and highways.</p> <p>Babergh District Council has undertaken two “calls for sites” since 2015 and these did not result in any development sites being put forward in the village.</p>	<p>None</p>

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
3	<p>Section 6</p> <p>Item (v) of CS I identifies several key community needs. The Plan emphasises the need to increase the number of younger families and children in the village to make it more sustainable. As key village facilities are concentrated in the BUAB (Clinic and School) it is also important to recognise that <b>any development should be connected to this core area</b> by suitable footpaths and within reasonable walking distance. Otherwise access to these core facilities will be by road, further accentuating an existing problem for traffic and parking around the school, and greatly increasing the risk of death or injury to school children. This further supports the need for a focussed assessment of housing development options within and adjacent to the BUAB. This is recognised to an extent in Section 7.15 of the HNP (page 30). The accompanying map shows the <b>location of paths that provide suitable access to the core facilities</b> and begs the question of availability and suitability for development of land adjacent to the pathways or in immediately adjacent areas that can be connected by new paths.</p>	<p>Even within the BUAB the footway network is incomplete but this is the typical characteristic of rural villages such as Hartest. The provision of footways would result in an unacceptable urban intervention being introduced into a village distinct for its high quality historic and natural environment. The additional trips to the school and clinic resulting from minimal development in the clusters as provided for in Policy HAR3 would not have a significant impact on the highways.</p> <p>The number of sites identified would be contrary to the strategic policies in the Babergh Core Strategy. There is no evidence provided that these sites are available, viable or deliverable. Two calls for sites by Babergh District Council (2015 and 2016) did not result in any sites in Hartest being submitted.</p>	<p>Policy HAR3 has been amended to clarify what development might be suitable within a cluster including restricting the size of the dwellings and requiring such sites to be adjacent or fronting an existing highway.</p>
4	<p>Section 7</p> <p>Outside of the BAUB, the HNP has proposed the definition of “Clusters” and, by extension, proposing that development would be preferential in such clusters. They are separated by “Visually Important Gaps”. The aim of the proposal appears to be to avoid, where possible, ribbon development of the village. The policy, as written, is ambiguous and could lead to unintended consequences. The implication appears to be that one or two dwellings per cluster could be considered reasonable. If one or two dwellings are allowed in one of these “clusters”, a developer could subsequently propose another one or two in the same area using the HNP as a justification which, being in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan policy, would have to be allowed unless material considerations indicated otherwise. Further, when the cluster is ‘full’, adjoining sites would have to be considered because the clusters are so poorly defined and it could not be</p>	<p>The HNP does not state that development would be preferential but acknowledges that there may be opportunities in addition to development within or adjoining the BUAB.</p> <p>The wording of the policy clearly states “within” a cluster and not adjoining</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.6 have been amended to reinforce the rationale of the Core Strategy as it relates to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The maps in the document and the Proposals Map have been amended to remove the red dotted line that identified the clusters in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Policy HAR3 has been amended to clarify what development might be suitable within a cluster including restricting the size of the dwellings and requiring such sites to be adjacent or fronting an existing highway.</p>

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	argued that a site within the cluster is sustainable but the adjoining site, possibly outside a vaguely defined line, is not.		
4	<p>Section 7</p> <p><b>An important observation</b>, which is not made in the HNP, but illustrated on the accompanying map, is that along the roads (particularly north of Hartest along the B1066, <b>development has resulted in staggered plots on either side of the road</b>. This almost inevitably results in <b>each house retaining its frontage as open countryside</b> and also results in no “ribbon development”, even though many plots have outbuildings. <b>A far stronger characterisation of the area is provided by the off-set plots and visually important gaps rather than clusters</b>. The HNP could usefully add a statement that, as this an established development pattern that avoids ribbon development while minimising visual impact on the character of the area and wider landscape setting, where <b>future developments are acceptable, they should follow this pattern</b>. This form of development would respect the existing settlement pattern of the village in accordance with CS1 I and paragraph 58 of the NPPF. It should therefore replace the cluster concept.</p> <p>The designation of “Clusters” in the draft HNP is necessarily ambiguous and arbitrary and does not recognise the significance of the staggered developments described above. <b>As a result, the Cluster concept is not regarded as valid</b> when designating specific areas for acceptable development (and, by extension, excluding others).</p> <p>For example, houses to the west of Hartest (Mile End) are not designated in to clusters, although they have a density and number that is comparable to existing proposed “clusters”. Others could also be “possible”, as shown on the map. If the concept of clusters is to be used (and we contend that this is flawed and should not be used), there should be no attempt to identify particular clusters. It is far too prescriptive and anomalies are inevitable. Rather, a criteria-based policy approach could be used.</p>	<p>As illustrated on the map accompanying the representation, there is a suggestion of built development that extends from Cross Green to Burnthouse Farm. The reality is that, with exception of the closely knit development at Cross Green buildings are set within the wider dominant landscape.</p> <p>Disagree that suggestion would represent the existing settlement pattern.</p> <p>The identification and designation of cluster recognises the historic landscape pattern and respects the ‘Undulating Ancient Farmland’ characteristic identified in the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.6 have been amended to reinforce the rationale of the Core Strategy as it relates to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The maps in the document and the Proposals Map have been amended to remove the red dotted line that identified the clusters in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Policy HAR3 has been amended to clarify what development might be suitable within a cluster including restricting the size of the dwellings and requiring such sites to be adjacent or fronting an existing highway.</p>

