

Barrow cum Denham Neighbourhood Development Plan

Responses to the Examiner's Clarification Note. Barrow cum Denham Parish Council

Version 2

March 2025

Planning practice guidance (ID:41-009-20190509) advises that whilst a neighbourhood plan is not tested against the policies in an emerging local plan the reasoning and evidence informing the local plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested. In this context, the submitted Plan is largely silent on the well-advanced emerging Local Plan. It would be helpful if the Parish Council explains its approach to this matter.

The spatial strategy of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was conceived approximately three years ago and ratified in October 2022, at a time when the West Suffolk emerging Local Plan (eLP) was at an early stage in its development.

The single strategic site choice made by the Parish Council was independently considered at that time and not influenced by the site options at Bury Road selected in the eLP. The NP has therefore not sought to alter its preferred spatial strategy for Barrow to align with alternative site selections made in the emerging Local Plan (eLP) as that plan has evolved.

The NP meets all the relevant basic conditions when tested against the existing Development Plan. However, the evidence informing the eLP process indicates that additional housing growth of around 165 new homes is needed in Barrow during the plan period and the emerging NP responds to this as a relevant consideration, albeit with an alternative choice of strategic site location.

Is the development of the allocated site in the Plan intended to be in addition to the proposed housing allocations (AP24/25) in the emerging Local Plan or an alternative approach to the development of those sites?

During 2022, 2023 and 2024, the Parish Council sought to engage with West Suffolk Council (WSC) to encourage the harmonisation of the strategic draft residential allocation in the eLP with that of the emerging NP. The choice of strategic site location made under policy BCD2 is a local decision, which has been soundly considered, and the Parish Council hoped that this would be an influential factor in the choice of strategic site for Barrow in the eLP.

For the avoidance of doubt, the site shown in the eLP has always been intended to be the single strategic allocation for Barrow and was not purposely intended to be a site additional to the site now selected at Bury Road in the eLP. The fact that both draft allocations exist is more reflective of the desire of WSC to forge ahead with its own strategic site choice, in the knowledge that the Parish Council had selected an alternative site location in 2022.

In this context, do the Habitats Regulations Assessment (AECOM July 2024) and the Environmental Report (AECOM September 2024) address the impact of Policy BCD2 on protected sites, or the combined impact of Policy BCD2 (in the submitted Plan), and Policies AP24 and AP25 (in the emerging Local Plan) on protected sites?

The Parish Council has undertaken further discussions with AECOM and our Planning Consultants, and having regard to the Parish Council's response to the previous question, the Parish Council's position remains as consistently stated, i.e. that our site selection for the growth required in the emerging Local Plan (eLP) is a single site allocation for the village during the plan period, and is not intended to be in addition to West Suffolk's preferred site in their eLP.

Furthermore, it has been accepted and acknowledged by West Suffolk that the appropriate number of dwellings for Barrow in the new Local Plan period is only 165 new homes and not 330 new homes (this was also raised at the public examination into the West Suffolk eLP).

A primary consideration is that the eLP has not yet reached a stage where it can be adopted, and at the time of writing, the eLP is still undergoing public consultation (Main Modifications) until 15th April 2025. Whilst the Examination is at a relatively advanced stage, it is therefore far from being concluded and the public consultation on the extensive modifications proposed by the Council is still in progress.

The Schedule of main modifications proposed by West Suffolk Council runs to over 170 pages and there are modifications proposed to the majority of the policies found in the emerging Local Plan, some of which are significant and substantive changes, such as to Policy SP9 (Spatial Strategy) which is proposed to be almost completely reworded. As such, the consultation is not merely a final housekeeping exercise, as a number of significant main modifications are proposed, which are in turn, are likely to attract a significant scale of response, including from the Parish Council, who were participants in the examination.

It is therefore too early to presume that there are no remaining significant and unresolved objections, or that no new potential objections may arise to the emerging Local Plan as a consequence of the ongoing main modifications consultation. It is also important to note that the two Inspectors are active contributors to the final outcome of the main modifications process, as clarified by the 'Next Steps' letter sent to West Suffolk Council on 9th January 2025.

