

**Examination of the
King's Lynn & West Norfolk
Local Plan Review 2016-2036**

**MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS
FOR THE EXAMINATION (MIQs)
Part 2**

Inspectors: Karen L Baker DipTP MA DipMP MRTPI
Mike Hayden BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Annette Feeney
annette.feeney@ipswich.gov.uk
07775 771026

INTRODUCTION

This document contains the second part of the Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs), which form the basis for the Examination of the King's Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan Review 2016-2036. They cover the policies and site allocations for the Main Towns and rural settlements, and the remaining policy matters in the Plan, except for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers, which awaits the submission of further evidence. The questions set out below will be discussed in the second and third weeks of the Examination Hearing, taking place in January 2023.

These MIQs should be read alongside the Outline Hearing Programme [Document G1], which contains the dates when each Matter will be considered. You should also refer to the Inspectors' Examination Guidance Note [G2], which explains how you can participate in the Hearing and the timescales for submitting any further written responses to the MIQs.

Document References in footnotes or square brackets are to the Examination Library List, which can be viewed at the link below:

https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20216/local_plan_review_2016_-_2036/882/proposed_pre-submission_local_plan_review_documents

Abbreviations used in this document:

AONB – Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
DtC – Duty to Co-operate
HLS – Housing Land Supply
HMA – Housing Market Area
HMOs – Houses in Multiple Occupation
HMP – Habitat Mitigation Payment
HNA – Housing Needs Assessment
HRA – Habitat Regulations Assessment
GIRAMS – Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy
NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework
NSPF – Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework
LHN – Local Housing Needs
PPG – Planning Practice Guidance
SA – Sustainability Appraisal
SAC – Special Area of Conservation
SANGS – Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspaces
SBCH – Self-build and Custom Housebuilding
SCI – Statement of Community Involvement
SHMA – Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SFRA – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SPA – Special Protection Area
SVHs – Smaller Villages and Hamlets

MATTER 5 – SETTLEMENTS AND SITES (Continued)

Issue 5: Are the proposed settlement and site allocations policies justified, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and are they positively prepared in meeting the Borough’s development needs, effective in terms of deliverability over the Plan period and consistent with national policy in enabling sustainable development?

Site Allocations Policies

147. Are the site allocation policies throughout the Plan justified and effective where they require:
- a) Safe access to be ‘to the satisfaction of the local highway authority’ rather than in line with national and local planning policies?
 - b) Sewer and odour mitigation to be provided ‘to the satisfaction of Anglian Water’ rather than in line with national and local policies?
 - c) The provision of affordable housing to be in line with ‘current standards’ or ‘the standards at the time’ rather than those specified in Policy LP28 of the Plan?

Main Towns

Downham Market (Policy LP39)

148. The supporting text to Policy LP39 refers to the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan for Downham Market. What is the current status of the Downham Market Neighbourhood Plan?
149. Is the strategy for the growth of Downham Market appropriate and is Policy LP39 justified and effective?
150. Is the planning policy status of the employment land at Bexwell clear and unambiguous? Given the commitment to a further 23 hectares (ha) of employment land at Bexwell, and the recognition, in paragraph 5.1.14 of the Plan, of the importance of this and the existing employment uses at Bexwell in serving the wider area, should this be included as an employment allocation?
151. Should Policy LP39 include reference to biodiversity net gain?

Downham Market: Town Centre Area and Retailing (Policy F1.1)

152. Should Policy F1.1 and its supporting text make more detailed reference to the specific character and appearance of Downham Market?

Downham Market: Land off St John’s Way (Policy F1.2)

153. Should the references to Use Classes in Policy F1.2 be updated to reflect the revised Use Classes Order?
154. Is the employment allocation in Policy F1.2 justified and effective?
155. What evidence is there to support the deliverability of this employment site and what is the anticipated timescale for its development?

Downham Market North-East: Land east of Lynn Road in vicinity of Bridle Lane (Policy F1.3)

156. Is the number of dwellings set out in Policy F1.3 (at least 250) conservative, given that the most recent housing trajectory projects the delivery of 394 dwellings on this site?
157. Given that planning permission has been granted for 240 dwellings on the site, is the timescale for its delivery, as set out in the Housing Trajectory, justified and realistic?

Downham Market South-East: Land north of southern bypass in vicinity of Nightingale Lane (Policy F1.4)

158. Is the number of dwellings set out in Policy F1.4 (at least 140) conservative, given that the most recent housing trajectory indicates that 300 dwellings benefit from planning permission on this site?
159. Given that planning permission has been granted for 300 dwellings on the site, is the timescale for its delivery, as set out in the Housing Trajectory, justified and realistic?

Hunstanton (Policy LP40)

160. Should Policy LP40 include reference to biodiversity net gain?
161. Are the housing allocations in Hunstanton justified as the most appropriate sites when considered against the reasonable alternatives?

Hunstanton: Town Centre Area and Retailing (Policy F2.1)

162. Should the references to Use Classes in Policy F2.1 be updated to reflect the revised Use Classes Order?

Hunstanton: Land to the east of Cromer Road (Policy F2.2)

163. As the site benefits from planning permission and is under construction, should it remain as an allocation in the Plan?

Hunstanton: Land South of Hunstanton Commercial Park (Policy F2.3)

164. Is the housing allocation justified, effective and consistent with national policy, with particular regard to:
- a) the effect of the development on landscape character, heritage, biodiversity, agricultural land, flood risk, highway safety, infrastructure and facilities;
 - b) the relationship of the site to the existing settlement and its accessibility to local services and facilities;
 - c) the evidence to support the site's 'developability', as defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF, and set out on the housing trajectory; and,
 - d) its viability, having regard to the provision of any infrastructure, affordable housing and other policy requirements?