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
5	<p>Section 7</p> <p>North of Hartest the “Peartree Cluster” has been proposed, although its boundaries are vague. It has the lowest density of buildings of the four proposed clusters and is characterised by a preponderance of open paddocks.</p> <p>Another group of buildings is located to the north of the “Peartree Cluster” including Mayfair, The Hanger and Stowe Hill. It is important that these two areas do not become amalgamated by infill building and therefore it is recommended that <b>Visually Important Gaps should be designated between these two groups of buildings</b>. This is discussed in more detail below in relation to HARI1 and HARI2, but the map shown in HNP does not extend far enough to make this distinction. It should.</p> <p><b>The cluster policy as proposed does not comply with the NPPF, Paragraph 55.</b> This provides support for the Core Strategy hierarchy of settlements, with Hartest being a ‘hinterland village’, and development within the village potentially supporting services in larger, higher-order settlements nearby. It does not support the provision of houses remote from settlements, even if there are existing remote houses nearby.</p>	<p>The Visually Important Gap designation relates to the gaps between the BUAB and clusters. The Peartree “cluster” is separated from the BUAB by Cross Green and, as noted in Policy HAR3, development in clusters is only allowed <u>within</u> the cluster. Development in the vicinity of a cluster that does not accord with this policy would be deemed as countryside and be determined against separate policies</p> <p>The HNP is not making a provision for significant levels of housing development and is therefore in accordance with the Core Strategy and the NPPF in terms of sustainable development. The emerging local plan has identified the development of additional homes with clusters as an option and therefore this approach is not without support.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.6 have been amended to reinforce the rationale of the Core Strategy as it relates to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The maps in the document and the Proposals Map have been amended to remove the red dotted line that identified the clusters in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Policy HAR3 has been amended to clarify what development might be suitable within a cluster including restricting the size of the dwellings and requiring such sites to be adjacent or fronting an existing highway.</p>
5	<p>HARI</p> <p>When consideration is given to the arbitrary and ambiguous definition of the “Clusters” identified in the report it is regarded as inappropriate to mention them by name in this Policy.</p> <p><b>An alternative more appropriate wording may be:</b></p> <p><i>“To be considered “well related”, sites should be adjacent to the Built-Up Area Boundary (subject to the natural environmental constraints set out in this Plan). Sites that do not meet the above criteria will be treated as countryside and development proposals in these areas will need to have regard to other relevant national and local planning policies.”</i></p>	<p>Disagree. The HNP seeks to provide a positive basis for meeting the <u>local</u> housing needs balanced against the desire to protect and maintain the distinct and important built and natural environment.</p> <p>The emerging local plan has identified the development of additional homes with clusters as an option and therefore this approach is not without support.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.6 have been amended to reinforce the rationale of the Core Strategy as it relates to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The maps in the document and the Proposals Map have been amended to remove the red dotted line that identified the clusters in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Policy HAR3 has been amended to clarify what development might be suitable within a cluster including restricting the size of the dwellings and requiring such sites to be adjacent or fronting an existing highway.</p>

