

SUFFOLK COASTAL LOCAL PLAN SECOND ALTERATION – SUMMARY OF ALL REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

Reference Number	Nature of Representation	Name of representation	Representation Comments	Council's Response
MOD 01	Object	Framlingham Properties Limited C/o Roger Bullworthy Associates	Objecting to M4 on the grounds that paragraph 23 is contrary to Circular 6/98. SCDC should revert back to original wording in 2 nd Alteration document May 2004.	Raises no new issues not already considered at the public inquiry and by the Council in response to the Inspector's report. M4 is in direct response to the inspector's recommendation and the reasoning has been explained in the Modifications document. It defines affordable housing in the local context.
MOD 02	Object	Framlingham Properties Limited C/o Roger Bullworthy Associates	Objecting to L2. Thresholds are likely to reduce number of dwellings built and therefore reduce housing provision overall. Thresholds appear to be set in a manner aimed at increasing cash payments in lieu of affordable housing. Amount of affordable housing should be determined on suitability of the site.	Raises no new issues not already considered at the public inquiry and by the Council in response to the Inspector's report. Justification for the proposed thresholds is explained in the Modification document. Attention is also drawn to the need to assess the number of affordable units against the economics of provision.
MOD 03	Support	Felixstowe Town Council	Fully supportive of the proposed Modifications	Noted

MOD 04	Support	Suffolk ACRE	Fully supportive of L1. Exception policy for Woodbridge should provide good opportunities for affordable housing in the future, as town boundary is very tight.	Noted
MOD 05	Support	Suffolk ACRE	Fully supportive of L2 thresholds. Very few large developments are built in villages so Inspector's recommendation is unreasonable	Noted
MOD 06	Object	Mr J Clark – Waldringfield Resident	The inspector's figure of a need for 13 affordable units in Waldringfield is erroneous.	It is recognised that there is an error in the Inspector's report – the local needs survey identified a need for 10 not 13 units. This does not in itself justify further Modifications or a second public inquiry.
MOD 07	Support	Yoxford Parish Council	Strongly support modifications. Yoxford has sought to increase affordable housing in village but this has proved difficult. Thresholds recommended by the Inspector would make development very difficult.	Noted
MOD 08	Support	Wickham Market Parish Council	Strongly support modification L2 and comment that thresholds in Inspectors Recommendations are too high to be practical. Each rural area ought to be judged on its own needs and merits with District Council having flexibility to adopt its own thresholds.	Noted

MOD 09	Support	Hollesley Parish Council	The Parish Council support these modifications	Noted
MOD 10	Object	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	Object to M1 and would like to see wording RSL included because biggest land owner in parish is Trinity College who in the past have had a disregard for local wishes	Raises no new issues not already considered at the public inquiry and by the Council in response to the Inspector's report. M1 is in direct response to the inspector's recommendation and the reasoning has been explained in the Modifications document.
MOD 11	Support	Trimley St Mary Parish Council	Agrees with the reduction to the thresholds and fully supports the intention of the District Council.	Noted.
MOD 12	Object	Home Builders Federation	Objects to the Council's intention to not accept Inspectors' recommendation on thresholds. HBF ask the thresholds of 15 and 9 be adhered to.	Raises no new issues not already considered at the public inquiry and by the Council in response to the Inspector's report. M4 is in direct response to the inspector's recommendation and the reasoning has been explained in the Modifications document. In particular the inspector's proposal for thresholds of 9 and 15 units in villages and towns respectively lack justification and practicality.
MOD 13	Object	Suffolk County Council	Object to L1 and share views of Inspector with regard to potential housing in Woodbridge & Melton.	Raises no new issues not already considered at the public inquiry and by the Council in response to the Inspector's report. L1 is in direct response to the inspector's recommendation and

				the reasoning has been explained in the Modifications document.
MOD 14	Support	Melton Parish Council	In Support of paragraph L1 and directs the District Council to the recently completed Melton Village Plan which identified a site for Affordable Housing within the Village	Noted
MOD 15	Support	Melton Parish Council	In Support of paragraph L2 and directs the District Council to the recently completed Melton Village Plan	Noted
MOD 16	Support	Bucklesham Parish Council	In support of L2 and stress need to keep young people and essential workers in rural areas and increasing Affordable Housing will assist with this	Noted
MOD 17	Support	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council	Support SCDC in the reduction of thresholds and agrees with the need for social housing.	Noted
MOD 18	Support	Middleton Parish Council	Support M4 to ensure clarity in the definitions.	Noted
MOD 19	Object	Middleton Parish Council	Object to M1 as the Parish Council thinks it best to maintain affordable/social housing in the stock	Raises no new issues not already considered at the public inquiry and by the Council in response to the Inspector's report. M1 is in direct response to the inspector's recommendation and the reasoning has been explained in the Modifications document.

MOD 20	Support	Middleton Parish Council	Parish Council endorse SCDC reasons and agree that the Inspectors logic is faulty	Noted
MOD 21	Support	Middleton Parish Council	Supports L2. The Inspector has not taken due regard to the nature and demographics of small rural communities.	Noted
MOD 22	Object	Town & Country Consultants Ltd	Objects to L2 and believes the modifications could hinder the development of some sites. Suggests introduce thresholds of ten in towns and five in villages.	Raises no new issues not already considered at the public inquiry and by the Council in response to the Inspector's report. Justification for the proposed thresholds is explained in the Modification document.
MOD 23	Support	GO-East	The GO are content with modifications M1-M4	Noted
MOD 24	Object	GO-East	Object to Woodbridge and part of Melton being included in exceptions policy. National policy suggests exception policies should relate to small rural communities where the right to buy is not available to tenants and the accommodation can, therefore, be available in perpetuity. Woodbridge does not meet this criteria	Raises no new issues not already considered at the public inquiry and by the Council in response to the Inspector's report. In particular the Council considers the concept of a "bottom-up" approach to planning is important and local issues should have greater weight than national policy.
MOD 25	Support	Go-East	Content with threshold of 3 within villages and state that the threshold of 6 in towns is contrary to national policy. However in light of evidence put forward do not	Noted

			object to the intentions of SCDC in respect of both town and village threshold figures.	
MOD 26	Support	RSPB	No objections to the proposed modifications	Noted.
MOD 27	Support	Boyton Parish Council	Fully supportive of the thresholds SCDC is promoting in L2	Noted
MOD 28*	Support	Grouped Parishes of Benhall & Sternfield	Supports proposed thresholds	Noted
MOD 29*	Support	Suffolk Preservation Society	Endorses the Council's position	Noted

* Late submissions received after the deadline