

**Borough Council of King's Lynn & West
Norfolk:**

**Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2036 –
Decision on Examiner's recommendations**

14 June 2023

Borough Council of
**King's Lynn &
West Norfolk**



Borough Council Decision on the Examiner's recommendation for the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan

Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2012

Name of neighbourhood area	Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Area
Parish Council	Stoke Ferry Parish Council
Submission Plan (Regulation 16) consultation	30 September – 11 November 2022
Examination	January – May 2023
Examiner's Report Received	15 May 2023

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), states that the Council has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans (NDPs), also known as Neighbourhood Plans, and to take the plans through a process of examination and referendum.
- 1.2 The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) details the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.
- 1.3 This Decision Statement confirms that the modifications proposed by the examiner's report have been accepted. Accordingly, the draft Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan has been amended, taking into account these modifications. The Borough Council has reached the decision that the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Development Plan should proceed to referendum.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Neighbourhood Area of Stoke Ferry was designated on 24 October 2018. The Neighbourhood Area corresponds with Parish boundaries for Stoke Ferry Parish Council. The Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared by Stoke Ferry Parish Council, the Qualifying Body. Work on the production of the plan has undertaken by members of the Parish Council and the local community, since 2018.
- 2.2 The first draft Plan was published by the Parish Council for Regulation 14 consultation in March 2022. The Regulation 14 consultation took place from 17 March – 9 May 2022, inclusive. Further details are set out in the Consultation Statement¹.

¹ https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/7358/stoke_ferry_consultation_statement.pdf

- 2.3 The Plan was submitted to the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk in August 2022, with the Regulation 15 legal check signed off on 5 September 2022. A consultation under Regulation 16 took place over 6 weeks, between 30 September – 11 November 2022, inviting comments from the public and stakeholders.
- 2.4 In January 2023, an independent examiner Mr Andrew Matheson was appointed by the Borough Council with consent of the Qualifying Body, to undertake the examination of the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan. The examination took place from January – May 2023, reviewing whether the plan meets the basic conditions required by legislation and should proceed to referendum. This culminated in the Examiner's Report being issued on 15 May 2023.
- 2.5 The Examiner's Report concludes that subject to making the modifications recommended by the examiner, the plan meets the basic conditions as set out in legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum. The Borough Council and Stoke Ferry Parish Council accepted all the proposed modifications, except for a minor editorial change recommended by the Examiner to the Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022 document (Recommendation 13.3) that is not considered to materially affect the content. The Parish Council confirmed this acceptance on 2 June 2023.
- 2.6 The Borough Council is required to consider the recommendations made by the Independent Examiner. Modifications proposed by the Examiner are set out in Appendix 1 alongside the council's decision in response to each recommendation and the reasons for them.

3.0 Reasons for Decision

- 3.1 The Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2036 (the Plan) as modified by the Examiner's recommendations and the Borough Council, has had regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State. A requirement to have regard to policies and advice does not require that such policy and advice must necessarily be followed, but it is intended to have and does have to a significant effect. A neighbourhood plan must not constrain the delivery of important national policy objectives. The principal document in which national planning policy is contained is the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (NPPF) and this conclusion is reached bearing this in mind. The advice within National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) has also been borne in mind in reaching this conclusion.
- 3.2 Paragraph 13 of the NPPF is clear that neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans and spatial development strategies. Qualifying bodies should plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside these strategic policies. More specifically paragraph 29 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area or undermine those strategic policies.

- 3.3 Beyond this, the content of a draft neighbourhood plan will determine which other aspects of national policy are or are not a relevant consideration to be taken into account. The basic condition allows qualifying bodies, the independent examiner and local planning authority to reach a view in those cases where different parts of national policy need to be balanced.
- 3.4 Having considered all relevant information, including representations submitted in response to the Plan, the Examiner's considerations and recommendations, the council has come to the view that the Plan recognises and respects relevant constraints. The Plan has developed a positive suite of policies that seek to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. As set out in the Plan Vision, there is a focus on safeguarding its local character and historic setting on the River Wissey, meeting local needs, addressing the ongoing challenges of climate change, whilst achieving a balanced housing mix.
- 3.5 Having carefully considered each of the recommendations made within the Examiner's Report and the reasons for them, the Borough Council (in accordance with the 1990 Act; Schedule 48 paragraph 12) has decided to make the modifications to the draft plan referred to in Appendix 1 (below) to ensure that the draft plan meets the basic conditions set out in legislation.
- 3.6 As set out in Appendix 1, it has been decided by the Borough Council and Parish Council to split up the modifications made within the Examiner's report. This has been separated into appropriate columns. As stated by the examiner in the final examination report (May 2023) and left apparent in the table: Areas that need modification are expressed in column 2.
- 3.7 In order to comply with the basic conditions on the European Union legislation, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment screening was undertaken and signed off by the Borough Council on 26 May 2022, prior to publication of the first draft Plan for consultation under Regulation 14. The Strategic Environmental Assessment sets out the introduction and background in sections 1, 2 and 3. Section 4 sets out the application of SEA Directive to plans and programmes. Section 5 sets out the framework for Habitats Regulation Assessment. Section 6 sets out the screening outcome, summary and monitoring of the assessment.
- 3.8 The Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, is in all respects fully compatible with Convention rights contained in the Human Rights Act 1988. 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.
- 3.9 The Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, complies with the definition of an NDP and the provisions that can be made by a NDP. The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in the whole of the neighbourhood area; it specifies the period for which it is to have effect and it does not include provision about development that is 'excluded development'.

4.0 Decision

- 4.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations that the examiner made in the report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.
- 4.2 King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council have carefully considered each of the recommendations made in the examiner's report and the reasons for them and have decided to accept the modifications to the draft plan and accompany Annex, the "Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022", except for Recommendation 13.3.
- 4.3 Following the modifications made, the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions:
- Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the plan;
 - The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan - Core Strategy (2011) and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016);
 - The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations; and;
 - The making of the neighbourhood plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.
- 4.4 It is recommended that the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan progresses to referendum.

Decision made by:

Geoff Hall
Executive Director Environment and Planning (on behalf of the Cabinet
Member for Development and Regeneration) 14 June 2023

Appendix 1: Examiner’s Recommendations

Section	Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021 Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text . Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i> .	Who will make these changes ? LPA or QB	Do you agree with the modification	What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?	Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.
Front cover	Recommendation 1: 1.1 Amend the front cover to remove “<i>Submission version</i>”. 1.2 Review the Contents page in the light of the recommendations in this Report.	QB – Retained editing rights for document	YES	Textual amendments	Minor modifications/ editorial changes to cover and contents pages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission version Referendum version July 2023 • Page references corrected in Contents page
Throughout document	Recommendation 2: 2.1 Review the Plan text to ensure that it refers consistently to a 2036 end date. 2.2 Consistently reference the “<i>Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022</i>” as such within the Plan and detail it as an ‘Annex’ on the document and the Plan Contents Page.	QB	YES	Textual amendments	Minor modifications/ editorial changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2036 end date now specified throughout • References to Stoke Ferry Design Codes/ Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022 included throughout document • P1 – Annex 1: Stoke Ferry Design Codes, June 2022 • P123 – Annex: Stoke Ferry Design Codes, June 2022.
Paragraph 1.5	Recommendation 3: Under the heading “Introduction”, in paragraph 1.5 amend the last bullet point to read: <i>‘Helps to ensure that development and infrastructure are considered in tandem’.</i>	QB	YES	Textual amendments	1.5 The aim of the Working Group is to establish a Neighbourhood Plan for Stoke Ferry that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives a voice to residents to shape and reach consensus on new development and regeneration.

