

## Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 16) Submission Responses October 2024

<b>Respondent Name</b>	. . (Persimmon Homes (Suffolk) Ltd)
<b>Agent Name</b>	Nicky Parsons (Pegasus Group)
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text						
02 Local context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These representations are made to the ‘Regulation 16’ Submission Consultation on the Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan (2021 – 2040) on behalf of Persimmon Homes. Details of Persimmon’s interests at Land off Crown Lane, Ixworth and the rationale behind promotion of this site have been set out in previous representations to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, which should be referred to. Persimmon is encouraged to note that comments made to the previous consultation have been considered and some amends made to the Ixworth Neighbourhood Plan Submission (‘the Plan’). Persimmon considers that the Plan would benefit from minor modifications to ensure the relevant Basic Conditions are met.</li> <li>• The update of the <i>Development in the planning pipeline</i> sub-section to paragraph 2.17 confirming the continued allocation of the site in the emerging Local Plan (under a single allocation Policy AP30) is noted. The emerging Local Plan has now been submitted for Examination (Regulation 22) and Persimmon continues to support the allocation of the site for the delivery of new homes.</li> <li>• Paragraph 2.18 states ‘<i>Access to the developments shown on Map 3 [i.e. allocations RV12(b) and RV12(c)] has been a cause for dispute between the developer and local authorities and there has been a long delay to development as a result.</i>’ This is not accurate. As confirmed in our June 2023 representations, planning permission has been obtained for a vehicular access from the A1088, and the access has been implemented by Persimmon.</li> </ul>						
04 Spatial Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of the reference to the allocation of the site in the emerging West Suffolk Local Plan at paragraph 4.3 is again welcomed. For consistency with Policy AP30 (which is not directly referenced in the Plan), paragraph 4.3 should note that the capacity of the allocation is stated as being ‘around’ 145 dwellings in AP30. Persimmon maintain that the site is capable of accommodating a greater number of dwellings, which would make effective use of the site while remaining in full compliance with relevant development plan policies.</li> <li>• Criterion A of Policy IXW1 currently states:  <i>Development proposals within the settlement boundary <u>or on further site allocations</u> will be supported subject to compliance with the other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></li> <li>• The inclusion of the underlined words is new. It is not clear what further allocations this refers to, nor why it is necessary to include this wording. This could also be in conflict with the basic condition which requires general compliance with the development plan. It is recommended that this wording is deleted.</li> <li>• The wording in criterion B(c) continues to refer to ‘high quality’ buildings. The Consultation Statement (June 2024) notes Persimmon comment about ‘high quality’ being a subjective term, but concludes that an amendment is not required. Persimmon maintains that IXW3 is a robust design policy which negates the need for criterion B(c).</li> </ul>						
07 Movement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wording of Policy IXW8, criterion D remains unchanged. Persimmon acknowledges that this infrastructure would be strongly supported by the Parish Council, although evidence has not been provided about wider support for a footbridge nor for the need for a crossing. Persimmon’s previous comments therefore remain valid.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Policy/Area</th> <th>Included in 2023 Reps?</th> <th>Changes Made</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>IXW1</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>                     Reference to RV12 removed entirely – including the reference to Langridge and land at Dairy Farm.                       Criterion C(a) has become B(a) – unchanged content                       Criterion C(b) has become B (b) – virtually unchanged but added reference to a pedestrian footbridge over the A143 and pedestrian movement contributions. <b>Wording remains contribute proportionately as necessary and appropriate towards key infrastructure.</b>                       Criterion C(c) has become B (b) – unchanged content, still subjective language. NPPF's removal of 'beauty' and move away from the ambiguous and subjective language could provide more of a rebuttal to this.                 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Policy/Area	Included in 2023 Reps?	Changes Made	IXW1	Yes	Reference to RV12 removed entirely – including the reference to Langridge and land at Dairy Farm.  Criterion C(a) has become B(a) – unchanged content  Criterion C(b) has become B (b) – virtually unchanged but added reference to a pedestrian footbridge over the A143 and pedestrian movement contributions. <b>Wording remains contribute proportionately as necessary and appropriate towards key infrastructure.</b>  Criterion C(c) has become B (b) – unchanged content, still subjective language. NPPF's removal of 'beauty' and move away from the ambiguous and subjective language could provide more of a rebuttal to this.
Policy/Area	Included in 2023 Reps?	Changes Made					
IXW1	Yes	Reference to RV12 removed entirely – including the reference to Langridge and land at Dairy Farm.  Criterion C(a) has become B(a) – unchanged content  Criterion C(b) has become B (b) – virtually unchanged but added reference to a pedestrian footbridge over the A143 and pedestrian movement contributions. <b>Wording remains contribute proportionately as necessary and appropriate towards key infrastructure.</b>  Criterion C(c) has become B (b) – unchanged content, still subjective language. NPPF's removal of 'beauty' and move away from the ambiguous and subjective language could provide more of a rebuttal to this.					

