

Marshland St James
Neighbourhood Development Plan
2022-2038

Consultation Statement

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Overview of Marshland St James Neighbourhood Development Plan	3
About this consultation statement	3
Summary of consultation and engagement activity.....	4
Summary of Early Engagement of the Review.....	4
Early Engagement - Summary of the main issues raised (April 2022).....	7
Early Engagement - How this was considered in development of the pre-submission plan	8
Regulation 14 Consultation	9
Overview	9
Responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation	11
Statutory Stakeholders.....	11
Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	11
National Gas.....	18
Natural England	18
Historic England.....	18
Anglian Water.....	19
Online Survey	30
Appendix A- Initial Consultation Survey Poster April 2022.....	37
Appendix B- Regulation 14 Email/Letter	38
Appendix C- Regulation 14 Poster.....	39

Introduction

Overview of Marshland St James Neighbourhood Development Plan

1. Marshland St James Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has been prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Localism Act 2011, the Neighbourhood Development Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and Directive 2001/42/EC on Strategic Environmental Assessment.
2. It establishes a vision and objectives for the future of the parish and sets out how this will be realised through non-strategic planning policies.

About this consultation statement

3. This consultation statement has been prepared by [Collective Community Planning](#) on behalf of Marshland St James Parish Council to fulfil the legal obligation of the Neighbourhood Development Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out that a Consultation Statement should contain:
 - a) Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - b) Explains how they were consulted;
 - c) Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - d) Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
4. It has also been prepared to demonstrate that the process has complied with Section 14 of the Neighbourhood Development Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This sets out that before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must:
 - a) Publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work, or carry on business in the Neighbourhood Development Plan area:
 - i. Details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan;
 - ii. Details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected;
 - iii. Details of how to make representations; and
 - iv. The date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised;
 - b) Consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; and
 - c) Send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority.
5. Furthermore, the National Planning Practice Guidance requires that the qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its Neighbourhood Development Plan, and ensure that the wider community:
 - Is kept fully informed of what is being proposed;

- Is able to make their views known throughout the process;
 - Has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan; and
 - Is made aware of how their views have informed the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan.
6. This statement provides an overview and description of the consultation that was undertaken by the NDP steering group on behalf of Marshland St James Parish Council, in particular the Regulation 14 Consultation on the pre-submission draft. The steering group have endeavoured to ensure that the NDP reflects the views and wishes of the local community and the key stakeholders.

Summary of consultation and engagement activity

7. This section sets out in chronological order the consultation and engagement events that led to the production of the draft Marshland St James Neighbourhood Plan that was consulted upon as part of the Regulation 14 Consultation.
8. A significant amount of work went locally into engaging with the community early in development of the NDP, so that it could be informed by the views of local people. Consultation events took place at key points in the development process. A range of methods were used and at every stage the results were analysed and shared with local people.

Summary of Early Engagement of the Review

Date	Activity	Summary
June 2021	Area Designation	The Parish area was designated as the NDP Area in June 2021.
July 2021	Meeting with the Borough Council	Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) had held a virtual meeting with members of the BC Planning Policy team. This had been arranged to discuss initial ideas and talk through the next steps.
November 2021 onwards	Monthly Parish Council Meeting Agenda Item ¹	The NDP has been a standard agenda item in Parish Council meetings since November 2021 when discussions first began on developing a NDP, finding a consultant and collecting evidence. Monthly minutes can be read on the parish council website from this date.

¹ [Meeting Dates, Minutes & Agendas – Marshland St. James Parish Council](#)