165. Is Policy F2.3 effective and justified in respect of the level of affordable housing required as part of any proposed development on this site?
166. Is Policy F2.3 consistent with national policy in respect of the approach to Heritage Assets?
167. Is Policy F2.3 justified in requiring a financial contribution for any upgrades or additional provision in terms of water and sewerage necessary to serve the development or is this matter dealt with through other legislation?

Hunstanton: Land north of Hunstanton Road (Policy F2.4)

168. As the site benefits from planning permission and is under construction, should it remain as an allocation in the Plan?

Hunstanton: Land south of Hunstanton Commercial Park (Policy F2.5)

169. Is the employment allocation in Policy F2.5 justified and effective?
170. What evidence is there to support the deliverability of this employment site and what is the anticipated timescale for its development?
171. In order to be effective, should the policy be amended to include Class C2 care uses?
172. Is Policy F2.5 justified in requiring a financial contribution for any upgrades or additional provision in terms of water and sewerage necessary to serve the development or is this matter dealt with through other legislation?

Wisbech Fringe: Land east of Wisbech (west of Burrettgate Road) (Policy F3.1)

173. Having regard to the Council's Position Statement on the Wisbech Fringe, September 2022¹, is the continued allocation of this site for 550 dwellings justified as appropriate, based on the evidence? For soundness, should the site be deleted from the Plan?

Growth Key Service Centres

Marham

Land at The Street, Marham (Policy G56.1)

174. What is the current delivery status of the site? What evidence is there that development of the first phase will commence in 2022/23?
175. What evidence is there that development of the remainder of the site will take place between 2027/28 and 2030/31?
176. Are the Main Modifications suggested by the Council² to Policy G56.1, its supporting text and site allocation map, necessary for soundness?

¹ Examination document F23

² Examination Document F21

Land off School Lane, Marham (Policy MAR1)

177. Is the Plan justified in allocating further land for housing development at Marham? What is the evidence to support the need for the number of additional homes that are proposed to be allocated at MAR1?
178. Is the housing allocation justified, effective and consistent with national policy, with particular regard to:
- a) the effect of the development on landscape character, biodiversity, agricultural land, flood risk and highway safety infrastructure and facilities?
 - b) the relationship of the site to the existing settlement and its accessibility to local services and facilities;
179. Should Policy MAR1 require the proposed development to contribute to improvements to education and health facilities, public transport and other local community infrastructure as necessary to support the additional homes?
180. Is there a reasonable prospect that site MAR1 will be available and could be viably developed between 2027/28 and 2028/29? If so, what evidence is there to support this delivery trajectory?
181. Are the Main Modifications suggested by the Council to Policy MAR1, its supporting text and site allocation map, necessary for soundness?

Watlington

Land south of Thieves Bridge Road, Watlington (Policy G112.1)

182. Is the Plan justified in allocating a single site for 32 dwellings at Watlington, given its status as a Growth KRSC within the A10/main rail line growth corridor, and its range of facilities, including a railway station?
183. Should the Plan set a housing requirement for the designated Neighbourhood Area of Watlington to guide the preparation of the Watlington Neighbourhood Plan, in line with paragraph 66 of the NPPF?
184. Given that site G112.1 is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel resources, is there a reasonable prospect that it will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged in the Housing Trajectory? If so, what evidence is there to support this delivery trajectory?
185. Is the selection of site G112.1 as the preferred location for housing in Watlington justified as an appropriate, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on the evidence?
186. Are the Main Modifications suggested by the Council to the supporting text of Policy G112.1 necessary for soundness?

Key Rural Service Centres

187. Are the proposed housing allocations in the Key Rural Service Centres justified, effective and consistent with national policy, with particular regard to:
- a) the effect of the development on landscape character, heritage, biodiversity, agricultural land, flood risk, highway safety, infrastructure and facilities;
 - b) the relationship of the site to the existing settlement and its accessibility to local services and facilities;
 - c) the evidence to support the site's 'deliverability' and/or 'developability', as defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF, and set out on the housing trajectory; and,
 - d) its viability, having regard to the provision of any infrastructure, affordable housing and other policy requirements?
188. This section of the Plan contains an Inset Map for each settlement, which the Council has confirmed form part of the Policies Map. In order to be clear that this is the case and for the Plan to be effective, should these Inset Maps be removed from the Plan and included as part of the Policies Map, as proposed in the Council's suggested Main Modifications?
189. Should the supporting text to the Plan include a plan following each policy which indicates the extent of allocated sites within each Key Rural Service Centre in order to be effective, as proposed in the Council's suggested Main Modifications?
190. Is reference to the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016) in the supporting text to Policies within this section of the Plan justified and effective or should it be removed as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Brancaster with Brancaster Staithe/Burnham Deepdale

191. The Council has put forward several suggested Main Modifications to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Brancaster with Brancaster Staithe/Burnham Deepdale Key Rural Service Centre, which includes Policy G13.1 Brancaster – Land to the east of Mill Road and G13.2 Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale – Land off the Close as these sites have been completed. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Burnham Market

192. Is the inclusion of a description of the Burnham Market Key Service Centre and update on the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses?

193. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Burnham Market Key Rural Service Centre. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

194. Is the Plan effective in respect of the approach to the issues within Burnham Market Key Rural Service Centre?

Castle Acre

195. Is the allocation of the site at Castle Acre – Land west of Massingham Road justified given its proximity to the Castle Acre Conservation Area and a listed building?

