

Sedgeford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017-2036

**A report to the Borough Council of King's Lynn and
West Norfolk on the Sedgeford Neighbourhood
Development Plan**

**Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
BA (Hons) M.A. DMS M.R.T.P.I.**

Director – Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited

Executive Summary

- 1 I was appointed by the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk in March 2019 to carry out the independent examination of the Sedgeford Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 2 The examination was undertaken by written representations. I visited the neighbourhood plan area on 23 April 2019.
- 3 The Plan includes a range of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. There is a very clear focus on promoting new residential development and safeguarding its historic character. It also proposes the designation of a suite of local green spaces
- 4 The Plan has been underpinned by community support and engagement. It is clear that all sections of the community have been actively engaged in its preparation.
- 5 Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this report I have concluded that the Sedgeford Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.
- 6 I recommend that the referendum should be held within the neighbourhood area.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
27 June 2018

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the findings of the independent examination of the Sedgeford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017-2036 (the 'Plan').
- 1.2 The Plan has been submitted to the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk (KLWNBC) by Sedgeford Parish Council in its capacity as the qualifying body responsible for preparing the neighbourhood plan.
- 1.3 Neighbourhood plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently embedded in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012, 2018 and 2019. The NPPF continues to be the principal element of national planning policy.
- 1.4 The role of an independent examiner is clearly defined in the legislation. I have been appointed to examine whether or not the submitted Plan meets the basic conditions and Convention Rights and other statutory requirements. It is not within my remit to examine or to propose an alternative plan, or a potentially more sustainable plan except where this arises as a result of my recommended modifications to ensure that the plan meets the basic conditions and the other relevant requirements.
- 1.5 A neighbourhood plan can be narrow or broad in scope. Any plan can include whatever range of policies it sees as appropriate to its designated neighbourhood area. The submitted plan has been designed to be distinctive in general terms, and to be complementary to the development plan in particular. It addresses a series of environmental and community issues and proposes residential allocations.
- 1.6 Within the context set out above this report assesses whether the Plan is legally compliant and meets the basic conditions that apply to neighbourhood plans. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends changes to its policies and supporting text.
- 1.7 This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome the Plan would then be used to determine planning applications within the plan area and will sit as part of the wider development plan.

2 The Role of the Independent Examiner

- 2.1 The examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted neighbourhood plan meets the relevant legislative and procedural requirements.
- 2.2 I was appointed by KLWNBC, with the consent of the Parish Council, to conduct the examination of the Plan and to prepare this report. I am independent of both KLWNBC and the Parish Council. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.
- 2.3 I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I am a Director of Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited. In previous roles, I have over 35 years' experience in various local authorities at either Head of Planning or Service Director level. I am a chartered town planner and have significant experience of undertaking other neighbourhood plan examinations and health checks. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service.

Examination Outcomes

- 2.4 In my role as the independent examiner of the Plan I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the examination:
- (a) that the Plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (b) that the Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
 - (c) that the Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 2.5 The outcome of the examination is set out in Section 8 of this report.

Other examination matters

- 2.6 In examining the Plan I am required to check whether:
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood plan area; and
 - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one neighbourhood area); and
 - the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.
- 2.7 Having addressed the matters identified in paragraph 2.6 of this report I am satisfied that all of the points have been met.

3 Procedural Matters

- 3.1 In undertaking this examination I have considered the following documents:
- the submitted Plan and the various Appendices;
 - the Basic Conditions Statement;
 - the Consultation Statement;
 - the SEA and HRA report;
 - the Parish Council's responses to my Clarification Note;
 - the representations made to the Plan;
 - the adopted King's Lynn and West Norfolk Core Strategy 2011;
 - the adopted King's Lynn and West Norfolk Sites Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016;
 - the National Planning Policy Framework 2019;
 - Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014 and subsequent updates); and
 - relevant Ministerial Statements.
- 3.2 I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the Plan area on 23 April 2019. I looked at its overall character and appearance and at those areas affected by policies in the Plan in particular. My site inspection is covered in more detail in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.16 of this report.
- 3.3 It is a general rule that neighbourhood plan examinations should be held by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted plan, I was satisfied that the Plan could be examined without the need for a public hearing. I advised KLWNBC of this decision early in the examination process.
- 3.4 On 24 July 2018 a revised version of the NPPF was published. This fell within the plan-making process. Paragraph 214 of the 2018 NPPF identifies transitional arrangement to address these circumstances. As the Plan was submitted after 24 January 2019, I am required to examine the Plan on the basis of the most recent version of the NPPF. All references to paragraph numbers within the NPPF in this report are to those in the 2019 version. The 2018 version of the NPPF was subsequently updated in February 2019. However, those updates did not affect the transitional arrangements.

4 Consultation

Consultation Process

- 4.1 Policies in made neighbourhood plans become the basis for local planning and development control decisions. As such the regulations require neighbourhood plans to be supported and underpinned by public consultation.
- 4.2 In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 the Parish Council has prepared a Consultation Statement. This Statement is proportionate to the Plan and its policies. It includes an assessment of the consultation undertaken during the various stages of Plan production. It also provides specific details about the consultation process that took place on the pre-submission version of the Plan (September to October 2018).
- 4.3 The Statement sets out details of the range of consultation events that were carried out in relation to the initial stages of the Plan. They include:
- the discussions with local groups;
 - the distribution of questionnaires in the neighbourhood area;
 - the meetings with landowners;
 - the use of leaflets to explain the proposed housing allocations;
 - the visits to the school; and
 - the use of a Facebook page.
- 4.4 From Section 8 onwards the Statement also provides specific details on the comments received as part of the consultation process that took place on the pre-submission version of the Plan. It identifies the principal changes that worked their way through into the submission version. They are captured in Appendix 6. They help to describe the evolution of the Plan.
- 4.5 It is clear that consultation has been an important element of the Plan's production. Advice on the neighbourhood planning process has been made available to the community in a positive and direct way by those responsible for the Plan's preparation.
- 4.6 From all the evidence provided to me as part of the examination, I can see that the Plan has promoted an inclusive approach to seeking the opinions of all concerned throughout the process.

