

# Interim Consultation Statement

## 1.00 Introduction

- 1.1. This Interim Consultation Statement provides an overview of consultation and stakeholder involvement in the production of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Draft Joint Local Plan (Draft JLP). This Consultation Statement has been produced in accordance with the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which is available on the Councils website.
- 1.2. From 21<sup>st</sup> August 2017 to 10<sup>th</sup> November 2017 the Councils consulted on the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan – Consultation Document (Regulation 18 Stage).
- 1.3. During the consultation, the Joint Local Plan and comment forms were made available at libraries within the Districts. Paper copies of the Sustainability Appraisal, Joint Local Plan and comment forms were made available at the Council offices<sup>1</sup>. Hard copies of the Joint Local Plan Consultation Document were provided to all Town and Parish Councils within the Districts.
- 1.4. Six public drop in events were held in the District's during October 2017, which allowed communities to find out more about the Joint Local Plan and speak to the Strategic Planning Team. Approximately 1,240 people attended the events. Additionally, all Town and Parish Councils within the Districts were invited to attend briefing sessions with Council officers.
- 1.5. The Councils accepted representations via an online consultation portal, by email and by letter either by post or hand delivered to the Council offices. A total of **13,959 representations** were received during the consultation from **1,370 respondents**. 52.7% of representations were made using the Councils Joint Local Plan consultation portal (online), 32.5% were made via email and 14.8% were made by letter. Two petitions were provided to the Councils.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that at the time the Council's offices were in Hadleigh (Babergh District Council) and Needham Market (Mid Suffolk District Council).

## 2.00 Summary of the main issues raised during the 2017 consultation and how they have been taken into account

2.1 In accordance with the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) this Consultation Statement sets out a summary of the main issues raised during the consultation and how they have been taken into account. It is set out in the following themes:

- i. Housing;
- ii. Economy;
- iii. Environment;
- iv. Communities;
- v. Infrastructure; and
- vi. Place comments (Potential development sites and proposed settlement boundaries).

2.2. Where reference is made to evidence documents, these and all available evidence documents, are available on the Councils website <https://www.babergh.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/evidence-base/current-evidence/> or <https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/evidence-base/current-evidence/>.

### Housing

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
<b>Housing Requirement</b>	Housing targets are too high and need reducing to achievable levels.	The SHMA has been robustly produced in accordance with the relevant Government guidance for identifying housing needs. However, since then the new NPPF (2019) has changed the way in which Local Planning Authorities calculate their overall housing requirements. The Draft JLP has been amended to incorporate the new methodology for calculating housing need, resulting in an overall housing requirement of 420 dwellings per annum
	The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is not robust and over/under estimates housing requirements.	

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
		in Babergh and 556 dwellings per annum in Mid Suffolk.
<b>Contingency Buffer</b>	A contingency buffer was widely supported, with a range of suggestions ranging from 5% and 50% above housing requirements.	The Draft Joint Local Plan proposes a 20% buffer in both Districts to aid with the delivery of housing. Too low a figure would not allow enough flexibility for schemes which fail to materialise, and too high a figure could lead to the over delivery of housing which may have implications on infrastructure capacity.
<b>Spatial Distribution</b>	Four broad options for the spatial distribution of development were put forward as part of the 2017 Consultation. All four broad options had a significant range of comments made against them (both positive and negative). Suggested locations for a new settlement were put forward.	Draft Joint Local plan proposes a spatial distribution which combines a market town/rural area balance and a transport corridor focus (B/MHD2 & B/MHD3 in Consultation Document). The balance between market town/rural area and a transport corridor focus emphasises securing delivery as this is where there is most market demand. It is considered appropriate to explore potential locations for a new settlement further in a plan review.
<b>Settlement Hierarchy</b>	A number of comments were received which stated that settlements were incorrectly categorised, predominantly as a result of inaccurate scoring of services and facilities within those settlements. Additional criteria were proposed during the consultation.	As a result of the comments received, the settlement hierarchy has been reviewed and a new version has been included within the Draft JLP. Further criteria were not included as this would have little impact on identifying the sustainability of settlements.
<b>Rural Growth</b>	Overall the greatest support was for taking forward an allocation led approach with provision for development in	The Draft JLP proposes allocations in Ipswich Fringe Settlements, Market

