

Terrington St John Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 16 comments and response

This table only addresses those comments which suggest a need for modifications to the submitted plan.

Item	Comment	Response
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk		
Policy 1 Extensions to Village development Boundary	Slight confusion on the policy title. It needs to state specifically that this is the development boundary with the changes	As the boundary is defined in the existing Site Allocations and Development Management Policies document, the title seems appropriate, but there would be no objection to a modification to "Village development Boundary and Extensions"
	Is the Map 3 legend an error?	Yes! Apologies. The red edged sites should be "2016 call for sites" and the blue edged sites should be "2019 call for sites".
	Map 4 could just say village development boundary including extensions. The map needs to be of a better quality to clearly see where the "proposed extensions" lines are falling over. At the moment the line seems to be too thick to be able to judge where on the road the line falls. It is suggested to exclude the road and keep to the westward frontage to stop adjoining sites/land which abuts the line being considered or coming forward.	Agreed The map was prepared for us by the Borough Council. A version with a thinner boundary line taking in these comments would be acceptable
Policy 3: Exception sites and Affordable Housing	<p>The supporting text appears to be generally supportive of Rural Exception Sites and makes some good points about the potential need for this type of development. However, the criteria set out within Policy 3 may be overly restrictive and prevent suitable sites from coming forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy states "where it can be demonstrated to be necessary to deliver the development up to 25% of the dwellings, rounded down to the nearest dwelling, may be market housing." Whilst the primary use of the site 	<p>We do not consider this is over restrictive. The intention of government policy is to consider allowing an element of market housing where it is necessary to make the development viable. The supporting text to Policy DM2 suggests that "The Borough Council will consider a minor</p>

Item	Comment	Response
	<p>should certainly be affordable housing, setting a limit of 25% market housing may prevent some developments for coming forward or could result in the applicant having to provide much larger units which may not best meet the need for open market housing.</p>	<p>element of market housing on these (exception sites) if this would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs identified by the Borough Council and where it is demonstrated that such provision could not otherwise be made. We consider that more than 25% would not be consistent with “a minor element”</p>
	<p>Criteria d states "The development would not be intrusive in the countryside", the term "intrusive in the countryside" would appear to be open to interpretation and if interpreted strictly could prohibit the vast majority of sites outside development boundary as these would be classed as being in the countryside. Could you clarify what you meant</p>	<p>We accept that this criterion needs clarification and would welcome a proposed modification on the lines of “the development would not be prominent in views of the village across open countryside”.</p>
	<p>Criteria E states "The development would not be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring residents". Again this would appear to be open to interpretation and if interpreted strictly, could be prohibitive, particularly given that criteria a requires sites to be adjacent to the development boundary. What would be considered as harmful to living conditions?</p>	<p>The replacement of “be harmful” with “cause unacceptable harm” may be appropriate.</p>
<p>Policy 4 Design</p>	<p>What if the adjacent character is undesirable? Supporting text 5.16 – can you specify what you mean by an antique style tiled roofs?</p>	<p>The insertion of “where appropriate” after “...properties and area” would address this. This means pantiles</p>
<p>Policy 5: Development of shops, workshops and business units</p>	<p>No comment on the policy. However, the visual image classed as map 5 is good but we would suggest to also have a map alongside this to make it clearer for users to see the location of facilities.</p>	<p>We think this image makes the location clear but if a map is considered necessary we would have no objection.</p>

Item	Comment	Response
Policy 6: Village Services and Facilities	It would be beneficial to give more of a specific reference to which criteria in policy 5 development must meet.	The reference is to all the criteria in Policy 5.
Flood Risk and Historic Environment	Would it be worth having a reference to flood risk or historic environment in any of the other policies since there are no neighbourhood plan policies for these chapters?	We do not have the capacity or expertise to add to national and local plan policy on these matters. PPG makes it clear that neighbourhood plans should not repeat existing policies.
Norfolk County Council		
Historic Environment	The comment suggests that the Plan could do more to identify heritage assets and their significance and consulting NCC's Historic Environment Service	There is no obligation for a neighbourhood plan to address any specific subject and the Plan relies on national and strategic planning policies for the historic environment
Lead Local Flood Authority	The comment welcomes the way in which the Plan now addresses flood risk	Comment welcomed.

We have no comments on the responses from: The National Grid, Highways England, The Environment Agency, The National Gardens Trust and the Water Management Alliance as they contain general guidance and do not make any specific comments on the submitted Neighbourhood Plan.