Representations Received

- 4.7 Consultation on the submitted plan was undertaken by the District Council for a six-week period that ended on 8 April 2019. This exercise generated comments from a range of organisations and private individuals as follows:

- Mrs V Danziger
- Mr K Mills
- Historic England
- Norfolk County Council
- Mr A Ramsay
- KLWNBC
- Anglian Water Services
- Mr H Head
- Natural England
- Sport England
- Forestry Commission

4.8 Where it is appropriate to do so I make specific references to some representations in the detailed sections of this report

5 The Neighbourhood Area and the Development Plan Context

The Neighbourhood Area

- 5.1 The neighbourhood area consists of the parish of Sedgeford. Its population in 2011 was 613 persons. It was designated as a neighbourhood area on 20 July 2016. It is located to the east of Heacham and approximately three miles inland from The Wash to the west. The western half of the neighbourhood area is within the Norfolk Coast AONB
- 5.2 The village of Sedgeford dominates the neighbourhood area. Its layout reflects its location along the B1451. Its vernacular buildings contain a traditional mix of carstone, red brick and clunch materials. The attractive historic core of the village is located around Saint Mary the Virgin Church. It is a designated conservation area. More modern development has generally taken place in a linear fashion along the B1451. Given its limited size Sedgeford has relatively few services and facilities. However, it enjoys a primary school, a village hall and an associated recreation ground, the King William IV public house and St Mary's Church.
- 5.3 The remainder of the neighbourhood area is predominantly rural in character. Its landscape predominantly consists of rolling open farmland with some plateau farmland in the north eastern part. The Peddars Way long-distance footpath runs along the high ground towards the eastern edge of the neighbourhood area. In addition, National Cycle Route 1 also passes on a north-south alignment through the village, along Ringstead Road and Snettisham Road. The disused railway line of the former West Norfolk Junction railway sits to the north of the village. It remains visible within the wider landscape. The former railway station off Ringstead Road has been converted to a private dwelling.

Development Plan Context

- 5.4 The development plan covering the neighbourhood plan area is the adopted King's Lynn and West Norfolk Core Strategy 2011 and adopted King's Lynn and West Norfolk Sites Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016. The Core Strategy sets out a vision, objectives, a spatial strategy and overarching planning policies that guide new development in the Plan period.
- 5.5 Policies CS02 and CS06 of the Core Strategy provides a focus for new development in the neighbourhood area. Sedgeford is identified as a Rural Village (CS02) where limited minor development will be permitted which meets the needs of settlements and helps to sustain existing services. Policy CS06 continues this approach based on the settlement hierarchy identified in CS02. In respect of rural villages, it comments that modest levels of development will be permitted to support local needs and to maintain the vitality of the various communities.
- 5.6 The Sites Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 (SADMP) gives effect to and complements the Core Strategy. As its name suggest it allocates

land to meet the development requirements identified in the Core Strategy. In addition, it includes a series of development management policies. The following policies in the SADMP are particularly relevant to the submitted Plan:

- DM2 Development boundaries
- DM5 Enlargement or replacement of dwellings in the countryside
- DM9 Community Facilities
- DM11 Touring and Permanent Holiday Sites
- DM15 Environment, Design and Amenity
- DM22 Protection of Local Open Space
- G78.1 Sedgeford

- 5.7 The Borough Council has embarked on the preparation of a new Local Plan. The Local Development Scheme indicates that the Local Plan will be submitted for examination in 2020. On this basis it is not at a sufficiently advanced stage to play any significant role in the examination of the submitted neighbourhood plan.
- 5.8 The submitted Plan has been prepared within its wider adopted development plan context. In doing so it has relied on up-to-date information and research that has underpinned existing planning policy documents in the Borough. This is good practice and reflects key elements in Planning Practice Guidance on this matter. It is clear that the submitted Plan seeks to add value to the Core Strategy and to give a local dimension to the delivery of its policies. This is captured in the Basic Conditions Statement.

Unaccompanied Visit

- 5.9 I carried out an unaccompanied visit on 23 April 2019. The weather was bright and breezy and provided a perfect context within which to look around the neighbourhood area.
- 5.10 I drove into the neighbourhood area from the west from Heacham along the B1451. This gave me an initial impression of its setting and the character in general, and its relationship to The Norfolk Coast AONB in particular.
- 5.11 I looked initially at that part of the neighbourhood area around Ringstead Road and Jarvie Close. I looked in detail at the proposed Jarvie Close housing site and the two sites proposed to the east of Ringstead Road. In doing so I saw the importance of the School to the local community.
- 5.12 I also took the opportunity to look at two of the local green spaces proposed in the Plan. I saw the scale and size of the Recreation Ground and the associated Village Hall. I saw that the Recreation Ground was being well-used. I then walked down to The Green near the Mill. I saw its close relationship to the surrounding houses to the east and to the south.

- 5.13 I continued walking to the main road and then down Snettisham Road towards the Church. In doing so I saw the proposed local green space at The Washpit adjacent to the River Heacham. I saw that it was a pleasant triangular grassed area. I sat in the sunshine for a while on the metal bench provided by the Sedgeford Carol Singers to commemorate the Queen's Golden Jubilee in 2002.
- 5.14 I spent some time in the Church grounds. I saw its 14th century very distinctive round tower. I also found several interesting elements of the history of the village. I saw the gates erected in memory of those who died during the typhus epidemic in 1852. I also saw the Lamp erected in memory of the 'Men of Sedgeford who gave their lives to keep the light of freedom burning'.
- 5.15 I then walked along the footpath between the Church and The Old Vicarage, over the River Heacham and onto the Snettisham Road as it turns to the west to the south of the village. I walked back along that road into the centre of the village. In doing so I saw the Sedgeford Historical and Archaeological Research Project site to the immediate east of the road. I carried on back into the village and continued down to Cole Green. I saw the impact of traffic movements on the character and appearance of the village. I also saw the proposed local green space around the War Memorial.
- 5.16 I finished my visit by looking at the more outlying parts of the neighbourhood area. In particular I drove to the east along the B1451 towards Docking. I also drove to the north on the Ringstead Road. In doing so I saw the successful residential conversion of the former railway station. This part of the visit also helped me to understand further the wider landscape setting in which the neighbourhood area is located.

