

Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan 2022 - 2037

Focused consultation on proposed amendment to Settlement Boundary

Independent examination of the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) commenced on 6 June 2023.

On the 10 June, the Examiner wrote to both Parish and District Council to seek clarity on a number of matters. One of these concerned the planning status of a parcel of land on the west side of the village. Responding, Elmswell Parish Council submitted a proposal to re-draw the settlement boundary set out in their submission draft plan so that it now excluded the land in question.

Because this would constitute a significant change to the Plan the Examiner instructed Mid Suffolk District Council to undertake a focused consultation exercise on this matter alone. That took place between Friday 4 August and Friday 18 August 2023.

In total, 79 representations were received and copies of these are attached. The majority of these came from Elmswell residents supporting the proposed change.

Ref No.	Consultee
(1)	Suffolk County Council
(2)	Natural England
(3)	National Highways
(4)	Marine Management Organisation
(5)	Elmswell Resident - objection
(6)	Elmswell Residents - support

For reference purposes only, a late representation was also received from Historic England. Their letter states that: *“Historic England does not have any comments to make regarding the proposal to amend the settlement boundary to now exclude an area of open land north of Church Road.”*, and refers us *“to any detailed comments [they] may have made at earlier stages of the plan’s production including Regulation 14, 16 and where it was required, SEA screening/scoping and draft report stages”*

[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

(1) SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

Date: 18 August 2023
Enquiries to: Georgia Teague
Tel: 01473 265054
Email: georgia.teague@suffolk.gov.uk
neighbourhoodplanning@suffolk.gov.uk



Spatial Planning Policy Team,
Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils,
Endeavour House,
8 Russell Rd,
Ipswich,
Suffolk,
IP1 2BX

Dear Mr Bryant,

Focused Consultation of the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council (SCC) on this focused consultation for Elmswell neighbourhood plan.

SCC makes no objection to the proposed changes to the settlement boundary, in regard to this consultation.

Yours sincerely,

Georgia Teague
Planning Officer
Growth, Highways, and Infrastructure

[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

(2) NATURAL ENGLAND

Date: 15 August 2023
Our ref: 444577
Your ref: Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan



Mr Paul Bryant
Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

BY EMAIL ONLY

communityplanning@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Mr Bryant

Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan 2022–2037 - Consultation on change to settlement boundary

Thank you for your letter dated 4 August 2023 notifying Natural England of the above Neighbourhood Planning Area

Natural England does not wish to make comment on the suitability of the proposed plan area or the proposed neighbourhood planning body.

However we would like to take this opportunity to provide you with information sources the neighbourhood planning body may wish to use in developing the plan, and to highlight some of the potential environmental risks and opportunities that neighbourhood plans may present. We have set this out in the annex to this letter.

Natural England's role

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. The local planning authority will be aware and should advise the neighbourhood planning body when Natural England should be consulted further on the neighbourhood plan.

Planning policy for the natural environment

Neighbourhood plans and orders present significant opportunities, but also potential risks, for the natural environment. Proposals should be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. The key principles are set out in paragraphs 170-177.

The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
- recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;

The neighbourhood planning body should also consider the natural environment policies in the area's Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan or order should be consistent with these, and the neighbourhood planning body may decide that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should provide more detail as to how some of these policies apply or are interpreted locally.

The attached annex sets out sources of environmental information and some natural environment issues you may wish to consider as the neighbourhood plan or order is developed.

Yours sincerely

Sally Wintle
Consultations Team

(3) NATIONAL HIGHWAYS



Our ref: NH/23/02180 Elmswell NP
Your ref: Elmswell NP Focused Consultation

Elmswell NP Focused Consultation
c/o Spatial Planning Policy Team Babergh & Mid
Suffolk District Councils Endeavour House
8 Russell Rd
Ipswich, Suffolk, IP1 2BX

Shamsul Hoque
National Highways
Spatial Planning
Operations (East)
Woodlands Manton
Lane Bedford MK41
7LW

07 August 2023

Via email to: communityplanning@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

**DRAFT ELMSWELL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2022-2037– FOCUSED CONSULTATION ON
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY**

Thank you for your correspondence, received on 04 August 2023, notifying National Highways of the consultation above.