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
6	<p>HAR2</p> <p>The overriding impression is that the HNP comes to the (unsupported) conclusion that there is little or no option for further development within or adjacent to the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) of the village and, instead, intimates that further development would be preferred in several “clusters” which are not well defined and inconsistently allocated. Given existing planning policies it is considered inappropriate to have a HNP plan which <b>does not recognise, in detail and with justification, opportunities to develop in and around the BUAB as a priority</b> as it provides housing close to the village amenities with maximum safety for the residents’ access. There are large swathes of open land adjacent to the BUAB that would permit building of small, low-rise, low-cost buildings of the type identified as the main requirement for the village which will benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not impinging aesthetically on the core of the village</li> <li>- Providing the type of low-cost housing required by the village as a priority</li> <li>- Reinvigorating the core of the village with younger families with children</li> <li>- Providing easy access to village amenities like the school</li> <li>- Providing pedestrian access to these new developments will reduce car use, congestion and increased safety to all road users</li> <li>- Benefit from main sewer and other utilities and services</li> </ul> <p>The area shown in green on the accompanying map (<b>areas potentially available for development adjacent to the BUAB</b>) amount to <b>~68 acres (~27.5 hectares)</b> <b>Of this area, only 6.5% is affected by flood risk</b> as specified by the Environment Agency map.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the HNP includes the explicit statement (presumably in Policy HAR 2) that <b>”proposals for appropriate and sensitive developments to provide</b></p>	<p>The HNP is realistic about the limited opportunities for acceptable development within the BUAB. However, it does not state a preference for development in the clusters rather than the BUAB.</p> <p>Development of these ‘large swathes of open land’ would result in the character and landscape setting of the village changing out of all recognition. Furthermore, there is no indication that such sites are available, viable or deliverable. Neither is there any indication that such proposals have the support of the village residents.</p> <p>Disagree. There is no need for this amount of potential growth.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.6 have been amended to reinforce the rationale of the Core Strategy as it relates to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The maps in the document and the Proposals Map have been amended to remove the red dotted line that identified the clusters in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Policy HAR3 has been amended to clarify what development might be suitable within a cluster including restricting the size of the dwellings and requiring such sites to be adjacent or fronting an existing highway.</p>

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p><b>homes within and adjacent to the BUAB that are consistent with the requirements of the village will be given priority over similar proposals made outside of that area”.</b></p> <p>While it is recognised that the illustrative potential development areas shown on the accompanying map (in green) may not be available for development at the present time, this may change in the scope of the HNP (to 2036). <b>This should be explicitly discussed in the HNP.</b></p>		
7	<p>HAR3</p> <p>While it is commendable that a distinction is drawn between the (higher) density of housing that may be developed adjacent to the BUAB and a lesser density in more remote areas, the metrics of a maximum of 3 houses in areas adjacent to the BAUB appears to be too restrictive. Given the large potential areas adjacent to the BUAB that “could” be developed, <b>wouldn’t a “housing density” metric be more appropriate</b> and provide more guidance to developers?</p> <p>Development adjacent to the BUAB will also benefit from access to mains utilities, such as sewers. Areas remote from the BUAB (including most of the notional clusters mentioned in the draft HNP) rely on soak-away and septic tanks which increases environmental risk, particularly in the heavy clay substrate that dominates and typifies the HNP area.</p>	<p>The potential larger areas identified in the representation would be out of character with the historic and landscape setting of the village.</p> <p>Such proposals would need to satisfy the Building Regulations and Environment Agency requirement in respect of sewers.</p> <p>Further consideration has been given to the scale of development that would be acceptable adjoining the BUAB and it is proposed to increase the new to four dwellings</p>	<p>Policy HAR3 has been amended to allow single dwellings and small scale groups of up to 4 dwellings outside, but adjacent to, the Built-up Area Boundary and to clarify what development might be suitable within a cluster including restricting the size of the dwellings and requiring such sites to be adjacent or fronting an existing highway.</p>
7	<p>HAR4</p> <p>While the policy clearly states that smaller more affordable homes are a priority for the area, it is somewhat <b>surprising that no preference is made for single-story or bungalow-style houses which may benefit older or infirm residents.</b> Perhaps this could be included in the HNP either in HAR 4 or in a more appropriate place?</p>	<p>Bungalows may not be suitable on some sites due to their setting. Guidance on design for individual developments is provided elsewhere.</p>	<p>None</p>
7	<p>HAR5</p> <p>The policy provides the opportunity to replenish the types of houses that are recognised as being required in the village, being smaller, more affordable dwellings.</p>	<p>Disagree. The replacement of a single dwelling with one, much larger family home could have the same impact as that raised.</p>	<p>Policy HAR5 has been amended to limit the potential impact that the replacement of dwellings in the countryside could have on the village.</p>