196. Is the allocation of this site justified given that 4 dwellings have been completed and 11 dwellings are under construction, with a further 4 dwellings benefitting from planning permission according to the latest housing trajectory?

197. Is the development boundary around Castle Acre justified and effective?

198. Is the supporting text to Policy G22.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Clenchwarton

199. Is sufficient land allocated for housing within Clenchwarton for the Plan period in respect of Policy G25.1 Clenchwarton – Land between Wildfields Road and Hall Road (at least 10 dwellings); Policy G25.2 Clenchwarton – Land north of Main Road (at least 20 dwellings); and Policy G25.3 Clenchwarton – Land south of Main Street (at least 20 dwellings)?

200. Is the supporting text to Policies G25.1, G25.2 and G25.3 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Dersingham

201. Is the supporting text to Policies G29.1 and G29.2 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

202. Is the development boundary around Dersingham justified and effective?

Docking

203. Is the supporting text to Policy G30.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

East Rudham

204. Is the supporting text to Policy G31.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

205. What is the Council's strategy for managing development on the site allocated in Policy G31.1 East Rudham – Land off Fakenham Road given its location within the Wensum SAC nutrient neutrality zone? Is the allocation of this site for housing justified and consistent with national policy in this respect?

Emneth

206. Is the supporting text to Policy G34.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

207. Has adequate provision been made for self-build and/or custom build housing within Emneth?

Feltwell with Hockwold-cum-Wilton

208. Is Policy G35.3 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, with 7 dwellings having been completed according to the latest housing trajectory?

209. Is the inclusion of a description of Hockwold-cum-Wilton in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses within the settlement?

210. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to Hockwold-cum-Wilton. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

211. Is the supporting text to Policies G35.1 and G35.3 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Great Massingham

212. Is the supporting text to Policy G43.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Grimston/Pott Row with Gayton

213. Is Policy G41.2 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, with 12 dwellings having been completed according to the latest housing trajectory?

214. Is the supporting text to Policies G41.1 and G41.2 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Heacham

215. Is the supporting text to Policy G47.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

216. Is Policy G47.1 Heacham – Land of Cheney Hill sufficiently clear in respect of Criteria 6 and 7 in respect of the reference to the SPAs? The Council proposes to make an Additional Modification to the Plan on adoption to provide clarity – is this change necessary for soundness?
217. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to Policy G47.2 Heacham – Land to the south of St Mary’s Close and its supporting text as this site has been completed. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Marshland St James with St John’s Fen End and Tilney Fen End

218. Is the inclusion of Marshland St James as a Key Rural Service Centre justified?
219. Is Policy G57.1 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, according to the latest housing trajectory?
220. Is the development boundary around Marshland St James, as shown on the Policies Map, justified by the evidence and effective?
221. Is the supporting text to Policies G57.1 and G57.2 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?
222. Has adequate provision been made for self-build and/or custom build housing within Marshland St James?

Methwold with Northwold

223. Are Policies G59.1, G59.2, G59.3 and G59.4 effective and justified given that these allocated sites are under construction, according to the latest housing trajectory?
224. Would Policy G59.4 Methwold – Land off Globe Street/St George’s Court be effective without the requirement for a project level HRA focussing on the potential impacts of development for stone curlew breeding sites and patterns in/around the area? The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to add a new Criterion to the policy in this respect. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?
225. Is the supporting text to Policies G59.1, G59.2, G59.3 and G59.4 effective or should it be amended as suggested by the Council in its proposed Main Modifications in order for the Plan to be sound?

Middleton

226. Is the inclusion of a description of the Middleton Key Service Centre in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses?
227. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Middleton Key Rural Service Centre. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Snettisham

228. The Council has put forward several suggested Main Modifications to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Snettisham Key Rural Service Centre, which includes Policy G83.1 Snettisham – Land south of Common Road and behind Teal Close as this site has been completed. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Southery

229. Is Policy G85.1 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, according to the latest housing trajectory?

230. Is the supporting text to Policy G85.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Stoke Ferry

231. Is the supporting text to Policies G88.1, G88.2 and G99.3 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

232. Is the development boundary around Stoke Ferry justified and effective?

233. Is Policy G88.3 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, according to the latest housing trajectory?

Terrington St Clement

234. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to Policies G93.1 Terrington St Clement – Land at Church Bank, Chapel Road and G93.2 Terrington St Clement – Land adjacent King William Close and the supporting text as these sites have been completed. Are these changes necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

235. Is the supporting text to Policies G93.3 and TSC1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

236. In response to representations from Norfolk County Council in respect of Policy TSC1 and its supporting text, the Council agrees that a change should be made to paragraph 12.19.4.4 to require that access to the allocated site be via Churchgate Way, west of the site, with a road link via the site allocated by Policy G93.3 to Benn's Lane, along with a change to Policy G93.3(3) however the proposed Main Modifications do not appear to include these changes. Are these changes required in order for the Plan to be effective, along with a corresponding change to Policy TSC1?

237. Is the development boundary around Terrington St Clement, as shown on the Policies Map, justified by the evidence and effective?

Terrington St John with St John's Highway and Tilney St Lawrence

238. Is the supporting text to Policy G94.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Upwell and Outwell

239. The Council has put forward suggested Main Modifications to delete the sections of the Plan relating to Policies G104.2 Upwell – Land south/east of Townley Close and G104.4 Upwell – Land off St Peter's Road and the supporting text, along with other references to them, as these sites have been completed. Are these changes necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

240. Is Policy G104.1 effective in relation to the downstream flood risk and water level management system capacity? The Council has put forward suggested Main Modifications to this policy and supporting text which highlight the need to mitigate the impacts of new developments upon downstream flood risk and water level management systems and require adequate arrangements to be made for the long term funding, management and maintenance arrangements for the upkeep of any water level and flood risk management system, whether on or off site, in perpetuity. Are these changes necessary for soundness?