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
	hamlets. The greatest emphasis in the comments set out the need for certainty, clarity and for growth to be proportional with acceptable impacts.	Towns and Urban Areas and Core Villages. Settlement boundary expansions will provide growth in Hinterland and Hamlet Villages. Further clarity added to 'Hamlets and Clusters of development in the Countryside' policy.
<b>Self-build and custom build housing</b>	Generally, there was support for encouraging self-build and custom build dwellings across the Districts.	The Draft JLP includes a self-build policy.
<b>Affordable housing</b>	Concerns were raised that the SHMA does not accurately measure affordable housing needs in the Districts.	The SHMA has been robustly produced in accordance with the relevant Government guidance. Due to the changes in overall housing requirements a partial update to the SHMA has been produced.
	Options put forward during the consultation for affordable housing provision ranged from 20% to 50%.	Draft JLP proposes an affordable housing target of 35% which takes into account sites that do not provide affordable housing (e.g. for viability reasons or too small a site) and the viability/deliverability of sites. 35% affordable housing provision has been viability tested.
	There was <b>not</b> an overwhelming preference for prioritising either affordable housing or infrastructure provision where viability is an issue.	As there was no overwhelming difference in levels of support for either prioritising affordable housing or infrastructure provision, it is deemed appropriate to deal with such issues on a case-by-case basis.
	Comments were generally split between providing a preference to key workers and not.	No preference will be given to key workers in affordable housing within the Draft JLP.

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
<b>Rural Exception Sites</b>	A range of on-site market provision between 5% and 80% were suggested.	The Draft JLP proposes an allowance of 35% market housing on rural exception sites. If levels were set any higher this would lessen the opportunity to provide for affordable housing on the site.
<b>Housing Mix and Type</b>	A large number of responses were received with an overarching support for bungalows and accessible housing in-line with the findings in the SHMA.	The Draft JLP proposes that the mix, type and size of new housing development will be expected to reflect established needs in the most relevant district needs assessment.
	Concerns were raised that requiring a proportion of bungalows and/or accessible dwellings would be overly restrictive and against market forces.	This is noted, however with the aging demographics of each District expected to continue there is a need to address specific requirements. Draft policies have been viability tested.
<b>Gypsies and Travellers</b>	There was a limited response this topic. There was not a strong preference to either allocating standalone Gypsies and Traveller site(s) or allocating as part of larger residential developments.	The current assessment has shown that there is little to no requirement for additional sites within Babergh and Mid Suffolk therefore to allocate sites as part of residential allocations would be considered disproportionate to meet current need. Criteria based policy proposed in the Draft JLP.
<b>Mooring Provision</b>	Wide acknowledgement that greater management is required with regards to existing and potential future moorings at Pin Mill, Chelmondiston. This management extends beyond Babergh District Council. Request for a robust policy to control inappropriate moorings.	Houseboat Policy has been included in the Draft JLP.

## Economy

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
<b>Economic Needs</b>	Concerns were raised over the accuracy of employment needs forecasts claiming that future uncertainty will limit the demand for employment land.	Forecasts are based on projections and do not take into account future uncertainty or future interventions which could impact on future demand. Could be reviewed at a later plan review.
<b>Allocating employment land to meet needs to allocate over and above</b>	The Joint Local Plan should be aspirational and support business expansion and development. However, others felt that the focus should be on the suitability of the land and managing the risk of change of use from employment to residential use which could be increased by over allocating land.	In accordance with the NPPF the Draft JLP supports and encourages sustainable economic growth seeking to ensure a continuous range and diversity of sites and premises which are fit for purpose are available across the Districts. Policy also provides criteria for the delivery of new employment sites.
<b>Retaining Employment Land</b>	Land should not be allocated in perpetuity.	Draft JLP policies generally seek to protect employment land. However, policies set out the circumstances in which employment land may be considered suitable for redevelopment into other uses.
<b>Retail</b>	Limited representations were received. Representations that were received varied with thresholds for Retail Impact Assessment ranging from 200m <sup>2</sup> to 2,500m <sup>2</sup> . Comments suggested amendments to Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages.	Babergh and Mid Suffolk Town Centre and Retail Study (2015) sets clear recommendations to be implemented through the JLP.