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows the village to develop sensitively, in terms of heritage, local character and the environment. • Facilitates a sense of community. • Protects, maintains and promotes the natural environment. • Identifies and provides evidence for the use of developer contributions for the future Helps to ensure that development and infrastructure are considered in tandem.
<p>Figures 9 and 10</p>	<p>Recommendation 4:</p> <p>4.1 Replace Figure 9 with a map more clearly delineating the boundary for the Conservation Area and provide a source reference (alternatively merge the content of Figures 8 & 9 since both concentrate on the historic core).</p> <p>4.2 For Figure 10 provide a footnote to briefly explain its broader-than-Neighbourhood Area scale, along these lines: ‘A 500m “buffer zone” beyond the Neighbourhood Area boundary has been illustrated by the Biodiversity Information Service recognising that biodiversity considerations do not stop at administrative boundaries.’</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Cartographic and textual amendments</p>	<p>Replacement of Figure 9, to show the Conservation Area boundary more clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 9: Stoke Ferry Conservation Area (source: Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk) (source: Parish Online, with own annotations). Blue line denotes parish boundary. <p>Figure 10 [new footnote 10]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 500m “buffer zone” beyond the Neighbourhood Area boundary has been illustrated by the Biodiversity Information Service recognising that biodiversity considerations do not stop at administrative boundaries.

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p>Section 3/ paragraph 3.8</p> <p>Section 5</p>	<p>Recommendation 5:</p> <p>5.1 Under the heading “How the Plan was Prepared”, add a brief paragraph summarising the ways in which community consultation has influenced/impacted on the drafting and redrafting of the Plan.</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>New sub-section “Summary of key issues from consultation”, following paragraph 3.8:</p> <p>3.9 The various stages of consultation resulted in a rich harvest of views. The results of the early consultation exercises and the Household Survey identified the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance attributed to the historic buildings in the High Street • Residents valued the tranquility and peacefulness of the River Wissey • Desire for a Post Office • Green spaces should be protected. • Concerns over the visual appearance of some dilapidated sites • Concerns over dangerous parking in the village centre particularly close to the village hall. • Concerns over the level of housing already expected in the parish. <p>3.10 These issues were addressed in the draft Neighbourhood Plan as appropriate. The Pre-Submission Version of the Neighbourhood Plan did not make further allocations for new housing development due to the number of extant permissions and community concerns over future development. The draft Plan also included policies on the protection of</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>Local Green Spaces, the delineation of a River Wissey landscape corridor, the protection of the historic environment and the identification of Non-Designated Heritage Assets, the identification of important views and the allocation of a car park.</p> <p>3.11 The Pre-Submission Consultation resulted in support expressed by the community for the policies protecting landscape, the river corridor, green spaces and the historic environment. The Neighbourhood Plan was amended following the consultation as a result of comments made by statutory consultees and the community. The main changes included, refinement of the Non Designated Heritage Assets and Local Green Spaces list, additions to the important views, clarifications of policy wording, changes to composition of the housing mix policy and mapping amendments.</p>
	<p>5.2 Under the heading “Vision and objectives”, amend the date reference to 2036 and from the Vision statement delete “in the future”.</p>	QB	YES	Textual amendments	<p>Vision 2037 2036:</p> <p>...The parish will have a balanced housing mix in keeping with the character of the area. Important aspects of the natural and historical environment will be actively protected. Stoke Ferry will continue to be an attractive place where people of all ages choose to live, work, and visit in the future.</p>
<p>Section 7 (submission</p>	<p>Recommendation 6:</p>	QB	YES	Textual amendments	<p>7.6 This was very much reflected in the results of the household survey where it was clear that the existing</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p>Plan policies SF1-SF3)</p>	<p>Under the heading “Community & Services”:</p> <p>6.1 Add to paragraph 7.6 after “well-being of the wider community” ‘(the important green spaces are now protected as Local Green Spaces under Policy SF15)’ – see later for Policy renumbering.</p>				<p>facilities in the village are much valued by the local community. Facilities such as the village hall, the school, the Blue Bell, the playing field and the cemetery are vital to the community’s functioning, its community cohesion and make a significant contribute to the social, spiritual and physical well-being of the wider community. (The important green spaces are now protected as Local Green Spaces under Policy SF15). The lack of available doctors and dentists was a key concern together with a Post Office and public transport. The existing facilities are valued by the community and should be retained for the benefit of the local community. This is best illustrated by the recent efforts to retain The Blue Bell Public House as referred to in Chapter 2.</p>
	<p>6.2 Merge Policies SF1 & SF2 and locate the new Policy SF1 in place of Policy SF2; word the combined Policy as follows:</p> <p>‘Community facilities</p> <p>1.1 Where a planning consent is required, proposals to redevelop or change the use of an existing community facility as set out in this policy are only supported where:</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Replace policies SF1 and SF2 with new Policy SF1 [Community facilities], to follow paragraph 7.8:</p> <p>Community facilities</p> <p>Where a planning consent is required, proposals to redevelop or change the use of an existing community facility as set out in this policy are only supported where:</p> <p>i. This would not result in their loss or be detrimental to their community function; or</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p><i>i. This would not result in their loss or be detrimental to their community function; or</i></p> <p><i>ii. It can be demonstrated that it would not be economically viable or feasible to retain the existing community facility.</i></p> <p>1.2 The following are identified as community facilities and their location is indicated in Figure 19:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Village Hall 2. School and Nursery 3. Local retail units 4. The Blue Bell public house 5. Community Centre 6. Community Gardens – Lynn Road and The Hill. <p>1.3 Proposals that would result in the enhancement or improvement of existing community facilities are supported.</p> <p>1.4 In principle support is offered for the development of new community facilities with specific support for proposals that would provide: health and medical facilities; school outreach facilities; an outdoor classroom; outdoor recreation facilities; a Post Office;</p>				<p>ii. It can be demonstrated that it would not be economically viable or feasible to retain the existing community facility.</p> <p>The following are identified as community facilities and their location is indicated in Figure 19:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Village Hall 2. School and Nursery 3. Local retail units 4. The Blue Bell public house 5. Community Centre 6. Community Gardens – Lynn Road and The Hill. <p>Proposals that would result in the enhancement or improvement of existing community facilities are supported.</p> <p>In principle support is offered for the development of new community facilities with specific support for proposals that would provide: health and medical facilities; school outreach facilities; an outdoor classroom; outdoor recreation facilities; a Post Office; opportunities for shared spaces/ multi-use community facilities.</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p><i>opportunities for shared spaces/ multi-use community facilities.</i></p> <p>6.3 Renumber subsequent Policies accordingly.</p>				
	<p>6.4 Amend Figure 19 to ensure that the facilities and their numbering exactly match with Policy SF1; delete facilities 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 & 13 and amend the numbering of the remaining facilities accordingly.</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Cartographic and textual amendments</p>	<p>Figure 19 – Amendments to key:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Village Hall. 2. School and Nursery. 3. Local shops and takeaway food outlets. 4. The Blue Bell public house (and associated land). 5. Playing field*. 6. Cemetery, Furlong Drove*. 7. 5. Community Centre (also All Saints Academy, Primary School). 8. All Saints Church Graveyard and adjacent Victorian Cemetery*. 9. Bus shelter. 10. 6. Community Gardens – Lynn Road and The Hill. 11. Telephone kiosk.
	<p>6.5 Amend Policy SF3 to read: ‘A site of 0.38 acres immediately southwest of the existing cemetery at Furlong Drove, as shown in Figure 20, is allocated for use as a cemetery extension.’</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Policy SF3-SF2 Cemetery extension at Furlong Drove</p> <p>A site of 0.38 acres immediately southwest of the existing cemetery at Furlong Drove is allocated for use as a cemetery extension. A site of 0.38 acres immediately southwest of the existing cemetery at</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>Furlong Drove, as shown in Figure 20, is allocated for use as a cemetery extension.</p>
<p>Section 8 (submission Plan policies SF4-SF8)</p>	<p>Recommendation 7:</p> <p>7.1 In relation to Policy SF4 (now renumbered as SF3):</p> <p>7.1.1 In paragraph 8.5 replace the first sentence following the bullet points with: ‘In 2020, Stoke Ferry Parish Council appointed AECOM to produce a bespoke Housing Needs Assessment (HNA¹). This highlighted a total need for 68 affordable houses of differing tenures at Stoke Ferry. The replacement Local Plan (paragraph 4.1.5) identified a reduced Local Housing Need (LHN) for the Borough, such that committed site allocations throughout the Borough (as a whole), including consents on sites allocated at Stoke Ferry through the 2016 Site Allocations Development Plan Document (52 dwellings), should be sufficient to cover the LHN for the Borough as a whole, including meeting Stoke Ferry’s needs over the Local Plan period to 2036.’</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>8.5 The Borough Council have confirmed that the proposed allocations which are rolled forward from the 2016 Site Allocations Development Plan Document are more than sufficient to meet Stoke Ferry’s needs over the Local Plan period to 2036. Given this high level of committed housing development and the level of change in the village that will occur as those commitments are built, and taking into account community views expressed through consultation, it is not considered necessary to make any additional housing provision through site allocations in this Neighbourhood Plan. In 2020, Stoke Ferry Parish Council appointed AECOM to produce a bespoke Housing Needs Assessment (HNA)². This highlighted a total need for 68 affordable houses of differing tenures at Stoke Ferry. The replacement Local Plan (paragraph 4.1.5) identified a reduced Local Housing Need (LHN) for the Borough, such that committed site allocations throughout the Borough (as a whole), including consents on sites allocated at Stoke Ferry through the 2016 Site Allocations Development Plan Document (52 dwellings), should be sufficient to cover</p>

