

## Babergh District Council

### Lavenham Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Submission Consultation Responses

In December 2015 Lavenham Parish Council (the 'qualifying body') submitted their Neighbourhood Development Plan to Babergh District Council for formal consultation under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012). The consultation period ran from Monday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016 until Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> February 2016. Twelve organisations / individuals submitted representations. For cross-reference purposes, their comments are reproduced below against the relevant chapter headings of the Lavenham NDP.

GENERAL			
Ref No.	Consultee Name	Organisation	Comments / Response
LVN - 1	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	The Parish Council has actively engaged with the County Council during the preparation of its Plan and due to this positive approach, concerns have been resolved and the County Council has no overriding concerns relating to the Plan as drafted. However, there are a number of minor amendments requested to improve clarity or consistency with the Basic Conditions. Comments are set out under service headings, where matters raised by this Plan are relevant to County Council service responsibilities or policy objectives.  <i>[BDC note: See sections below for SCC comments referred to above]</i>
LVN - 4	Mr Grosvenor (Clerk to ...)	Brent Eleigh Parish Council	Brent Eleigh Parish Council considered the Lavenham NDP at its meeting on 21 January and decided that it had no comments to make.
LVN - 5	Sue Ball	Anglian Water	Thank you for the opportunity to provide representation on the plan, however, on this occasion we have no comment to make.
LVN - 6	Mr David Abbott	Highways England	Highways England has reviewed the neighbourhood plan and has no comments to make at this time. We look forward to continuing to work with you as your plan develops.
LVN - 7	Mr Jack Hayes	Natural England	We do not have any specific comments to make on this draft neighbourhood plan; this is consistent with our previous advice to Lavenham Parish Council (our ref: 160400, dated 9 <sup>th</sup> September 2015).
LVN - 8	Mr David Grech	Historic England	Last year Historic England (then operating as English Heritage) provided detailed comments on the draft to the authors of the plan, and we also attended a subsequent meeting to discuss our comments further. A copy of our comments is attached for your information <i>[See Appendix 1]</i> . We therefore do not wish to comment further on the draft Plan at this stage.

<b>LVN - 9</b>	Mr J Firth	Strutt & Parker (obo Marden Homes Ltd)	Strutt & Parker instructed by Marden Homes Ltd to submit representations on the plan. Subject to our comments <i>[see separate sections below]</i> we strongly support the aspirations of the NHP and the significant amount of work that has been undertaken by the local community. Look forward to continuing to work with the Parish Council and the community in helping to meet local housing needs in accordance with the aspirations of the NHP. Should a hearing be held Strutt & Parker would request the opportunity to attend obo Marden Homes to provide further information with regards to <i>[comments below]</i> which are considered important to the achievement of sustainable development within Lavenham
<b>LVN - 12</b>	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<p>My opinion is that whilst consultation was made and comments were invited there does not seem to be sufficient breadth in the final document. I feel that this document does not promote the best interests of the whole village. It seems to include catch phrases and themes such as 'young people' and 'affordable housing' which may be currently fashionable but do not take a holistic approach to the village. I hope that my comments may be taken into account.</p> <p>I prefer to see Planning policy remain in the hands of the professionals. In this case, at Babergh instead of elected, or even unelected, people probably without planning qualifications.</p> <p><i>[BDC note: See also separate sections below for other representations made]</i></p>

<b>Chapter 1 - Introduction</b>			
<b>Ref No.</b>	<b>Consultee Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Comments / Response</b>
<b>LVN - 12</b>	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<p>1.5 ... <i>the NP was considered vital because the balance of our community is threatened by an ever increasing divergence between ages groups.</i></p> <p>Lavenham may well have a higher than average proportion of older residents but these are the people who may use the two Co-ops, Heeks the Grocers and the Bakers on a daily basis. God willing, we all age and this is a wonderful community. There are working and young families in the village and children in the village but the may be less apparent as they are working or studying. I dispute 1.5.</p>

Chapter 2 - Key Issues			
Ref No.	Consultee Name	Organisation	Comments / Response
LVN - 12	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<i>2.2 The opportunities for employment and the need for more young people are closely linked.</i> I do not see any correlation. The shop assistants and those working in the various hostelrys are of many different ages. There seems to be a strange emphasis throughout the document of the vague phrase 'young people'. How young and surely not every child growing up in Lavenham will work in Lavenham.

Chapter 3 - Consultation			
Ref No.	Consultee Name	Organisation	Comments / Response
LVN - 12	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<i>3 Consultation.</i> There is mention of a 68% response to the NP questionnaire in 2013. I will be interested to know the percentage of response to the 2015 plan proposal.

Chapter 5 - Objectives			
Ref No.	Consultee Name	Organisation	Comments / Response
LNV - 1	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<b>Transport</b> - In para 5.3 it is stated that the NHP 'aspires to re-designate the A1141 to a B road with a weight limit'. The Parish Council is reminded that a change from A to B classification would reduce the amount of funding to maintain the road. Presently the A1141 carries less traffic than any other A road in Babergh and less than many of the B roads.
LVN - 12	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<i>5.2 The purpose... is to make Lavenham and more sustainable community... Investment in affordable housing for younger people will be the main driver of is.</i> I disagree. When I first visited Lavenham as a 14 year old in 1968 there were derelict properties in Lavenham. I see none now and to my mind Lavenham is currently fully sustainable. I fail to see how an increase in the number of younger people makes for a more sustainable community. There is no guarantee that new residents will work in the village. In addition, many older people may wish to stay in their slightly larger homes so that visiting family can stay. Affordable is a relative term in any case.