## Environment

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
<b>Biodiversity</b>	Responses received largely acknowledged the need to protect biodiversity but with a strong desire to widen the criteria of the approaches taken.	Draft JLP policy seeks to protect species and habitats but also seek enhancements for the network of habitats and biodiversity where appropriate.
<b>Flood Risk</b>	Limited responses were received (however some site-specific comments were made which are addressed in the place section).	Flood Risk policy within the Draft Joint Local Plan seeks to limit the flood risk of development in accordance with the NPPF and local circumstances. The site allocation process in the Draft Joint Local Plan steers development away from areas at the highest risk of flooding.
<b>Renewable Energy</b>	Limited responses were received. There was an over-arching support for a renewable energy policy. Some representations provided additional measures that could be considered for inclusion. Concerns were raised that the requirement could deem development to be unviable.	The Draft JLP supports renewable energy and includes criteria related specific impacts which will actively support the delivery of renewable technologies appropriate for the area, on a case by case basis. Whole plan viability testing has been conducted.
<b>Building Sustainability</b>	Over-arching views are supportive of building sustainably with a number of comments providing additional sustainability measures. Anglian Water considered there is sufficient evidence to support water efficiency measures.	The Draft JLP proposes water efficiency measures (110 litres per person per day).
<b>Landscape</b>	Concerns were raised that there is a lack of robust evidence to substantiate removal of locally designated landscape areas.	Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (Aug 2015) identifies the specific landscape and settlement characteristics within the Districts. Furthermore, Landscape Fringes of Ipswich – Settlement Sensitivity Assessment (July 2018) produced after

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
		the consultation provides a robust analysis of the sensitivity of settlement fringes to development. Babergh and Mid Suffolk Heritage and Settlement Sensitivity Assessment (March 2018) produced after the consultation. This document provides an analysis of the historic characteristics of the landscape.
<b>Minimum standards</b>	Generally, there was support for including national space standards in the Joint Local Plan. Concerns were raised that space standards would impact on viability and delivery.	Minimum space standards to be included within the Draft JLP and have been viability tested.
<b>Design Policies</b>	Generally, there was support for improving the design quality of developments across both Districts, with support for reviewing and updating the Suffolk Design Guidance and stronger design policies.	Design policy within Draft JLP incorporating the desire to improve the design quality in the Districts.

## Communities

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
<b>Open Space Provision</b>	<p>Generally, there was support for the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requiring open space provision for non-residential uses of 1ha or more;</li> <li>• Open space requirements related to identified needs;</li> <li>• Protect open spaces unless assessment shows it is surplus, or the equivalent or better provision would result from the development and recognising the local distinctiveness of open spaces.</li> </ul> <p>Viability concerns were raised.</p>	Incorporated within the Draft JLP policies, which have been viability tested.

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
<b>Local Green Space</b>	Numerous spaces were proposed as Local Green Spaces.	The Draft JLP does not propose 'Local Green Spaces' in accordance with the NPPF. Open Space Assessment (2019) provides the evidence base for generally protecting open spaces. If local communities wish to designate Local Green Spaces this can be achieved through Neighbourhood Plans in accordance with the NPPF.
<b>Protection and Provision of Community Facilities</b>	Generally, there was support for inclusion for a policy for the protection and provision of community facilities. Concerns were raised that a criteria-based policy could result in the loss of community facilities, and the relocation of facilities could have traffic and travel impacts. A number of community facilities were proposed to be included within this policy.	A list of community facilities to be protected is included within the Draft JLP. Draft JLP policy includes a consideration of the traffic and accessibility impacts and requires evidence that the facility is not viable either in its current or future form.

## Infrastructure

Topic	Main issues raised during consultation	How this has been taken into account
<b>Strategic Infrastructure Policy</b>	There was widespread support for a strategic infrastructure policy to manage infrastructure, particularly as this would address issues of cumulative growth.	Strategic infrastructure policy has been included within the Draft JLP. The Councils have produced an Infrastructure Delivery Programme (IDP) which provides evidence for the Draft JLP. This has been produced in consultation with Suffolk County Council and the relevant infrastructure providers.