The letter indicated to the Council that the Inspectors were satisfied at this stage of the examination that the main modifications proposed by the Council in response to their various questions and action points were necessary to address soundness issues and will be effective in so doing, subject to any detailed changes that the Inspectors may wish to make, but was caveated as follows:

'However, this is without prejudice to our final conclusions which will ultimately be made having regard to representations in response to the forthcoming public consultation - in addition to all of the evidence currently before us'.

To summarise, a number of soundness issues have been raised by the participants during the examination process, which require main modifications, and the Inspectors consider that these issues are potentially capable of resolution, with the modifications proposed by the Council, subject to any detailed changes that the Inspectors also need to make.

However, the Inspectors are unequivocal in that these proposed main modifications, currently undergoing consultation, are not the end of the matter and that the Inspectors reserve their final judgement until they have had full regard to all of the representations received in 2025. Only at this point, can the Inspectors arrive at their final conclusions, having regard to these forthcoming responses to the proposed main modifications and the entirety of all of the examination evidence before them.

The sequence of events following the close of the current public consultation is also not completely guaranteed as the scope of work suggested by the Inspectors is extensive and likely to be very time consuming given the range and the scale of the modifications currently undergoing consultation.

In this regard the Inspectors have stated:

‘As soon as possible following the end of the consultation period, the Council should forward the representations to the Programme Officer along with a report listing all of the representations; a brief summary of the main issues raised; and the Council’s brief response to those main issues..... We will consider all of the representations, and the Council’s responses to them, before finalising our report’.

Whilst the letter states that it is not currently the Intention of the Inspectors to hold any further hearing sessions, this statement is however caveated as follows:

‘Unless we consider it essential to deal with substantial issues raised in representations about the proposed main modifications, or to ensure fairness’.

The conclusion to be drawn is that the outcome of the examination into the emerging West Suffolk Local Plan cannot be prejudged on the basis that some of the issues of soundness which have so far been identified in the emerging Local Plan may be capable of remedy, by way of the main modifications currently undergoing public consultation.

The eLP, whilst advancing through the statutory process of plan-making is clearly not yet at a stage where it is sound to rely upon its emerging local plan policies (including the proposed allocation at Bury Road) and afford them considerable weight. It is with these factors in mind that the HRA and Environmental reports we commissioned are therefore predicated only on the delivery of our preferred site and we do not consider it relevant to assess the potential cumulative effects of both sites (which we are strongly opposed too) until such time as the Inspectors examining the eLP have issued their Final Report into the soundness of the eLP.

Section 4 of the Environmental Report properly addresses reasonable alternatives to the approach taken in the Plan. I note the findings in Tables 4.2 to 4.9 and the summary in Table 4.10. However, the basis on which Option C has been selected is unclear both generally, and given the summary information presented in Table 4.10. It would be helpful if the Parish Council elaborated on the way in which it selected Option C in favour of Option B or Option E.

The preferred approach of the NP is summarised at pages 2 and 3 of the SEA (September 2024) prepared by AECOM. Option C was primarily selected because development at Barrow Hill would not give rise to any coalescence issues with other settlements, as would be more likely the case with a similar scale of development located at Bury Road, notably in relation to the relationship with Burthorpe to the east and the potential loss of settlement identity in this area.

The Parish Council also considered that there were sensitivities with other site options in terms of impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets, as these are more historic areas of the village. Finally, the Barrow Hill site location was chosen as it had accommodated a similar scale of new residential development in the recent past and so is an area of the Barrow, which is much less sensitive to new development change than other, more historic, locations in Barrow. The premise of the NP site selection is that larger scale development to the south of Barrow will ensure that the settlement identity and character of nearby Denham and Burthorpe will be protected from future erosion and coalescence.

- criterion iv comments about the delivery of a care home on the identified employment land. As described this approach seems contradictory. Please can the Parish Council explain its approach to this matter;
- does criterion vi relate to the details in paragraph BCD2.8? If so, how will the improvements anticipated be achieved where they would be located outside the allocated site?
- I understand the potential importance of criteria xi and xii. However, could they be repositioned into the supporting text as they explain how the policy would be implemented rather than being land use in their nature?

The Parish Council considers that the location of a new Care Home on the central spine of the overall scheme within the proposed linear employment area is positively considered, notably in terms of its central relationship with the rest of the residential allocation and attractive outlook to the south. Other forms of independent later living such as bungalows, would however not be located within the employment area. In this regard it is emphasised that the Parish Council does not envisage any significant industrial activity in this location, rather, the NP is supportive of modern, bespoke, business space (criterion v) to provide sustainable working opportunities within the NP Area.