Date	Activity	Summary
December 2021	Parish Council Meeting	Agreed that CCP would be used as the consultants for the NDP.
February 2022	A Working Group of local people was organised involving Parish Councillors and the Parish Clerk.	<p>Various meetings both face-to-face and remote, of both the full steering group and with individual members have been held and the process is moving forward rapidly. This includes working on an initial community survey.</p> <p>Reported at the Parish Council Meeting.</p>
March 2022	Parish Council Meeting	The steering group meets again on 16th March to finalise the questionnaire and the publicity for it.
March 2022	AECOM Design Codes walkabout around the parish to understand the character of the area.	This interactive session involved NDP steering group members including some from the parish council to develop a design guide for the parish.
April 2022	Parish Council Meeting	<p>The consultation started on 7th April with the distribution of postcards throughout the village, together with website and social media publicity. The Steering Group await the consultation results in a month's time.</p>
April- May 2022	Initial community survey consultation ran for 4 weeks between 7 April and 8 May 2022 (Appendix A).	<p>The consultation was advertised via a postcard that was dropped through every door in the parish, and through posters in public places such as the community centre. It was possible for residents to complete a copy of the survey online or via paper copies that were available in the community centre or from members of the neighbourhood plan steering group.</p> <p>The online surveys explained at this stage the survey was voluntary and anonymous and that all age groups, residents and business owners are encouraged to join in.</p> <p>The survey included 23 questions. Overall, 76 responses were received.</p>
October 2022	Parish Council Meeting	It was reported back that the Steering Group expects to move forward with a Call for Sites and will be holding a meeting shortly to progress this

Date	Activity	Summary
November 2022	Parish Council Meeting	<p>Cllr Redhead explained that responses to the consultation survey carried out earlier in 2022 as part of the development of the Neighbourhood Plan, showed that 60% of respondents wanted a village shop, 50% supported a Call for Sites and 55% would value the provision of start-up/small business units. The Housing Needs Analysis carried out at the same time found that small 2/3 bed properties were needed within the village as there is already significant numbers of large properties. To help the steering group with their planning our planning consultants CCP provided some data on potential sites so that the owners could be contacted but the steering group were concerned that a direct approach might not be fully transparent, and it would be preferable to proceed with an advertisement for the call for sites to give all landowners the opportunity to make a submission.</p> <p>The Call for Sites would be advertised in early December.</p>
December 2022	Call for Sites Consultation Parish Council Meeting	<p>It was reported back at the PC meeting that the Call for Sites process is ongoing, closing on 22nd December. A number of application forms have been issued. Further detail on the call for sites has been detailed in the following section of the document.</p>
February – April 2023	Call for Sites	<p>The sites submitted were analysed by CCP and discussed with the Steering Group. It was reported back to the PC that a number of applicants have been invited to make a more detailed presentation of the proposals submitted at a meeting in early April. April onwards the sites were then sifted through.</p>
December 2023	Sites for Consultation	<p>The NPSG considered each of the sites submitted in December 2022 and based on the objective assessment and meeting with landowners or their agents to further discuss their potential four sites were selected for consultation with the community in December 2023. Analysis of the communities response to the sites consultation</p>

Date	Activity	Summary
		led to a decision by the steering group to not allocate.
April 2024	Parish Council Meeting	Work on the draft NDP has been underway. It was recommended for approval in readiness for consultation with the community (Reg.14). This was done so in a private session.
June- July 2024 September 2024	SEA/HRA Screening Opinion Consultation was led by the Borough Council of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk this ran from June to July 2024. The decision statement was signed off by BCKLWN on 3 September 2024.	Statutory Environmental Bodies were consulted on the draft plan as part of a Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening exercise. It was determined that a full SEA and HRA was not needed allowing the NDP to proceed to the first draft (2012 Neighbourhood Plan Regulations, Regulation 14) consultation.

Early Engagement - Summary of the main issues raised (April 2022)

9. In April 2022 the analysis of the initial community survey showed the main concerns/ issues included:

- Need for new local services and facilities for the community such as a village shop, post office, public house, or meeting spaces to support community cohesion and members of the community who cannot drive.
- Encouragement for more facilities and activities to be introduced in the village for all age groups, particularly younger people.
- Many respondents raised the concern of the poor state of roads and footways and the need to improve these and reduce speed limits etc.
- The identity of Marshland St James as a village, and retaining its current rural character of Marshland St James is important.
- There is strong support for protecting the environment, through identification of local green spaces such as the playing field, wildlife corridors and encouraging biodiversity.
- The design of any new housing is important, there's support for creating a design policy and also new development should incorporate low carbon design.
- There were some suggestions for non-designated heritage assets, including the church and particularly infrastructure dating back to the former railway station (1848) including Station House on Smeeth Road.
- People enjoy access into the countryside and would like to see more footpaths and routes solely for pedestrian use and not further country roads for speeding traffic.
- Some respondents were supportive of allocating a site for employment such as small start-up units, or housing purposes, suggestions for the location of this included

Trinity, Smeeth Rd, Walton or providing infill development in existing parts of the village.