National Highways is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England on behalf of the Secretary of the State. In the area within and surrounding the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan, we have responsibility for the trunk road A14, part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

Recently, we have reviewed and sent our comment related to the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan, dated 25 April 2023. With this consultation on the proposed amendment to the Elmswell's settlement boundary, it will not have a significant impact on the operation of the SRN. National Highways will not have any objection on that.

We do not have any more comments on this.

Please contact us at PlanningEE@nationalhighways.co.uk if you require any clarification.

Yours faithfully,

S. H.

Shamsul Hoque
Assistant Spatial Planner

Standing advice to the local planning authority

The Climate Change Committee's [2022 Report to Parliament](#) notes that for the UK to achieve net zero carbon status by 2050, action is needed to support a modal shift away from car travel. The NPPF supports this position, with paragraphs 73 and 105 prescribing that significant development should offer a genuine choice of transport modes, while paragraphs 104 and 110 advise that appropriate opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport should be taken up.

Moreover, the build clever and build efficiently criteria as set out in clause 6.1.4 of [PAS2080](#) promote the use of low carbon materials and products, innovative design solutions and construction methods to minimise resource consumption.

These considerations should be weighed alongside any relevant Local Plan policies to ensure that planning decisions are in line with the necessary transition to net zero carbon.

(5) MARINE MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION

E from: Consultations.MMO@marinemanagement.org.uk
Rec'd: 9 August 2023
Subject: Elmswell NP Focused Consultation

Good morning,

Thank you for your invitation to participate in the consultation for the change to settlement boundary for Elmswell.

No further comment is required from the MMO regarding the review given your proximity to the marine environment, we do however advise that you consider any relevant policies within the [East Marine Plan Documents](#) in regard to areas within the plan that may impact the marine environment, including the tidal extent of any rivers. We recommend the inclusion of the East Marine Plans when discussing any themes with coastal or marine elements.

When reviewing the East Marine Plans to inform decisions that may affect the marine environment, please take a whole-plan approach by considering all marine plan policies together, rather than in isolation.

For further information, a copy of the standard response is attached.

Many thanks for the opportunity to comment,

Louise Feavyour

East Coastal Marine Planner | Marine Management Organisation

MMO | Pakefield Road | Lowestoft | Suffolk | NR33 0HT

Louise.Feavyour@marinemanagement.org.uk | 07584 547534

Our MMO Values: Together we are **Accountable**, **Innovative**, **Engaging** and **Inclusive**

[Explore Marine Plans](#) [Website](#) [Blog](#) [Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [LinkedIn](#) [YouTube](#)

Standard Response:

Consultation response - PLEASE READ

Thank you for including the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) in your recent consultation submission. The MMO will review your document and respond to you directly should a bespoke response be required. If you do not receive a bespoke response from us within your deadline, please consider the following information as the MMO's formal response.

Kind regards,

The Marine Management Organisation

Marine Management Organisation Functions

The MMO is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are: marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing grants.

Marine Planning and Local Plan development

Under delegation from the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (the marine planning authority), the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the Mean High Water Springs

(MHWS) mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of MHWS, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans, which generally extend to the Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) mark. To work together in this overlap, the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) created the [Coastal Concordat](#). This is a framework enabling decision-makers to co-ordinate processes for coastal development consents. It is designed to streamline the process where multiple consents are required from numerous decision-makers, thereby saving time and resources. Defra encourage coastal authorities to sign up as it provides a road map to simplify the process of consenting a development, which may require both a terrestrial planning consent and a marine licence. Furthermore, marine plans inform and guide decision-makers on development in marine and coastal areas.