			<p>Furthermore, if the current Government pass their proposals there will be little appetite for developers to build affordable homes knowing that they will shortly be able to be purchased by the tenants and so reduce the affordable housing stock once more as happened with the sale of Council Homes.</p> <p><i>5.3 ...direct traffic away from the centre of the village. The historic core will have a less congested and more relaxed feel...</i></p> <p>I love Lavenham but it is a place to live in, visit, shop in, eat in etc. It is not a theme park and taking traffic away from the historic core could kill the wonderful shops which sell daily basics as well as luxuries to residents and tourists. I also think parking in the Market Place and the High Street has a benefit in that people can easily get to the shops and in the High Street and Church Street parked cars self-police any potential speeding.</p> <p><i>5.6 Increase and Improvements in Care home provision.</i></p> <p>Unless I am mistaken, there are no Care Homes in Lavenham. Were there a sufficient market for these then surely a Care Home / Sheltered Housing buyer would have come forward for the Amorex / Old Station site?</p>
--	--	--	---

Chapter 6 – What does this plan do?			
Ref No.	Consultee Name	Organisation	Comments / Response
LVN - 12	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<p><i>6 H6 Care Homes</i></p> <p>As above; the market will decide. [BDC note: See comments from Mr Eborn recorded under Chapter 5 table above]</p> <p><i>D1-D4 Lavenham specific policies on design</i></p> <p>Definitely NOT. This is a planning decision which should be left to the professionals at Babergh and the Architects / Applicants. To have a small body of people, who may lack planning and design experience, decide on design is totally wrong. It could also preclude novel designs. In a small village that could even lead to comments (which I had reported to me) such as ‘I know they won’t do a good design so I don’t want to look at it’. It could also lead to recommendation of refusal based on personal preference of certain styles and even on likes or dislikes of certain people.</p> <p><i>C7 Earmarks the School site for the needs of older residents, (should it be relocated)...</i></p> <p>There is comment in another part of the document about the wish to retain the existing building. Have worked in property, I feel that it is entirely unsuitable for conversion to a nursing home, care home or sheltered housing. It would make an ideal conversion into residential ‘loft style’ homes.</p>

Chapter 7 – Housing Strategy and Policies			
Ref No.	Consultee Name	Organisation	Comments / Response
LNV - 1	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<p><b>Health and Social Care</b> - Policy H2 seeks to require that a proportion of new development is built to the Lifetime Homes standard. The County Council supports the intent of this policy, given that the population of Babergh is ageing and the contribution that adaptable and accessible homes can make to the quality of life for older people. However, this approach is not consistent with national policy in that a Ministerial Statement of 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015 stated that ‘Neighbourhood plans should not be used to apply the new national technical standards.’<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the Lifetime Homes Standard is now defunct and has been replaced with the M4(2) standard within the Building Regulations.</p> <p>The principle behind the Parish Council’s approach is sound and, as an alternative, the most appropriate course of action appears to be to <i>encourage</i> the delivery of M4(2) standard homes as a means of meeting the requirement on a housing mix which meets the existing and future needs of the village.</p> <p>It is hoped that this can be put forward and agreed through the examination process.</p> <p>Policy H6 is understood to be intended as a positive approach to meeting specialist housing needs in Lavenham. However, the intention to restrict occupancy to those aged 60 and above is not supported. Whilst 60 is, by modern standards, relatively young to enter housing with care, it is not unheard of for people younger than that to require care.</p> <p>Housing with care almost always falls into Use Class C2 and the use of the building is regulated through permission for this use type. The final clause of the policy is unduly restrictive and potentially discourages developers from bringing proposals forward.</p> <p>Models of delivery for housing with care are evolving and new settings increasingly don’t conform with established ‘traditional’ models of delivery. In order to encourage the development of specialist housing with care for older people, it would be helpful to retain flexibility within the policy as to the level and range of care provided. This, it is hoped, would encourage developers to come forward to work with the local planning authority, the parish council and the County Council (as the lead for older people’s services) to understand need and demand and respond in a bespoke fashion that takes into account all local dynamics and developing future needs. This may also include the needs of people with specialist housing needs unrelated to age.</p>
LNV - 1	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<p><b>Floods and Water</b> - Page 18 [Table 7.2] provides some narrative on flood risk in Lavenham. This reflects flood risk from rivers (based on Environment Agency information), but it would helpfully also refer to surface water flood risk. An addition is proposed as further context:</p> <p>‘Lavenham is situated on the western bank of the River Brett, where the majority of the built up area lies in Flood Zone 1 (lowest probability of flooding from the river).</p>

<sup>1</sup> See the ‘Plan Making’ section of the Minister’s statement of 25/03/15, available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/planning-update-march-2015>.

			<p>The lower parts of the village sit on the alluvial floodplain adjacent to the river. This places a constraint on housing delivery in this part of the village.</p> <p><u>There are two ordinary watercourses which run from west to east through the parish, one to the north runs under the High Street and the second which is south of the town runs along Water Lane. Therefore some areas of Lavenham are predicted to be affected by surface water flooding during significant rainfall.</u></p> <p>[Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>]</p>
<b>LNV - 1</b>	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<p><b>Education</b> - The Plan, in paragraph 7.2.9, correctly identifies the provision of primary school places as a constraint on the development of housing in Lavenham. Lavenham Primary School does not have spare capacity to accept additional children arising from development and is on a constrained site such that the County Council does not have confidence that the school could be expanded on its current site.</p> <p>The Plan, in identifying the constraint and seeking a positive resolution, deals with the issue appropriately. Unfortunately the County Council cannot commit to providing the funds needed to enable relocation of the school, but will continue to work with the Parish and District Councils to seek ways of delivering sustainable growth.</p>
<b>LVN - 2</b>	Spatial Planning Policy Team	Babergh District Council (BDC)	<p>Overall this is a well-considered document that takes account of both the policy context set out in the existing policy framework and of the views expressed by the local community. Comments on specific policies are as follows:</p> <p><b>H1</b> - suggest that the final paragraph includes reference to heritage as well as landscape and visual sensitivity.</p> <p><b>H2</b> - the Core Strategy sets out the policy framework for meeting affordable housing need on a district-wide basis. In accordance with the settlement hierarchy (CS2) Core Villages (<i>which includes Lavenham</i>) are to act as a focus for development within the functional cluster. Accordingly in accommodating housing need it is important that consideration is given to both local and the strategic context.</p> <p><b>H4</b> - the Core Strategy sets out the policy framework for meeting affordable housing need on a district wide basis. In accordance with the settlement hierarchy (CS2) Core Villages (<i>which includes Lavenham</i>) are to act as a focus for development within the functional cluster. Accordingly in accommodating housing need it is important that consideration is given to the strategic context. Lavenham NDP policy H4 sets a requirement for a 'local connection,' however the plan does not define what 'local'. In accordance with the Core Strategy the role of the settlement within the hierarchy should be considered in defining 'local' in terms of housing need.</p> <p><b>H5</b> - The NPPF (para 54) sets out that local planning authorities should ...'consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to BDC' is considering an amendment to its policy CS20 to take this into account. The Lavenham NDP may also wish to give this further consideration.</p> <p><b>7.9.3</b> - the walking distance thresholds proposed for sheltered housing (policy H6) are the generic DfT (transport Note 1/04) recommendation thresholds. It does not take account of the further recommendations on changes in gradients for every rise and fall of 1 m to reduce by a further 10m. Policy H6 addresses sheltered</p>