- Some respondents were not supportive of having any more development.
- Where there is new housing preference is for Affordable Housing / First Homes to help younger people get on the housing ladder, or for bungalows for those looking to downsize or cater for accessibility needs.
- Those currently looking for a house in Marshland St James, this is mainly for 2 and 3 beds.
- Many comments raised as a concern are non-planning matters but are worthwhile discussing as community action points. This includes concerns around speeding issues, dog bins/dog mess, littering and anti-social behaviour.
- A large number of response related to the need for strategic infrastructure improvements, such as public transport, roads, schools, doctors, broadband etc. Neighbourhood plans can only deal with land use planning issues at a non-strategic level which means some needs for improvement such as a public bus service is outside of the neighbourhood plans remit and is dealt with by authorities like Norfolk County Council.

Early Engagement - How this was considered in development of the pre-submission plan

10. Feedback from residents on housing helped shaped the conversations had with AECOM when they were developing the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) in early 2022. Feedback in relation to design, the environment and local character was fed into the work on developing Design Codes. This was led by AECOM, but members of the steering group met with AECOM in mid-2022 to undertake an initial walk around and identify key priorities such as parking.
11. Key issues for the NDP have been identified through engagement with the local community alongside a process of reviewing existing objective evidence, such as population characteristics, recent planning permissions and housing stock data.
12. Feedback from the community has been sought throughout the plan's development since 2022. This includes events at the village hall and two surveys. This engagement and findings from it have helped direct the plan's focus on achieving a sustainable community, with housing and infrastructure that meets local need. The three key issues raised by residents include:
 - The community needs more services locally to support its growth.
 - The mix of new housing should reflect local need.
 - Traffic can have a negative impact on the village given its linear nature.
13. As part of developing this neighbourhood plan the option of allocating a site was explored. A call for sites was held in December 2022. The focus of this aimed to reflect comments made by residents, it requested sites were put forward for the development of smaller homes and business units. Overall, 14 sites were put forward by local landowners. These ranged from very small infill sites to larger sites that could accommodate 40 new homes, open green space, and commercial development.

14. An objective assessment was undertaken to determine each site's suitability for future development. This considered physical constraints, location, amenity, highway and environmental benefits, similar as would be considered by the Planning Authority when undertaken their site assessment process. Each of the sites was given a 'red', 'amber' or 'green' rating. The assessment is available as part of the evidence base for this plan.
15. The neighbourhood plan steering group considered each of the sites based on the objective assessment and met with landowners or their agents to further discuss their potential. Following this, four sites were selected for consultation with the community in December 2023. The site numbers relate to the sites original numbering when submitted as part of the call for sites. Further details on the four sites is below:
- Site 4: Land south of 339 Smeeth Road for six new homes including two pairs of semis which are 2 or 3 bed and two larger homes.
 - Site 9: Land adjacent to 70 Smeeth Road for three new homes, including a pair of semis which are 2 or 3 bed.
 - Site 11: Land off Smeeth Road/ Chapel Road for approximately 18 new homes including six pairs of 2 or 3 bed semis, six larger homes, four small business units, open green space and children's play area.
 - Site 12: Land off Walton Road for approximately 33 new homes including 12 pairs of 2 or 3 bed semis, nine self-build plots, four commercial/business units and open green space.
16. Residents were asked to consider whether they would support development on each of the sites and provide their reasoning for this. It is possible to draw key themes from the comments people made. There were some general concerns, mostly about whether there is sufficient infrastructure to support more development in the village, the impact it may have on roads, especially Smeeth Road, and whether the character of the village would be impacted through delivery of the larger sites. There was also a reflection that development could help to address these concerns. Positive comments were received about development providing housing to meet a local need and commercial units providing an opportunity to gain amenities, such as a shop, which would benefit the community. Meeting local need, by providing more affordable smaller homes was recognised.
17. Overall, despite the comments, residents indicated that they were not generally in favour of any of the sites coming forward as part of the neighbourhood plan, and so a decision was made not to allocate a site as part of this.