The Parish Council also considers that a Care Home is an employment providing land-use in its own right, and the equal of many other types of employment use, in terms of the numbers of persons employed relative to the available floorspace. Finally, the nature of the jobs to be provided at a new Care Home are likely to be more locally sourced, which means that a good proportion of the new Care Home workers should be able to travel to the Site by sustainable transport means.

Criterion vi does relate to Paragraph BCD 2.8. the Parish Council envisages that the anticipated improvements can be funded by developer contributions and facilitated by the Parish Council in liaison with the County Council and other relevant stakeholders.

Criteria xi and xii were added to Policy BCD 2 following the Regulation 14 consultation in response to comments made by Natural England. Whilst the information is generally informative it is more transparent as part of the policy narrative.

It is agreed however that it is not strictly a delivery requirement, so the Parish Council would be prepared to modify this section to end the list of development criteria at x and combine points xi and xii into a general closing narrative.

I note the comments on the Plan from the site owners and Ceres Ltd. Is the Parish Council satisfied that the site is available for development and would be deliverable in the Plan period?

The Parish Council is confident that the site is immediately available for development and would be deliverable early in the NP period. To this end, the Parish Council have actively engaged with the Site owners and Ceres Ltd during the development of the NP.

Pursuant to this engagement, a Statement was signed on 17th May 2024 by all three landowners confirming agreement with the NP's Key Objectives and the policies relating to the draft allocation at Barrow Hill.

The landowners and Ceres have subsequently conducted a public consultation event in the village in 2025, which set out preliminary development proposals to inform a future planning application. Accordingly, the Parish Council is confident that the Site will be delivered at an early stage in the NP period, in accordance with the objectives and relevant policies of the Draft NP.

Policy BCD 3 - I am minded to recommend that the opening element is modified so that it requires compliance with the various criteria where they are relevant to the proposal concerned. Does the Parish Council have any observations on this proposition?

The Parish Council have no particular concerns with this proposition.

The final sentence of the policy does not have regard to national policy. Paragraph 84 of the NPPF identifies a series of development proposals which would be acceptable in the countryside. I am minded to recommend that this element is broadened to reflect national policy. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

The Parish Council have no particular concerns with this proposition, albeit noting that Paragraph 84 of the NPPF mainly relates to isolated homes in the Countryside.

The Parish Council generally considers that this part of the NPPF would still be a material consideration in decision-making, irrespective of whether this national policy reference was, or was not, expressly mentioned as part of this NP policy.

Policy BCD6 - This is a good policy on sustainable design and construction which has regard to Section 14 of the NPPF and the Written Ministerial Statement (Planning: Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update) of December 2023. I am minded to recommend that the second part of the policy should be applied proportionately to the scale and nature of the development proposals. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

The Parish Council see positive merit in the suggestion that this policy should be applied proportionately to the scale and nature of the development proposals under consideration. No objection.

Policy BCD7 - This is generally a good policy on employment uses. However, a series of detailed questions arise as follows:

- In i what would be appropriate and sustainable locations?

These are locations where the nature of the business proposed would not be likely to cause any unacceptable impacts, by reason of noise and disturbance, to existing residential amenity or unacceptable impacts upon the setting of existing heritage assets. Preferred locations will include those Sites which can access the existing services in the village by sustainable means.

- Does criterion ii bring any added value beyond the identified Local Plan policy?

The rational of this criterion is prevent employment uses being unnecessarily lost to new residential uses, when the NP has made adequate strategic provision for such uses over the NP period.

The Parish Council takes the point however that the direct reference to Policy DM30 does not particularly bring added value and that this aspect of the policy may therefore have more force if it were not linked with a policy which is likely to be superseded later in 2025.

- Will the approach taken in criterion iii still be relevant when the emerging Local Plan replaces the adopted Plan? Did the Plan consider the appropriateness of allocating the same sites in the submitted Plan?

As per the preceding response, the Parish Council is keen to prevent these employment uses not coming forward as intended and thereafter coming under pressure in the future for additional residential development.