6 The Neighbourhood Plan and the Basic Conditions

6.1 This section of the report deals with the submitted neighbourhood plan as a whole and the extent to which it meets the basic conditions. The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has helped considerably in the preparation of this section of the report. It is a well-presented, informative and very professional document.

6.2 As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. To comply with the basic conditions, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in the area;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations; and
- not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (7).

6.3 I assess the Plan against the basic conditions under the following headings.

National Planning Policies and Guidance

6.4 For the purposes of this examination the key elements of national policy relating to planning matters are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in February 2019. Paragraph 3.4 of this report has addressed the transitional arrangements which the government has put in place as part of the publication of the 2018 and 2019 versions of the NPPF. As the plan was submitted in February 2019 it is assessed against the most recent version of the NPPF. This approach is reflected in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement.

6.5 The NPPF sets out a range of core land-use planning principles to underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The following are of particular relevance to the Sedgeford Neighbourhood Plan:

- a plan led system– in this case the relationship between the neighbourhood plan, the adopted Core Strategy and the SADMP;
- recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving local communities;
- taking account of the different roles and characters of different areas;
- always seeking to secure high quality design and good standards of amenity for all future occupants of land and buildings; and
- conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

- 6.6 Neighbourhood plans sit within this wider context both generally, and within the more specific presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is identified as a golden thread running through the planning system. Paragraph 29 of the NPPF indicates that neighbourhoods should both develop plans that support the strategic needs set out in local plans and plan positively to support local development that is outside the strategic elements of the development plan.
- 6.7 In addition to the NPPF I have also taken account of other elements of national planning policy including Planning Practice Guidance and ministerial statements.
- 6.8 Having considered all the evidence and representations available as part of the examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It sets out a positive vision for the future of the plan area within the context of its position in the settlement hierarchy. In particular it positively allocates sites for residential development. It includes a series of policies that seek to safeguard the quality and nature of its natural environment and designates local green spaces. The Basic Conditions Statement maps the policies in the Plan against the appropriate sections of the NPPF.
- 6.9 At a more practical level the NPPF indicates that plans should provide a clear framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made and that they should give a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal (paragraphs 17 and 154). This was reinforced with the publication of Planning Practice Guidance in March 2014. Its paragraph 41 (41-041-20140306) indicates that policies in neighbourhood plans should be drafted with sufficient clarity so that a decision-maker can apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. Policies should also be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.
- 6.10 As submitted the Plan does not fully accord with this range of practical issues. The majority of my recommended modifications in Section 7 relate to matters of clarity and precision. They are designed to ensure that the Plan fully accords with national policy.

Contributing to sustainable development

- 6.11 There are clear overlaps between national policy and the contribution that the submitted Plan makes to achieving sustainable development. Sustainable development has three principal dimensions – economic, social and environmental. It is clear that the submitted Plan has set out to achieve sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. In the economic dimension the Plan includes policies for housing and employment development (Policies H1-H3 and EMP1 respectively). It also offers support for broadband connectivity (Policy C2). In the social role, it includes a policy on community facilities (Policy C1) and on housing mix and type (Policy H5). In the environmental dimension the Plan positively seeks to protect its natural, built and historic environment. It has specific policies on the conservation area (Policy E5), on its river setting (Policies E1/E2) and on local green spaces

(Policy E3). The Parish Council has undertaken its own very impressive assessment of this matter in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement.

General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan

- 6.12 I have already commented in detail on the development plan context in the wider King's Lynn and West Norfolk area in paragraphs 5.4 to 5.8 of this report.
- 6.13 I consider that the submitted Plan delivers a local dimension to this strategic context. The Basic Conditions Statement helpfully relates the Plan's policies to policies in the development plan. I am satisfied that the submitted Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan.

European Legislation and Habitat Regulations

- 6.14 The Neighbourhood Plan General Regulations 2015 require a qualifying body either to submit an environmental report prepared in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 or a statement of reasons why an environmental report is not required.
- 6.15 In order to comply with this requirement, KLWNBC undertook a screening exercise on the need or otherwise for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be prepared for the Plan. The report is thorough and well-constructed. It comments that the submitted Plan can be seen as a minor adaptation of the Core Strategy/SADMP. As a result of this process KLWNBC concluded that the Plan is not likely to have any significant effects on the environment and accordingly would not require SEA.
- 6.16 KLWNBC also prepared a parallel Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan. It concludes that the Plan is not likely to have significant environmental effects on a European nature conservation site or undermine their conservation objectives alone or in combination taking account of the precautionary principle. As such Appropriate Assessment is not required. The assessment has been produced in a similar standard to the SEA screening report. Whilst there are no designated sites within the neighbourhood area itself the screening report addressed the potential impact of the Plan following protected sites elsewhere:
- Dersingham Bog (SAC, RAMSAR);
 - The Wash (SPA, SAC, RAMSAR); and
 - North Norfolk Coast (SPA, SAC, RAMSAR).
- 6.17 Having reviewed the information provided to me as part of the examination, I am satisfied that a proportionate process has been undertaken in accordance with the various regulations. None of the statutory consultees have raised any concerns with regard to either neighbourhood plan or to European obligations. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I am entirely satisfied that the submitted Plan is compatible with this aspect of European obligations.
- 6.18 In a similar fashion I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on

Human Rights (ECHR) and that it complies with the Human Rights Act. There is no evidence that has been submitted to me to suggest otherwise. There has been full and adequate opportunity for all interested parties to take part in the preparation of the Plan and to make their comments known. On this basis, I conclude that the submitted Plan does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR.

Summary

- 6.19 On the basis of my assessment of the Plan in this section of my report I am satisfied that it meets the basic conditions subject to the incorporation of the recommended modifications contained in this report. Section 7 assesses each policy against the basic conditions. Where necessary it recommends modifications on a policy-by-policy basis.