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>HAR 5 allows for up to 3 dwellings replacing a single dwelling in specified circumstances. Para 55 of the NPPF states that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided. HAR 5 would result in potentially 2 new isolated homes in the countryside per replacement dwelling (one true replacement plus 2 new ones), so would be contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>In accordance with adopted local policy, <b>replacement dwellings must be of similar size to existing and there must be no increase in the number of dwellings on the site.</b> Similarly, draft <b>Development Management policies on this subject requires replacement dwellings to be ‘one for one’.</b> So, provided they are on a ‘like for like’ and ‘one for one’ basis, replacement dwellings are acceptable in principle.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan policies must comply with national and local policies and, because HAR 5 allows for one house to be replaced by up to 3 houses, it would not comply.</b></p>	<p>However, further consideration has been given to the potential impact of this policy on the countryside and the policy has been amended accordingly.</p>	
7	<p>HAR6 necessarily addresses affordable housing on rural exception sites. CS20 specifies that rural exception sites will be allowed where they are adjacent to or well-related to the settlement boundary. As it stands, <b>HAR 6 does not comply with CS20 because it does not give these restrictions.</b></p> <p>However, based on the text of section 7.23 (page 35) of the HNP, surely the Policy <b>should firstly and predominantly address affordable housing “appropriately located close to the heart of the village”</b> and therefore adjacent to the BUAB. HAR 6 should specify that <b>Rural Exception Sites will only apply where they are adjacent to or well-related to the BUAB.</b></p>	<p>The policy stated is in accordance with policy CS20 and complements it rather than repeats it by reinforcing the local circumstances that would apply.</p>	None
8	<p>HAR9 and HAR10 <b>The proposed extended SLA north of Hartest is strongly supported.</b> This is appropriate as the area now incorporates</p>	<p>Noted. The support is welcomed. However, in response to the comments received from Babergh District Council, it is proposed to</p>	<p>Policy HAR9 and the Proposals Map have been amended to identify an Area of Special Landscape</p>



Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>the high ridge north of Cross Green which affords sweeping views over open countryside that is characteristic of the Hartest neighbourhood in general and its agricultural heritage in particular. Hartest village is not visible as it is located in the valley that is along this sight-line. This is illustrated by the accompanying photograph from GoogleEarth StreetView which shows an horizon to Shimpling and Stanstead of over 6km. <b>The proposal complies with NPPF paragraph 109 regarding protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.</b></p> <p>The statements encouraging planting of hedgerows and similar initiatives is highly commendable (HAR 8)</p>	<p>further refine the boundary and change the name of the designation in order that it is in closer conformity with the recently made Lawshall Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Quality. The area covered by this designation has been amended.</p> <p>Policy HAR10 is deleted as a result of this amendment.</p>
8	<p>HAR11</p> <p>When approaching Hartest from Brockley, the view illustrated above is the first panorama that is available after crossing relatively flatter ground to the north of Hartest. <b>Designation of this area as part of the SLA will help to preserve this “introduction to the village of Hartest”</b> which is highly evocative.</p>	<p>Noted. In response to the comments received from Babergh District Council, it is proposed to further refine the boundary and change the name of the designation in order that it is in closer conformity with the recently made Lawshall Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Policy HAR9 and the Proposals Map have been amended to identify an Area of Special Landscape Quality. The area covered by this designation has been amended.</p> <p>Policy HAR10 is deleted as a result of this amendment.</p>
8	<p>HAR12</p> <p>The Hartest Neighbourhood Plan identifies “Visually Important Gaps” on a map on Page 49. The map does not illustrate the entire plan area north of the village and it is therefore recommended that the map be completed to cover the entire Hartest Plan Area (page 7) and that <b>the existing gaps between Burnt House Farm and Stow Hill-Mayfair be designated as a “Visually Important Gap”</b> in common with the others along the B1066.</p>	<p>The Visually Important Gap designation relates to the gaps between the BUAB and clusters. The Peartree “cluster” is separated from the BUAB by Cross Green and, as noted in Policy HAR3, development in clusters is only allowed <u>within</u> the cluster. Development in the vicinity of a cluster that does not accord with this policy would be deemed as countryside and be determined against separate policies</p>	<p>None</p>
9	<p>Section 9</p> <p>The proposal of “Community Action 2” is welcomed. There would appear to be a strong case for <b>northward extension of the current Conservation Area to include Burnt House</b></p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Conservation Areas is covered by separate legislation. Neighbourhood Plans cannot amend or create new conservation areas.</p>	<p>None</p>