241. Are Policies G104.1 and G104.5 effective and justified given that these allocated sites are under construction, according to the latest housing trajectory?

242. Is Policy G104.6 effective in ensuring that appropriate mitigation for addressing flood risk from all sources, including foul water discharges, from the development of this allocated site is in place? The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to this policy in this regard. Is this change necessary for soundness? Furthermore, is the wording of this proposed change appropriate, in ensuring that the decision maker is clear about how a proposal should be assessed?

243. Is the supporting text to Policies G104.1, G104.5 and G104.6 effective or should it be amended as suggested by the Council in its proposed Main Modifications in order for the Plan to be sound?

Walpole St Peter with Walpole St Andrew and Walpole Marsh

244. In order to be effective, should Policy G109.1 and its supporting text include a cross reference to Policy LP25 in respect of flood risk assessments? The Council has suggested Main Modifications in this regard. Are they necessary for soundness?

245. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to Policy G109.2 Walpole St Peter – Land south of Church Road as this site has been completed. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

246. Is the supporting text to Policy G109.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

West Walton

247. Is the inclusion of a description of the West Walton Key Service Centre in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses?

248. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the West Walton Rural Service Centre. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

249. Is the development boundary around West Walton, as shown on the Policies Map, justified by the evidence and effective?

Rural West Norfolk

250. Is Policy LP41 justified and effective in respect of its approach to development in rural areas? Does the Plan enable the development of small parcels of land within Rural Villages, within the defined settlement boundaries, including opportunities for self and custom build housing?

251. Is the supporting text to Policy LP41 effective or, for clarity, are changes required, as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications?

Rural Villages

252. Are the proposed housing allocations in the Rural Villages justified, effective and consistent with national policy, with particular regard to:

- a) the effect of the development on landscape character, heritage, biodiversity, agricultural land, flood risk, highway safety, infrastructure and facilities;
- b) the relationship of the site to the existing settlement and its accessibility to local services and facilities;
- c) the evidence to support the site's 'deliverability' and/or 'developability', as defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF, and set out on the housing trajectory; and,
- d) its viability, having regard to the provision of any infrastructure, affordable housing and other policy requirements?

253. This section of the Plan contains an Inset Map for each settlement, which the Council has confirmed form part of the Policies Map. In order to be clear that this is the case and for the Plan to be effective, should these Inset Maps be removed from the Plan and included as part of the Policies Map, as proposed by the Council's suggested Main Modifications?

254. Should the supporting text to the Plan include a plan following each policy which indicates the extent of allocated sites within each Rural Village in order to be effective, as suggested by the Council's proposed Main Modifications?

255. Is reference to the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016) in the supporting text to Policies within this section of the Plan justified and effective or should it be removed as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Burnham Overy Staithe

256. Is the inclusion of a description of the Burnham Overy Staithe Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

257. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Burnham Overy Staithe Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

258. Is the identification of Burnham Overy Staithe as a Rural Village justified or should it be included in the Plan as a Smaller Village or Hamlet?

259. Is the development boundary for Burnham Overy Staithe justified and effective?

Castle Rising

260. Is the inclusion of a description of the Castle Rising Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

261. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Castle Rising Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Denver

262. Is the supporting text to Policy G28.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

263. Is sufficient land allocated for housing within Denver for the Plan period in respect of Policy G28.1 Denver – Land to the South of Sluice Road (for at least 8 dwellings)?

East Winch

264. Is the supporting text to Policy G33.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

265. Is Policy G33.1 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, with 9 dwellings having been completed according to the latest housing trajectory?

266. Is sufficient land allocated for housing within East Winch for the Plan period in respect of Policy G33.1 East Winch – Land south of Gayton Road, given that this site is almost complete?

Fincham

267. Is the supporting text to Policy G36.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

268. Is Policy G36.1 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, according to the latest housing trajectory?

269. Is sufficient land allocated for housing, including affordable housing, within Fincham for the Plan period in respect of Policy G36.1 Fincham – Land east of Marham Road (for at least 5 dwellings)?

Flitcham

270. Is the inclusion of a description of the Flitcham Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

271. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Flitcham Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Great Bircham/Bircham Tofts

272. Is the supporting text to Policy G42.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Harpley

273. Is the supporting text to Policy G45.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Hilgay

274. Is the supporting text to Policy G48.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Hillington

275. Is the inclusion of a description of the Hillington Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

276. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Hillington Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

277. Should land be allocated for housing within Hillington to meet local needs?

Ingoldisthorpe

278. Is the supporting text to Policy G52.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

279. Is sufficient land allocated for housing within Ingoldisthorpe for the Plan period in respect of Policy G52.1 Ingoldisthorpe – Land opposite 143-161 Lynn Road (for at least 10 dwellings)?

280. Is Policy G52.1 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, with 9 dwellings having been completed according to the latest housing trajectory?

Old Hunstanton

281. Is the inclusion of a description of the Old Hunstanton Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

282. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Old Hunstanton Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Runton Holme

283. Is the supporting text to Policy G72.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

284. Is Policy G72.1 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, with 2 dwellings completed, according to the latest housing trajectory?