			<p>provision which has further sensitivity to accessibility. Accordingly, the application of the thresholds should be considered for review and further consideration to Good Practice Guidance recommendations, such as BS8300 for mobility or visually impaired. NDP policy D2 sets out further guidance on provision of safe and attractive paths which could be cross referenced to in the context of sheltered housing provision.</p> <p><b>Page 19 – 20</b> – it is uncertain if text is missing or if there is an error with the calculation of &gt;300 as the preceding text refers to 201 and 13 buildings.</p> <p><b>7.3.10</b> – it would be helpful if a map could be included.</p>
<b>LVN - 3</b>	Julie Abbey-Taylor (Corporate Manager - Strategic Housing)	Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils  (BDC)	<p><b>Table 7.2 page 18 &amp; 20 (Comments)</b></p> <p>BDC has submitted plans for a further 12 units as a redevelopment of the garages on the Council-owned Meadow Close Estate. This should be updated [as follows]: “Babergh District Council has been granted planning permission for 12 units as a redevelopment of the garages on the Council-owned meadow Close Estate. Construction is expected to commence Spring 2016.”</p> <p><b>Para 7.3 Issue 3 (Support with modifications)</b></p> <p>7.3.1 “There should be provision for those with a strong local connection to have preferential access to housing”. This statement should then then refer to what is defined as local connection i.e. state paragraph number.</p> <p>7.3.4 A large majority of residents do not wish to see major new housing developments in Lavenham which would inevitably lead to a significant change in the character of the village – should read a large majority of the residents who responded to consultation events and surveys.</p> <p><b>Policy H4 / Section 7.7 – Support with modifications</b></p> <p>The Local connection criteria will need to conform to the local connection policy adopted by Babergh District Council, which is not the same as the one listed in H4. The revised policy should be: -</p> <p>The Affordable Housing Units shall not be Occupied or permitted or suffered to be Occupied other than as Affordable Housing by a person who falls within one of the following categories of persons who immediately before taking up Occupation of one of the Dwellings:-</p> <p>(1) had his only or principal home in the parish of Lavenham for a continuous period of not less than 2 years and in the event that there are no or insufficient individuals qualifying under this sub-paragraph then the choice of person shall default to (but with no preference in ranking order) to those individuals fulfilling the criteria set out in the following sub-paragraphs</p> <p>(2) has or a member of whose household has a parent adult child brother or sister whose only or principal home is and has been for a continuous period of not less than 2 years in the parish of Lavenham and wishes to be near that relative or</p> <p>(3) is employed in the parish of Lavenham on the date of the consideration of the individual’s entitlement for an Affordable Housing Unit and has been continuously so employed for 2 years</p>

			<p>(4) who during the period commencing from the date on which an Affordable Housing Unit to which such individual is eligible pursuant to this sub-paragraph becomes available (for the purposes of this sub-paragraph called the “<b>Availability Date</b>”) can provide satisfactory written evidence to the Council of his or her former residency in the parish of (name of Parish) for either (i) six months out of the preceding twelve months or (ii) three years out of the preceding five years and in either case such period of former residency shall end with the Availability Date</p> <p>(5) Where there are two or more applicants applying to Occupy one of the Affordable Housing Units all of the applicants must meet the local lettings criteria set out in paragraphs (1) to (4) of this Schedule and subject to paragraph 8 of this Schedule preference must be given to the applicant/s who have the highest housing need according to Mid Suffolk/Babergh District Council’s (delete as applicable) current allocations policy.</p> <p>(6) In the event that no person qualifying under the criteria set out in paragraph 5 of this Schedule above who is willing and able to accept the terms of an occupancy of one of the Affordable Housing Units is identified at the relevant time then such criteria shall be applied to a person who is in housing need and references to the parish of Lavenham shall be substituted with references to “one of the parishes of (Brent Eleigh, Thorpe Morieux, Preston St Mary, Cockfield, Alpheton, Long Melford, Acton, and Great Waldingfield).</p> <p>(7) In the event that there is no person qualifying in the parishes of Lavenham or one of the other parishes referred to in the preceding paragraph then nominees from elsewhere in the Babergh District who are on the Choice Based Lettings Scheme can occupy the Affordable Housing Units subject to the other provisions of this Schedule</p> <p>(8) If any of the Affordable Housing Units are designed or adapted for people with disabilities then any such Dwelling may be first offered to a person or persons with disabilities who requires such accommodation even where such a person has a lesser local connection under paragraphs (1) to (5) of this Schedule than someone who does not have disabilities.</p> <p>The above clauses would be part of the Nomination Agreement which is a Schedule of the S106 agreement.</p> <p><b>Para 7.8 – Support with modifications</b></p> <p>In view of the comments provided by BDC’s Planning Policy team the Lavenham NP does not include anything in regards to paragraph 54 of the NPPF in that a Local Planning Authorities should in particular consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision additional affordable housing to meet local needs. The revised policy should include: -</p> <p>Reference to Para 54 of the NPPF. This is particularly important now that there is no grant funding available for affordable rented housing, so some form of cross-subsidy is critical to provision of rented affordable housing.</p>
--	--	--	--