The Parish Council therefore takes the view that if these historic allocation sites are retained as the village grows, that these sites are likely to be more viable in the future to attract further non-residential investment to Barrow.

- Should criteria iv and v be incorporated into Policy BCD2?

The Parish Council have no particular views on this proposition.

- Does the final sentence of criterion vi have regard to paragraphs 61 and 125 of the NPPF?

This sentence does have regard to paragraphs 61 and 125 of the NPPF. However, the relevant land in question for this criterion is not under-utilised or brownfield land and does not involve the repurposing of existing buildings.

It is arable land which has been allocated specifically for employment purposes and the above statement in relation to protecting such sites from future residential pressure, in circumstances where adequate strategic housing provision has been made, therefore applies.

This underpins the Parish Council's desired intentions to adequately provide for housing needs, whilst maintaining existing land allocations with longer term potential to attract future non-residential investment.

- does criterion vii intend to say that the Plan supports proposals for working from home?

This criterion is clear in that it supports remote working, as a strand of sustainability, by either working from home, including in circumstances where additional floorspace is needed, or in small new community hubs to promote social inclusion and integration.

- what is the purpose of criterion viii? Is it a land use policy?

This criterion seeks planning obligations from the Site Allocation made under BCD 2 to help further assist the delivery of employment and future investment in Barrow.

Policy BCD8 - This is a comprehensive policy on community facilities. I am minded to recommend that it is broken down into its separate sections. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition? What is the purpose of the paragraph on securing community funding? Is it a land use policy?

The Parish Council have no comments on the proposed restructuring of this policy, where this is deemed beneficial by the Examiner. The desire to secure community funding will enable the Parish Council to have a more direct and proactive role in facilitating new community investment in the Parish.

Examples of current and proposed initiatives to which such community funding would be directed include:

- Upgrading of the village Skatepark
- Protecting public grassed areas from vehicles
- Fencing around allotments to protect from deer
- Resurfacing village pathways

Is paragraph BCD9.1 the driving force behind the need for this policy? If so, is it appropriate for the Plan directly or indirectly to support the development of BCD2 for residential and employment uses if it is anticipated that it will not be able to accommodate its recreational needs on the allocated site?

If this is not the driving force behind the policy, is it anticipated that proposals for large scale sporting and recreational facilities will come forward in the Plan period? What is the purpose of criterion vii?

For the avoidance of doubt, the development proposed under Policy BCD2 will be expected to deliver the required quantum of public open space, as set out in relevant guidance at the time of determination sufficient to meet all of its own recreational needs, within the boundaries of the allocation site.

However, the Parish Council have identified a need for additional strategic recreational provision for more organised sporting activity, which is unlikely to be able to be accommodated on the BCD2 site in circumstances where the open space requirement for Site BCD2 has already been met.

Accordingly, Policy BCD9 supports the principle of new development proposals for larger scale sporting and recreational needs, outside of the defined settlement boundaries, coming forward where this will result in further positive investment in the Parish and the balance of any additional sporting benefits provided clearly outweighs any harm to the character and setting of the site in question.

Policy BCD10 - The policy takes a positive approach towards ecology and the natural environment. I am minded to recommend that the final part of the policy should be applied proportionately to the scale and nature of the development proposals. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

The Parish Council see positive merit in the suggestion that this policy should be applied proportionately to the scale and nature of the development proposals under consideration and have no objection.

Policy BCD11 - The policy takes an appropriate approach towards local heritage assets However does it bring any added value beyond national and local policies? Does the final section of the policy relate to major development? Should it be applied proportionately?

This policy is conceived with major development in mind, however it is agreed that it should be applied proportionately. The general approach taken by this policy reflects the consultation comments received from Historic England, which mirrors national guidance. It is noted in this regard that the NPPF reference, relating to the public benefit test, is however now out of date and should be changed to **Paragraph 215**.

Does the opening element of the monitoring and review section suggest that the Parish Council is intending to undertake a review of any made Plan following the adoption of the West Suffolk Local Plan?

The Parish Council has no current plans to immediately review the NP following the adoption of the West Suffolk Local Plan in 2025/26. However, the NP will be periodically reviewed, notably to reflect the fact that West Suffolk have committed to an immediate and early review of the eLP following its adoption.