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p><b>Farm</b> (Grade 2 Listed), located in a very prominent position overlooking much of the northern views of the village. There are overwhelming precedents for the proposed extension, as Burnt House Farm is located in a similar peripheral location as others in the Conservation Area including Long Farm, Tan Office Farm and others remote from the BUAB. The proposed extension of the Conservation Area complies with NPPF paragraph 127.</p>		
9	<p>HAR14 and HAR15 These are important and useful guides to future development and how it should enhance and complement the existing buildings and character.</p>	Thank you.	None
9	<p>HAR16 Although the draft HNP implies that there are limited development opportunities adjacent to the build-up area there are, for example, over 20,000 square feet of farm buildings on a site of approximately 2 acres at Place Farm, about 150 yards from The Green. These buildings are within the Conservation Area, and thus they have no permitted development rights for conversion to dwellings.</p> <p>Using the HNP's criteria of 98 square metres (~1000 sq.ft) per dwelling, this sustainable brownfield site should be capable of containing up to 20 new homes where there is already a mass of buildings. However the proposed NP prefers an economic development use which could result, for example, in a haulage yard or other business that may profoundly affect the ambiance (and safety) of the area immediately adjacent to The Green, and the roads throughout the village. Unless a suitable business use is secured, <b>this important site would only be permitted a maximum of three dwellings under HAR 3, a clear waste of an opportunity</b> and contrary to normal policy or logic.</p> <p>In addition, the policy as drafted would allow the change of use of modern farm buildings – those constructed after 2013 - to a commercial use, whilst presently they have no permitted</p>	<p>There is no indication that this site is available for any development and therefore any proposals that did come forward would have to be considered against the relevant planning policies of the time.</p> <p>The demolition of this site and the construction of 20 dwellings in the conservation area would be totally contradictory to the community engagement that has informed the preparation of this environmentally led Neighbourhood Plan</p>	None

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	development rights, further introducing development into the countryside.		
9	It is recommended that <b>ribbon development should be regarded as a THREAT.</b>	Noted	None

### Comments Log and Responses 2017 – Babergh District Council

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
9	Generally I consider the Plan to be well written and is clearly the product of a significant amount of work by the local community.	Thank you	None
9	Page 9 The dates shown in the later stages of the timetable are unrealistic and cannot be achieved, given the lead-in times for consultation on the submitted plan, the examination and the referendum [amended timetable proposed].	Noted	The timetable has been amended
9	Pages 22-24 and the proposals map – you may be aware that the Examiner for the Lawshall NP has raised a question on the definition of the clusters in that plan which has adopted a similar approach to you. The examiner has said: ‘One of the issues I have identified is how easy or difficult it would be for a prospective developer to be able to identify the extent of each of the clusters with clarity and precision. Would be useful for the clusters to be identified more closely and if so, please could maps be prepared for each?’ You may wish to consider how the clusters may be defined in the light of these comments.	Noted.	The way in which the clusters have been identified in the Neighbourhood Plan has been amended to provide more clarity. However, the approach does differ to the Lawshall Neighbourhood Plan.
9	[SLA] I am concerned how the Special Landscape Area is dealt with in the plan and justification for the proposed extension. Firstly, government guidance has encouraged a move away from blanket designations to a criteria-based approach based on Landscape Character Areas. A decision on whether to retain SLAs in Babergh will be made as part of the new Joint Local Plan for Babergh and Mid Suffolk. Secondly, I do not think that the	In response to these comments it is proposed to further refine the boundary and change the name of the designation in order that it is in closer conformity with the recently made Lawshall Neighbourhood Plan. Further work has been undertaken to assess the extent of the designation and to define the boundaries	Policy HAR9 and the Proposals Map have been amended to identify an Area of Special Landscape Quality. The area covered by this designation has been amended.  Policy HAR10 is deleted as a result of this amendment.

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	evidence that has been produced is sufficiently robust to justify the proposed extension. I think in order to justify an extension to the SLA more detailed evidence is required which may include surveys that map the features of the area and demonstrate how the topography and vegetation combine to produce an area of Special Landscape Quality.		
9	The Proposals Map does not cover the whole parish or show all the proposals of the plan. In particular it does not show the proposed extension of the SLA. I would suggest that the Proposals Map should be in 2 parts comprising a plan of the whole Parish with an inset showing more detail for the main built-up area of the village. Also in the key the clusters are shown in blue and in the map in red.	Noted	The Proposals Map has been amended to cover the whole parish and to include an Inset Map for the central built-up area.

### **Comments Log and Responses 2017 – Suffolk County Council**

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
1	Suffolk County Council is supportive of the Hartest Neighbourhood Plan vision for the Parish. Whilst a number of concerns with the plan itself are outlined below, the county council is willing to assist Hartest Parish Council in further developing its plan where matters relate to county council service responsibilities and policy objectives.	Noted.	
1	The advice is given in this responds to the Neighbourhood Plan is without prejudice to any advice provided following any formal planning application consultation on sites identified in this plan.	Noted.	
2	Whilst the county council does not have a specific overarching responsibility in respect of ecology, it has a general statutory duty to biodiversity and the natural environment. For that reason, the county provides comments on ecology and landscape.	Noted.	