Regulation 14 Consultation

Overview

18. The consultation ran for six weeks from Friday 1 November to Friday 13 December 2024. The activities undertaken to bring the consultation to the attention of local people and stakeholders are set out below. This meets the requirements of Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 in Regulation 14.

Date	Activity	Summary
31 October 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emails and letters sent to stakeholders advising them of the Regulation 14 consultation and how to make representations 	<p>An email or letter was sent directly to each of the stakeholders, including statutory consultees, supplied by BCKLWN, in addition to local stakeholders. The email/letter informed the stakeholders of the commencement of the consultation period. The email notified consultees of the NDP's availability on the website, alongside supporting materials, and highlighted different methods to submit comments. This meets the requirements of Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 in Regulation 14. This was sent on 31 October. A copy of this is provided in Appendix B.</p>
Week commencing 28 October 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printed off posters and arranged for volunteers to deliver these to every property in the parish informing the community of the consultation (Appendix C). • Copies of the poster were put on the PC website and social media pages. • Printed copies of the survey and neighbourhood plan were available for people to view and collect from the Marshland Hall. • All draft NDP documents and a link to the smart survey and QR code were published on the PC website. 	<p>Various methods were used to bring the Regulation 14 Consultation to the attention of local people. All methods stated the consultation dates, where NDP documents could be accessed and how to respond.</p> <p>People were able to make representations by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completing an online survey. • Filling in a hard copy of the survey and sending this to the parish clerk. • Providing feedback via letter or electronically to the parish clerk. <p>The NDP documents made available as part of this process included²:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation 14 draft NDP • Design Codes 2022 • Housing Needs Assessment 2022 • Evidence Base • BCKWLN SEA Decision Statement

² [Marshland St James Parish Council | Neighbourhood Plan](#)

Date	Activity	Summary
22 November 2024	Drop-in event at Marshland Hall from 10am-2pm	This session allowed the community to turn up to share their views on the NDP.
27 January 2025	Marshland St James NDP Steering Group met with CCP to review the representations received at the Regulation 14 stage and agree amendments to be made to the plan in advance of the parish council meeting in March 2025.	The meeting allowed everyone to discuss the views which had been raised by the community and statutory stakeholders. CCP led the meeting going through the summary table and the group agreed amendments to the NDP to then share with the full parish council.
February 2025	Parish council went through the suggested summary amendments table agreed by the NDP steering group.	In the meeting it was resolved to take forward the suggested amendments to the plan in light of the views by the community and different stakeholders.

Responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation

19. At the end of the consultation period there were 41 completed surveys, either filled in electronically, by hand or online. 5 statutory stakeholders wrote to the steering group with their comments on the draft plan in email form.
20. The next section summarises the main issues and concerns raised and describes how these were considered in finalising the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Statutory Stakeholders

Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
General/overall comment	Several policies state that Development proposals “ must... ”. Use of the word “must” within development plan policies is generally inappropriate, as everything in a Plan policy is negotiable through the development management system, dependent upon development viability etc. It is not possible to require (“must provide” etc) something (e.g. item of local infrastructure) that is not obliged under legislation.	Note the comments. Note the comments on “must”. Will change this to “should” where necessary. Numbered the policy paragraphs to make this easier for the user to read.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Instead, the word “should” ought to normally be used, rather than “must”. This would still give the necessary leverage to the local planning authority in determining planning applications and securing high quality/ sustainable development.</p> <p>It recommended to number each policy paragraph as a); b); c) for ease of referencing and usability to the end user.</p> <p>As a result of LPR Hearings the plan period for emerging Local Plan has been extended from 2021 to 2040, maybe this NP should consider whether they wish to extend their plan period to align with the replacement Local Plan, which it is anticipated will be adopted by March 2025.</p> <p>It is also advisable to remove references to specific Local Plan policies in the plan, although the status of Marshland St James is proposed to remain a rural village in the replacement Local Plan 2021-2040. We advise that you review/ check the data and remove specific Local Plan policy references throughout the document. Instead, these references =should be replaced by the phrase “Local Plan policies for...”, which should future-proof the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Removed specific references to the current LP policies and reviewed the plan where changed were needed.</p>
MSJ1	<p>Second Para states the following:</p> <p>“Although effort should be made to ensure proposals are well connected to the main settlement area, thereby encouraging sustainable travel opportunities, <u>support will also be given to those located adjacent or beyond this.</u> Where development is located outside of the main settlement/ built-up area, proposals should be sensitively designed to reduce impacts on the landscape.”</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Amended the paragraph to:</p> <p>Effort should be made to ensure proposals are well connected to the main settlement area, thereby encouraging sustainable travel opportunities. support will also be given to those located adjacent or beyond this. Where development is located outside of the main</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Does the policy maker accept the notion that certain decisions can be made under prior notification, as suggested by the underlined text?</p> <p>The language of this policy seems overly permissive. It would be more appropriate to emphasise the promotion of sustainable, active modes of transport, ensuring that people can access employment opportunities without a reliance on private cars.</p> <p>The policy should prioritise the use of Class E for commercial purposes, rather than community uses, and avoid referencing specific use classes altogether. Given the current wording of the policy, it could potentially facilitate development in areas such as Middle Drove, which may be better suited for other forms of planning consideration."</p> <p>Whilst the policy supports new employment opportunities, which aligns with the NPPF's objective of fostering growth in rural areas. The policy could be enhanced by promoting energy-efficient and sustainable building practices, such as the use of renewable energy sources, local materials, and low-carbon technologies in new developments or conversions of farm buildings.</p> <p>Suggest wording:</p> <p><i>"Sustainable construction practices, including the use of local materials, renewable energy sources, and low-carbon technologies, should be incorporated wherever possible."</i></p>	<p>settlement proposals should be sensitively designed to reduce impacts on the landscape.</p> <p>Removed the word community use in the third para. And removed reference to Use Class E.</p> <p>Added in the suggested text on energy efficiency.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
MSJ2	<p>Whilst this policy effectively safeguards key community facilities, there is potential for further enhancement. Consider the following additions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear wording regarding the redevelopment of these facilities. • Provisions addressing the potential loss of these facilities. • Guidance on the refurbishment of existing community facilities. • Consideration of proposals for new community facilities. <p>Could the policy incorporate measures to promote the retention of these facilities?"; e.g. replace word "protection", with "retention".</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>No change. Don't want to include anything on redevelopment. Wouldn't want the facility to stand empty and redundant if it's not usable for its original purpose. First para of MSJ1 covers new community facilities.</p> <p>Do not feel the need for guidance on refurbishment of existing community facilities. This will be dealt with at the relevant times by the owners of the properties.</p> <p>Prefer the wording protection rather than retention.</p>