Parish Council Comments on Representations to the Neighbourhood Plan

Bloor Homes Eastern

The comments from Bloor Homes mainly focus on the Parish Council's site-selection process (which is addressed at Page 9 below) and the assessment of Site BD13 in the SEA.

This assessment of Site BD13 is currently being reviewed in liaison with AECOM and we refer to our response above, pages 2-4.

Phizacklea, Stanton and Steer

These are supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan and so we have no comments.

Fleur Homes

Fleur Homes made a presentation at a Parish Council meeting, circa 2021, which was before the final housing requirement for Barrow during the plan period had been confirmed to the Parish by West Suffolk Council, which did not occur until April 2022.

In the interim, the site Fleur Homes were promoting, known as BD5 (located north of the village) had been deferred from further consideration by West Suffolk Council on the grounds that it was not adjacent to the settlement boundary and concerns over its proximity to nearby Historic monuments.

As there were other suitable sites to assess, which had not been deferred by West Suffolk Council, the Parish Council did not consider it necessary to take forward BD5 in our own assessment. The Parish Council also received no further representation from Fleur until 3 months after the Parish Council had selected their preferred site.

Suffolk County Council

The Parish Council considers that we have incorporated the policy changes suggested by the statutory bodies from the Regulation 14 consultation.

We have detailed in our Consultation Report, dated October 2024 the process, feedback, and how we responded, together with a schedule detailing the main modifications. All responses can be seen on the dedicated website referred to in the Consultation report. This document is included as our Regulation 16 submission draft.

As such, it would be helpful if SCC could detail the specific recommendations provided to the Parish Council that they believe have not been considered.

Ceres Property

There comments are supportive of the NP so we have no further comment.

Sport England

The responses of Sport England to the NP are noted, however they are generic statements, and no comments have been made on individual policies in the NP, as far as we are aware.

Several objections to the Plan have been received from parishioners. They raise overlapping issues. It would be helpful if the Parish Council responded to the following issues raised in these objections:

- **the location of the proposed allocation and its accessibility to the A14.**

We acknowledge that there will be an increase in traffic, irrespective of which option is finally approved. For traffic wishing to access the A14 from Bury Rd will need to travel via the Street, as will traffic from Barrow Hill. Whilst it is true that traffic travelling to Bury from the Bury Road site will not need to pass through the village, however, traffic from Barrow Hill can gain access to Bury Rd by turning right past the Green, without needing to pass particular pinch points around the shop/Post Office.

- **the site selection process.**

The Parish Council completed a call for sites in October 2020, from which 15 sites were assessed and 7 were identified as appropriate locations for consideration. (sites listed in Table NTS1 on page vi, of AECOM's Strategic Environmental Assessment dated September 2024).

As stated above, sites which were deemed not suitable or had been deferred by West Suffolk Council were not considered. One site (for one dwelling) had been subsequently delivered; one further site was excluded due to its relatively small size plus its location within Burthorpe (see page vii of above report)

The SEA process assessed a number of spatial options which are listed as Option A, B etc on page viii of the SEA report dated September 2024. During this period up to August 2022 (and beyond) landowners/developers presented their initial proposals at Parish Council meetings.

During 2021, the Parish Council engaged with West Suffolk, specifically around the housing numbers we would need to accommodate; this they were unable to confirm, and meetings were re-scheduled by West Suffolk with a date being finally agreed for 26th of April 2022.

It was with total surprise that the Parish Council learned from the Bury Free Press newspaper on the 22nd of April 2022 that West Suffolk announced the housing numbers that Barrow would need to accommodate, together with the Council's own preferred site option.

Whilst we objected to this process and disagreed with their site selection, subsequent meetings were conducted and the Parish Council were under the impression that if we accepted the numbers, in principle, then we could select the sites we preferred, providing they met the necessary criteria. This has proved not to be case, hence our NP not being in harmony with West Suffolk's eLP.

Chronologically, our NP sub-committee of the steering group held a meeting (in public) on the 25th of August 2022 to discuss the West Suffolk preferred site option and our own preference, together with the housing number being imposed upon us. On the 20th of September 2022, the Working party of the NP met with the Landowners of Barrow Hill and Bloor (Bury Rd site) to discuss their proposals.