² https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/7447/stoke_ferry_hna_november_2020.pdf

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p>¹ https://www.westnorfolk.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/7447/stoke_ferry_hna_november_2020.pdf</p> <p>7.1.2 Amend the wording of the Policy as follows:</p> <p>7.1.2.1 In the second paragraph after “(HNA) 2020,¹³” add ‘or successor document’.</p> <p>7.1.2.2 In the third paragraph replace “qualifying sites” with ‘sites meeting the affordable housing obligation’.</p> <p>7.1.2.3 Under the heading “Affordable Housing” remove the bullet point and delete “maximum”.</p> <p>7.1.2.4 Under the heading “Open market housing” amend the first bullet point to read: ‘housing, such as bungalows, to allow for downsizing and to meet the particular needs of those requiring housing adaptations’.</p> <p>7.1.2.5 Under the heading “Open market housing” amend the second bullet point to read: ‘housing options that would be suitable for purchase by first time buyers’</p>				<p>the LHN for the Borough as a whole, including meeting Stoke Ferry’s needs over the Local Plan period to 2036.</p> <p>Policy SF4-SF3 Housing mix (size, type, and tenure)</p> <p>Support will be given to the provision of a wide range of types of housing that meet local needs and enable the creation of a mixed, balanced and inclusive community.</p> <p>The housing mix (size, type, tenure) of new housing provided should meet the needs of the parish as reflected in the Stoke Ferry Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) 2020,¹⁴ or successor document. Support is also given for opportunities for Self-Build and Custom Build.¹⁵</p> <p>Proposals for new housing development on all sites meeting the affordable housing obligation should therefore include the following:</p> <p>Affordable Housing¹⁶</p> <p>To be provided as maximum 70 per cent affordable rented; and 30 per cent affordable routes to home ownership with the 30 per cent consisting of 25 per cent first homes and 5 per cent shared ownership.</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p>7.1.2.6 In the final paragraph delete: “to encourage social integration within the development, in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)”.</p>				<p>Open market housing</p> <p>Where open market housing is proposed consideration should be given to the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing, to allow for downsizing and adaptation to meet the needs of families or disabled people, such as bungalows Housing, such as bungalows, to allow for downsizing and to meet the particular needs of those requiring housing adaptations. • Proposals for smaller schemes) should, where appropriate include housing options that would be suitable for purchase by first time buyers Housing options that would be suitable for purchase by first time buyers. <p>Affordable housing should be identical in external form, quality, and character to open market housing. It should be ‘pepper-potted’ around the site, rather than grouped in clusters to encourage social integration within the development, in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>
	<p>7.2 In relation to Policy SF5 (now renumbered as SF4) amend the Policy wording by:</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Policy SF5-SF4 Design and character</p> <p>The detailed design and appearance of all new development should contribute positively to the character of the area by respecting Stoke Ferry's local</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p>7.2.1 In the second paragraph, quoting the corrected document title: ‘Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022’.</p> <p>7.2.2 Deleting the third paragraph.</p>				<p>distinctiveness and character and seek to enhance its quality.</p> <p>Development proposals should be consistent with the principles and guidance laid out in the Stoke Ferry Design Guidelines and Code Codes, June 2022, which is a supporting document to this Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The design of all proposals should be based on an understanding of the context of Stoke Ferry. All proposals for new development should respect the scale, materials, form, function and character of the existing and surrounding buildings in the area.</p>
	<p>7.3 In relation to Policy SF6 amend this to a Community Action, which should be clearly distinguished from Policy content with a different presentation, as follows:</p> <p>7.3.1 Delete site 2 from the lists and Figure 21; renumber the remaining sites accordingly.</p> <p>7.3.2 Retitle Policy SF6 as a Community Action, renumber subsequent Policies accordingly, and amend the subsequent wording as follows:</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Policy SF6 Community Action 1 Sites for visual enhancement</p> <p>Proposals that would result in the visual enhancement of the character and appearance of current underused/derelict sites through their appropriate redevelopment/regeneration or renewal will be supported.</p> <p>Measures that would improve the visual appearance of these sites are encouraged. Measures to improve the visual appearance of these sites are encouraged and the Parish Council will work with interested parties as required to achieve these.</p>