			<p><b>Para 7.9.2 – Support with modifications</b></p> <p>The policy regarding sheltered housing does not mention Extra Care Housing or Very Sheltered as an option for specialist housing development. The revised policy should include: -</p> <p>Development proposals for a Residential Care Home, for a Sheltered Housing or Very Sheltered Housing scheme or other specialist housing such as an independent living housing product that will meet the needs of the older generation will be permitted provided that proposals are either located within or adjacent to the built up area boundary of Lavenham and where the scheme can be clearly demonstrated to be well related to the existing pattern of development in Lavenham.</p>
<b>LVN - 9</b>	Mr J Firth	Strutt & Parker (obo Marden Homes Ltd)	<p><b>Policy H1 – Scale and location of new development</b> - We support the recognition that development will come forward outside of existing development boundaries subject to meeting policy criteria. We also support the overall approach taken in allowing for sustainable sites to come forward subject to meeting site criteria. We would however also like to raise a number of issues where we feel modifications should be made in order to better meet the basic conditions and in particular best achieve sustainable development within Lavenham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy should recognise that not all sites will provide on-site services provision, particularly in the context of the plan's preference for smaller sized sites. The second paragraph of the policy would therefore be better worded to reflect the need for schemes to make appropriate contributions towards required infrastructure necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms in line with national planning policy.</li> <li>• With regards to the third paragraph of the policy we support the fact that additional evidence base work has been undertaken in the form of the Lavenham Character Assessment. Given that this document itself has not been subject to consultation and is a technical assessment rather than a policy document we would suggest the policy requires proposals to have regard to the assessment. This would allow flexibility for appropriate schemes and further landscape work to be undertaken.</li> <li>• We would suggest that the third bullet point with regards to walking distances is currently unclear. The NPPF sets out core planning principles at paragraph 17 including the need for plan-making and decision taking to "actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable". This policy requirement should therefore be made clearer in the submission plan in order to have full regard to national planning policy. We consider there should be a strong preference to sites that are located within walking distance of the facilities of the village centre and would suggest there is no need to repeat other considerations within this policy regarding focal points and historic core as these are covered elsewhere within the plan.</li> <li>• We support the desire for smaller sites of 24 units or less and Marden Homes will be working to develop a final proposal that meets this requirement.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy H2 Housing Mix – Meeting Local Needs</b> - Support the proposed policy requirement to take into account the needs of young people looking for 2 and 3 bedroom properties. The emerging scheme for Marden Homes will be developed in full accordance with this proposed policy requirement in line with discussions and local public engagement.</p>

<p><b>LVN - 12</b></p>	<p>Mr Eborn</p>	<p>Lavenham Resident</p>	<p><i>7.1.2 Demographics and Housing stock.</i>  There is a fraction fewer residents 30 to 64 in Lavenham than elsewhere and 10 % more in the 65 + age range. Surely it is good that there are so many older full time residents who may use the shops and restaurants etc. Lavenham is a draw to a wide hinterland with many older people moving to the village in their later life. The supply of such people renews itself and I believe that the gathering of older residents adds to the unique character of the village, helps to keep clubs and societies vibrant, aids to the security of the village and the viability of the local shops. This is daily throughout the year in a way that the younger working person would not necessarily be able to do.</p> <p><i>7.14 20% of homes in Lavenham are socially rented compared with 13.1 % in Babergh.</i>  Surely therefore Lavenham has exceeded in its provision.</p> <p><i>7.2 Local Affordable Housing needs.</i>  38 of the required 50 already provided or in train. The Norman Way development should easily provide the remaining 12.</p> <p><i>7.2 No provision of public allotment space.</i>  The Norman Way development can provide this.</p> <p><i>7.2 The Halt was built on one of the last remaining sites of Brownfield land in Lavenham</i>  I can think of the Printers in Water Street – (only part is Period), the land around the Gasometer, Howletts Garage in Melford Road, the land zoned for commercial use behind Howletts, the units on Second Meadow on Brent Eleigh Road.</p> <p><i>7.3.1 There is a need to provide a more balanced housing stock with smaller houses.</i>  This is arbitrary. Surely a vibrant community includes homes of all types. The Glebe and Mortlocks / Lower Road and Whitegates are excellent developments of detached (and semi-detached at Whitegates) homes ideal for families and also for the more affluent resident who may indeed have downsized but wants space to accommodate visiting children and Grandchildren. I feel that we need larger new homes too. I do not know any survey results on house sizes but I think that on examination it might be found that there could be already be more smaller homes than larger ones.</p> <p><i>7.36 New Housing should be delivered through several smaller sites</i>  The reasoning given is that smaller developments can more easily be integrated into the village. I disagree; integration depends on people, community spirit and design and location. The proposed Norman Way development is a short walk into the core of the village and so should be easily integrated whereas say, more development around Green Willows could well result in a split community.</p> <p><i>7.3.10 The Lavenham Character Assessment assesses 7 landscape parcels.</i>  This seems to be a fait-a-complis decision and integral to the validity of the document but no plans or locations seem to be provided within the document. I do not believe that a document can even be considered for adoption when the premise under which it is submitted is unavailable to the reader.</p> <p>I have attached scan of two pages of an A3 document with circled potential development areas which I think may be the plan referred to. <i>[BDC note: Included as Appendix 2 to this document]</i></p>
------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	---

			<p><i>7.3.11 The figure of 24 Units...</i>  This figure seems arbitrary. The Old Station (Halt / Amorex) has 40 plus homes. Although in my opinion they are badly designed, have insufficient outdoor space and parking plus some of the development is on land the development does not own; the actual street scene as one drives or walks by is not unpleasant. I support the recent application for a large development of land off Norman Way with an additional pedestrian route past Kemps the Printers. It seems to be an ideal location as it is close to the village centre yet invisible from the historic core. By their statement the PC would seem to wish to oppose this ideal site for development in the village if it were to provide more than 24 homes. I cannot see any justification for this arbitrary figure.</p> <p><i>7.5.2 Lavenham Parish Council would welcome proposals for housing on sites... to be made available for sale to local residents for 3 months</i>  This goes against all free trade. Incomers often bring new vitality to the village. This must be struck off and I feel it could even be contrary to human rights. It is certainly prejudiced. I think you will find that some of the current PC were 'incomers' when they bought homes in the village. In fact, local residents are likely to be the first to hear of future developments long before they are in the Public Domain but there must not be any right to delayed marketing and first purchase.</p> <p><i>7.8.3 Affordable Housing on Rural Exception sites.</i>  I believe that affordable homes should not be pushed to the edge. In addition the statement that affordable housing is provided in perpetuity is unenforceable if the Government change the law.</p>
--	--	--	--

Chapter 8 - Design			
Ref No.	Consultee Name	Organisation	Comments / Response
LNV - 1	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<b>Health and Social Care</b> - The reference to Lifetime Neighbourhoods in Policy D2 is welcomed.
LNV - 1	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<b>Archaeology</b> - The information in para 8.7.3 refers to all development – not just infill – and could helpfully be moved to be a new para 8.1.12, to help explain how Lavenham's heritage will be protected through the development process.
LNV - 1	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<b>Transport</b> - Where policy D2 refers to designing streets to function as social spaces, this may be acceptable on some streets where traffic flows are not to a level where safety would become an issue. So this may be acceptable on roads within new residential development.  Policy D2 states that streets should be designed to 'accommodate on-street parking.' In this respect, the Parish Council may wish to refer to the 'Suffolk Guidance for Parking' technical guidance document which contains standards for on-street parking.