7 The Neighbourhood Plan policies

- 7.1 This section of the report comments on the policies in the Plan. In particular, it makes a series of recommended modifications to ensure that the various policies have the necessary precision to meet the basic conditions.
- 7.2 My recommendations focus on the policies themselves given that the basic conditions relate primarily to this aspect of neighbourhood plans. In some cases, I have also recommended changes to the associated supporting text.
- 7.3 I am satisfied that the content and the form of the Plan is fit for purpose. It is distinctive and proportionate to the Plan area. The wider community and the Parish Council have spent time and energy in identifying the issues and objectives that they wish to be included in their Plan. This sits at the heart of the localism agenda.
- 7.4 The Plan has been designed to reflect Planning Practice Guidance (41-004-20170728) which indicates that neighbourhood plans must address the development and use of land.
- 7.5 I have addressed the policies in the order that they appear in the submitted plan. Where necessary I have identified the inter-relationships between the policies.
- 7.6 For clarity this section of the report comments on all policies whether or not I have recommended modifications in order to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions.
- 7.7 Where modifications are recommended to policies they are highlighted in bold print. Any associated or free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are set out in italic print.

The initial sections of the Plan

- 7.8 These introductory sections of the Plan set the scene for the range of policies. They do so in a concise and proportionate way. The Plan is presented in a very professional way. It is colourful and makes a very effective use of maps. A very clear distinction is made between its policies and the supporting text. It also draws a very clear connection between the Plan's objectives and its resultant policies.
- 7.9 The 'Preparation of the Plan' section provides a very clear context to the neighbourhood area and when it was designated. It identifies how the Plan was prepared, how it will fit into the wider planning system in the event that it is 'made' and what the Plan sets out to achieve. It includes a map of the neighbourhood area (Map 1).
- 7.10 Section 4 provides a very helpful and comprehensive context to Sedgeford. It draws a useful comparison between its history and its current character and appearance. Map 3 provides a very useful summary of the extent of the AONB and the designated

conservation area. It also provides useful information on the neighbourhood area. It highlights its ageing population and a that a significant number of dwellings have no permanent residents.

- 7.11 Section 5 summarises the consultation exercises undertaken as part of the plan-making process. It provides a useful context for the more detailed Consultation Statement.
- 7.12 Section 6 sets out the strategic planning context that has underpinned the plan-making process. It makes appropriate references to both the Core Strategy and to the SADMP. It highlights that Sedgeford is identified as a Rural Village in the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy.
- 7.13 Section 7 establishes a Community Vision for the Plan. The vision is underpinned by four community objectives.
- 7.14 The remainder of this section of the report addresses each policy in turn in the context set out in paragraphs 7.5 to 7.7 of this report.

Policy H1: Development of site allocated at Jarvie Close

- 7.15 This policy refers to a parcel of land on the south side of Jarvie Close. It was allocated for residential development in Policy G78.1 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD.
- 7.16 As paragraph 8.1.1 of the submitted plan comments outline planning permission was granted in October 2016 for the development of nine dwellings on the site. At the time of the submission of the Plan a reserved matters application had not been submitted to KLWNBC. In this context the Plan comments that these circumstances provide an opportunity for it to influence the detailed layout of the site in general, and its size and associated ability to deliver affordable housing in particular. This theme is explored in detail in paragraph 8.1.2 of the Plan. It translates into the policy with a requirement in its first criterion for the development to provide a minimum of 11 dwellings or 1000 square metres of floorspace to facilitate the provision of two affordable houses.
- 7.17 I have sympathy for the approach taken. However, it is somewhat prescriptive. I recommend that the reference to the delivery of affordable housing in the policy is addressed in the supporting text. The delivery of affordable housing would be a consequence of the implementation of the policy rather than directly a policy matter.
- 7.18 In addition the policy approach may have unintended consequences. The reference to a minimum of 11 dwellings may detract from the ability of KLWNBC to resist a development of a significantly greater number of dwellings which would conflict with the character and appearance of the neighbourhood area. In this context I recommend an additional criterion is included within the policy to address this matter.
- 7.19 The approach taken in the supporting text also fails to recognise fully that a neighbourhood plan cannot directly or indirectly influence the process by which a developer/landowner continues the outline planning application process into a reserved matters application. I recommend that this matter is made clear in the

supporting text together with an indication that the policy would apply in circumstances either where the extant outline planning permission lapses or where a new outline application is submitted.

- 7.20 The other elements of the policy are well-considered. They relate to design and access arrangements.

In the opening part of the policy replace ‘required to’ with ‘supported where it would’

In a) delete ‘to facilitate.... affordable dwellings’

Thereafter insert an additional criterion to read: ‘the development respects the density, form and layout of houses in the immediate locality’

At the end of paragraph 8.1.1 add: ‘This would apply in circumstances either where the extant outline planning permission lapses or where a new outline application is submitted.’

Replace paragraph 8.1.2 with: ‘Policy H1 provides a context for the determination of planning application on the site in the event that the proposal associated with the extant outline application does not proceed. Its ambition is to make the best and most efficient use of land in a sustainable location in general, and to deliver affordable housing in particular. The delivery of affordable housing will be subject to the tests in Policy CS09 of the Core Strategy. The second criterion of the policy has been designed to ensure that new development on the site respects the density, form and layout of existing dwellings in the immediate locality.’

Policy H2: The location of new residential development

- 7.21 This policy is an important part of the Plan. It allocates two sites off Ringstead Road for residential development. They are Site 1 (Land North of the Primary School – 0.28 hectares) and Site 2 (Land east of Ringstead Road opposite Jarvie Close – 0.67 hectares). The former is anticipated to yield four dwellings and the latter to yield eight dwellings. The supporting text comments on how the site selection process was undertaken in general, and how it overlapped with the call for sites as part of the Local Plan review process being undertaken by KLWNBC. The submitted Plan includes two appendices that set out the process followed and the various sites which were assessed. It is clear that the process followed has been thorough.
- 7.22 I looked at the two sites carefully when I visited the neighbourhood area given the significance of the proposed allocations within the context of the village, and the representations received from local residents and the County Council in particular. I looked at the two sites from both the Ringstead Road and from the fields to the north and east of Site 2. I saw that in both cases they comprised the western parts of land which extended farther to the east. In the case of Site 2 I saw that it largely consisted of a succession of paddock strips running in an east-west direction.
- 7.23 The two sites are located to the north and to the south of a terrace of four cottages on the eastern side of Ringstead Road. Map 5 shows a potential footpath through the

site to the immediate east of the four cottages. The effect of this proposal would be to allow safe and convenient access from the school to the immediate south of Site 1 into both the proposed allocated sites. This has generated objections from two of the owners of the cottages. The County Council has also commented on this issue. It objects to Site 2 because of the inability to deliver a continuous footway link from the site to the school along Ringstead Road.