Section	Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021 Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text . Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics .	Who will make these changes? LPA or QB	Do you agree with the modification?	What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?	Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.
	<p>7.3.2.1 Delete the first paragraph.</p> <p>7.3.2.2 Amend the opening of the second paragraph to (and delete item 2 on the list as above):</p> <p><i>‘Measures to improve the visual appearance of these sites are encouraged and the Parish Council will work with interested parties as required to achieve these.’.</i></p> <p>7.3.2.3 In the third paragraph replace “will” with ‘should’ and amend “SF7 to ‘SF5’.</p>				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Former Dukes Head, The Hill, Wretton Road. 2. The Old Station Yard, Bridge Road. 3. 2. Land adjacent to the Village Hall Lynn Road. 4. 3. 2Agriculture Grain Store, Furlong Drove. 5. 4. 2Agriculture Mill Site, on the southwest side of Lynn Road. 6. 5. Land between Indigo Road and the 2 Agriculture Grain Store. <p>Where a site is located either within or adjacent to the Conservation Area, specific regard will should be given to the impact of any proposals on the historic environment in accordance with Policy SF7 SF5.</p>
	<p>7.4 In relation to Policy SF7 (now renumbered as SF5):</p> <p>7.4.1 Add a specific reference to the “Stoke Ferry Conservation Area Character Statement 1992” in paragraph 8.34 and add to the first paragraph of Policy SF5 (as renumbered) ‘with specific regard to the Stoke Ferry Conservation Area Character Statement 1992’.</p>	QB	YES	Textual amendments	<p>8.34 As described in earlier chapters, Stoke Ferry parish possesses a high quality and varied historic environment with a wealth of historic buildings and structures concentrated within the historic core of the village centre which is reflected in its designation as a Conservation Area. The Conservation Area was designated in 1979 and the Borough Council undertook an appraisal of it in 1992, resulting in the production of some management guidelines the Stoke Ferry Conservation Area Character Statement 1992.</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p>7.4.2 From the third paragraph of the Policy delete “(including highways and directional signage)”.</p>				<p>Policy SF7-SF5 Historic environment and Conservation Area</p> <p>The special character of Stoke Ferry Conservation Area and its setting will be preserved and enhanced with specific regard to the Stoke Ferry Conservation Area Character Statement 1992.</p> <p>This will be achieved by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Encouraging the retention and maintenance of buildings which contribute to the overall character of the Conservation Area, whether listed or not. b. Ensuring that new development is in keeping with the special qualities, character and appearance of the Conservation Area c. Protecting the setting of the Conservation Area from development which adversely affects views into or out of the Conservation Area. d. Encouraging the maintenance and enhancement of features and details which contribute to the area’s local distinctiveness. <p>Where new or reconfigured advertising signage (including highways and directional signage) is proposed, consideration must be given to its size, design, and siting to ensure that it does not detract</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Proposals that seek to rationalise or reduce the amount of signage within the Conservation Area will be supported. Proposals seeking to enhance the streetscape and public spaces through appropriate use of street furniture¹⁸ which preserves and enhances the area will be supported.</p> <p>Measures to improve the visual appearance of sites before and during construction including the use of well-designed and sympathetic hoardings, which form part of the overall scheme visualisation will be supported.</p>
	<p>7.5 Renumber Policy SF8 as Policy SF6.</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Policy SF8-SF6 Non-designated Heritage Assets (important unlisted buildings)...</p>
<p>Section 9 (submission Plan policies SF9-SF11)</p>	<p>Recommendation 8:</p> <p>8.1 In relation to Policy SF9 (now renumbered as SF7):</p> <p>8.1.1 Amend the Policy wording under the heading “Public Rights of Way” by removing “and ‘droves”” from the title and “, including bridleways and historic routes such as</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Policy SF9 SF7 Accessibility</p> <p>Proposals should maximise opportunities for sustainable transport¹⁹, prioritising these modes as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Walking 2. Cycling 3. Public Transport