			<p>Policy D2 states that streets should be designed ‘to allow for plenty of trees and planting to balance the visual impact of parked cars’. Such vegetation would need to be carefully located so as not to cause problems for highway users and utility companies.</p> <p>Policy D3 refers to considerate construction methods. The Parish Council may wish to include reference to lorry route management strategies, as part of implementing this approach.</p> <p>The reference to spending CIL monies on sustainable transport measures is welcomed (para 9.5.3).</p>
<b>LVN - 10</b>	Bethany Philbidge (Planning Officer)	Suffolk Preservation Society	<p>We applaud the group’s work in writing their neighbourhood plan and particularly welcome the detail in section 8 on the design and character of the built environment of the village which inform future development.</p> <p>We also welcome the amendment to paragraph 8.1.10 to include the requirement for a heritage statement for developments affecting non-designated heritage assets as these assets contribute to a parish’s distinctive character. This amendment will strengthen their protection from demolition or harmful development within their setting which is otherwise limited, particularly outside the conservation area. The Society has recently been involved in two instances elsewhere in the county where the assessment of a building as a non-designated heritage asset has successfully prevented its demolition.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate that the compilation of a local list of non-designated heritage assets will require a considerable amount of time, which is why it has been earmarked as a future project, there would be an advantage in setting down the assessment criteria within policy P15 at this point. This will allow future ad hoc applications for development, including demolition, to be assessed against agreed local criteria in advance of a local list being formally adopted by Babergh DC.</p> <p>We refer you to the criteria for the assessment of non-designated heritage assets recently adopted by Suffolk Coastal DC which may aid your group in this. <a href="http://www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk/yourdistrict/planning/designandconservation/non-designated-heritage-assets/">http://www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk/yourdistrict/planning/designandconservation/non-designated-heritage-assets/</a></p> <p>We also consider that ‘heritage asset’ – both designated and non-designated - should be included in the glossary in appendix 1.</p>
<b>LVN - 12</b>	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<p><i>8.5 Light Pollution</i> There is no mention of the new LED street lamps which I love. I feel that these lights are much better than faux Victorian Lamps on mainly Tudor Houses which had no street lighting when built. These lamps are discrete and give wonderful light and without glare and so assist in reducing light pollution.</p> <p><i>8.7.3 Lavenham historic core is archaeologically sensitive...</i> I am concerned not to see more mention made of the History of Lavenham. Much of its current attraction derives from the Tudor period and that heritage is very apparent but no mention is made of the Roman Heritage such as the Bath reported to have been found in the grounds of The Grove in Lady Street which is in the historic core. There is also no mention of the Roman kilns reported in Potland Lane or indeed of the Bronze Age building reported South of Nether Hall, both of which are outside the historic core. Lavenham exists because of its past and thought needs to be given to the care, improvement and adaptation of the historic buildings as well as to careful archaeology of the whole Parish and not just the historic core.</p>

Chapter 9 – Community and Well-being			
Ref No.	Consultee Name	Organisation	Comments / Response
LNV - 1	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<p><b>Public Rights of Way</b> - The section on Rights of Way (Chapter 9.3/Policy C3) is acceptable in terms of the Basic Conditions; however a number of changes are recommended. Supporting text is helpful for establishing the context for a policy. Para 9.3.1 could helpfully be expanded to explain the social, environmental and economic objectives of Policy C3.</p> <p>‘Lavenham has an excellent network of public footpaths, <u>which provide opportunities for social interaction and the promotion of healthy lifestyles.</u> They also support the local economy through the providing activities for tourists. Public Rights of Way make a significant contribution to quality of life. Local routes include the Railway Walk leased to the Parish Council from Suffolk County Council.’</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Proposed new text <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Policy C3, as phrased, implies that map C.3 is the comprehensive set of rights of way in the Parish as regards determining what should be protected and enhanced. Whilst the map is accurate in the routes it shows, it should not be confused with the Definitive Map held and maintained by the County Council.</p> <p>As such, this could be clarified within the policy as follows:</p> <p>‘The existing network of footpaths and bridleways (<u>including those shown on map C3</u>) will be protected.’</p> <p>An alternative might be to say ‘<u>particularly those shown on map C3</u>’.</p>
LNV - 1	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<p><b>Early Years</b> - Under current statutory requirements for the provision of early education, 35 dwellings are expected to generate demand for an additional four early years places.</p> <p>Under the Community Infrastructure Levy regime, this would be expected to generate a request for approximately £24,364.00 from the District Council’s Levy funds, based on the current price for providing early education places. However, given the forthcoming statutory changes, this figure is likely to increase as the state provides more free hours per child.</p> <p>In response to an earlier request for comments on this Plan, the County Council identified that the children emanating from the new dwellings could be accommodated in the relocated and expanded pre-school on the site of the Village Hall.</p> <p>Whilst there are emerging plans to construct a new early years setting on the site of the village hall (referenced in paragraph 9.7.4), this proposal is dependent on funding being identified. This could offer a way of providing additional early education capacity in support of growth.</p> <p>Early education capacity should, therefore, be considered as a constraint on housing growth in Lavenham – with the proposal at the Village Hall offering one mechanism for providing additional capacity if funding can be found.</p>