Under Section 58(3) of [Marine and Coastal Access Act \(MCAA\) 2009](#) all public authorities making decisions capable of affecting the UK marine area (but which are not for authorisation or enforcement) must have regard to the relevant marine plan and the UK [Marine Policy Statement](#). This includes local authorities developing planning documents for areas with a coastal influence. We advise that all marine plan objectives and policies are taken into consideration by local planning authorities when plan-making. It is important to note that individual marine plan policies do not work in isolation, and decision-makers should consider a whole-plan approach. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our [online guidance](#) and the [Planning Advisory Service: soundness self-assessment checklist](#).

We have also produced a [guidance note](#) aimed at local authorities who wish to consider how local plans could have regard to marine plans. For any other information please contact your local marine planning officer. You can find their details on our [gov.uk page](#).

See [this map on our website to locate](#) the marine plan areas in England. For further information on how to apply the marine plans and the subsequent policies, please visit our [Explore Marine Plans](#) online digital service.

The adoption of the [North East, North West, South East, and South West Marine Plans](#) in 2021 follows the adoption of the [East Marine Plans](#) in 2014 and the [South Marine Plans](#) in 2018. All marine plans for English waters are a material consideration for public authorities with decision-making functions and provide a framework for integrated plan-led management.

Marine Licensing and consultation requests below MHWS

Activities taking place below MHWS (which includes the tidal influence/limit of any river or estuary) may require a [marine licence](#) in accordance with the MCAA. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object. Activities between MHWS and MLWS may also require a local authority planning permission. Such permissions would need to be in accordance with the relevant marine plan under section 58(1) of the MCAA. Local authorities may wish to refer to our [marine licensing guide for local planning authorities](#) for more detailed information. We have produced a [guidance note](#) (worked example) on the decision-making process under S58(1) of MCAA, which decision-makers may find useful. The licensing team can be contacted at: marine.consents@marinemanagement.org.uk.

Consultation requests for development above MHWS

If you are requesting a consultee response from the MMO on a planning application, which your authority considers will affect the UK marine area, please consider the following points:

- The UK Marine Policy Statement and relevant marine plan are material considerations for decision-making, but Local Plans may be a more relevant consideration in certain circumstances. This is because a marine plan is not a 'development plan' under the [Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004](#). Local planning authorities will wish to consider this when determining whether a planning application above MHWS should be referred to the MMO for a consultee response.

- It is for the relevant decision-maker to ensure s58 of MCAA has been considered as part of the decision-making process. If a public authority takes a decision under s58(1) of MCAA that is not in accordance with a marine plan, then the authority must state its reasons under s58(2) of the same Act.
- If the MMO does not respond to specific consultation requests then please use the above guidance to assist in making a determination on any planning application.

Minerals and Waste Local Plans and Local Aggregate Assessments

If you are consulting on a minerals and waste local plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommends reference to marine aggregates, and to the documents below, to be included:

- The [Marine Policy Statement \(MPS\)](#), Section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK's) construction industry.
- The [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\)](#), which sets out policies for national (England) construction mineral supply.
- [The minerals planning practice guidance](#) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.
- [The national and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020](#) predict likely aggregate demand over this period, including marine supply.

The minerals planning practice guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments. These assessments must consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine sources. This means that even land-locked counties may have to consider the role that marine-sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) have – particularly where land-based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.

If you wish to contact the MMO regarding our response, please email us at consultations@marinemanagement.org.uk or telephone us on 0208 0265 325.

[Ends]

[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

(5) Elmswell Resident – Objection to boundary change

E from: Elmswell Resident [surname withheld by MSDC]

Rec'd: 9 August 2023

Subject: Elmswell NP Focused Consultation

Dear Sir,

I am writing in regards to the email sent on Friday 4th August in reference to 'Elmswell NP Focused consultation' and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan.

Please take this as my objection to the proposal by Elmswell Parish Council for an amendment to the settlement boundary to exclude the area of open land north of Church road (also referenced as the land previously identified as site LA064 in the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (Nov 2020)).

For clarity I am in favour of the development of this land especially if it can be reserved for affordable housing for those with a connection to the area. I am aware that there is local opposition to any suggestion of development and I do not agree with the Parish Council's position. I think it is short sighted and reminiscent of 'NIMBYism'. This area is already surrounding by development and therefore it makes sense for it to be used for further housing.