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p>‘droves’” from the first paragraph; also move the listing of droves as below.</p> <p>8.1.2 Add after the amended Policy a Community Action, clearly distinguished from Policy content with a different presentation, as follows:</p> <p><i>‘The Parish Council recognises and will work to retain and, where appropriate, enhance the routes of the historic ‘droves’ identified below and on Figure 23, only a few which have Public Right of Way status: [add back in here the listing of droves].’</i></p> <p>8.1.3 Replace Figure 23 with the revised version submitted by the Borough Council within the joint email dated 18th April 2023.</p>				<p>Highway safety and access</p> <p>Major development proposals should be accompanied by a travel plan to assess traffic impacts and identify opportunities for mitigation.</p> <p>Walking and cycling</p> <p>Unless demonstrably impractical, new developments, as appropriate should contribute to the health and wellbeing of residents through increasing levels of walking and cycling by the provision of safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle routes and crossings, that are suitable for all users including those with a disability.</p> <p>Large scale new developments i.e., over 25 dwellings, should contain more than one point of access for pedestrians and cyclists and improve community cohesion by providing good connections to the rest of the village and existing services e.g., pub, school, shop, village hall, playing field and allow for access to the wider countryside and neighbouring villages.</p> <p>Public Rights of Way and ‘droves’</p> <p>Existing Public Rights of Way, including bridleways and historic routes such as ‘droves’ should be protected and enhanced. The following are identified as historic ‘droves’:</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>a. Furlong Drove. b. Barker's Drove. c. Little Man's Way (Footpath 5). d. Great Man's Way. e. Limehouse Drove. f. River Drove. g. Stringside Drove. h. Herringay Drove. i. Romer Drove. j. Stoke Drove (now School Lane).</p> <p>Enhancement can take the form of new routes, connections, improved surfaces and/or signage increasing access to the countryside and connectivity between communities suitable for all users including horse-riders. Where Public Rights of Way may be unavoidably impacted or lost, appropriate diversions or new routes should be provided that are equally safe, accessible, and convenient for users.</p> <p>Community Action 2 Historic Drovers</p> <p>The Parish Council recognises and will work to retain and, where appropriate, enhance the routes of the</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>historic 'droves' identified below and in Figure 23, only a few which have Public Right of Way status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Furlong Drove. b. Barker's Drove. c. Little Man's Way (Footpath 5). d. Great Man's Way. e. Limehouse Drove. f. River Drove. g. Stringside Drove. h. Herringay Drove. i. Romer Drove. j. Stoke Drove (now School Lane). <p>[Figure 23: addition of revised version of map, distinguishing between Public Rights of Way and other historic droves]</p>
	<p>8.2 Delete Policy SF10 (but retain the supporting text); amend the Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022 to include appropriate reference to the Norfolk Parking Standards 2007 (updated</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments to Neighbourhood Plan document</p>	<p>Policy SF10-Parking</p> <p>New residential developments should provide sufficient parking for residents and visitors and have regard to</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p>2020) at MV.04; amend subsequent Policy numbering accordingly.</p>			<p>and Stoke Ferry Design Codes</p>	<p>adopted parking standards¹⁹ and guidance in the Stoke Ferry Design Codes.</p> <p>Parking provision in new residential developments should be located to be discreet, accessible, and appropriate to the character of the proposed development. Where appropriate to the specific site, parking areas should not be disconnected from the dwelling and should be located to promote natural surveillance and security.</p> <p>Taking into account, the proposal and its location, parking provision should include adequate off-street parking for the size of the dwelling. Where garages are proposed they should be of a size to accommodate and provide easy access to and from a range of modern vehicles and where appropriate, specific provision should also be made for layby parking and visitor parking.</p> <p>Non-residential development, including commercial development, should provide adequate parking²⁰ for the intended users.</p> <p>The provision of electric charging points in new developments, as appropriate (for use by residents and in public spaces) is supported.</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>[Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022 – addition of reference to Norfolk Parking Standards 2007 (updated 2020) at MV.04]</p>
	<p>8.3 Renumber Policy SF11 as SF8.</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Policy SF11-SF8 Village Hall carpark...</p>
<p>Section 10 (submission Plan policies SF12-SF19)</p>	<p>Recommendation 9:</p> <p>9.1 With regard to Policy SF12 (as renumbered SF9):</p> <p>9.1.1 Add to the first sentence of paragraph 10.1: ‘established in accordance with Policy Approach set out on page 18 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 [provide a footnote source reference].</p> <p>9.1.2 Delete paragraphs 10.7 & 10.8 and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.</p> <p>9.1.3 Amend and reduce the Policy wording to: ‘The development boundary for Stoke Ferry is shown on Figure 25. Development within the development boundary is supported in principle but the areas outside the development boundary (excepting</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>10.1 As referred to in previous chapters the Neighbourhood Plan does not intend to amend the Development Boundary for the parish established in accordance with the policy approach set out on page 18 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016²⁰ [footnote source reference added]. Development boundaries define the areas where development (of a type suitable for the settlement) is likely to be acceptable, provided it conforms to other policies in either the Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Areas outside the development boundaries will be subject to policies for development in the countryside. Development boundaries are useful tools for developers, the public and planning authorities, in that they provide more certainty when assessing planning applications for development. The identification of such boundaries helps avoid development encroaching on the countryside and limits village sprawl. For the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan policies, where they refer to</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p><i>specific allocations for development) are treated as countryside where new development will be more restricted and will be limited to that identified as suitable in rural areas by other policies of the Development Plan.</i></p> <p>9.1.4 Delete the related footnotes.</p>				<p>development boundaries, the Plan will use the boundary identified in the most recent version of the Adopted Local Plan. The expectation is that applications for new development, either inside or outside of the development boundary will be determined using the policies of the Adopted Local Plan, and that the focus of new development will be small scale, incremental infill development within the development boundary rather than new development outside of it (except on specifically allocated sites identified in the Local Plan).</p> <p>10.7 The household survey asked a specific question about the potential for a 'Strategic Gap' e.g. protecting land between Stoke Ferry and the neighbouring village (Wretton), from development and specifically to try to protect the specific identity of the settlements and prevent one settlement merging with another. Strategic gaps help to protect the identity and character of separate settlements, giving a sense of leaving one place and arriving at another. The survey revealed support for this concept and with land between Stoke Ferry and Wretton (to the west of the village) being the most mentioned by respondents. In order for Stoke Ferry to remain as a distinct settlement, it is necessary to protect the existing undeveloped gap between the village and</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>neighbouring Wretton. This should protect the open character and prevent the coalescence of settlements.</p> <p>10.8 Therefore land between the built-up area of Stoke Ferry and Wretton identified in the policy below, is intended to be a ‘Strategic Gap’ with the aim of preventing the physical joining up of the settlements and further ribbon development along Wretton Road.</p> <p>Policy SF12-SF9 Development boundary and strategic gap</p> <p>The existing development boundary for Stoke Ferry (figure 25 and 26) will be adopted for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan. The development boundary will be the focus for new small scale and infill development in line with the statement made above in relation to new housing.²¹</p> <p>Proposals for new residential development outside of the development boundary will only be permitted in accordance with paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework.²²</p> <p>Land between the built-up area of Stoke Ferry and Wretton (figure 25) will be maintained as a ‘Strategic Gap’ to prevent the physical joining up of the settlements and further ribbon development along Wretton Road. All development should respect and</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>retain the generally open and undeveloped nature of the separation between Stoke Ferry and Wretton. Development will only be permitted provided it does not result in the actual or perceived 'joining up' of the settlements (or part thereof). [related footnotes also deleted]</p> <p>The development boundary for Stoke Ferry is shown on Figure 25. Development within the boundary is supported in principle but the areas outside the development boundary (excepting specific allocations for development) are treated as countryside where new development will be more restricted and will be limited to that identified as suitable in rural areas by other policies of the Development Plan.</p>
	<p>9.2 With regard to Policy SF13 (as renumbered SF10) reword the second paragraph of the Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>'Development proposals within the ambit of a valued view must assess and address their impacts to ensure acceptability within the landscape, with mitigation as appropriate. Proposals that would result in a visual enhancement to an approach to the village will be supported.'</i></p>	QB	YES	Textual amendments	<p>Policy SF13-SF10 Protection of Important Public Views</p> <p>The following views are identified as Important Public Local Views (figure 25 and 26):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. View south from School Lane. 2. Views looking west towards Old Tower Mill from Furlong Drive. 3. View from the bypass looking south towards the village.