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	National policy on the natural environment is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and other documents such as the 2011 Government White Paper on natural environment. The general principle is that, in addition to statutory requirements on designations and assessments, the planning system should seek to conserve and enhance habitats and biodiversity. Suffolk County Council welcomes the plan's focus on the protection and enhancement of natural environment recognising their value to the local community.		
2	The county council is content with chapter 8 'Natural Environment' which discusses local environmental distinctiveness in a positively and robust way.	Noted.	
2	The approach taken to extend the existing Special Landscape Area is also reasonable and justifiable given the nature of the area in question, rolling landform which contributes to the character and setting of a dispersed settlement in this part of the parish. However, the revised boundary is probably too widely drawn to be robustly defensible as it covers too much of the plateau between the headwaters of the Glem and the Chad Brook. Therefore, the county council would advise that the boundary should be revised that it reflects defined features on the ground. Below the Suffolk County Council suggests an alternative approach, but <u>it must stress that this is without benefit of a site visit and is just a place to start.</u>	In response to these comments it is proposed to further refine the boundary and change the name of the designation in order that it is in closer conformity with the recently made Lawshall Neighbourhood Plan. Further work has been undertaken to assess the extent of the designation and to define the boundaries	Policy HAR9 and the Proposals Map have been amended to identify an Area of Special Landscape Quality. The area covered by this designation has been amended.  Policy HAR10 is deleted as a result of this amendment.
2	In addition, Suffolk County Council would propose to unsure that Policy HAR 9 - Special Landscape Area clearly identifies the new designation as referred to under paragraph 8.11. Especially as the proposals map only shows the Special Landscape Area as green hatching and without the reference to the designation boundary.	Noted	The Proposals Map have been amended to identify an Area of Special Landscape Quality. The area covered by this designation has been amended.
2	Policy HAR 10 - Development Proposal in the Special Landscape Area is reasonable worded and not overly restrictive.	Noted.	This policy has been deleted as a result of amendments to Policy HAR9.

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
3	<p>In some circumstances a Neighbourhood Plan could have significant environmental effects and may fall within the scope of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and so require strategic environmental assessment. One of the basic conditions that will be tested by the independent examiner is whether the making of the Plan is compatible with European Union Obligations. Whether a Neighbourhood Plan requires a strategic environmental assessment, and the level of detail needed will depend on what is proposed in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In order to be compliant with international and national regulations, a plan level screening exercise will need to be carried out. The local planning authority will be able to advise the parish council if the emerging neighbourhood plan will need to be subject to assessment.</p>	<p>Babergh District Council will be asked to screen the Plan for significant effects before it is submitted to the District Council.</p>	<p>None</p>
3	<p>The county council has a legal duty to ensure provision of education from ages 2 to 16. The National Planning Policy Framework (paras. 38, 72, 203-204) establishes a role for the planning system in ensuring that provision can be met, in resolving issues before planning applications come forward. Furthermore, it seeks to minimise the need for travel, especially by private car. Safe routes to school are necessary; otherwise the education authority must bear the cost of school transport.</p> <p>The County and District Councils would use their shared approach for ensuring that development makes provision for early years, primary, secondary and sixth form education, which is set out in the adopted 'Section 106 Developer's Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk'. It is expected that development funds new places, if needed, through Section 106 agreements or (where/when in place) the community infrastructure levy.</p> <p>When a site allocation or planning application comes forward for consultation, the county council considers;</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan																		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whether local schools can cope with the additional pupils arising from the development. If there is sufficient spare capacity, no action needs to be taken.</li> <li>- If local schools do not have sufficient spare capacity, whether it is possible for those schools to be expanded by means of developer contributions (of land and funding for construction).</li> <li>- If it is not possible for development to enable necessary education expansion, the may recommend that development does not take place.</li> </ul> <p>The Hartest Neighbourhood plan does not allocate land for development.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.4 of the Hartest Neighbourhood Plan refers to the local Hartest CEVC Primary School and a forecast of the school roll since September 2015. Please find below the current number of pupils on roll and a forecast up to 2020/2021.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="219 836 927 967"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>PAN</th> <th>Capacity</th> <th>95%</th> <th>16/17</th> <th>17/18</th> <th>18/19</th> <th>19/20</th> <th>20/21</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hartest CEVC Primary School</td> <td>15</td> <td>105</td> <td>100</td> <td>70</td> <td>72</td> <td>71</td> <td>69</td> <td>66</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		PAN	Capacity	95%	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	Hartest CEVC Primary School	15	105	100	70	72	71	69	66		
	PAN	Capacity	95%	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21													
Hartest CEVC Primary School	15	105	100	70	72	71	69	66													
4	<p>Suffolk County Council is the planning authority with responsibility for mineral extraction and waste disposal. Local policy on minerals and waste planning is set out in the Suffolk Waste Core Strategy and Policies (2011) and Suffolk Minerals Core Strategy (2008) and Suffolk Minerals Site Allocations (2009).</p> <p>It is not envisaged that neighbourhood plans will consider these issues directly. However, the County's Minerals and Waste Plans are part of the Development Plan with which neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity.</p>	Noted.	None																		

Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>National policy requires the county council to recognise that minerals are finite natural resource, and to protect resources from development which would compromise our ability to extract them at a later date. The northern part of Hartest is located inside the 'minerals consultation area', which defines areas likely to contain viable resources.</p> <p>When development comes forward in these areas, the county council has the ability to require investigation of the mineral resources on these sites, before planning permission is granted. This gives the County Council the ability to prevent new development from being an obstacle to the extraction of minerals or to require that limited mineral extraction is carried out before the new development is constructed.</p> <p>This does not mean that extraction is automatically required in these areas. Rather, Suffolk County Council will need to consider whether extraction is desirable.</p>		
4	<p>As per paragraph 75 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the planning system should seek to protect and enhance public rights of way, for the purposes of encouraging healthy and sustainable travel. Whilst there is no requirement on neighbourhood plans to consider any specific matters (beyond meeting the basic conditions), Suffolk County Council welcomes Community Action 9 to support the maintenance and improvements of the local public right of way network.</p> <p>Developing countryside access would help ensure the plan adequately covers sustainable travel options and quality of life objectives regarding the health and the wellbeing of communities. If the Parish Council wishes to pursue these potential opportunities, the county council would be pleased to work in partnership.</p>	Noted.	None
5	<p>The objectives of the Suffolk Health and Wellbeing Strategy are amongst others covered by the consideration which this Plan gives in the protection and maintenance of local green space (policy HAR13 and Objective 4 - Preserve existing and promote an increase in green spaces and provide better access to them)</p>	Noted.	None



Page	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>The contribution which planning and the built environment can make to improving mental health and wellbeing is less obvious and direct, though some principles (feelings of safety, opportunities to exercise, opportunities for social interaction) can be exemplified in this plan through the consideration given to open space which offers opportunities for exercise such as walking, community services and facilities in the village centre and highway safety.</p> <p>Finally, this plan seeks to make a contribution to the Health and Wellbeing Strategy's objective on older people. The contribution which planning can make to wider responses to the ageing of the population is promoted in the Planning Practice Guidance and is also set out in a Government paper called 'Lifetime Neighbourhoods'. Local accessible service provision is a key component of a lifetime neighbourhood, so the Parish Council's efforts in relation to the retention and provision of community facilities (policy HAR 17) can be seen to support this objective.</p> <p>In addition, provision of community facilities can also help reinforce community networks which can support and reduce the social isolation of people with physical and learning disabilities.</p> <p>Based on the evidence, consistency with national policy (chapter 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework) and consistency with local health and wellbeing objectives, the county council supports the provisions of this Plan.</p>		