[Ends]

[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

(6) Elmswell Residents – Support for boundary change

Written representations in support of the proposed settlement boundary change were received from 74 Elmswell residents during the two week consultation period. These comprised a standard response (received from 44 residents) or a variation on this, or other general supportive comment (received from 30 residents).

Table 1 below records the names of the 44 residents who submitted the standard response. The response itself follows on from this.

Table 1: Names of residents who submitted the standard response		
Mr Abbott	B & W Instrall	Mr Pinyuon
Ms Abbott	Ms Jackson	Mr Pyle
Mrs Baker	Ms Jenkinson	Ms Pyle
Mr Beresford	Ms Jones	Ms Quilton
Mr/s Buick	Ms Lawrence	Ms Rafferty
Mrs Byford	Ms Lazarus	Mr Ray
Mr Clark	Mr Macdonald	Mr Read
Mr Cleary	Ms McNeeney	Mr Ryan
Ms Cocksedge	Mr Myers	Ms Smith
Mr Cocksedge	Mr Newland	Ms Tottie
Ms Cook	Ms Noy	Mrs Tierney
Mr Fouracre-Smith	Mr O'Doherty	Mr Webb
Dr Gale	Ms Osborne	Ms Wyles
Ms Govier	Mr Oxford	Ms Yarrow
Ms Hooley	Mr Payne	

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing to you in regards to the email sent on Friday 4th August in respect / reference to Elmswell NP Focused consultation and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan.

Please take this as my full support of the Elmswell Parish Council to amend the settlement boundary to now exclude the area of open land north of Church Road (also referenced as the land previously identified as site LA064 in the emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk joint local plan (Nov 2020)).

To clarify / Therefore please note that ... I am in full support of amending the settlement boundary to EXCLUDE this piece of land.

Regards

[Name and address]

Table 2 below records the 30 other comments received. Please note that, where appropriate, we have also taken the decision to remove some information that was of a more personal nature.

Surname	Comment
Barber:	I support the change to the village plan. No houses on there.
Barber:	I understand that Elmswell Parish Council wish to have the land at Pightle Close taken out of the settlement boundary in order to protect it from housing development. I am writing to inform you that we agree with this. We also wish to see this area remain as a Public Open Space.
Castle	We definitely support the EPC proposal to take the land out of the Settlement Boundary. ECO houses may be in vogue but not as important as the future wellbeing of our children or the community. A new school in the future would be just as ECO.
Cox	I fully support the proposed change to the settlement boundary as suggested by EPC. I would like the space to remain a public space [...] and always used that area with children, grandchildren and dogs.
Davidson	I am writing to you in regards to the email sent on Friday 4th August in reference to 'Elmswell NP Focused Consultation' and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan. Please take this as my full support of the Elmswell Parish Council to amend the settlement boundary to now exclude the area of open land north of Church Road (also referenced as the land previously identified as site LA064 in the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (Nov.2020)). To clarify I am in full support of amending the settlement boundary to EXCLUDE this piece of land. It's a very popular green space and should be preserved for future village use.
Davison	I am writing to you in reference to Elmswell NP Focused Consultation and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan. Please take this communication as my full support of the Elmswell Parish Council to amend the settlement boundary to now EXCLUDE the area of open land north of Church Road (also referenced as the land previously identified as site LA064 in the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (Nov.2020)). I [...] walk around this field on a regular basis. The field is not only a place for people and families to walk but is also a haven for wildlife. I have often seen barn owls flying across the area and on occasion lucky enough to witness them dive into the long grass and catch a meal. Such a sight to see. The green spaces around Pightle Close attracted us to buy our house here. Alas some green areas have already been built on. Such a shame if this area should be lost to [development] and not kept as an area for all to enjoy. To clarify I am in full support of Elmswell Parish Council amending the settlement boundary to EXCLUDE this piece of land.
Feeney	I support Elmswell Parish Council's proposal to amend the settlement boundary in the neighbourhood plan and to exclude the area north of Church Road shown on your map. This area is currently used as public open space and I believe it should remain as such, with the possibility of being reserved for a new school site at some future point.
Feeney	I am writing to add my support to EPC's wish to exclude the land to the north of Church Road from the settlement boundary. I believe the long term interests of the local community are better served by leaving the land as a POS, with the potential at some future point for reserving it as a site for a new village school.