Question Number	User Response: Text		
IXW2	Yes	<p>Criterion A – unchanged text. Still relying on the 2019 survey.</p> <p>Criterion B removed entirely including references to Policy CS5.</p> <p>Criterion C has become B – text changed to remove reference to the percentage of M4(2) dwellings to respond to comments raised re: viability of such requirements.</p>	
IXW3	-	IXW3 mostly unchanged.	
IXW4	Yes	<p>IXW4 A(e) has been strengthened to introduce a 100l of water/day consumption target – <b>but wording changed to include ‘encouraged’. eLP also currently requires 100l/p/d.</b></p> <p>IXW4 B has been expanded, to include reference to renewable schemes (versus community energy schemes in the previous draft)</p> <p>IXW4 C now references the Environment Act but is substantially unchanged.</p> <p>IXW4 D retains the wording from the previous draft. No additional explanation is given. <b>Supporting text confirms raised planting beds (50m2) or similar would be sufficient.</b></p>	
IXW5	Yes	The same points apply re: refurbishment of the existing hall. The need to move is alluded to through the poor condition of the existing facilities, and the lack of ability to provide additional services (proposals to expand were not received warmly in 2017).	
IXW6	-	IXW6 (village centre substantially unchanged)	
IXW7	-	Reference removed to delivery on-site in IXW7(b) and replaced with S106/CIL contribution only	
IXW8	Yes	<p>(a) now references the Suffolk Design Guide 2022 in prioritising pedestrian/cycle movements</p> <p>(b) removes reference to IXW12</p> <p>(d) Wording of Criterion D unchanged – still does not reflect RV12 allocation wording. Retains reference to footbridge</p>	
IXW9	-	Introduced references to residential and public cycle parking provision in part (b) including the need to provide secure and accessible cycle parking in accordance with the adopted parking guidance.	
IXW10	-	Unchanged	
IXW11	-	(c) changed to state preference is for SuDS to return water to the aquifer. <b>Wording confirms this is something that ‘should’ be done ‘where possible.</b>	
Section 9 – Site Allocation – Land at the Langridge and Dairy Farm	-	Deleted along with IXW12	
Policies Map	Yes	<p>Removed IXW13 western extent.</p> <p>Removed IXW12</p> <p>Annotated Crown Lane allocation from emerging Local Plan.</p>	