MSJ3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This should apply to open market units only, not s106 affordable housing. 2. "The second paragraph states that the Marshland St James Housing Need Assessment (2022) will be considered acceptable evidence. 3. It is recommended to add the following wording to the policy for clarity: '...unless more up-to-date, robust evidence identifies a different local housing need.'" 4. Clarification is needed on what the 75% threshold refers to. It would be helpful to specify whether this applies to the overall development or to individual plots. 5. Additionally, consideration should be given to custom and self-build homes. Is it intended to allow market housing to come forward, even if it involves a single plot with a four-bedroom home? 6. To make the 75% requirement more meaningful, it may be better to apply it to developments of four or more dwellings, 	<p>Note the comments. The wording already applies to open market units only in the Second Paragraph.</p> <p>Amended the first paragraph with suggested wording by BCKWLN.</p> <p>Wish to keep the 75% to cover the entire development, rather than applying it to developments of 4 or more homes.</p> <p>The emerging LP has a new policy on Custom and Self-Build Housing. The policy wording has been considered when adding further detail to the NP. Added the definition of self-build and custom build housing to the glossary.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>while allowing more flexibility for single plots. This would provide clearer guidance on housing mix expectations."</p>	<p>In the supporting text we have provided further explanation on self-build housing and how people would need to be on the self-build register.</p> <p>This policy doesn't apply to the development of individual plots for self builds. But doesn't exempt a site that is for a number of self-build plots.</p>
MSJ4	<p>Planning Policy Comment: This policy aligns with wider objectives on delivering affordable housing that meets local needs. Can this policy further clarify what evidence will be accepted to prove connectivity to the village?</p> <p>The inclusion of local connection criteria for First Homes is a reasonable approach to prioritising those with ties to the parish. However, this approach may conflict with and restrict access to affordable housing, as the NPPF stresses the need to avoid overly restrictive local connection criteria that limit opportunities for eligible buyers in areas with high demand.</p> <p>It is recommended to revised the wording on NPPF guidance regarding "First Homes" and whether it is still being used and referred to as such.</p> <p>Affordable Housing - The guidance gives NP groups the ability to set local connection criteria, please see below our preferred wording. It should be noted the local connection criteria applies for 3 months after which it reverts to the national criteria. The guidance also states local connection criteria should be disapplied for all active members of the Armed Forces</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/first-homes#first-</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Added some examples in the supporting text which links to the bullet points.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>homes-in-plan-making-and-decision-making therefore this needs to be included within the policy too.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing residents of [insert parish] who have lived there for more than 3 years 2. Past residents of [parish] who have lived there for more 5 years and moved away within the last 3 years to another location within the area of the Borough Council of King’s Lynn & West Norfolk, or 3. Existing residents who have been living in [parish] for more than 12 months and have been in the area of the Borough Council of King’s Lynn & West Norfolk for more than 3 years 4. Those with permanent employment in [parish] 5. Existing residents of [parish] who have lived in [parish] for less than 12 months and have lived in the area of the Borough Council of King’s Lynn & West Norfolk for more than 3 years. 6. Existing residents of the area of the Borough Council of King’s Lynn & West Norfolk who have been living in the area for more than 5 years. 	
MSJ5	<p>I only found one design codes document please view it here , which appears to reference few out of date materials including the NPPF regulations. It would be recommended to revise the contents of the document.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The term 'edge of the settlement' should be clearly defined for greater clarity; e.g. “as defined by the development boundary”. 8. Regarding point f) on parking, the paragraph should be rephrased to allow for flexibility. As currently written, it may be too restrictive and could inadvertently encourage development that includes front or side parking, which may 	<p>The design codes document was finalised and commissioned by AECOM in 2022. Some NPPF references may be out of date, however, we cannot amend the document now. This will not have a real impact on the design codes and character areas set for the parish.</p> <p>Added wording to the Policy about the character area maps. Figure 11 shows the character areas including CA3 – Edge of the Settlement and a</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	not be appropriate or in keeping with the character of the area."	clearer map is available in the design guide. Moved point f to MSJ6 which focuses on parking.
MSJ6	<p>9. It is suggested that minor adjustments be made to the wording of the policy to enhance clarity and environmental considerations. For example:</p> <p>10. "To minimise the visual impact of parked cars, landscaping should be integrated into the design, ensuring that green spaces and soft landscaping elements mitigate the dominance of parking areas within the streetscape."</p> <p>11. "Parking areas and driveways should be constructed using sustainable materials, such as permeable paving, to reduce the impact of impermeable surfaces on drainage systems and improve the environmental quality of the development.</p> <p>12. Parking spaces should be provided in accordance with the established parking standards. The inclusion of layby parking may not comply with highway standards and recommendations. Additionally, layby parking could limit the availability of spaces for residents, as these spaces may be accessible to the general public.</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Incorporated the BCKLWN comments.</p>
MSJ7	<p>13. This policy should clarify the types of development and the areas where thresholds for footpath improvements will be established.</p> <p>14. Consider rephrasing 'new development' to provide a clearer definition, such as 'new residential development' or 'new commercial development.' It is important to specify the expectations for each type of development; e.g. does this include householder development where a new access is proposed?</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>New built development to cover residential and commercial.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	15. Additionally, consideration should be given to whether it is reasonable to include such a policy within the neighbourhood plan."	