Sedgeford

285. Is the supporting text to Policy G78.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

286. Is the inclusion of Policy H1 from the Sedgeford Neighbourhood Plan in the Plan necessary given that it forms part of the development plan and is this approach consistent with national policy? Is Policy G78.1 consistent with Policy H1 in the Neighbourhood Plan?

Shouldham

287. Is the supporting text to Policy G81.2 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?
288. Is sufficient land allocated for housing within Shouldham for the Plan period in respect of Policy G81.2 Shouldham – Land accessed from Rye’s Close (for at least 5 dwellings)?
289. Is Policy G81.2 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, with 3 dwellings completed, according to the latest housing trajectory?

Stow Bridge

290. Is the inclusion of a description of the Stow Bridge Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?
291. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Stow Bridge Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Syderstone

292. Is the supporting text to Policy G91.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?
293. What is the Council’s strategy for managing development on the site allocated in Policy G91.1 Syderstone – Land west of No 26 The Street given its location within the Wensum SAC nutrient neutrality zone? Is the allocation of this site for housing justified and consistent with national policy in this respect?
294. Is Policy G91.1 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, according to the latest housing trajectory?

Ten Mile Bank

295. Is the inclusion of a description of the Ten Mile Bank Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?
296. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Ten Mile Bank Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Thornham

297. Is the inclusion of a description of the Thornham Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

298. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Thornham Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Three Holes

299. Is the inclusion of a description of the Three Holes Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

300. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Three Holes Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Tilney All Saints

301. The Council has put forward several suggested Main Modifications to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Tilney All Saints Rural Village, which includes Policy G97.1 Tilney All Saints – Land between School Road and Lynn Road as this site has been completed. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

302. Should changes be made to the Plan through Additional Modifications as suggested by the Council to reflect the status of the made Tilney All Saints Neighbourhood Plan?

303. Is the development boundary for Tilney All Saints justified and effective?

Walpole Cross Keys

304. Is the inclusion of a description of the Walpole Cross Keys Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

305. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Walpole Cross Keys Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Walpole Highway

306. Is the supporting text to Policy G106.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications in order for the Plan to be sound?

307. Is Policy G106.1 effective and justified given that this allocated site is under construction, with 4 dwellings completed, according to the latest housing trajectory?

Walton Highway

308. The Council has put forward several suggested Main Modifications to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Walton Highway Rural Village, which includes Policy G120.1 Walton Highway – Land adjacent Common Road as this site has been completed. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

309. Should further land be allocated for housing within Walton Highway to meet local needs?

Welney

310. RAMS contributions are not mentioned in Policies G113.1 and G113.2, although this is set out in Policy LP27. Should it be separately referenced in the site allocations Policies G113.1 and G113.2, in order for the Plan to be effective?

311. Should Policies G113.1 and G113.2 also make reference to the need for a project level HRA, as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

312. Is the Plan justified and effective in defining the development boundary for Welney on Inset 90 of the Policies Map to exclude the majority of site allocation G113.2? If so, what is the justification?

313. Is the supporting text to Policies G113.1 and G113.2 effective, including in relation to the discharge from these proposed developments into the Internal Drainage Board watercourses at Welney, or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications, in order for the Plan to be sound?

Wereham

314. The Council has put forward several suggested Main Modifications to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Wereham Rural Village, which includes Policy G114.1 Wereham – Land to the rear of 'Natanya', Hollies Farm, Flegg Green as this site has been completed. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

315. Should further land be allocated for housing within Wereham?

West Newton

316. Is the inclusion of a description of the West Newton Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

317. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the West Newton Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Wiggenhall St Germans

318. Is the supporting text to Policy G123.1 effective or should it be amended as proposed by the Council in its suggested Main Modifications in order for the Plan to be sound?

319. Is sufficient land allocated for housing within Wiggenhall St Germans for the Plan period in respect of Policy G123.1 Wiggenhall St Germans – Land north of Mill Road (for at least 5 dwellings)?

Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalen

320. Is the inclusion of a description of the Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalen Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

321. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalen Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

322. Should land be allocated for housing within Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalen to ensure the continued viability and sustainability of the village?

323. Is the development boundary for Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalen justified and effective?

Wimbotsham

324. Is the inclusion of a description of the Wimbotsham Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

325. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Wimbotsham Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

Wormegay

326. Is the inclusion of a description of the Wormegay Rural Village and a plan showing the extent of the development boundary for the settlement in the Plan effective and justified, given that there is no policy allocating any sites for housing or other uses and that the latter is identified on the Policies Map?

327. The Council has put forward a suggested Main Modification to delete the section of the Plan relating to the Wormegay Rural Village. Is this change necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?

328. Should land be allocated for housing within Wormegay to meet rural housing needs?

Smaller Villages and Hamlets

329. The Council has put forward suggested Main Modifications to delete the Inset Maps in section 15 of the Plan showing the development boundaries of each Smaller Village and Hamlet. Are these changes necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound?
330. Do the changes to the supporting text in chapter 15 of the Plan, proposed by the Council as Additional Modifications, materially affect the policies of the Plan? Should they be treated as Main Modifications?

MATTER 6 – HOUSING

Issue 6: Has the Plan been positively prepared and is it justified, effective consistent with national policy in meeting the housing needs of all groups in the Borough over the plan period?