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Dr Stephen Mann (Jiggins memorial Village Hall and playing field CIO)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
06 Community facilities and Ixworth High Street	<p>Submission of the Jiggins Trustees on the Ixworth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The Jiggins Memorial Hall and Playing Field Trust is a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO No 1179584). It owns and runs Ixworth Village Hall and playing field for the benefit of Ixworth Residents and as such is governed by the Charity Commission.</p> <p>In the section of the West Suffolk Local Plan (WSLP) for Ixworth an area to west of Bardwell Road is presented as an area for potential development: Policy AP29. The following are the appropriate sections of the West Suffolk Local Plan</p> <p>“5.8.9. The site has been identified in the Ixworth Neighbourhood Plan which was subject to pre-submission consultation (regulation 14) from May to July 2023. The allocation seeks to bring forward a comprehensive approach to the delivery of mixed-use development on the site, to include housing, retail and community facilities”.</p> <p>“5.8.10. The site boundary and indicative capacity in this plan differs to that proposed in the neighbourhood plan to ensure that an area of surface water flood risk is avoided to the west”.</p> <p>During the regulation 14 consultation of the Ixworth Neighbourhood Plan (INP) no objections were received to the concept of retail and community facilities as a part of the site identified as AP29 in the WSLP. However, since the regulation 14 consultation this site has been removed from the Ixworth Neighbourhood Plan. Now making the INP inconsistent with the West Suffolk plan.</p> <p>The Jiggins Trust has an interest in a new village hall and welcomes the statement in the Ixworth Neighbourhood Policy plan IXW5 (c) for the subsequent reuse of the existing village hall should a new village hall come to fruition.</p> <p>Ixworth NP policy IXW5“C. If a new Village Hall is provided in Ixworth Village, then the re-use of the existing facility for activities which enhance the function of Ixworth Village Centre will be strongly supported. This includes office, retail and community uses (provided they do not compete with the facilities offered at the new Village Hall) and employment/meeting space”.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is the opinion of the Trustees that the INP is now inconsistent with the WSLP. However, the INP could be improved and made consistent with the WSLP were an additional clause or clauses to be added to the INP Policy IXW5. Such clauses would mirror the comments in the WS local plan in identifying a part of the Langridge site to the northeast end of the site adjacent to the Bardwell Rd as a suitable site for a new village hall and retail facility. This area is currently occupied by redundant old agricultural buildings.</p> <p>In retrospect the Jiggins trustees also think that the INP item 6.4 is ambiguous and misleading. Following on from 6.3 with its references to the Seckford Educational Trust it might appear that the “Trust” said to be looking for a new site for the village hall is the Seckford Educational Trust rather than the Jiggins Memorial Village Hall CIO. This should be made clear.</p> <p>We would, therefore, like to suggest such amendments.</p> <p>For the Jiggins Trustees Chairman.....</p>

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Miss Georgia Teague (Suffolk County Council)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
0 Issued identified by the parish council and addressed in the plan	See attached
01 Introduction	See attached
02 Local context	See attached
03 Vision and objectives	See attached
04 Spatial Strategy	See attached
05 Housing	See attached

Question Number	User Response: Text
06 Community facilities and Ixworth High Street	See attached
07 Movement	See attached
08 Environment	See attached
09 Non-policy actions	See attached
10 Policies map	See attached
Appendix A: Local green spaces	See attached