<b>LNV - 1</b>	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<b>Transport</b> - The ref' o spending CIL monies on sustainable transport measures is welcomed (para 9.5.3).
<b>LVN - 12</b>	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<p><b>9.2 Lavenham's Open Spaces and Recreation Areas</b> I feel that the plan is misleading as it identifies as permanent Grassland, parcels of land which are not in public ownership and so could be ploughed or planted. I do not think that number 3 is freely open to the public. I believe that number 10 is private for residents only and the two areas of number 12 are private.</p> <p><b>9.78 The present school buildings could represent an ideal place for retirement living assisted retirement living / care home.</b> I disagree. Such development would require lifts to the first floor and given the nature of the existing building with a number of gables, there would need to be a similar number of lifts. These would be uneconomic and the design would not facilitate their installation.</p> <p><b>9.9.3 Change of use of the core area will only be considered if the building has been marketed...</b> One of the wonderful things in recent years has been the flexibility of Babergh to allow change of use from home to shop and back again in these areas. This flexibility gives vibrancy to the village and will, I hope remain as it is an asset to the village and to the owners.</p> <p><b>9.9.4 Victorian Cottages</b> I believe these are now for sale as private homes.</p>

<b>Chapter 10 - Environment</b>			
<b>Ref No.</b>	<b>Consultee Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Comments / Response</b>
<b>LNV - 1</b>	Sean Cunniffe	Suffolk County Council	<p><b>Landscape</b> - Policy ENV1 is much improved in relation to the definition and sensitivity of the defined views. Furthermore, given the uncertainty regarding the future of role of Special Landscape Areas (SLA) the specific retention of this policy in the Plan seems a robust approach. However, the definition of local special qualities in relation to the revised SLA cannot be made using the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment as this is contrary to the Lavenham Landscape Study which states that:</p> <p><i>“the means for defining areas of higher value at a parish level are not in place within a County level assessment undertaken at 1:50,000. The means for defining landscape quality are available following this parish level characterisation and sensitivity study. Therefore, in order to retain the additional protection afforded to sites within SLAs, Lavenham Parish Council wished to review and retain Special Landscape Area within the parish, based on the findings of this study.”</i></p> <p>Given the above it is suggested the Parish Council should ensure that the Special Qualities of the revised SLA are robustly defined within the parish level study and the wording in the policy should be revised to reflect the wording of the Parish Landscape Assessment.</p>

			<p>Project 13, to support the linkage of Special Landscape Areas, is potentially no longer relevant as a review and extension of the SLA has already been undertaken.</p> <p>Policies C2 and C3 are much improved in terms of their clarity.</p>
<b>LVN - 9</b>	Mr J Firth	Strutt & Parker (obo Marden Homes Ltd)	<p><b>Policy ENV1 - Defined View and Special Landscape Area</b> - We note that the plan states that “<i>Any proposals for development in the newly defined Lavenham Special Landscape Area will have to accord with Babergh’s existing policy wording which will be retained in its current form.</i>”</p> <p>We also note that the policy wording states that proposals will be required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintain or enhance the special landscape qualities of the area, identified in the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment;</li> <li>• and, are designed and sited so as to harmonise with the landscape setting.</li> </ul> <p>The emerging scheme being prepared by Marden Homes is designed and sited so as to harmonise with the landscape setting in accordance with detailed Landscape Assessment work. In this respect we therefore do not see a conflict with this policy requirement however in line with the comments above on landscape character areas we would suggest the extent of the Special Landscape Area would be better defined as the shoulder of the valley side than the current line of Bear’s Lane.</p>
<b>LVN - 9</b>	Mr J Firth	Strutt & Parker (obo Marden Homes Ltd)	<p><b>Lavenham Landscape Character Assessment [LLCA]</b> - Although not part of the formal Neighbourhood Plan we would additionally wish to comment on the LLCA as referred to within Policy H1 and ENV1. This important evidence base document has been published for the first time as part of this consultation and we would suggest it would have been preferable if this had been available at an earlier stage in the process.</p> <p>Whilst we support the fact that additional evidence base work has been undertaken we would question whether some of the character areas identified and whether these should have been drawn differently based on assessment work carried out for Marden Homes by Matt Lee Landscape Architects.</p> <p>With regards to identified Landscape Character Areas we would suggest that area LAV1 ‘Pit Meadow’ which is located around the valley side could have been drawn with reference to the valley edge rather than the line of the existing road. Landscape work undertaken by Matt Lee Landscape Architects suggested there is a clear break on the shoulder of the hill near the Bear’s Lane between the different landscape character areas. The smaller upper part of the area adjacent to Bear’s Lane would instead be better considered as part of LAV2 ‘Lavenham Wood’. In landscape terms this area relates more to the housing estate beyond Bear’s Lane than the valley to the east. All of this higher land forms part of the less sensitive plateau to the south of the village. To the east of the ‘shoulder’ the rest of land does indeed form part of the valley side and in this context we agree that this area of the land should be included within LAV1. Amendments in this regard would ensure the scheme can most fully accord with national policy and contribute to sustainable development.</p> <p>We support the recognition in relation to land parcel 1 that there is some scope for development towards the plateau edge. We also support the aspiration that Existing patterns in the eastwest boundary hedges could be replicated as well as efforts to restore historic field patterns lost during the 20th century, as this is part of the intention of the emerging Marden Homes scheme.</p>