Fox	<p>I am writing to you in regards to the email sent on Friday 4th August in reference to 'Elmswell NP Focused Consultation' and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Please take this as my full support of the Elmswell Parish Council to amend the settlement boundary to now exclude the area of open land north of Church Road (also referenced as the land previously identified as site LA064 in the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (Nov.2020)).</p> <p>To clarify I am in full support of amending the settlement boundary to EXCLUDE this piece of land. I would also strongly support any restrictions possible to retain as much open space and access within the Parish.</p>
Govier	<p>I am writing to you with regard to the email sent on Friday 4th August with reference to Elmswell NP Focused Consultation and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan. Please take this notification by email that I fully support Elmswell Parish Council to amend the settlement boundary to exclude the area of open land to the north of Church Road [also referenced as LA064] in the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan [November.2020].</p> <p>This land should be used as an open community area for walking, wildlife and recreation purposes. We have enough housing within the village and anymore would be detrimental to the village. We need an open area in this part of the village and the only other justified use would be to build a new school on the former School site which already has an area of land which you maintain. The present School is up to capacity and new children to the village have to go to neighbouring village schools. It would not be sensible to send them to the proposed new school in Woolpit across the A14 and the road to Ixworth as they are very busy roads and more infra structure would be needed to make the safety of the children a priority.</p>
Hawes	<p>I am against this land being used for another housing estate. We do not have the infrastructure in the village to support it. Therefore I support this amendment to the village plan.</p>
Harvey	<p>Further to your email dated 4 August 2023 I confirm that I am in favour of the proposed amendment to the Settlement Boundary regarding land to the west of Pightle Close, Elmswell.</p> <p>This parcel of land is a much used by local walkers and dog owners and is one of the diminishing areas of Public Open Space within the village. Many other similar areas have been swallowed up by the numerous local housing developments that have sprung up on, seemingly, every available patch of land. It should be noted that a 5 year housing supply need has been more than achieved and more houses are not, at present, needed.</p> <p>To lose this area to yet more housing would be an immense shame and should not be allowed.</p>
Hay	<p>I am writing to you with regard to the email sent on Friday 4th August in reference to 'Elmswell NP Focused Consultation' and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I wish to register my full support of the Elmswell Parish Council to amend the settlement boundary to now exclude the area of open land north of Church Road (also referenced as the land previously identified as site LA064 in the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (Nov.2020)).</p> <p>This is a valuable piece of community land which is easily accessible to everyone who lives to the South of the railway line dissecting the village. It is used by many people wishing to walk in safety away from the very busy roads around the village.</p> <p>To clarify I am in full support of amending the settlement boundary to EXCLUDE this piece of land.</p>