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Mr Andrew Fillmore (Pigeon Investment Management Limited)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
0 Issued identified by the parish council and addressed in the plan	Please see supporting statement for the representations on behalf of Pigeon.
01 Introduction	Please see supporting statement.
02 Local context	Please see supporting statement.
03 Vision and objectives	Please see supporting statement.
04 Spatial Strategy	Please see supporting statement.
05 Housing	Please see supporting statement.
06 Community facilities and Ixworth High Street	Please see supporting statement.
07 Movement	Please see supporting statement.
08 Environment	Please see supporting statement.
09 Non-policy actions	Please see supporting statement.
10 Policies map	Please see supporting statement.
Appendix A: Local green spaces	Please see supporting statement.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Mr Michael Priaulx (Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
08 Environment	<p>In summary, the Environment section is very welcome, but please consider building-dependent wildlife such as red-listed bird species which inhabit buildings in Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe.</p> <p>Therefore, please add: Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in new developments including extensions, in accordance with best practice guidance such as BS 42021 or CIEEM. Artificial nest cups for house martins may be proposed instead of swift bricks where recommended by an ecologist.</p> <p>Also please add: Existing nest sites for building-dependent species such as swifts and house martins should be protected, as these endangered red-listed species which are present but declining in Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe return annually to traditional nest sites. Mitigation should be provided if these nest sites cannot be protected.</p> <p>In more detail for supporting evidence, the reason for this is that nest sites in buildings and bird boxes/ bricks and other species features are excluded from the DEFRA Biodiversity Net Gain metric, so require their own clear policy.</p> <p>The Government's response in March 2023 to the 2022 BNG consultation stated that: "We plan to keep species features, like bat and bird boxes, outside the scope of the biodiversity metric... [and] allow local planning authorities to consider what conditions in relation to those features may be appropriate" (page 27, <a href="https://consult.defra.gov.uk/defra-net-gain-consultation-team/technicalconsultation_biodiversitymetric/">https://consult.defra.gov.uk/defra-net-gain-consultation-team/technicalconsultation_biodiversitymetric/</a>).</p> <p>Swift bricks are the only type of bird box specifically mentioned as valuable to wildlife in national planning guidance, along with bat boxes and hedgehog highways (NPPG Natural Environment 2019 paragraph 023). The National Model Design Code Part 2 Guidance Notes (2021) also recommends bird bricks (Integrating Habitats section on page 25, and Creating Habitats section on page 26).</p> <p>Swift bricks are considered a universal nest brick suitable for a wide range of small bird species including swifts, house sparrows and starlings (e.g. see NHBC Foundation: Biodiversity in New Housing Developments (April 2021) Section 8.1 Nest sites for birds, page 42: <a href="https://www.nhbcfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/S067-NF89-Biodiversity-in-new-housing-developments_FINAL.pdf">https://www.nhbcfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/S067-NF89-Biodiversity-in-new-housing-developments_FINAL.pdf</a>).</p> <p>Therefore, swift bricks should be included in all developments following best-practice guidance (which is available in BS 42021:2022 and from CIEEM ( <a href="https://cieem.net/resource/the-swift-a-bird-you-need-to-help/">https://cieem.net/resource/the-swift-a-bird-you-need-to-help/</a>)).</p> <p>Many local authorities are including detailed swift brick requirements in their plans, such as Wiltshire Local Plan Regulation 19 stage, which requires an enhanced number of 2 swift bricks per dwelling (policy 88: Biodiversity in the built environment, page 246 - "As a minimum, the following are required within new proposals: 1. integrate integral bird nest bricks (e.g., swift bricks) at a minimum of two per dwelling;" <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/8048/Current-consultation-Reg-19">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/8048/Current-consultation-Reg-19</a> ),</p> <p>which follows the exemplary swift brick guidance implemented by Brighton &amp; Hove since 2020,</p>

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Mr Nicholas Cross (S W Cross & Sons Ltd)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
07 Movement	<p>Paragraph 7.7: footpaths Paragraph 7.8: Map 5</p> <p>As the landowner, S W Cross and Sons would like to make clear that we did not offer all the walking routes referred to in paragraph 7.7 and indicated in Map 5 for the development of the Langridge as proposed through the West Suffolk emerging Local Plan, specially those north of the A1088 and the footpath across the meadow.</p> <p>The offer was made in connection with a significantly larger scheme incorporating what is currently a working farm, utilising a tunnel under the A1088 used for livestock, which was subsequently withdrawn by the Parish Council in January 2024.</p> <p>Whilst the farm remains a working farm with livestock and machinery, footpaths in this area will not be put forward. However, the proposed circular walking routes referred to in paragraph 7.7 to the west of the village, including the walk along the river, as well as the walking/ cycling route along the Langridge track, will be offered in support of the Langridge scheme as proposed through the West Suffolk emerging Local Plan. For the above reasons, we request that paragraph 7.7 is removed or amended accordingly.</p>