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>4. Views along Oxborough Road.</p> <p>a. south</p> <p>b. north</p> <p>5. Views from the Bridge looking:</p> <p>a. east along the River Wissey.</p> <p>b. south away from the village.</p> <p>c. west along the River Wissey.</p> <p>Development that would adversely affect an identified public view would not be supported. Proposals that would result in a visual enhancement to an approach to the village will be supported. Development proposals within the ambit of a valued view must assess and address their impacts to ensure acceptability within the landscape, with mitigation as appropriate. Proposals that would result in a visual enhancement to an approach to the village will be supported.</p>
	<p>9.3 With regard to Policy SF14 (as renumbered SF11):</p> <p>9.3.1 Amend the opening sentence of the Policy to read: ‘<i>Development that may adversely affect the visual, scenic and</i></p>	QB	YES	Cartographic and textual amendments	<p>Policy SF14 SF11 River Wissey corridor</p> <p>The visual, scenic and undeveloped nature of the River Wissey corridor (figure 27) will be protected from development, within the parish that may adversely affect: Development that may adversely affect the</p>

Section	Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021 Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text . Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics .	Who will make these changes? LPA or QB	Do you agree with the modification?	What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?	Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.
	<p><i>undeveloped nature of the River Wissey corridor within the Parish (figure 27) should demonstrate regard for:</i></p> <p>9.3.2 Amend the second paragraph of the Policy to read: ‘<i>Subject to the above, proposals to provide/ improve public access will be supported.</i>’</p> <p>9.3.3 Add to Figure 27 and its key the two bridleways referenced in the supporting text.</p>				<p>visual, scenic and undeveloped nature of the River Wissey corridor within the Parish (figure 27) should demonstrate regard for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the value of its landscape character, b. views across the river, c. its contribution to the setting and entrance to the village, d. its wildlife value, or e. its recreational use. <p>Proposals that would provide opportunities to increase public access, including disabled access for the enjoyment of the River Wissey will be supported. Subject to the above, proposals to provide/ improve public access will be supported.</p> <p>Figure 27: [Addition of bridleways referenced at paragraph 10.14]</p>
	<p>9.4 With regard to Policy SF15 (as renumbered SF12):</p> <p>9.4.1 Add a data source reference to Figure 28.</p> <p>9.4.2 Add to paragraph 10.21 a reference to “Norfolk County Council (NCC) – Lead Local</p>	QB	YES	Cartographic and textual amendments	<p>Figure 28: Flood risk in Stoke Ferry (source: Parish Online with own annotations, data from Environment Agency). Blue line denotes parish boundary.</p> <p>10.21 The use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) is now commonly promoted by Norfolk County Council as the Local Lead Flood</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
	<p>Flood Authority (LLFA) Statutory Consultee for Planning: Guidance Document” and provide a source reference footnote.</p> <p>9.4.3 Within the Policy wording:</p> <p>9.4.3.1 In the first paragraph replace “seek to achieve lower than greenfield runoff rates” with ‘take account of the impacts of climate change’.</p> <p>9.4.3.2 In the second paragraph delete the content after “Borough Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment” and provide a source reference for that document.</p> <p>9.4.3.3 In the third paragraph delete the content after “e.g. the New Drain (Dutch Drain)”.</p> <p>9.4.3.4 Replace the fourth paragraph with ‘Development proposals should demonstrate regard for the related design guidance in the Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022.’</p> <p>9.4.4 Delete Figure 29 and renumber subsequent Figures accordingly.</p>				<p>Authority. This is due to their benefits not only to flood relief but also in preventing pollution and their potential to benefit wildlife. The County Council encourages all new development (including minor developments of less than 10 dwellings or less than 1000m²) to use appropriate sustainable drainage systems (including SuDS and drainage lagoons), wetland and water features, to protect against pollution, provide drainage and wider amenity, recreational and biodiversity benefits. See the Norfolk County Council (NCC) – Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) Statutory Consultee for Planning: Guidance Document²² Policy SF15-SF12 below has been constructed with this mind.</p> <p>Policy SF15-SF12 Drainage and flood risk</p> <p>All development will be expected to demonstrate how it can mitigate its own flooding and drainage impacts, avoid increase of flooding elsewhere and seek to achieve lower than greenfield runoff rates take account of the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Development will not be supported in areas of high probability of flood risk as identified in the Borough Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment²³ [SFRA footnote reference] including Bridleway 8 and 9, land</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>adjacent to the railway station and land between the bridge and Little Man's Way.</p> <p>New development should not exacerbate existing surface water, groundwater or foul drainage problems, nor should it have an adverse effect on historic drainage features e.g., the New Drain (Dutch Drain).</p> <p>The following are identified as areas of localised flooding (figure 29):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. River Walk either side of the River Wissey. 2. East of the bypass and north of the River Wissey. 3. Area adjacent western boundary of the parish. 4. The Old Railway Station, north of the Drainage ditch. 5. South of the drainage ditch, west of Bridge Road. 6. Land between Bridge Road and Great Man's Way. <p>Developments that include measures to reduce surface water run off e.g., permeable surfaces, ponds and tree planting will be supported. Development proposals should demonstrate regard for the related</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>design guidance in the Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022.</p> <p>Delete Figure 29: Figure 29: Identified areas of localised flooding (source: Parish Online with own annotations). Blue line denotes parish boundary.</p>
	<p>9.5 With regard to Policy SF16 (as renumbered SF13) reword the entire Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>'Development proposals should address light spillage and eliminate all unnecessary forms of outdoor lighting to appropriately maintain dark skies throughout the Parish.'</i></p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Policy SF16 SF13 Dark skies</p> <p>Development proposals that address light spillage and eliminate all unnecessary forms of outdoor lighting to maintain dark skies throughout the parish will be supported.</p> <p>External lighting in new developments will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it is required for safety, security or community reasons and where the design minimises the potential for light spillage.</p> <p>Where street lighting and the lighting of residential dwellings or businesses is proposed, proposals will be supported that include environmentally efficient lighting that is sympathetic in design (for example, down lighting).</p> <p>Where lighting is proposed adjacent to the countryside, historic assets and the protected natural habitats and features identified in Policy SF17,</p>

Section	Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021 Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text . Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics .	Who will make these changes? LPA or QB	Do you agree with the modification?	What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?	Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.
					<p>particular care should be taken in order to mitigate adverse impacts.</p> <p>NB: It should be noted that this policy does not apply to 'temporary lighting' erected for specific events or functions e.g., Christmas lighting. Development proposals should address light spillage and eliminate all unnecessary forms of outdoor lighting to appropriately maintain dark skies throughout the Parish.</p>
	<p>9.6 With regard to Policy SF17 (as renumbered SF14) replace the last line (but not in bold) with:</p> <p><i>'Development proposals should demonstrate regard for the related design guidance in the Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022.'</i></p>	QB	YES	Textual amendments	<p>Policy SF17-SF14 Protection and enhancement of natural features and species</p> <p>Natural features typical of the Fens landscape character of the area will be protected from development that would have an adverse impact upon their character, appearance, and biodiversity value.</p> <p>Development proposals should retain existing features of biodiversity or landscape value where possible to do so (e.g., ponds, trees, including veteran trees, dykes, the River Wissey, marshes, the cut-off channel hedges, woodlands and verges) and provide at least a 10 per cent net gain for wildlife through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the creation of new natural habitats. b. the planting of additional trees and hedgerows.