## Place Section Comments

The Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan: Consultation Document (August 2017) sought the views on the suitability of 'potential development sites' identified in the Draft Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) (2017) and proposed settlement boundaries. The Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation July 2019 (Reg 18) includes draft site allocations and settlement boundaries to meet the development needs of the Plan.

Summary of the issue	Settlements Affected		How this issue has been taken into account
<p><b>The impact of development on the following infrastructure:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Highways safety and capacity;</b></li> <li>• <b>Primary and secondary school capacity;</b></li> <li>• <b>Healthcare capacity;</b></li> <li>• <b>Utilities capacity (gas/water/electricity/sewage);</b></li> <li>• <b>Emergency services; and</b></li> <li>• <b>Waste capacity.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aldham;</li> <li>• Bacton;</li> <li>• Belstead;</li> <li>• Bentley;</li> <li>• Beyton;</li> <li>• Bildeston;</li> <li>• Botesdale &amp; Rickingham;</li> <li>• Boxford;</li> <li>• Brantham;</li> <li>• Bramford;</li> <li>• Chelmondiston;</li> <li>• Claydon/Barham;</li> <li>• Cockfield;</li> <li>• Copdock and Washbrook;</li> <li>• East Bergholt;</li> <li>• Finningham;</li> <li>• Great Blakenham</li> <li>• Great Waldingfield;</li> <li>• Glemsford;</li> <li>• Hadleigh;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holbrook;</li> <li>• Hunston;</li> <li>• Kenton;</li> <li>• Leavenheath;</li> <li>• Little Waldingfield;</li> <li>• Long Thurlow</li> <li>• Metfield;</li> <li>• Needham Market;</li> <li>• Redgrave;</li> <li>• Shimpling;</li> <li>• Sproughton;</li> <li>• Stutton;</li> <li>• Sudbury;</li> <li>• Thorndon;</li> <li>• Wetherden;</li> <li>• Woolpit;</li> <li>• Wolverstone;</li> <li>• Worlingworth;</li> <li>• Yaxley;</li> </ul>	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Programme (IDP) and consultation with Suffolk County Council and the relevant service providers have informed the Draft JLP. Where applicable mitigation measures are proposed within draft site allocations. The spatial distribution of growth considers the infrastructure capacity of settlements and the opportunities to provide new infrastructure provision.</p>