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Mrs Carry Murphy (Anglian Water)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
01 Introduction	<p>Dear Sir/ Madam,</p> <p>Anglian Water has previously submitted comments on the pre-submission version (Reg 14) of the Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe neighbourhood plan. We welcome the amendments in the submission version of the neighbourhood plan, following our comments and recommended changes. We also note the deletion of the housing allocation under PolicyIXW12: Land at the Langridge &amp; Dairy Farm which we had made representations on regarding water mains and wastewater assets within the proposed site.</p> <p>I can confirm, Anglian Water has no further comments to make and wish the neighbourhood plan group every success in taking this forward.</p> <p>I should be grateful if you could please acknowledge receipt of this representation and keep me updated on further progress made on the neighbourhood plan. Please note we are now using a team email address for neighbourhood plan correspondence and I should be grateful if you could please update your records as necessary – <a href="mailto:strategicgrowth@anglian.water.co.uk">strategicgrowth@anglian.water.co.uk</a>. Thank you.</p>

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Mrs Kelly Alsawaf
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
06 Community facilities and Ixworth High Street	The bus service is appalling particularly the school one which cannot accommodate the children already in the village. The high school is oversubscribed. There needs to be more incentives to bring shops/ businesses to the village. There is not enough recreational space.
08 Environment	Vegetation is overgrown everywhere and when it is cut back it is to a minimum and cuttings are left to be blown back across pavements (often there is only one pavement on one side of the road) and pierce dogs paws or block drains which are often already not fit for purpose, such as Walsham rd. which repeated floods. Roads are narrow and struggle under current population. There are frequent power cuts due to old system. Internet speed is too slow. Weeds growing out of pavement making it difficult for people with mobility or sight issues to navigate.
Appendix A: Local green spaces	There are not enough green spaces in Ixworth or safe walking routes.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Parish Clerk (Bardwell Parish Council)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
01 Introduction	Whilst having no specific comments to add to the individual sections, Bardwell Parish Council supports the Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Planning Central (Sport England)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
01 Introduction	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Government planning policy, within the <b>National Planning Policy Framework</b> (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>Therefore, it is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 102 and 103. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in <b>protecting playing fields</b> and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.</p> <p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</a></p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on <b>developing planning policy</b> for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.</p> <p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</a></p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 103 of the NPPF, this takes the form of <b>assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities</b>. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance">http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</a></p> <p>If <b>new or improved sports facilities</b> are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p> <p>Any <b>new housing</b> developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how <b>any new development</b>, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</a></p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</a></p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a></p> <p><i>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</i></p>

Question Number	User Response: Text
	If you need any further advice, please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Planning East of England (National Highways)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
01 Introduction	See attached