National Gas

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	No record of such assets within the NPA.	Noted.

Natural England

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	No specific comments on this draft plan.	Noted.

Historic England

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>We note from the plan that within the plan boundary there is only one designated asset (the grade II listed War Memorial LEN 1444678). Your steering group may wish to consider developing a positive strategy for the area's locally important heritage assets that aren't recognised at a national level through listing or scheduling.</p> <p>If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets, including sites of archaeological interest, locally listed buildings, or identified areas of historic landscape character. Your plan could, for instance, include a list of locally important</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Decision taken not to include NDHAs.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	neighbourhood heritage assets, (e.g. historic buildings, sites, views or places of importance to the local community) setting out what factors make them special.	

Anglian Water

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
Preamble	<p>Anglian Water is identified as a consultation body under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and we support neighbourhood plans and their role in delivering environmental and social prosperity in the region.</p> <p>Overall, Anglian Water is the water supply and water recycling provider for over 6 million customers. Our operational area spans between the Humber and Thames estuaries and includes around a fifth of the English coastline. The region is the driest in the UK and the lowest lying, with a quarter of our area below sea level. This makes it particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change including heightened risks of both drought and flooding, including inundation by the sea. Additionally, parts of the area have the highest rate of housing growth in England.</p> <p>Anglian Water has amended its Articles of Association to legally enshrine public interest within the constitutional make up of our business – this is our pledge to deliver wider benefits to society, beyond the provision of clean, fresh drinking water and effective treatment of used water. Our Purpose is to bring environmental and</p>	Note the general background.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>social prosperity to the region we serve through our commitment to Love Every Drop.</p> <p>Anglian Water wants to proactively engage with the neighbourhood plan process to ensure the plan delivers benefits for residents and visitors to the area, and in doing so protect the environment and water resources. Anglian Water has produced a specific guidance note on the preparation of NPs found using this link under our Strategic Growth and Infrastructure webpage - Strategic Growth and Infrastructure (anglianwater.co.uk) The guidance also has sign posting/ links to obtaining information on relevant assets and infrastructure in map form, where relevant.</p> <p>Anglian Water is committed to ensuring that development in our region continues to thrive while protecting our assets, existing customers and the environment. We want to ensure that growth aligns with environmental responsibilities and infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>Anglian Water delivers new water supply and sewerage services across our region to support sustainable growth for housing and economic development in the fastest growing region of England. There are areas in our region where our water and wastewater networks are at capacity. To remedy this Anglian Water will deliver over £5bn in new infrastructure between 2025-2030 including initiating development of two new strategic reservoirs, upgrading treatment facilities, extending our strategic water supply pipeline by nearly 700km, and numerous nature-based solutions such as wetlands and sustainable urban drainage schemes.</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>The infrastructure we deliver is primarily funded in two ways, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developers pay infrastructure charges to connect to, and where necessary provide additional capacity for our water supply and sewerage networks, which are governed by Ofwat’s charging rules; and 2. Water and sewerage charges agreed by Ofwat every five years, paid by our customers to fund our investment programme on past and future infrastructure to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address a rapidly growing population; • Ensure we are resilient to impacts of climate change; • Enhance our environment to reach the environmental destination agreed with customers and regulators; and • Secure future water supplies. • <p>Anglian Water’s plans are reviewed every five years and include business plans for our investments through the Water Resources Management Plans (WRMP) Water resources management plan and Drainage and Wastewater Management Plans (DWMP) Drainage and wastewater management plan and a Long Term Delivery Strategy (LTDS) Our strategies and plans. These provide a 25-year long term view to 2050, which also corresponds with the Government’s net zero commitment.</p>	