LVN - 11	Mr & Mrs Tinkler	Lavenham Residents	<p>We would like to submit a response concerning the Lavenham Neighbourhood Development Plan, and specifically about Special Landscape Areas. We regret that the Lavenham NDP does not uphold the current Special Landscape Area classification of the area east and south of Lavenham. Also we would like to stress the importance of the arable farming landscape there.</p> <p><b>Conservation Area Appraisal</b> - The field east of Bears Lane is classified in Babergh District Council's <i>Conservation Area Appraisal</i> as a Special Landscape Area. The same document focuses specifically on the footpath along the north side of that field, saying that</p> <p>Similarly south of Water Street footpath 5 links Bear's Lane eastwards to Brent Eleigh Road This last path in particular gives good views back into the medieval heart of the village, with the rears of the many listed buildings on Water Street visible against a backdrop of the rising ground of Lady, Barn and Shilling Streets to the north.</p> <p>Living next to this footpath, we have not only strong personal views about, but also insight into, the use and value of the footpath and field around it. Local people use the footpath even in preference to Water Street to move from the lower to the upper part of the village, in spite of the fact that it leads them some distance from the amenities, and in spite of (or perhaps because of) the mud and unevenness. Many ramblers and tourists staying in Lavenham also use it for their walks.</p> <p>The NDP recognizes the importance of views in and out of the village, and especially some involving the zone I am referring to (pages 50 and 51; view 2 on the former). In fact, under the map on page 50 the caption says <b>"This view encapsulates arable farming on "high Suffolk" and provides an important contrast to the more enclosed views from Lavenham"</b>. This we would like to strongly support. However, the NDP falls short by not upholding the Special Landscape Area classification of this area and by not sufficiently stressing that it is not only the view, but also the framing landscape and arable farming mentioned in this caption that are crucial to the quality of the view. The NDP document refers elsewhere to the importance of landscape "reminiscent of Constable" – the field east of Bears Lane is the closest you get to it.</p> <p><b>English Heritage (now Historic England).</b></p> <p>In their response to the NDP (<i>Lavenham Consultation Statement</i>, Appendix 8) English Heritage discusses at length the Special Landscape Areas, how under the new plan none of the policies connected with SLAs are retained and how something should be done about this. The relevant section is quoted in its entirety below. We would like to stress how English Heritage chooses as its focus precisely the area of Lavenham we are concerned with (Appendix 8 of the <i>Lavenham Consultation Statement</i>, last two pages, with our bold): "Policy P13 is concerned with Special Landscape Areas (SLAs). Currently <b>the land to the east and south of Lavenham is designated a Special Landscape Area</b> (as noted in the map to Appendix 3 on page 41 of the plan) and the 2006 Baber [sic] Local plan had 3 policies associated with SLAs (Policy CR04, CR05 and CR06). Of these only policy CR04 has been saved and carried forward, but even that policy does not appear in the new Core Strategy. ..."</p> <p>The only response we can find, also in the <i>Lvnhm Consultation Statement</i>, is: "I am pleased to note that the pre submission draft of the Plan has sought to address the substantive issues raised in our previous response and we therefore do not wish to respond in detail on this latest version." We find this neither clear nor satisfactory.</p>
----------	------------------	--------------------	---



			<p>To sum up, the NDP is unsatisfactory in terms of upholding and protecting Special Landscape Areas, and especially the area south and east of Lavenham. This area is also recognized as important in the <i>Lavenham Landscape Character Assessment</i> (p.35):</p> <p>The areas of highest landscape sensitivity are found in the meadows west of the village and the <b>rolling valley sides to the east and south</b>. Here, the factors indicating higher sensitivity are either a valley-side location (<b>parcels 1 &amp; 6</b>) or relatively fine grain intact historic meadow landscape (parcel 4 &amp; 7).</p> <p>Full quote from English Heritage response:</p> <p>“Policy P13 is concerned with Special Landscape Areas (SLAs). Currently <b>the land to the east and south of Lavenham is designated a Special Landscape Area</b> (as noted in the map to Appendix 3 on page 41 of the plan) and the 2006 Baber Local plan had 3 policies associated with SLAs (Policy CR04, CR05 and CR06). Of these only policy CR04 has been saved and carried forward, but even that policy does not appear in the new Core Strategy. Policy CR04 stated:</p> <p>Development proposals in Special Landscape Areas will only be permitted where they: • Maintain or enhance the special landscape qualities of the area, identified in the relevant landscape appraisal; and • Area designed and sited so as to harmonise with the landscape setting. If this policy no longer exists in the new Baber Core Strategy, the protection it affords to the SLA within Lavenham parish will also no longer exist and you may wish to discuss with Barber the practicalities of reinstating this policy within your Neighbourhood Plan to afford a degree of protection to that part of the SLA that currently exists within your parish. Policy P13 specifically concerns extending the SLA to fully encompass Lavenham, but in extending the SLA careful consideration would then need to be given to where new housing might be sited to fulfil the objective of the plan for a better balanced community.”</p>
LVN - 12	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<p><i>Defined Views In.</i></p> <p>Number 2 shows the view from the North of Clay Hill and not from the Brent Eleigh Road. Number 3 is in fact shown from the Northern end of Park Road.</p> <p><i>10.03 The Market Place... increasing its use for community and leisure purposes.</i></p> <p>I feel that to limit parking there would impact very badly on the shops and businesses there and I would resist any scheme to reduce the number of parking spaces. I know in particular that Heeks Grocers often carry shopping out to cars for elderly shoppers, many of whom may have driven in from the hinterland.</p>

Chapter 12 - Projects			
Ref No.	Consultee Name	Organisation	Comments / Response
LVN - 12	Mr Eborn	Lavenham Resident	<p><i>12.2 Traffic Management - Limit HGV access to the Historic Core.</i></p> <p>I assume the historic core includes Water Street. Whilst I agree that unnecessary HGV vehicles should be re-routed it must be remembered that Lavenham is in the centre of a rich agricultural area and I know that many of the HGV's are grain lorries and other vehicles associated with modern day large scale farming. In addition, the shops and restaurants in the Market Place and High Street do require deliveries and nowadays many of these arrive in large vehicles in order to keep costs to a minimum. I think though pressure should be put on the Sat-Nav operators not to include Lavenham as a through route from to, from and between Colchester, Hadleigh, Sudbury and Bury St Edmunds.</p>

## Appendix 1 –

### Copy of letter from English Heritage to Lavenham NHP Working Group

Dated: 22 December 2014

Dear [Mr] Reeve

#### **Ref: Draft Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan**

Further to our e-mail exchange earlier this month, I have now had the opportunity to read the draft Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan and my comments are set out below.