Heywood	<p>I am writing to you in regards to the email sent on Friday 4th August, in reference to 'Elmswell NP Focused Consultation' and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Please take this as my own and my husband's full support of the Elmswell Parish Council to amend the settlement boundary to now EXCLUDE the area of open land north of the Church Road (also referenced as the land previously identified as site LA064 in the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (Nov.2020)).</p> <p>To clarify, we are in full support of amending the settlement boundary to EXCLUDE this piece of land.</p> <p>Our grandchildren who live in Elmswell, use this area constantly for recreation and this is the only green space in Elmswell, this side of the railway line. I am also able to use my electric wheelchair on this land and regularly come across to be able to get out and about in an open, safe space. We have been looking at potentially relocating to Elmswell and access to this space is a big factor for us.</p>
Jobbins	<p>Please could I add my support for the above area of land to remain as a public open space or a site for a future school. I would also support a proposal for the area to be moved outside of settlement boundary.</p>
Kent	<p>I would like to support the Parish Councils proposed changes to amend the settlement boundary to now exclude an area of open land north of Church Road.</p>
Kent	<p>We SUPPORT the Proposed Amendment to the Settlement Boundary in the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan. We would wish to see the hatched parcel of land retained as Public Open Space.</p>
Morrison	<p>We wholeheartedly support the Parish Council proposal to redraw the Settlement Boundary to now exclude the land north of Church Road, and their long term aspiration to see the land developed for educational use. We object to any other use of this land e.g. for commercial housing development or other such commercial use.</p>
Moseley	<p>I am writing to you in regards to the email sent on Friday 4th August in reference to 'Elmswell NP Focused Consultation' and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Please take this as my full support of the Elmswell Parish Council to amend the settlement boundary to now exclude the area of open land north of Church Road (also referenced as the land previously identified as site LA064 in the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (Nov.2020)).</p> <p>To clarify I am in full support of amending the settlement boundary to EXCLUDE this piece of land which is so valued and well used by myself, my extended family and our community!</p>
Russell	<p>I agree with the proposal to change the boundary of the land to the north of Church Road, and for that land to remain as a Public Open Space or to be used for a school.</p>
Russell	<p>I agree with the proposal to change the boundary to the north of Church Road and for the land to remain as a Public Open Space or for use as a school.</p>
Samson	<p>I am writing to you in regard to the email sent on Friday 4th August in reference to 'Elmswell NP Focused Consultation' and the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Please take this as my full support of the Elmswell Parish Council to amend the settlement boundary to now exclude the area of open land north of Church Road (also referenced as the land previously identified as site LA064 in the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (Nov.2020)).</p> <p>Currently, although I do not live in Elmswell expect move there shortly. I have for several years spent a lot of time looking after my grandchild who is resident in the village and got to know the village, its life and community.</p>

	To clarify, I fully and strongly support amending the settlement boundary to EXCLUDE this piece of land.
Seaborne	Please note that I am in favour of the proposed changes to the Elmswell NP settlement boundary currently out for consultation and requiring comment by 18th August.
Senior	I am fully 100% in favour of this plan. It is an excellent plan and I trust that common sense will prevail and it will go ahead. Elmswell has had more than its share of new builds. Please leave us with some open space to breath, walk and exercise ourselves and our dogs. Thank you.
Spencer	I support Elmswell Parish Council's proposed amendment to the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan that the settlement boundary to now exclude an area of open land north of Church Road, site LA064. This site is already treated by residents as a public open space within the village and should remain as a public open space
Spencer	I support Elmswell Parish Council's proposed amendment to the Elmswell Neighbourhood Plan that the settlement boundary to now exclude an area of open land north of Church Road, site LA064. This site is already treated by residents as a public open space within the village and should both remain so, and be designated as such.
Stevens	I am writing to confirm that I support the adjustment to that boundary change for the Elmswell neighborhood plan, to remove the parcel of land on the old school site and adjacent to school road as potential building land. I understand that the parish council may want to use this in future for a new school, so allowing it to be developed for housing would not be a sensible. My preference would be that it should always remain free from development, the old school playing field is a haven for nature and wildlife and should be left undisturbed for as long as possible.
Webb	I would like to affirm my agreement to the amendment to the settlement boundary in Elmswell. I believe it is essential to the well being of the community and all who the land for recreational purposes for it to remain as open land.
Williams	I am sending this email as I agree with the proposal to change the boundary and my preference for the land to remain as Public Open Space. I walk the meadow every day, I see many people who cannot walk a great distance or are uneasy on the public footpaths that can be quite remote for our elderly walkers, which are also quite uneven the[r]efore us[e] the meadow regularly to walk. From my perspective, It is an extremely well used area and there are so few areas of this nature- open space, in the village, which I think is important for people's emotional and physical well being. The public nature of the meadow also makes it a safe public space. [...] Despite its relatively small area it is a safe area to walk around.
Wilson	Please preserve the land at Pightle Close as open space for both physical and more importantly the mental health of Elmswell residents. I agree the change to keep it out of the settlement boundary.

Ends

[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]