- 7.24 The proposed allocation of the two sites for residential purposes raises a series of potentially-conflicting issues. On the one hand the two sites have been carefully selected as a result of a comprehensive site assessment process. In this context Site 1 is within the settlement boundary and Site 2 is immediately adjacent to the boundary. Together they would significantly boost the supply of housing in the neighbourhood area (NPPF paragraph 59). On the other hand, the sites have the ability to detract from the existing amenities of the terrace of cottages off Ringstead Road. In addition, they do not have fixed or natural boundaries along their eastern flanks. In this context they have the ability to sit uncomfortably within the context of the wider village and its relationship with the surrounding countryside.
- 7.25 Appendix 5 has also provided useful information on the deliverability of the two sites concerned. Site 1 is indicated as having a restricted covenant until 2021. Site 2 is indicated as having a restricted covenant for the next ten years. The assessment indicates that Site 2 is therefore unlikely to be available for development for the next ten years.
- 7.26 The Parish Council corrected and updated this information during the examination. It is now the case that the site would be able to be delivered from 2021.
- 7.27 Taking all these matters into consideration I am satisfied that Site 1 is a well-considered site that is capable of being delivered within the Plan period. It relates well to the remainder of the village in general, and to the school in particular. Within the general context I recommend a series of modifications to the policy. The first is designed to ensure that its development safeguards the amenities of the southern-most cottage in the terrace of cottages off Ringstead Road. This can be achieved by a series of design, plot location and landscaping arrangements. The second is that its eastern boundary is sensitively-designed to ensure that it sits apart from the remainder of the paddock to the east and provides a boundary treatment appropriate to this rural location. The third is to ensure that the design and layout of any new development respects that of the existing residential development in Ringstead Road.
- 7.28 I am also satisfied that Site 2 is a well-considered site that is capable of being delivered within the Plan period. It will function as a modest extension of the village to the north. Within the general context I recommend a series of modifications to the policy. The first relates to the need for its northern and eastern boundaries to sensitively-designed to ensure that it sits apart from the remainder of the paddocks to the east and provides a boundary treatment appropriate to this rural location. In particular these boundary treatments should provide a clear visual separation between the allocated site and the surrounding countryside.

- 7.29 The second is to ensure that the design and layout of any new development respects that of the existing residential development to the south of the site in Ringstead Road. They are single-plot developments. This arrangement sits comfortably with the street scene and provides for attractive rear gardens. The continuation of this approach in Site 2 would be appropriate both in general terms, and to safeguard and respect the existing character of Ringstead Road in particular.
- 7.30 The third is designed to ensure that its development safeguards the amenities of the northern-most cottage in the terrace of cottages off Ringstead Road. This can be achieved by a series of design, plot location and landscaping arrangements. I also recommend the deletion of reference to an indicative line of a possible footpath from the supporting text and the deletion of Map 5. I do so for two principal reasons. The first is that it is merely indicative. As such it would be inappropriate for inclusion within a development plan. The second is that the relatively modest traffic levels in Ringstead Road, and the availability of a pedestrian access on one or the other side of Ringstead Road between the School and Jarvie Close are such that this approach may be one of a series of options which could be considered when a detailed layout was being designed. In these circumstances the Borough Council will be able to assess all the technical details at that time, including any comments from the County Council.
- 7.31 Plainly circumstances may change within the Plan period. A key element of this change will be the adoption of the emerging Local Plan. This may have implications on the amount of new residential development required in the neighbourhood area. In addition, at that stage there will be greater clarity on the delivery or otherwise of these two allocated sites (and the site off Jarvie Close) for development. I recommend a modification to Section 9 on Monitoring and Review later in this report to address this matter.
- 7.32 I recommend modifications to the policy accordingly. I also recommend consequential modifications to the supporting text.

Replace the policy with:

'Land to the east of Ringstead Road and to the north of the School as shown on Map 4 is allocated for residential use.

Development proposals for residential use on the site will be supported subject to the following criteria:

- **they provide safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access;**
- **they incorporate boundary treatments to the east (to the existing paddock) and to the north (to the existing residential property to the immediate north) that are sensitively designed to respect the semi-rural location of the site and to safeguard the amenities of surrounding properties;**
- **they are designed to ensure that the layout of the site reflects the character and layout of properties in Ringstead Road; and**

- they provide off street car parking to the required standards in Policy DM17 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.

‘Land east of Ringstead Road opposite Jarvie Close as shown on Map 4 is allocated for residential use.

Development proposals for residential use on the site will be supported subject to the following criteria:

- they provide safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access;
- they incorporate boundary treatments to the north (to the surrounding countryside) to the east (to the existing paddock) and to the south (to the existing residential property to the immediate south) that are sensitively designed to respect the semi- rural location of the site and to safeguard the amenities of surrounding properties;
- they are designed to ensure that the layout of the site reflects the character and layout of properties in Ringstead Road. In particular the development should be designed so that it is of single-plot development with gardens running in an east to west direction to the east of the new dwellings; and
- they provide off street car parking to the required standards in Policy DM17 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.’

Delete Map 5

Replace paragraph 8.1.10 with:

‘As a result of this process Site 1 (land to the east of Ringstead Road and to the north of the School) and Site 2 (Land east of Ringstead Road opposite Jarvie Close) have emerged as the most suitable sites for development. They are within easy walking distance of the School, and other facilities in the village. Site 1 is within the development boundary. Policy H2 sets out a series of criteria with which development proposals would need to comply. They address a series of environmental matters including boundary treatments, layout and design and parking/access matters.’