Housing Land Supply

331. The Housing Trajectory lists a number of housing sites with planning permission, which were granted three or more years ago, but are still counted as part of the available housing land supply. What is the evidence to demonstrate those permissions remain extant? Should a discount be applied to the supply to account for lapsed planning permissions? If so, what would be an appropriate amount?
332. Is the allowance of 299 dpa for windfall sites from 2025/26 to the end of the Plan period justified as a reliable source of housing land supply, in addition to allocations, on the basis of compelling evidence? Does the windfall allowance take account of the effect that an increased housing supply from allocated sites may have on the availability of, and market demand, for windfall sites?
333. Does the evidence demonstrate that there is likely to be a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites in the Borough on the adoption of the Plan and a rolling 5-year supply from then until the end of the Plan period?
334. Given the reliance of the future housing supply on a small number of strategic sites, is there sufficient contingency within the projected supply for annual housing needs to be met in the event that the strategic sites stall or do not deliver at the rates expected?

Affordable Housing (Policy LP28)

335. Are the percentages of affordable housing sought in Criterion 7 of Policy LP28 justified, based on proportionate evidence of affordable housing need?
336. Would the mix of brownfield and greenfield residential development allocated in the Plan be viably able to support the proposed affordable housing percentages, in the light of the results of the Local Plan Review Viability Update published in April 2021³?

³ Core Document D1

337. Is the supporting text to Policy LP28 justified, effective and consistent with national policy in requiring a sequential approach to assess the suitability of sites as Exception Sites?
338. Is Criterion 16 of Policy LP28 justified, effective and consistent with national policy in requiring Exception Sites to adjoin 'sustainable' settlements defined in the settlement hierarchy in Policy LP02, when Policy LP02 does not specify which settlements in the hierarchy are 'sustainable'?
339. Would the Council's suggested Main Modification to Criterion 16(c) of Policy LP28 to extend the management of Exception Sites to 'Registered Providers or other arrangements for the effective management of affordable housing' ensure the Plan is positively prepared and effective in this regard?
340. For clarity and effectiveness, should Criterion 2, which applies to the size, type and tenure of market and affordable housing, and criteria 17-20, which apply to Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's accommodation, be contained in separate policies, rather than one dealing with affordable housing?
341. Is Criterion 10 justified in requiring a commuted sum of £60,000 per dwelling where provision for affordable housing is made on site?
342. Is Criterion 15 justified in seeking to ensure the policy requirement for affordable housing is not avoided by the sub-division of larger sites, based on the Council's judgement as well as the objective evidence specified in Criteria a, b and c?
343. Is the Council's suggested Main Modification to paragraph 7.1.3 of the supporting text to explain the parts of the Borough which are designated as rural areas under the 1985 Housing Act necessary for soundness, and if so, is it consistent with Policy LP04 in defining the rural areas of the Borough?

Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding

344. Given that the 2020 HNA for King's Lynn and West Norfolk identifies a need for 30-35 self-build and custom housebuilding (SBCH) plots per year over the next 15 years and that national policy expects local planning policies to reflect the housing needed by different groups, including people wishing to build their own home, is the Plan positively prepared and consistent with national policy, without a policy providing for SBCH plots?

Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation (Policy LP28)

Please note: Questions on how the Plan provides for the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople under Policy LP28 will be issued, if necessary, following the submission of an updated Gypsy and Travellers Need Assessment due to be published by the Council in Spring 2023.

Housing for the Elderly and Specialist Care (Policy LP29)

345. Is Policy LP29 positively prepared and will it be effective in providing for specialist housing for older people and others with care needs, to meet the needs for this type of accommodation in the Borough over the Plan period, identified in the supporting evidence base?
346. Should further specific sites be allocated in the Plan to meet the needs for specialist housing? Should Policy LP29 require strategic sites to include provision for specialist housing needs?
347. Is Criterion 3b justified in not permitting supported housing development outside of the Development Boundaries of Rural Villages, where proposals are able to meet an identified need and demonstrate access to local shops and services?
348. Should the requirement for specialist housing development to provide affordable housing in line with Policy LP28 be contained within the policy rather than supporting text? Is the guidance in the supporting text on the type of specialist housing developments which would be expected to provide affordable housing consistent with the results of the local Plan Review Viability Update⁴ in respect of the types of specialist housing scheme that could viably support affordable housing?
349. Is Criterion 6 consistent with national policy, regarding the impacts of development on the Norfolk Coast AONB and its setting? Does it serve a clear purpose and avoid unnecessary duplication with Policy LP16 and the NPPF, which define the policy to be applied to all development proposals within or affecting the setting of the AONB?

Adaptable and Accessible Homes (Policy LP30)

350. Are the following requirements in Policy LP30 justified by the housing needs evidence submitted with the Plan:
- a) 50% of all new homes to be built to meet the M4(2) optional requirement for accessible and adaptable dwellings in Part M of the Building Regulations?
 - b) 5% of affordable dwellings on major housing developments to be built to the M4(3) optional requirement for wheelchair adaptable dwellings in Part M of the Building Regulations?

If so, what and where is the evidence to justify these proportions?

351. Does the Viability Update⁴ demonstrate that future housing development in the Borough would be viably able to support the additional construction costs of the M4(2) and M4(3) requirements? If so, where is the evidence to support this conclusion? If not, does Policy LP30 allow sufficient scope for the requirements to be waived or reduced on viability grounds?

⁴ Core Document D1

352. Is the requirement in Policy LP30, that residential proposals should be accompanied by a document setting out how they would accord with the standards detailed in the Building Regulations, consistent with national policy, given that the PPG expects such policies not to impose any additional information requirements or seek to determine compliance with the Building Regulation requirements, which is the role of the Building Control Body?
353. For clarity and effectiveness, should the reference to wheelchair accessible dwellings in the final sentence of Policy LP30 be modified given that the policy only specifies requirements for wheelchair adaptable dwellings?