Summary of the issue	Settlements Affected			How this issue has been taken into account
<p><b>Potential impact of development on heritage assets including conservation areas.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aldham;</li> <li>• Acton;</li> <li>• Badwell Ash;</li> <li>• Bacton;</li> <li>• Barham;</li> <li>• Barking;</li> <li>• Belstead;</li> <li>• Bentley;</li> <li>• Beyton;</li> <li>• Bildeston;</li> <li>• Botesdale &amp; Rickingham;</li> <li>• Brantham;</li> <li>• Bures St Mary;</li> <li>• Capel St Mary;</li> <li>• Claydon</li> <li>• Cockfield;</li> <li>• Copdock &amp; Washbrook;</li> <li>• Cotton;</li> <li>• Creeting St Peter;</li> <li>• Drinkstone;</li> <li>• Earl Stonham;</li> <li>• East Bergholt;</li> <li>• Elmsett;</li> <li>• Eye;</li> <li>• Finningham;</li> <li>• Fressingfield;</li> <li>• Gislingham;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Blakenham;</li> <li>• Great Finborough;</li> <li>• Great Waldingfield;</li> <li>• Glemsford;</li> <li>• Harleston;</li> <li>• Henley;</li> <li>• Hessett;</li> <li>• Hinderclay;</li> <li>• Hitcham;</li> <li>• Holbrook;</li> <li>• Hoxne;</li> <li>• Hunston;</li> <li>• Lavenham;</li> <li>• Laxfield;</li> <li>• Lindsey;</li> <li>• Little Waldingfield;</li> <li>• Long Melford;</li> <li>• Long Thurlow;</li> <li>• Mellis;</li> <li>• Metfield;</li> <li>• Mendham;</li> <li>• Needham Market;</li> <li>• Occold;</li> <li>• Old Newton;</li> <li>• Onehouse;</li> <li>• Preston St Mary;</li> <li>• Raydon;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redgrave;</li> <li>• Shimpling;</li> <li>• Shotley;</li> <li>• Somersham;</li> <li>• Sproughton;</li> <li>• Stanstead;</li> <li>• Stoke by Nayland;</li> <li>• Stonham Parva;</li> <li>• Stowmarket;</li> <li>• Stowupland;</li> <li>• Stradbroke;</li> <li>• Stutton;</li> <li>• Sudbury;</li> <li>• Thorndon;</li> <li>• Tostock;</li> <li>• Walsham-le-Willows;</li> <li>• Wattisfield;</li> <li>• Wenham Magna;</li> <li>• Wetheringsett-Cum-Brockford;</li> <li>• Weybread;</li> <li>• Whatfield;</li> <li>• Wherstead;</li> <li>• Wilby;</li> <li>• Wortham;</li> <li>• Worlingworth;</li> <li>• Wolverstone;</li> <li>• Yaxley.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential heritage impacts were highlighted in the relevant SHELAA site assessments. Babergh and Mid Suffolk Heritage and Settlement Sensitivity Assessment (March 2018) produced after the consultation which provides part of the evidence base for the draft Joint Local Plan. The reassessment of sites using this new evidence has resulted in the removal of certain sites from the SHELAA. Where applicable mitigation measures are included in draft Joint Local Plan allocations.</p>

Summary of the issue	Settlements Affected		How this issue has been taken into account
<p><b>Development would be disproportionate to the existing settlement and/or there is no requirement locally for housing/employment land.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acton;</li> <li>• Bentley;</li> <li>• Botesdale and Rickingham;</li> <li>• Cockfield;</li> <li>• Glemsford;</li> <li>• Great Ashfield;</li> <li>• Great Waldingfield;</li> <li>• Holton St Mary;</li> <li>• Kenton;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leavenheath;</li> <li>• Little Waldingfield;</li> <li>• Long Melford;</li> <li>• Shimpling;</li> <li>• Sproughton;</li> <li>• Redgrave;</li> <li>• Woolverstone;</li> <li>• Worlingworth;</li> <li>• Wyverstone.</li> </ul>	<p>SHELAA is a technical assessment of the potential suitability of sites. Draft Joint Local Plan allocations and settlement boundary expansions include considerations of District wide housing and employment needs, spatial distribution, settlement hierarchy, environmental and physical constraints, infrastructure capacity and existing planning commitments.</p>
<p><b>Lack of services and facilities to accommodate growth</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bentley;</li> <li>• Cockfield;</li> <li>• Copdock and Washbrook;</li> <li>• Gisligham;</li> <li>• Glemsford;</li> <li>• Great Ashfield;</li> <li>• Kenton;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Waldingfield;</li> <li>• Sproughton;</li> <li>• Redgrave;</li> <li>• Woolverstone;</li> <li>• Worlingworth;</li> <li>• Wyverstone</li> <li>• Yaxley</li> </ul>	<p>Audit of services and facilities conducted as part of the draft Joint Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy Review. The settlement hierarchy (alongside the spatial distribution) plays an important role in the distribution of housing growth.</p>
<p><b>Biodiversity and/or Ecological impact of development.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bacton;</li> <li>• Botesdale &amp; Rickingham;</li> <li>• Capel St Mary;</li> <li>• Chelmondiston;</li> <li>• Claydon/Barham;</li> <li>• Cockfield;</li> <li>• Copdock and Washbrook;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holbrook;</li> <li>• Kenton;</li> <li>• Leavenheath;</li> <li>• Long Melford;</li> <li>• Stowmarket;</li> <li>• Woolpit;</li> <li>• Woolverstone;</li> </ul>	<p>The potential impact on biodiversity/ecology has been noted in the relevant SHELAA site assessments. Draft Joint Local Plan policies to address these concerns.</p>