Policy H3: Infill Development within the Development boundary

- 7.33 This policy complements the approach taken in Policy H2. In this case it offers support to development proposals within the development boundary. It includes five environmental criteria.
- 7.34 The approach is appropriate to the neighbourhood area. In addition, it will encourage sustainable development that will be close to community and other services. I recommend a series of modifications to the detailed wording in the policy and the supporting text so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF. Otherwise it meets the basic conditions.

In the opening part of the policy replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’

In the second criterion replace ‘be harmful to’ with ‘have an unacceptable detrimental impact on’

In the third criterion replace ‘would not be harmful’ with ‘would not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on’

In paragraph 8.1.12 replace ‘is supported’ with ‘will be supported’

Policy H4: Development outside the development boundary

7.35 This policy complements to the approach taken in Policy H3. In this case it relates to development proposed outside the settlement boundary. It takes a restrictive approach to such development except where it would be in accordance with national and local policies. It has two principal parts. The first outlines a series of criteria that need to be met locally for development outside the development boundary to be supported. The second part relates to occupancy restrictions for new dwellings in the countryside.

7.36 The generality of the approach taken in the Plan is distinctive to the neighbourhood area. In addition, in principle it has regard to national policy and is in general conformity with strategic policies in the development plan. Nevertheless, the wording and structure of the policy is unclear in places, and fails to provide a clear and consistent basis for decision-making. In this context I recommend a series of recommended modifications as follows:

- detailed word changes appropriate to a neighbourhood plan;
- providing a clear context for the bullet points;
- providing clarity on the application of the second part of the policy to rural exception sites for affordable housing. Otherwise the policy would inadvertently apply to more general proposals such as replacement dwellings and agricultural dwellings; and
- deleting the fourth criterion in relation to the need for an appraisal of development proposals outside the development boundary on the basis of the criteria used to select the two housing sites included in Policy H2.

7.37 On the latter point above I have taken into account the Parish Council’s response to my question on this matter in the clarification note. I appreciate that its intentions were to prevent otherwise unacceptable site from coming forward. However, the policy is otherwise suitably robust both in its own right and within the wider development plan context.

In the opening part of the policy replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’

Before the series of bullet points add: ‘Development proposals outside the development boundary should demonstrate that:’

In the first bullet point replace ‘that’ with ‘they’

In the second bullet point replace ‘Where development’ with ‘they’

In the third bullet point replace ‘Where the development’ with ‘they’ and ‘not be harmful to’ with ‘would not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on’

Delete the fourth bullet point.

In the beginning of the second part of the policy replace ‘these dwellings’ with ‘dwellings on rural exception sites which deliver affordable housing’

Policy H5: Housing Mix

- 7.38 This policy seeks to ensure that two- and three-bedroom houses are delivered on any residential development sites in the neighbourhood area. Its approach is underpinned by the findings of the KLWNBC Strategic Housing Needs Assessment 2014.
- 7.39 Within the context of its overall approach it seeks to ensure that where dwellings of this size are provided on a development sites that their design and layout should aim to limit the potential for large extensions or indeed the amalgamation of dwellings. The intention is to safeguard the supply of smaller dwellings which would come forward on such sites
- 7.40 I have taken account of the Parish Council’s response to my question on this latter matter in my clarification note. Whilst I recognise that the ambition is appropriate it is not capable of being incorporated within a development plan policy. To a certain extent this is already acknowledged in the policy by its use of the wording ‘should aim to limit’. In any event such an approach would not remove the ability of householders to extend their houses within permitted development rights. In these circumstances I recommend that the matter is deleted from the policy. It is already adequately addressed in the supporting text.
- 7.41 The principal part of the policy is appropriate and evidence-based. I recommend detailed modifications to its wording so that it can be applied clearly and consistently through the Plan period.

Replace ‘All development proposals...required to’ with ‘Proposals for new residential development of two or more houses should’

Delete the second sentence.

Policy H6: Replacement dwelling

- 7.42 This policy relates to proposals for replacement dwellings within the settlement boundary. Paragraph 8.1.17 comments that there is no objection in principle to such development. However, the purpose of the policy is both to assist in retaining smaller dwellings and to avoid a resulting overcrowded or urbanised street scene.
- 7.43 The resulting policy supports replacement dwellings where the footprint of the new dwelling does not exceed that of the original dwelling by more than 40% unless two sets of circumstances are met.

- 7.44 I sought advice from the Parish Council on the basis on which it had chosen the 40% limit. It advised that it had applied its local judgement to this matter based on the traditional relationship between houses and plot sizes in the neighbourhood area.
- 7.45 On balance I am satisfied that the application of a 40% indicative extension figure is appropriate for replacement dwellings. It relates well to the distinctive character of the neighbourhood area. In addition, the two circumstances identified in the policy where a larger replacement dwelling may be appropriate provide sufficient flexibility within which KLVNBC can make judgements on a case-by-case basis. The most important is the second set of circumstances which would apply where a larger proportionate increase in the scale of the dwelling would not appear inappropriate for the plot size.
- 7.46 I recommend detailed modifications to its wording so that it can be applied clearly and consistently through the Plan period.

Replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’

In the first bullet point replace ‘for an identified first occupant’ with ‘for the intended first occupants’

In the second bullet point replace ‘not appear cramped’ with ‘not be disproportionately large for the plot size concerned’

Policy H7: Residential Extensions

- 7.47 This policy continues the approach in Policy H6 into a more general policy on residential extensions. In this case it also applies a 40% limit on the total internal floorspace of an extended dwelling over and above the original dwelling.
- 7.48 As with Policy H6 I am satisfied that this is an appropriate figure. In some case it would support a significant extension to the floorspace available to existing or future occupants. As with Policy H6 this policy is supported by a series of environmental criteria. In this case it also includes a parking space requirement. I recommend a detailed modification to the wording of the policy. Otherwise it meets the basic conditions.

Replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’

Policy H8: New Housing as Permanent Dwellings

- 7.49 This policy is an important element of the Plan. It indicates that new open market housing will only be supported where there is a restriction to ensure its occupancy as a principal residence.
- 7.50 The policy approach is underpinned by robust evidence in paragraphs 8.1.20 to 8.1.24 of the Plan. It includes information on the number of existing dwellings being used as holiday homes/holiday lets and the community’s views about the advantages and disadvantage of the village’s attractiveness as a location for second home ownership.

- 7.51 Paragraph 8.1.24 is explicit in applying this policy to the two sites proposed in Policy H2 of the Plan. I recommend a consequential change to this paragraph to take account of my recommended modification to Policy H2.
- 7.52 On the basis of the evidence in the Plan I am satisfied that the general approach of the policy meets the basic conditions. I am also satisfied that its details and their ability to be applied and monitored through the development management process are robust.

In paragraph 8.1.24 replace 'allocates two sites' with 'allocates a site'

Policy E1: The River Valley Setting

- 7.53 This policy requires that new development should respect the relationship between the built form of the village and the valley of the Heacham River. I saw both its attractiveness and its role within the village when I visited the neighbourhood area.
- 7.54 The policy is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area. I recommend a series of modifications to the wording used in the policy to ensure that it has the clarity required by the NPPF. Otherwise it meets the basic conditions.

Replace 'unique' with 'distinctive'

Insert a full stop after 'the valley' in the final sentence. Replace 'and will not be intrusive' with 'Development proposals which would be intrusive to the relationship between the form of the village and its relationship to the river valley will not be supported'

Policy E2: The Heacham River

- 7.55 This policy is specifically related to the River itself. It has two related parts. The first requires where necessary that development proposals should demonstrate that they would not have a detrimental effect on the flow of water in the river. The second offers support to proposals which would enhance the flow of water.
- 7.56 The technical nature of the policy is reflected in the supporting text. It comments about the origins of the river, its associated habitats and its highly alkaline nature. It also makes reference to national and local publications.
- 7.57 The policy is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area. I recommend that the two parts of the policy are captured in separate sentences. Otherwise it meets the basic conditions.

Inset a full stop after Heacham River. Thereafter delete 'and' and replace 'any' with 'Any'

Policy E3: Local Green Spaces

- 7.58 This policy proposes the designation of five parcels of land as local green space (LGS). In doing so it has regards to paragraphs 99-101 of the NPPF.

- 7.59 Appendix 11 assesses the five proposed LGSs against the three criteria in the NPPF. In response to my clarification note the PC supplied the sizes of the proposed LGSs where the information concerned had not been included in the Appendix.
- 7.60 I looked at the various sites as part of my visit. They are clearly important local green spaces in their different ways within the context of the village. The formal green spaces to be found at the Green (LGS1) and the Recreation Ground (LGS2) contrasted with the more informal areas of the Washpit (LGS4) and the Cole Green War Memorial (LGS5).
- 7.61 On the basis of the evidence and my own observations I am satisfied that the LGSs properly relate to the three criteria in the NPPF and therefore meet the basic conditions.
- 7.62 In relation to proposed LGS 1 (the Green) I sought advice from the Parish Council on its detailed boundary as it connects to Parkside. The Parish Council clarified this matter and has suggested a revised boundary which is more focused on the substantive open area between Parkside and Jarvie Close. I recommend the revised area accordingly.
- 7.63 I recommend a detailed modification to the wording of the policy. Otherwise it meets the basic conditions.

Replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’

In Map 8 replace the boundary of LGS1 with the boundary in the map included as Appendix 1 of this report.

Policy E4: Sedgeford Historical and Archaeological Research Project

- 7.64 This policy seeks to safeguard potential archaeological remains on a site to the immediate south of the village. As the supporting text in paragraph 8.2.8 helpfully explains the Sedgeford Historical and Archaeological Research Project (SHARP) was established in 1995 to investigate the history of settlement and land use in the village. It is clearly an exciting experiment in democratic archaeology which has attracted widespread interest and volunteer activity.
- 7.65 The policy is a combination of background to the SHARP initiative and a planning-based approach which requires archaeological investigation and recording if any development comes forward within the site. I sought advice from the Parish Council on the status of the site and the purpose and design of the policy. I was advised that the site is not formally protected.
- 7.66 Taking all matters into account I recommend that the policy is recast so that it adopts a more policy-based approach to safeguard the potential of important archaeology in a manner proportionate to its importance. In any event the submitted policy reads in a way in which development proposals would otherwise be supported on the identified SHARP site. However, this would not necessarily be the case as it sits outside the development boundary and adjacent to the low-lying Heacham River flood plain.

Replace the policy with:

‘Any development proposals in the area of the Sedgeford Historical and Archaeological Research Project (SHARP) as shown on Map 9 should demonstrate the way in which they would safeguard its archaeological significance’

Policy E5: Conservation Area and buildings of local historic interest

- 7.67 This policy has been designed to safeguard the built heritage of the neighbourhood area. It has two related parts. The first refers to the conservation area. The second requires that new development takes account of three specific non-designated heritage assets.
- 7.68 The thrust of the policy meets the basic conditions. In particular it has regard to paragraphs 189 to 202 of the NPPF. I recommend a modification to the wording of the first part of the policy so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF in general, and makes a direct connection with the development management process in particular. Otherwise it meets the basic conditions. It will do much to assist in the Plan delivering the environmental dimension of sustainable development.

In the first part of the policy replace ‘will’ with ‘should’

Policy E6: Dark Skies

- 7.69 This policy seeks to ensure that the dark skies environment is sustained within the neighbourhood area. The protection of dark skies is a key element of the Norfolk Coast AONB. The CPRE Dark Skies Map indicates that the village has relatively dark skies.
- 7.70 The policy is evidence-based and distinctive. I recommend a series of word changes so that it has the necessary clarity for development control purposes. They have the indirect effect of simplifying the policy. Otherwise it meets the basic conditions.