English Heritage is primarily concerned with the historic environment and my comments therefore focus on those aspects of the plan. I note in Section 2 that the principal objective of the plan is to achieve a better balanced community through sustainable development of the town and the provision of 100 new homes in the plan period provided through a number of smaller developments. I welcome the identification on paragraph 2.2 of Lavenham's historic core and setting. However, while the preparation of defined views into, and out of, the town may help protect the historic setting, the plan would benefit from setting out the key contributors to the local distinctiveness of the town. Such information would help inform both designers and promoters of development proposals, and also the local planning authority when they are required to determine applications. From my knowledge of the town, the key contributor to its local distinctiveness is its vernacular architectural heritage and includes:

- The pallet of materials (timber frame and render, flint, gault clay and soft red brickwork, plain tiles and welsh slate).
- The relationship between roof pitch and roofing material – plain tiles are used on steeply pitched roofs (around 45 degrees) while slate appears on shallower pitched roofs (around 30 to 35 degrees).
- Roof orientation – Roofs are predominantly set parallel to the streets, but there are a number of exceptions where the buildings (or cross-wings) are set gable-on to the street.
- Location on plot – in the historic core buildings are sited tight to the back of the pavement, with buildings abutting directly to their neighbours.
- Scale and massing – Predominantly two storey, but with some accommodation provided within steeply sloping roof voids, and the use of projecting jetties at first floor on timber-framed buildings.
- Window-to-wall ratios (more wall than window)
- Window proportions (an overall horizontal emphasis in mediaeval buildings, but with the windows made up of a series of vertically proportioned elements, and with vertically proportioned sash windows to later Georgian and Victorian buildings).
- Et cetera

The map in figure 3.4 is helpful, but would be more legible if greater differentiation were used between the colour of the historic core and that of the 1990s buildings.

Turning to the Policies contained in the plan: Policy H1 sets out the target number for open market and affordable new homes. For clarity, the policy should state that the target figure of a minimum of 100 dwellings is over the life of the plan (ie 2015 –2035). No guidance is given as to the sites where this new housing is to be accommodated and again it would be helpful if the plan could be more explicit on this point. If you are unable to suggest sites (or unwilling to promote individual sites) then some more general advice could be given, such as 'visually prominent sites in the view cones attached to the plan would not be supported' (this is picked up in Policy H4 for affordable housing on exception sites). It may be necessary for the plan to identify important open sites (if any) within the town where applications would also not be supported. Policy H7 (Care Home) would again benefit from similar cautions in respect of siting. Policy H8 is concerned with the scale of development, but consideration might be given to expand this policy to also consider density of development, especially if you feel the town would benefit from having higher density development within the established built areas, but a lower density (to provide a transition to open countryside) on the edge of the settlement.

Policy D1 is concerned with Good Design and the reference to local distinctiveness is welcomed, but would benefit from clarification (hence my comments above). A perennial problem with policies that require high quality design is 'who is to be the judge', though that should not be a reason for not requiring it. However, you may wish to consider making use of an independent design review panel for larger developments in the town (I believe Shape East already operate such a panel). It would also be appropriate to include a general requirement that 'developments should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and respect the setting of nearby listed buildings'. I note that this draft contains two Policy D2 (one covering Design and Access, the second covering Site Management).

Policy C2 is concerned with Sports and Leisure Facilities. Consideration should be given to incorporating into this policy (or elsewhere in the plan) a requirement for new housing (and in particular housing sites on the edge of the settlement) to incorporate good pedestrian and cycle permeability out into the countryside.

Section 6.2 of the document concerns the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL); English Heritage would welcome a commitment in the plan for some of the monies received from this fund to be spent on enhancements to the public realm in Lavenham, possibly commencing with a 'Streets for All' type survey of the public realm to identify key opportunities for enhancement. Policy C4 is specifically concerned with Developer Contribution, and where development is to be phased in tandem with timely provision of infrastructure it is recommended that this be secured through appropriately worded conditions attached to the granting of planning permission. On Policy C9 (Communications Infrastructure) I request that the phrase 'and the setting of listed buildings' is added to the end of the policy.

Policies C10 and C11 are concerned with the change of use from residential and change of use from retail. On Policy C10 consideration should be given to adding a fifth bullet point to cover 'signage'. Signage on commercial buildings in historic places can be a real problem, and I would recommend that you do not support the use of internally illuminated signs, or signs made of Perspex or similar non-traditional materials. The size of any signage should also be proportionate to the building to which it is attached. Furthermore, you may wish to consider encouraging the use of traditional hanging signs. In Policy C11, when considering the marketing of a closed business premises, it would be important for that marketing to be at a 'fair market price'. Marketing of a business at an unrealistic or inflated value is unlikely to result in a successful outcome.

Policy ENV 3 is concerned with the Protection of the traditional roofscape of Lavenham, and for the avoidance of doubt I would recommend adding to the end of this policy the phrase 'or character or appearance of the conservation area, including the setting of nearby listed buildings.' In respect of Policy ENV4 (which deals with the Market Place), might this be an appropriate project for the expenditure of CIL receipts?

Policy P13 is concerned with Special Landscape Areas (SLAs). Currently the land to the east and south of Lavenham is designated a Special Landscape Area (as noted in the map to Appendix 3 on page 41 of the plan) and the 2006 Baber Local plan had 3 policies associated with SLAs (Policy CR04, CR05 and CR06). Of these only policy CR04 has been saved and carried forward, but even that policy does not appear in the new Core Strategy. Policy CR04 stated:

Development proposals in Special Landscape Areas will only be permitted where they:

- Maintain or enhance the special landscape qualities of the area, identified in the relevant landscape appraisal; and
- Area designed and sited so as to harmonise with the landscape setting.

If this policy no longer exists in the new Baber Core Strategy, the protection it affords to the SLA within Lavenham parish will also no longer exist and you may wish to discuss with Barber the practicalities of reinstating this policy within your Neighbourhood Plan to afford a degree of protection to that part of the SLA that currently exists within your parish. Policy P13 specifically concerns extending the SLA to fully encompass Lavenham, but in extending the SLA careful consideration would then need to be given to where new housing might be sited to fulfil the objective of the plan for a better balanced community.

Policy P14 is concerned with investigating the feasibility of adding Lave[n]ham to the UK's tentative list for UNESCO world heritage sites. While Lave[n]ham is an exceptionally fine historic town, English Heritage believes that it will be difficult to make a case that meets the criteria for Outstanding Universal Value, which is a requirement for World Heritage Status. Also, while there are potential economic benefits that can be derived from WHS inscription, there are significant costs in achieving and sustaining this status and ensuring that the UK continues to meet the terms of the World Heritage Convention.

I hope this letter will be of assistance in finalising the draft of your Neighbourhood Plan. Should you wish to discuss any aspect of this letter please give me a call.

Yours sincerely

## Appendix 2 – Copy of scanned images submitted by Mr Eborn

Reproduced below, copy of two separate scanned images submitted by Mr Eborn in connection with comments recorded against paragraph 7.3.10 [See page 10 above].