Summary of the issue	Settlements Affected		How this issue has been taken into account
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Waldingfield;</li> <li>• Hadleigh;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yaxley.</li> </ul>	
<b>Landscape impact of development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bentley;</li> <li>• Claydon/Barham;</li> <li>• Copdock and Washbrook;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Waldingfield;</li> <li>• Sproughton;</li> <li>• Woolverstone;</li> </ul>	Settlement Sensitivity Assessment - Landscape Fringes of Ipswich (July 2018) produced after the consultation to inform the Joint Local Plan.
<b>Impact of development on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chelmondiston;</li> <li>• Holbrook;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stoke by Nayland;</li> <li>• Wherstead;</li> <li>• Woolverstone;</li> </ul>	Relevant SHELAA sites have identified the potential impact upon AONB's. Where sites are allocated within or in close proximity to the AONB the Draft Joint Local site allocation policies require the potential impact to be mitigated. Planning applications would be required to include mitigation measures.
<b>Development proposed in areas at risk of flooding.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cockfield;</li> <li>• Copdock and Washbrook;</li> <li>• Kenton;</li> <li>• Needham Market;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stowmarket;</li> <li>• Worlingworth;</li> <li>• Yaxley.</li> </ul>	The SHELAA/Draft Joint Local Plan does not propose any development on Flood Zone 2/3 areas. Where site covers an area at risk of flooding this should be excluded from development.

Summary of the issue	Settlements Affected		How this issue has been taken into account
<p><b>Amendments to settlement boundaries were proposed including the removal of settlement boundaries, creation of new settlement boundaries and changes to proposed settlement boundaries</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acton – Newman’s Green;</li> <li>• Bacton;</li> <li>• Badwell Ash – Long Thurlow;</li> <li>• Bedfield – Little Green/Long Green</li> <li>• Bildeston;</li> <li>• Brantham;</li> <li>• Brundish;</li> <li>• Burgate;</li> <li>• Burstall;</li> <li>• Chilton;</li> <li>• Combs – Moat Tye</li> <li>• Copdock and Washbrook;</li> <li>• Cotton;</li> <li>• East Bergholt;</li> <li>• Elmswell;</li> <li>• Eye;</li> <li>• Framsdan;</li> <li>• Fressingfield;</li> <li>• Gedding;</li> <li>• Great Ashfield;</li> <li>• Great Cornard;</li> <li>• Great Finborough;</li> <li>• Hadleigh;</li> <li>• Harkstead;</li> <li>• Haughley;</li> <li>• Haughley New Street;</li> <li>• Haughley Green;</li> <li>• Hemingstone;</li> <li>• Holbrook;</li> <li>• Holton St Mary;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hoxne;</li> <li>• Lawshall;</li> <li>• Lindsey</li> <li>• Little Cornard;</li> <li>• Mendlesham Green</li> <li>• Nedging with Naughton;</li> <li>• Needham Market;</li> <li>• Norton;</li> <li>• Old Newton;</li> <li>• Palgrave;</li> <li>• Pinewood;</li> <li>• Raydon;</li> <li>• Redlingfield;</li> <li>• Shimpling Street;</li> <li>• Somerton;</li> <li>• Sproughton;</li> <li>• Stonham Earl;</li> <li>• Stowmarket;</li> <li>• Stowupland;</li> <li>• Stradbroke;</li> <li>• Stutton;</li> <li>• Sudbury;</li> <li>• Thorndon;</li> <li>• Thurston;</li> <li>• Westhorpe;</li> <li>• Wetheringsett-cum-Brockford;</li> <li>• Wickham Skeith;</li> <li>• Wickahm Street;</li> <li>• Wortham;</li> <li>• Woolpit;</li> <li>• Woolverstone;</li> </ul>	<p>Where settlements of 10 or more well related dwellings which are fronting a public highway, have been identified through the consultation process they have been provided with a settlement boundary in the Draft Joint Local Plan Preferred Options (July 2019). Settlement boundaries have been created using a consistent approach across the Districts, to meet the development needs of the Districts across the plan period. Draft allocations are included within the settlement boundaries proposed in the Draft Joint Local Plan Preferred Options (July 2019).</p>