Replace ‘will’ with ‘should’ and delete ‘will be supported.... development plan policies’

Policy C1: Community Facilities

- 7.71 This is an important policy within the context of the social well-being of the neighbourhood area. It identifies four community facilities (the school, the village hall, the recreation ground and the King William IV public house) where a change of use will only be supported in certain identified circumstances.
- 7.72 I looked at the four identified facilities. They are clearly important to the integrity and vitality of the neighbourhood area.
- 7.73 The cases where a change of use would be supported relate to an insufficient demand to justify the use of the facility or where an equivalent or better provision has been made in an appropriate and accessible location.
- 7.74 A second part of the policy offers support to proposals which would increase the sustainability of the four facilities.

- 7.75 I recommend two modifications to the first part of the policy. The first includes the potential redevelopment of the facilities concerned. As submitted the policy refers only to application for a change of use. I also recommend a detailed word change in the first part of the policy.

After change of use add ‘or the redevelopment for non-community use’.

Replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’

Policy C2: Broadband

- 7.76 This policy seeks to ensure that new development is broadband compatible. It also supports the more general improvement of the availability of high speed.

- 7.77 It meets the basic conditions.

Policy T1: Speed and volume of traffic passing through the village

- 7.78 This policy reflects the community’s concerns about traffic within the village on the B1451. In particular they relate to traffic speeds and their impact on highway safety.

- 7.79 The resulting policy requires that where appropriate development proposals should provide or contribute to offsite highway improvements or traffic calming measures. It has overlaps with the Parish Aspirations and Initiatives included at the end of the Plan. I sought advice from the Parish Council about the extent to which the policy was land use based rather than an expression of process. I was advised about the importance of this matter to the community and that the policy had been carefully designed to attempt to ensure that it is land used based.

- 7.80 I recognise the importance of this matter to the local community. However as submitted the policy has a clear focus on process requirements which may arise from developments elsewhere in the village. In any event that scale of new development being promoted elsewhere in the Plan (Policies H1/H2/H3) would be unlikely, either individually or cumulatively, to generate the need for the type of measures that the Parish Council has in mind.

- 7.81 In these circumstances I recommend that the policy is deleted. However, given the importance of this matter to the community I recommend that the issue about planning obligations to provide or to contribute to off-site highway improvements or traffic calming measures should be added to the list of Parish Aspirations and Initiatives. In this context it would complement other highways-related matters already included in that schedule.

- 7.82 I am satisfied that the supporting text should remain in the Plan notwithstanding my recommended deletion of the policy. I recommend a modification which refers to the Parish Aspirations and Initiatives as a means of addressing the matters included in the supporting text.

Delete the policy

At the end of 8.3.4 add: ‘This and other matters are addressed in the Parish Aspirations and Initiatives in paragraph 10.1 of this Plan’

In paragraph 10.1 add a further bullet point to read: ‘Investigate the need for future planning applications to be accompanied with planning obligations to provide or to contribute to off-site highway improvements or traffic calming measures where the need for such works directly arises from the development proposed’

Policy EMP1: Employment related development

- 7.83 This policy reflects the limited employment opportunities in the neighbourhood area. It offers support for small-scale employment development including new buildings, the re-use of redundant buildings or proposals for working from home. It includes three well-chosen criteria.
- 7.84 The policy is well-constructed and has regard to national policy. I recommend detailed changes to the wording used, and to ensure that any development needs to meet all of the three criteria. Otherwise it meets the basic conditions.

In the first and third bullet points replace ‘are not harmful’ with ‘would not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on’

At the end of the second bullet point add ‘; and’

Monitoring and Review

- 7.85 Section 9 of the Plan addresses monitoring and review issues. It comments in general terms that the Plan will be monitored on an annual basis and that the Plan will be reviews when evidence suggests that this approach is necessary.
- 7.86 I recommend the addition of an additional paragraph to tie this process into the ongoing process for the review of the Local Plan. This may have an impact on the strategic need for future development in the neighbourhood area. I also recommend that this process addresses the development of Policies H1 and H2 of the Plan. This overlaps with my comments in paragraph 7.30 of this report.

Insert a new paragraph (9.2) to read:

‘A key stage in the monitoring a review process review will be reached once the emerging Local Plan is adopted. This may have an impact on the strategic need for future development in the neighbourhood area. Any review process could usefully address the development or otherwise of the housing sites included in Policies H1 and H2 of this Plan.’

Parish Aspirations and Initiatives

- 7.87 The Plan includes a series of Parish Aspirations. They are matters which have naturally arisen during the plan-making process but which are not land use matters.
- 7.88 They include the designation of assts of community value, monitoring traffic speeds and the designation of Fring Road as a green lane. In their different ways these

aspirations are appropriate and distinctive to Sedgeford. In several cases they have been carefully designed to be complementary to land use policies in the main body of the Plan.

Other matters

- 7.89 This report has recommended a series of modifications both to the policies and to the supporting text in the submitted Plan. Where consequential changes to the text are required directly as a result of my recommended modification to the policy concerned, I have highlighted them in this report. However other changes to the general text may be required elsewhere in the Plan as a result of the recommended modifications to the policies. It will be appropriate for KLWNBC and the Parish Council to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text. I recommend accordingly.

Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.

8 Summary and Conclusions

Summary

- 8.1 The Plan sets out a range of policies to guide and direct development proposals in the period up to 2036. It is distinctive in addressing a specific set of issues that have been identified and refined by the wider community.
- 8.2 Following my independent examination of the Plan I have concluded that the Sedgeford Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a neighbourhood plan subject to a series of recommended modifications.

Conclusion

- 8.3 On the basis of the findings in this report I recommend to the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk that subject to the incorporation of the modifications set out in this report that the Sedgeford Neighbourhood Development Plan should proceed to referendum.

Referendum Area

- 8.4 I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. In my view, the neighbourhood area is entirely appropriate for this purpose and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore recommend that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the neighbourhood area as approved by the Borough Council on 20 July 2016.
- 8.5 I am grateful to everyone who has helped in any way to ensure that this examination has run in a smooth and efficient manner. The responses to my Clarification Note were very helpful in preparing this report.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
27 June 2019