Residential Development Reasonably Related to Existing Settlements (Policy LP31)

354. Is Policy LP31 clear and effective in its definition of what constitutes 'small scale' development, given that none of the policy criteria restricts development to this scale?
355. Is Policy LP31 clearly written, unambiguous and effective? In particular, is it evident how a decision maker should determine the following:
- In Criterion 1, whether an area is 'reasonably related' to an existing settlement?
 - In Criterion 3, what qualifies as 'meaningful consultation' with the local community?
 - In Criterion 4, what level of 'additional weight' should be given to proposals for Custom and Self-Build development?
356. Is Criterion 1g consistent with national policy in only expecting developments to be located to maximise sustainable transport solutions 'where possible'?
357. Is Criterion 2 of Policy LP31 justified in limiting development to schemes of less than 9 dwellings, in exceptional circumstances, if proposals are otherwise reasonably related and appropriate to the scale and character of the existing settlement?
358. Is Criterion 5 justified and consistent with national policy and Policy LP16 of the Plan in applying a blanket restriction development proposals permitted under Policy LP31 in the Norfolk Coast AONB?
359. Given that Policy LP31 is intended to act as a primary development management tool to support windfall housing development, which in turn forms a key element of the Plan's housing land supply, is Criterion 6 justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in stating that this policy approach does not apply to settlements covered by a made Neighbourhood Plan? How would this affect the projected supply of housing from windfall sites?

Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) (Policy LP32)

360. Is Policy LP32 sound in respect of the following requirements for proposals to create new HMOs:

- a) Are Criteria a and b justified, effective and consistent with national policy in expecting proposals for HMOs to have 'no adverse impact' on amenity and the environment and to provide bin storage and parking 'without detriment' to adjoining occupiers, when national policy only expects policies to minimise potential adverse impacts of new development on living conditions and the environment?
- b) Is the requirement in Criterion d for HMO proposals to meet the standards set out under other regulatory regimes a material consideration in whether or not to grant planning permission? As such is this part of the Criterion consistent with national policy?

Enlargement or Replacement of Dwellings in the Countryside (Policy LP33)

361. Is paragraph 7.7.4 of the supporting text to Policy LP33 consistent with national policy in:

- a) stating a presumption against new dwellings in the countryside?
- b) suggesting the use of conditions to restrict permitted development rights for extensions?

362. Is Criterion 2 justified, effective and consistent with national policy in seeking to refuse proposals which 'adversely affect the amenity of the area', when national policy only expects policies to minimise potential adverse impacts of new development on living conditions?

Housing Needs of Rural Workers (Policy LP34)

363. Is it clear which 'other respects' are being referred to in Criterion 1(c)(iv) of Policy LP34? Would it be evident to a decision maker whether this means the permanent occupational dwelling, the related business or the financial test should be acceptable in all other respects?

364. Is the reference to Smaller Villages and Hamlets (SVHs) in the supporting text to Policy LP34 necessary, given that Policy LP02 of the Plan supports limited development within SVHs and makes it clear that they are not part of the rural areas where it is necessary to carefully control new development?

Residential Annexes

365. Should Policy LP35 require the replacement of garages, which are proposed for conversion to living accommodation?

MATTER 7 – SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY

Issue 7: Is the Plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of its policies for community and culture?

Community and Culture (Policy LP36)

366. Is Criterion 6 of Policy LP36 justified and consistent with national policy in resisting development which would result in the loss of existing cultural facilities, irrespective of whether those facilities are required or remain viable?

Community Facilities (Policy LP37)

367. For effectiveness and to ensure consistency with national policy in promoting healthy communities, should Criterion 2 of Policy LP37 permit development resulting in the loss of an existing community facility, if the proposal would replace the facility in a suitable alternative location?

MATTER 8 - ENVIRONMENT

Issue 8: Is the Plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of its policies and proposals for the environment?

Coastal Areas (Policy LP15)

368. Should the reference to Tidal Hazard Mapping be removed from the supporting text to Policy LP15 for effectiveness?

369. Is Policy LP15 effective in balancing the needs of the local economy and the protection of the natural environment?

Norfolk Coast AONB (Policy LP16)

370. Do references to the current AONB Management Plan require updating in the supporting text to Policy LP16?

371. Is it appropriate that Policy LP16 requires development to meet the aims of the Norfolk Coast AONB Management Plan, which is not part of this Local Plan, or should reference to this be included in the supporting text?

372. Is Policy LP16 justified and effective in respect of the protection of the AONB and its extent?

373. Should reference be made to the relevant parts of the NPPF in the supporting text in order for Policy LP16 to be effective?

Coastal Change Management Area (Policy LP17)

374. Are the occupancy restrictions included in Policy LP17 justified and effective?

375. Is Policy LP17 justified and effective in respect of new and replacement dwellings in the Coastal Change Management Area?

376. Should Policy LP17 require that any replacement dwellings and associated landscape works should not encroach any closer to the flood defences than the footprint of the original dwelling?

377. Should the Plan apply an Integrated Coastal Zone management approach?
378. Should reference be made to the ADEPT guidance for the Emergency Flood Plan in the supporting text to Policy LP17 in order to be effective?
379. Is the Local Plan effective in the management of recreational disturbance along the Norfolk coast?
380. Is the Plan consistent with national policy in respect of the protection and enhancement of the AONB?