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. the restoration and repair of fragmented biodiversity networks. d. the connecting of fragmented habitats to create new wildlife corridors. <p>Where loss or damage to a feature is unavoidable, adequate mitigation measures or, as a last resort, compensation measures will be sought. If suitable mitigation or compensation measures cannot be provided, then planning permission should be refused.</p> <p>New tree planting should be of a scale, location and type which adds value, and with a view to optimising benefits to wildlife. Planting plans should take account of the expected eventual size of the tree including future shading and the relationship with surrounding buildings. The design of gardens should take account of the contribution gardens can make to enhancing wildlife and include trees and hedgerows in boundary treatments, where appropriate. Tree species selection should take into account the warming climate and native species.</p> <p>Proposals for new buildings should incorporate measures to protect and enhance wildlife species including the incorporation of wildlife friendly measures e.g., bat, swallow and swift boxes,</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>hedgehog doors and insect bricks, etc., new garden hedgerows and trees.</p> <p>Also, see guidance in the Stoke Ferry Design Codes Development proposals should demonstrate regard for the related design guidance in the Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022.</p>
	<p>9.7 With regard to Policy SF18 (as renumbered SF15):</p> <p>9.7.1 Correct the quote from the NPPF at paragraph 10.36 replacing “relatively” with ‘reasonably’.</p> <p>9.7.2 Amend paragraph 10.41 to ‘4’ spaces instead of “10”.</p> <p>9.7.3 Amend Appendix C to delete the assessments where it is now agreed that the criteria are not met, to exclude the cemetery extension from the Cemetery space and to correct the following factual inaccuracies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Church of All Saints should be qualified as ‘Former’ Church of All Saints. 	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Cartographic and textual amendments</p>	<p>40.36 10.34 The National Planning Policy Framework 2021, at paragraphs 101-103 introduces the concept of Local Green Spaces which can be identified through neighbourhood plans by local communities and allows green areas identified as being of particular importance to be protected. Paragraph 102, sets out 3 broad criteria for identifying and designating such spaces as follows:</p> <p><i>‘The Local Green Space designation should only be used when the green space is:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>in relatively reasonably close proximity to the community it serves.</i> <i>demonstrably special to a local community and holds particular local significance, for example, because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field) tranquillity and richness of its wildlife: and</i>

Section	Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021 Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text . Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics .	Who will make these changes? LPA or QB	Do you agree with the modification?	What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?	Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exclude the footprint of the former Church from the map of the graveyard. <p>9.7.4 Revise the Policy wording to:</p> <p>9.7.4.1 Remove space 1, the extension part of 3, and spaces 6-10 and renumber the list accordingly.</p> <p>9.7.4.2 Retitle space 5 as ‘Former’ Church of All Saints.</p> <p>9.7.4.3 Remove the NPPF reference (but not the footnote) from the final paragraph.</p> <p>9.7.5 Revise footnote 26 to apply to both spaces 5 and 6 in the list and to make it clear that not only is there no public access but that both spaces are in private ownership.</p> <p>9.7.6 Revise Figure 31 and its key to bring the spaces and their numbering in line with the Policy; exclude the cemetery extension from the Cemetery space and the footprint of the former Church from the graveyard space.</p>				<p>c) <i>local in character and not an extensive tract of land</i></p> <p>40.44 10.39 The candidate spaces and some additional spaces identified by the Working Group were assessed against the NPPF criteria. The result is the 40 four spaces shown in figure 34 30 and listed within Policy SF18. Assessments for each one against the criteria set out in the NPPF have been carried out and these are shown in Appendix C.</p> <p>Policy SF18-SF15 Local Green Spaces</p> <p>The following (figure 34 30) are identified as Local Green Spaces:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Common. 1. The Playing Field. 2. 2. Cemetery on Furlong Drove (plus the Cemetery extension). 3. 3. Victorian Cemetery.²⁷ 4. 4. Former All Saints Church graveyard.²⁸ [27 and 28 footnotes: Please note there is no public access or right of way to this area. Area in private ownership] 4 pieces of land owned by Charity (two in the village and one south and one north of Littleman’s Way). Three Acre field, Rear of Ashpond House, Oxborough Road. Buckenham Drive – 5 grassed amenity areas.

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>9. Grassed area at Oak Road. 10. Land behind Buckenham Drive between the Playing Field and 2 Agriculture.</p> <p>Development on the local green spaces will be consistent with national policy for Green Belts (see National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Paragraph 103²⁷ and paragraph 149).</p> <p>Figure 34-30 [revised – deletion of spaces 1 and 6-10 from submission Plan and amend Key accordingly]</p>
	<p>9.8 With regard to Policy SF19:</p> <p>9.8.1 Delete paragraph 10.45 and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.</p> <p>9.8.2 Delete Policy SF19 and renumber subsequent Policies accordingly.</p>	QB	YES	Textual amendments	<p>10.45 The following Policy SF19 has been devised in the light of the consultation responses, taking into account the increasing prominence of climate change and low carbon issues. It also has regard to the Written Ministerial Statement dated 25 March 2015 which makes it clear that it is not appropriate to refer to any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction or performance of new dwellings in neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Policy SF19 Energy efficiency and sustainability</p> <p>Proposals will be expected to incorporate sustainable features in the design of all new development, unless demonstrably impractical, to increase energy efficiency,</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>reduce carbon, minimise light pollution and deliver government targets.²⁸</p> <p>Support is given for the inclusion of the following sustainable features/mechanisms at a domestic scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rainwater harvesting/capture ● Grey water recycling ● Air/ground source heat pumps ● Solar panels (on domestic dwellings) ● Passive solar gain ● Biomass/wood pellet boilers ● Low energy/down lighting (for safety and security) ● Building orientation to take account of local climatic conditions ● Electric charging points ● Passive ventilation²⁹ ● Thermal mass³⁰ <p>Support is given in principle, for community energy projects which have an emphasis on local engagement, local leadership and control and the local community benefiting collectively from the outcomes.</p>
<p>Section 11 (submission</p>	<p>Recommendation 10:</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Policy SF20-SF16 New and existing business</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p>Plan Policy SF20)</p>	<p>Reword the second paragraph of Policy SF20 (as renumbered SF16) as follows:</p> <p><i>'Development proposals suitable for small businesses or homeworking, including shared spaces, are supported in principle.'</i></p>				<p>Proposals for new businesses and extensions to existing businesses, shall be sensitively designed and not have a significant adverse impact upon the character of the area, the historic environment, adjoining uses, or the amenity of local residents, through either their built form, proposed use, or traffic generated.</p> <p>Proposals that would result in the provision of new accommodation including shared spaces, which would be suitable for use by small businesses, or adaptation for homeworking will be supported. Development proposals suitable for small businesses or homeworking, including shared spaces, are supported in principle.</p> <p>Such proposals should include provision for high-speed broadband connections and adequate parking and servicing for visitors including deliveries and couriers.</p>
<p>Section 12 (submission Plan Policy SF21)</p>	<p>Recommendation 11:</p> <p>Reword Policy SF21 (as renumbered SF17) as follows:</p> <p><i>'Proposals for new buildings and extensions or the change of use or conversion of existing buildings providing spaces or facilities for community cultural or creative uses including</i></p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>Policy SF21-SF17 New cultural and creative facilities</p> <p>Proposals for the change of use or conversion of existing buildings which result in the provision of spaces or facilities available for community cultural or creative uses including digital, artisanal, creative facilities, school outreach, or rehearsal spaces will be supported in principle. Proposals for new buildings and extensions</p>