An Extraordinary Parish Council meeting was held on the 18th of October 2022 to discuss and agree, (a) Housing numbers, (b) Site selection. It was agreed to accept the housing number of 170 (subsequently reduced to 165) and the Barrow Hill site was voted as our preference.

We wish to clarify that as we have over-delivered by some 77 dwellings as part of the 2031 Plan, and it was expected that we would need to accommodate a further 77, as stated by AECOM in their report dated September 2021. The West part of the Bury Road site was assessed with this number in mind (subsequent reports also shows this on plan).

Our reasons for our site selection and objections to West Suffolk's site preference are as set out above and detailed on page iii in the SEA report dated September 2024.

As an aside, we have noted that some residents commented on the fact that from the 2020 Questionnaire (Q32) there was a preference for development to take place to the North of the village (54.7% of respondents), which as stated above, this site was deferred. The area of the village that was considered as a second preference under the same question was Barrow Hill. It is notable that in AECOM's report (January 2024) for the eLP it states that both site options are 'evenly balanced'.

'Barrow – the Council's emerging proposed approach (allocation of Land South of Bury Road, to the north- east of the village, plus a small site to the west) is judged to be preferable to the alternative approach proposed by the Parish Council's Draft

Neighbourhood Plan (2023) in transport, landscape and biodiversity terms; however, there is a historic environment argument in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan approach. Overall, it appears that matters are quite finely balanced, when looking at these two options’.

- **the factual details in the environmental report on the Bury Road site.**

The Parish Council have no comments to make in relation to the accuracy of the Environmental Report.

- **the lack of evidence about the delivery of the overall proposed allocated site from the various landowners.**

As stated above, the three landowners of our preferred Site have all signed a Landowners Statement which agrees with our Neighbourhood Plan policies. They have conducted Public Consultation events (independent of the Parish Council) at which they presented their proposals, the most recent was held on the 12th February 2025. This demonstrates their commitment to deliver the Site in line with the NP policy objective.

- **the sustainability of the employment element of the proposed allocation.**

As stated above, the location of this site offers the opportunity for modern bespoke employment opportunities, which are accessible to local residents to access via sustainable modes.

- **the inclusion of a care home within the allocation.**

See our response above regarding the suitability of co-locating a Care Home with other suitable employment generating land uses.

The demographic within our community has some 25% of residents over the age of 65 (as per our resident questionnaire 2020) which is likely to increase in the future, which is higher than the national average.

With the known pressures that the NHS are under, particularly with the lack of facilities available for elderly people to be discharged from hospital when able to do so, we believe this is an issue that needs to be addressed, particularly as our community expands.

In addition, there will be elderly residents who have lived in the village for most of their lives and will wish to remain in a community they know. Hence our inclusion of a Community Care home in our NP.

- **the lack of clarity on the purpose of the proposed Community Fund.**

Despite delivering some 200 dwellings over the past few years, our community has not benefited from these developments, other than via very limited S106 contributions. Our NP objective is quite simply to secure funding to finance projects (examples given above) within the Parish that will benefit the whole community.

The landowners (who are local) have agreed to this and we have a commitment from them to provide £500k for the fund, on the basis that our NP passes referendum, that planning permission is granted, and that the dwellings are sold.

It is our intention that the fund is administered by the Parish Council, via a sub-committee (which can include members of the public with relevant experience). We have sought advice from West Suffolk Council, who have referred us to Suffolk Association of Local Councils (SALC) and we are currently awaiting their response.

This fund is in addition to the normal S106 obligations, which would be paid in the usual way.

- **the way in which the Parish Council consulted with statutory bodies.**

The Parish Council consulted with the following bodies, to whom we sent our Regulation 14 Pre-consultation Draft of the NP and from whom responses were received (unless otherwise indicated).

- West Suffolk Council
- Historic England
- Natural England
- The Environment Agency
- Guildhall and Barrow Surgery
- The Homes and Communities Agency (no response received)

Suffolk County Council (We initially, inadvertently failed to send the NP to them, however this was corrected, and response was received).

With regard to utilities (Water/Electric) we contacted them however their involvement would take place at time of planning applications made by the developers.

West Suffolk Council make a series of comments and suggested changes on the Plan. The Parish Council's responses to the representation would be helpful.

Please see our responses above, on pages 2-4, in relation to the weight to be given to the eLP at this time, and our general approach to the assessment of cumulative effects.