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Suffolk County Council (Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
01 Introduction	<p>Good Morning,</p> <p>The Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service (SCCAS) has received an invite to comment on the Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan Submission (Reg 16) consultation.</p> <p>We submitted comments at Reg 14 and cannot see that these have been addressed, namely that the neighbourhood plan does not consider archaeology/historic environment in any detail beyond the historic background in chapter 2.</p> <p>This area is rich in heritage assets both below and above ground, designated and non-designated. A Scheduled Monument is present on the edge of Ixworth within the NP area representing the site of a Roman Villa (National Ref.1006047). In addition, a known Roman Road recorded on the Suffolk HER as SUF 098 runs into the centre of Ixworth. These heritage assets are directly related to a large Roman settlement, part of which is Scheduled (Ref.1006019), located just south of the parish border for Ixworth (see HER number PKM 007). Together this evidence identifies Ixworth as an important and substantial Roman settlement in West Suffolk. A further significant heritage asset is the Medieval Ixworth Priory (HER number IXW 012) and Saxon burials have also been identified within the NP area (IXW 005). In addition, there are 71 Listed Buildings within the NP area. It is important the NP considers the significance of the heritage of the area and actively seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment.</p> <p>SCCAS would encourage the addition of a chapter regarding the Historic Environment and built heritage of the parish, which could include details of currently recorded finds and monuments in the parish (both designated and non-designated) with information from the Historic Environment Record (HER) and reproduced on a map in the same way that green spaces have been presented. More information can be found on the HER and contact details can be found here. Information on the HER can be also seen on the Suffolk Heritage Explorer here <a href="https://heritage.suffolk.gov.uk/map">https://heritage.suffolk.gov.uk/map</a>.</p> <p>In addition to this, I would also encourage the addition of a note to the NP relating to archaeology in development, something along the lines of:</p> <p><i>“Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) manages the Historic Environment Record (HER) for the county, which holds numerous records for the parishes build and below ground heritage, as well as evidence of historic settlement and other cultural activity. Non-designated archaeological heritage assets would be managed in development through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). SCCAS advises that there should be early consultation of the HER and assessment of the archaeological potential of the area is undertaken at an appropriate stage in the design of new developments, in order that the requirements of the NPPF, and West Suffolk Local Plan are met. As the District Council archaeological advisor, SCCAS would be happy to advise on the level of assessment and appropriate stages to be undertaken.”</i></p> <p>Having this statement in the NP would give clarity to developers of future sites, and is an aspiration of the adopted Rural vision 2031 Plan – Aspiration 31e. The NP could also highlight a level of outreach and public engagement that might be aspired to from archaeology undertaken as part of a development project. Increased public understanding of heritage assets is an aspiration of the NPPF, and provision in project designs for outreach and engagement are welcomed.</p> <p>This addition would bring the Neighbourhood Plan in line with NPPF chapter 16 paragraph 196 and Policy DM20 of the Forest Heath and St Edmunds Bury Local Plan Joint Management Policies Document (JMPD 2015). In addition, the NP group might also want to consider Policy DM15 of the JMPD as there are a large number of listed buildings within the area. The emerging West Suffolk Local Plan (draft January 2024) also includes policies for the</p>

Question Number	User Response: Text
	Historic Environment and archaeology namely SP14 and LP55.  Do please let me know if you have any questions.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	West Suffolk Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Link</b>	<a href="#">View Response</a>

Question Number	User Response: Text
01 Introduction	<p>Please find below an officer response to the Submission Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of the Local Planning Authority (LPA).</p> <p>The comments have been provided to assist the examination of the plan focusing on the content and wording of the proposed policies and proposes amendments or raise issues that we suggest will require consideration during the examination.</p> <p>At the submission plan stage comments are invited regarding whether the ‘plan proposal’, fulfils the ‘basic conditions’, as required by Paragraph 8, Schedule 4B Town and Country Planning Act (as varied by s38C Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended). These require that the plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has regard to national policy and guidance from the Secretary of State;</li> <li>1. Contributes to sustainable development;</li> <li>1. Is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area or any part of that area;</li> <li>1. Does not breach or is otherwise compatible with EU obligations – this includes the SEA Directive of 2001/42/EC; and that</li> <li>2. The making of the Neighbourhood Plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species regulations 2010(d), either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.</li> </ol> <p>As part of the formal submission of the Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan a Basic Conditions statement was submitted in order to demonstrate that the basic conditions have been met. An analysis of the statement alongside the plan has been undertaken by officers and it is considered that the Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan complies with the requirements of the basic conditions as set out in Paragraph 8(1)(a) of Schedule 4B of the Act.</p> <p>Overall, the plan appears to have taken into account the concerns of the community, is well written and contains a comprehensive range of policies and guidance which will help to guide development and protect the character and setting of the neighbourhood area and its community facilities.</p> <p>If you have any queries about the council’s comments which are outlined in the table below, please do not hesitate to contact planning policy.</p>

Report run at 7 Oct 2024 14:41:10. Total records: 39