### Comments Log and Responses 2017 – Statutory Consultees

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
1	<p><b>Highways England</b></p> <p>Highways England has no further comment to make as [Hartest] is remote from the strategic road network</p>	Noted	None
2	<p><b>NHS England</b></p> <p>It is noted that there is [an] ambition for the provision of assisted living developments or nursing/care homes to cater for an ageing population, the provision of such services will have an increased</p>	Noted	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	impact on primary care services in the area. The Glemsford GP practice in terms of premises space is currently at capacity.		
2	<p><b>NHS England</b> Section 11.5 'Overall the Practice has spare capacity to cope with just over 300 additional people on their lists'. Can this statement please be removed? NHSE as primary healthcare commissioner assesses capacity in real time, the healthcare environment is constantly changing and this statement is of a very specific nature. This statement will be out of date and not span the lifetime of the neighbourhood development plan.</p>	Noted. The paragraph will be amended as requested.	Paragraph 11.5 has been amended.
2	<p><b>NHS England</b> The plan identifies preference for housing developments with smaller numbers of dwellings rather than large developments. Please bear in mind that the planning obligations that can be gained from a larger number of smaller developments will not always have as much benefit as one large development. This will limit the options available for the provision of additional community infrastructure to be delivered as part of a scheme and NHSE have limited funding available to invest in creating additional capacity as a result of development growth.</p>	Noted. However, surveys undertaken during the preparation of the Plan indicated that there is no support in the village for larger developments. It is considered that such a proposal could have a significant detrimental impact on the historic and natural environment.	None
2	<p><b>NHS England</b> We would welcome the addition of a simple statement to confirm that Hartest Parish Council will support NHSE in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of primary healthcare services for the residents of Hartest. NHSE and the clinical commissioning group would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the Parish Council potential solutions to ensure sustainable primary care services for the local community.</p>	Noted	Paragraph 11.5 has been amend.
3	<p><b>Natural England</b> Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft NP however, we refer you to [Annex 1: Neighbourhood Planning and the Natural Environment information, issues and opportunities] which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a NP.</p>	Noted	None
4	<b>Historic England</b>	Noted	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	Unfortunately, owing to current staffing capacity we will be unable to comment. We enclose a copy of our NP advice [English Heritage - Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment] and would recommend that you consult the relevant conservation and archaeological specialists in your district and county councils. [7 references to additional advice are also given]		
5	<p><b>Anglian Water</b>            HAR 15 We note that this policy includes reference to Sustainable Drainage Systems [SUDs] which is supported. However, it is suggested that the wording should be strengthened to ensure that SUDs are utilised before considering discharging surface water into the public sewerage network, having considered the available alternatives as set out in Part H of Building Regulations. It is therefore suggested that the policy should be amended as follows:            ‘Applicants are strongly encouraged to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage systems such as green roofs in order to assist with the management of surface water run-off. Surface water disposal to the public sewerage network should only be considered where it has been demonstrated that there are no reasonable alternatives having followed surface water hierarchy.’</p>	Noted	Policy HAR15 (now HAR14) has been amended as requested.
5	<p><b>Anglian Water</b>            In addition, reference is made to sites being self sufficient only in those areas which have previously been subject to surface water flooding. It would be helpful to clarify to what extent surface water-run off would be restricted in sites outside the areas identified by the Environment Agency.</p>	Outside these areas it is expected that development would accord with the remainder of the Policy	None
7	<p><b>Suffolk Preservation Society</b>            We congratulate your group on a well put together document and therefore offer advice to maximise its effectiveness. If a district authority cannot demonstrate that at least a 5-year supply of housing land, then any policy within its local plan that restricts housing, such as those that protect locally valued open spaces and views, will be considered out of date and the presumption in</p>	Noted. A decision was taken at an early stage of preparing the Plan not to allocate sites for housing in the Plan.	None

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>favour of sustainable development, as set out in the NPPF applies. Currently Babergh District has found itself in this position. Your draft plan may already allocate sites for housing. However, if this is not the case then we recommend that you consult your NP advisor on this matter.</p> <p>Recent changes and appeal decisions may have significant implications for the effectiveness of NPs. It is important to consider this to safeguard your plan's policies and maximise the weight given to your plan within the planning process.</p>		
8	<p><b>Environment Agency</b>            You may find the following 2 documents useful [Building a Better Environment – Our role in development and how we can help] [Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning: Supplementary files]            Please also find attached our document [Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level]</p>	Noted	None
8	<p><b>Environment Agency</b>            Page 17 this identifies that there are areas of Flood Zone 3 beside the ordinary water course inside the Built Up Area Boundary. Any infill development within Flood Zone 3 must be supported by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and pass the Sequential and Exception Tests. This is demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime and not increase flood risk to any neighbouring sites.</p>	Noted	None
10	<p><b>Glemsford Surgery</b>            We feel obligated to inform you of some changes we have had to make to our surgery face-to-face consultation availability as result of long-term sickness of a practise nurse for over 14 months, and also as a result of an inability to recruit a new GP either salaried or partnered. We presently trying to manage as a 2-partner GP practice, when we have historically been a 3-partner surgery for many decades. This situation has forced use to think realistically about our capacity and our provision of face-to-face appointments. As such, we have had to reduce our face-to-face consultation availability to 2 mornings per week in Hartest and it has been zero appointment availability for nursing appointments there for 14 months to date.</p>	Noted	Paragraph 11.5 and Policy HAR17 (now HAR16) has been amended in accordance with request and in accordance with comments received from National Health Service England.

ID	Summary of Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Response	Amendments made to Draft Plan
	<p>Our patients have always had core hour access to our main surgery at Glemsford. This means from Monday to Friday, 8am to 6.30pm, and this remains the case. Many patients living and registered primarily at Hartest already happily, and often through choice, see our doctors at the Glemsford site.</p> <p>We wish to formerly object to this plan.</p> <p>[Further correspondence received] We do not wish for any restrictions to be placed on our business premises unilaterally, and without consultation.</p>		

The Hartest Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

October 2017