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in bold italics.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>												
	<p><i>digital, artisanal, or creative facilities, school outreach, or rehearsal spaces will be supported in principle.</i></p>				<p>or the change of use or conversion of existing buildings providing spaces or facilities for community cultural or creative uses including digital, artisanal, or creative facilities, school outreach, or rehearsal spaces will be supported in principle.</p>												
<p>Section 13 (Implementation)</p>	<p>Recommendation 12:</p> <p>Under the heading “13. Implementation”, break paragraph 13.3 before “Planning obligations ...”, thus creating an additional paragraph 13.4 (renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly).</p> <p>To the truncated paragraph 13.3 add ‘- see table below:’ and insert the table supplied with the Local Authority’s email dated 18th April 2023 (and as shown above). Renumber Policy references and titles in the table accordingly.</p>	<p>QB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Textual amendments</p>	<p>13.3 The policies in this Neighbourhood Plan shape the way in which development will happen within the parish of Stoke Ferry. Some of the policies included within the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan have a delivery element, often a requirement of development or ‘planning obligation’ – see table below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1509 954 2168 1378"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1509 954 1624 1038">Policy reference</th> <th data-bbox="1624 954 1776 1038">Policy title</th> <th data-bbox="1776 954 2168 1038">Main delivery mechanism(s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1509 1038 1624 1209">SF1</td> <td data-bbox="1624 1038 1776 1209">Community facilities</td> <td data-bbox="1776 1038 2168 1209"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure • S106 – where specific infrastructure is required (e.g. open space, additional classrooms) to service new development </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1509 1209 1624 1323">SF2</td> <td data-bbox="1624 1209 1776 1323">Cemetery extension at Furlong Drive</td> <td data-bbox="1776 1209 2168 1323"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1509 1323 1624 1378">SF3</td> <td data-bbox="1624 1323 1776 1378">Housing mix</td> <td data-bbox="1776 1323 2168 1378"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S106 – affordable housing contributions </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Policy reference	Policy title	Main delivery mechanism(s)	SF1	Community facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure • S106 – where specific infrastructure is required (e.g. open space, additional classrooms) to service new development 	SF2	Cemetery extension at Furlong Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure 	SF3	Housing mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S106 – affordable housing contributions
Policy reference	Policy title	Main delivery mechanism(s)															
SF1	Community facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure • S106 – where specific infrastructure is required (e.g. open space, additional classrooms) to service new development 															
SF2	Cemetery extension at Furlong Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure 															
SF3	Housing mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S106 – affordable housing contributions 															

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification ?</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>									
					<table border="1" data-bbox="1509 520 2172 871"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1509 520 1624 719">SF7</td> <td data-bbox="1624 520 1774 719">Accessibility</td> <td data-bbox="1774 520 2172 719"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure, e.g. improved accessibility to droves/opening up Public Rights of Way • S106 – provision for walking and cycling, to service development </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1509 719 1624 780">SF8</td> <td data-bbox="1624 719 1774 780">Village Hall car park</td> <td data-bbox="1774 719 2172 780"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1509 780 1624 871">SF16</td> <td data-bbox="1624 780 1774 871">New and existing business</td> <td data-bbox="1774 780 2172 871"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure – high-speed broadband </td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="1509 919 2172 1102">13.4 Planning obligations (often referred to as Section 106 Agreements) are legal agreements negotiated between the Borough Council and a developer or landowner (usually in the context of a planning application). Planning obligations are typically used to ensure that new developments:</p> <ul data-bbox="1554 1126 2172 1342" style="list-style-type: none"> • Comply with planning policy, for instance, by requiring affordable housing or public open space to be provided; and • Do not impose undue burdens on existing facilities --- for instance, by requiring financial contributions to improve local services such as schools, libraries or transport. 	SF7	Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure, e.g. improved accessibility to droves/opening up Public Rights of Way • S106 – provision for walking and cycling, to service development 	SF8	Village Hall car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure 	SF16	New and existing business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure – high-speed broadband
SF7	Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure, e.g. improved accessibility to droves/opening up Public Rights of Way • S106 – provision for walking and cycling, to service development 												
SF8	Village Hall car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure 												
SF16	New and existing business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL – priority infrastructure – high-speed broadband 												

Section	Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021 Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text . Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i> .	Who will make these changes ? LPA or QB	Do you agree with the modification ?	What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?	Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.
Annex titled Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022	Recommendation 13: With regard to the Annex titled Stoke Ferry Design Codes June 2022: 13.1 Insert a map of the Parish to clarify the area of application.	QB	YES	Cartographic amendments	Insertion of new Figure 5: Map showing the Neighbourhood Plan Area boundary (Stoke Ferry Parish).
	13.2 Factual amendments required to correctly refer to Anglian Water Assets.	QB	YES	Textual amendments	[p49, CA6] School Lane, formerly Stoke Drove, is a rural lane that becomes River Drove and leads to East Anglian Waterworks and offices Stoke Ferry Anglian Water Treatment Works . It is busy at times with waterworks and local farm traffic as well as visitors to the Common. The line of the old railway track is still visible.
	13.3 Figure 76 – Character Area CA6: Factual amendments required to correctly refer to Anglian Water Assets.	QB changes made to CA6: Wretton Road/ School Lane map	NO	Textual amendments	[p50, Figure 76-77] Figure 76 was re-designated Figure 77, in accordance with minor amendments to the Design Codes document. The Examiner’s recommendation, to re-title the Water treatment works to “Anglian Water Stoke Ferry water recycling centre in accordance with Anglian Water’s Regulation 16 representation is not considered necessary to. To the end-users of the document, differing references to the “water recycling centre” (CA6) and “water treatment works” (CA7) is not considered significant.

Section	<p>Specific Modification for the NP to be compliant with the basic conditions as stated in the Final Stoke Ferry NP Examination Report September 2021</p> <p>Where modifications are recommended, they appear in bold text. Where the examiner has suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in <i>bold italics</i>.</p>	<p>Who will make these changes ?</p> <p>LPA or QB</p>	<p>Do you agree with the modification</p>	<p>What needs to be done to meet the specific modification?</p>	<p>Amendments and new changes made to the proposed Stoke Ferry neighbourhood plan.</p>
					<p>Instead, to the end-users of the document, both Anglian Water assets both function as water treatment works, even if different types of operations are taking place. Therefore, the proposed minor changes to the Stoke Ferry Design Codes are not considered to materially affect the content of that document.</p>