Design and Sustainable Development (Policy LP18)

381. Does the Local Plan promote sustainable development in line with the Government's objective of having a carbon neutral economy by 2050?
382. Is Policy LP18 justified and effective in respect of its promotion of high standards of sustainability and energy efficiency?
383. Is the requirement for all new homes across all tenures to meet the Government's Nationally Described Space Standard in Criterion 3(m) of Policy LP18 justified, based on proportionate evidence?
384. Should reference be made to light pollution in the supporting text to Policy LP18?
385. Should Policy LP18 require that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the PPG SuDS discharge location hierarchy and reference be made to the IDB's byelaws?
386. Should the Additional Modification to the supporting text at paragraph 6.4.1 of the Plan, proposed by the Council⁵, be treated as a suggested Main Modification, as it identifies key design principles to be followed?

Environmental Assets (Policy LP19)

387. Is Policy LP19 effective in respect of the roles performed by the area's soils?
388. Is Policy LP19 effective and justified in respect of the approach to the creation, protection, enhancement of networks of biodiversity? Should reference be made to the Norfolk GIRAMS and biodiversity net gain?
389. Is Policy LP19 effective in respect of the mitigation hierarchy of avoid, mitigate and compensate?
390. Would Policy LP19 be effective in ensuring sustainable development?

Historic Environment (Policy LP20)

391. Is Policy LP20 consistent with national policy in respect of heritage assets and archaeology?
392. Should Policy LP20 include a specific reference to 'non-designated heritage assets' in order to be consistent with national policy?

⁵ In Core Document A2

393. Is the supporting text effective and consistent with national policy in its reference to non-designated heritage assets?

Environment, Design and Amenity (Policy LP21)

394. Is Policy LP21 and its supporting text justified and effective in respect of infill development?

395. Should references to national policy in Policy LP21 and its supporting text be updated in order for it to be effective?

Provision of Recreational Open Space for Residential Developments (Policy LP22)

396. In order to be effective, should Policy LP22 be referenced in development policies which require the delivery of Green Infrastructure and/or have been identified as part of the Green Infrastructure Study?

Green Infrastructure (Policy LP23)

397. Is Policy LP23 positively prepared in respect of the projects supported and detailed in the Green Infrastructure Study set out in Criterion 3?

398. Is Policy LP23 and its supporting text effective in respect of the provision of SANGS?

Renewable Energy (Policy LP24)

399. Is the absence of support for wind energy development in Policy LP24 justified based on proportionate evidence and is it consistent with national policy, which expects plans to provide a positive strategy for energy from renewable and low carbon sources?

400. Is Policy LP24 justified and consistent with national policy in respect of renewable energy, given the omission of wind energy development from the policy?

401. Should Policy LP24 set out specific targets for new renewable energy developments and indicate how these would contribute to national climate change targets?

402. Is Policy LP24 consistent with national policy in respect of the weight given to renewable energy developments in appropriate locations?

403. Should Policy LP24 refer to sites of international nature or landscape conservation importance as well as national and local?

Sites in Areas of Flood Risk (Policy LP25)

404. In order to be justified and effective should reference to the latest SFRA be included in the supporting text to Policy LP25 and reference to the Environment Agency removed from Criterion 4 of the policy?

405. Should the Plan include proposals for new coastal defence infrastructure to protect farmland and coastal settlements from future rises in the sea level?

406. Should Policy LP25 and/or its supporting text refer to the need for a drainage strategy to accompany development proposals?
407. Is Policy LP25 justified in requiring a site-specific flood risk assessment for proposed developments on all sites at risk of flooding or should the policy include a specific threshold?
408. Does the policy reflect the revised NPPF in dealing with 'all sources of flooding'?

Protection of Local Open Space (Policy LP26)

409. In order for Policy LP26 to be effective, should local open space be identified on the Policies Map?
410. Does Policy LP26 recognise the importance of the views of local people when considering the impact of development proposals on local open space?

Habitats Regulations Assessment (Policy LP27)

411. Is Policy LP27 clearly written and unambiguous, so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals? In particular:
- a) Do the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy measures set out in Criterion 1 of the policy apply to development proposals which have an adverse impact on European Sites? If so where is this stated?
 - b) In Criterion 2, is it clear who will be expected to make the interim Habitat Mitigation Payment (HMP) of £50 per house and how it will be secured and collected? Does the policy need to state when the Norfolk RAMS will take effect and replace the interim HMP?
 - c) In Criterion 3:
 - (i). Who will provide local Green Infrastructure and open space to mitigate potential impacts from recreational pressure and to what standards?
 - (ii). How will developer contributions to mitigate residual effects be calculated?
 - d) Are Criteria 4 and 5 necessary as part of the policy, given that they are not specifying requirements for planning applications and development?
 - e) Is Criterion 6 fully consistent with the advice in the HRA about 'masked development'? Should the second sentence make clear that a 1,500m buffer zone applies in 'other parts of the Borough' where the qualifying features exist, rather than 'beyond the Breckland SPA', which could include land within the buffer adjacent to the SPA? Should the SPA buffer zone be identified on the Policies Map?

412. Is a Main Modification necessary to Policy LP27 and its supporting text to clarify that the Council, as a competent authority under the Habitats Regulations, will consider the nutrient impacts of any new development proposals on European sites and whether those impacts may have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site that requires mitigation, including through nutrient neutrality?

413. The Council has suggested Main Modifications to the supporting text to clarify the requirements for project level HRAs and the role of the HRA undertaken for the Plan. Are these necessary to ensure that the Plan is sound or can they be treated as Additional Modifications?

MATTER 9 - MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Issue 9: Is the strategy for the implementation and monitoring of the Plan appropriate and robust?

414. Is the monitoring framework of the Plan clear and unambiguous?

415. Are the indicators described likely to be effective in monitoring:

- a) Progress in delivering the Strategic Objectives of the Plan; and
- b) The significant economic, social and environmental effects of the Plan?

If so, how?