	<p>Section 6: Infrastructure <i>Infrastructure capacity</i> It is noted that the draft neighbourhood plan does not make specific allocations for housing, commercial or other development but includes policies for consideration of different development proposals which may come forward i.e. Policy MSJ1: New Services, Facilities and Employment Opportunities.</p>	<p>Note the comments. This is already a requirement under national and local policy so no need to repeat.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>In accordance strategic (national and local) planning policies, developers will need to demonstrate that there is sufficient water available to support proposed development and that adequate mains foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.</p> <p>In relation to wastewater services, the area is within the West Walton Sewer Catchment Area and the local water recycling centre (WRC) is West Walton. Anglian Water provides water supply services across the area. (Please see further comments below about water resources supply.) Map information of Anglian Water’s assets detailing the location of our water and water recycling infrastructure are available at: www.utilities.digdat.co.uk</p> <p>Paragraph 40 (page 15) refers to statutory agencies, including Anglian Water, that are also responsible for meeting their obligations and responding to growth by ensuring sufficient capacity is available. Whilst Anglian Water is a statutory consultee on Local Plans, Neighbourhood Plans and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, it does not have the same status when it comes to planning applications (including on surface water drainage matters). Anglian Water’s statutory obligations on water supply are set out in the section below.</p> <p>In cases where a supply or connection are to be requested from Anglian Water, developers should undertake pre-planning engagement at the earliest opportunity to assess infrastructure capacity, and any specific requirements that may be needed to deliver the proposed development, which may</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>include sustainable points of connection (SPOC) to our water supply and wastewater networks to minimise impacts on existing communities and the environment. It is imperative that there is sufficient capacity or the ability through a phased approach to support new development prior to the sites being occupied for use. This may need to be secured using appropriate planning conditions.</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> To support the sustainable development principles of the plan, we would advise that suitable wording is added to the neighbourhood plan in the relevant planning policies to cover infrastructure capacity. Proposals should demonstrate this to ensure that development does not result in a detrimental impact on the environment and water infrastructure, including sewers and surface water and other flooding. This should also take account of climate change. Developers should undertake early pre-application engagement, for the reasons set out above on SPOC to the water supply and wastewater infrastructure and network.</p> <p>Given the information supplied in this response regarding the clarification on responsibilities and statutory roles of water utility companies, we respectfully request that paragraph 40 of Section 6 is revisited and amended.</p> <p>If you wish to discuss this further or would like some assistance on the drafting of proposed wording, please do not hesitate to contact me. My contact details are shown at the end of this email.</p>	
Water Resources	Anglian Water has a statutory duty to supply water for domestic purposes. This means we are legally obliged to supply water to all household properties	Note the general comments.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>as well as any domestic requirements (e.g., drinking water, hand-basins, toilets and showers) of non-household properties. In many cases, domestic demand will be the only requirement for non-household properties (e.g., schools, hospitals, offices, shops and hairdressers). Non-domestic demand refers to water use for industrial processes, (e.g., agri-food production or car washes), and there is no legal requirement for us to supply for this type of water usage where it might put at risk our ability to supply water for domestic purposes.</p> <p>Anglian Water’s water resources management plan (WRMP) for 2025-2050 identifies key challenges of population growth, climate change, and the need to protect sensitive environments by reducing abstraction. Managing the demand for water is therefore an important aspect of maintaining future supplies. The neighbourhood plan area is located within the Fenland Water Resources Zone. See Water resources management plan (anglianwater.co.uk)</p> <p>To help protect the environment, the Environment Agency (EA) is reviewing abstraction licences and reducing the amount of water that businesses including Anglian Water can abstract from the environment. As a result, the gap between the demand for water and our supply (aka headroom) has shrunk.</p> <p>The current situation is reducing our ability to be flexible with new requests to supply non-domestic connections which were not planned for in the WRMP. However, where our supplies allow, we will endeavour to help businesses in whatever way we can to meet their needs and continue to serve the communities and economies they support.</p>	<p>Added in some wording around water infrastructure. The design guide code EE03 references flood mitigation.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>To respond to both this challenge, and a growing population, Anglian Water is building a new strategic pipeline to move water around our region. We have also developed plans to build two new reservoirs to increase water supply. These solutions will take time to deliver, and so it is more crucial than ever that all homes and businesses are water efficient, to reduce the overall demand for water, to meet government targets and to ensure there is enough water to go around.</p> <p>For water supply for non-household use*, Anglian Water now has a threshold of 20m3 a day for consideration of whether meeting that commercial/ industrial request could jeopardise domestic supplies for households. This is due to pressure on water supplies because of abstraction reduction, climate change and a fast-growing population. As a result, the gap between the demand for water and our supply (headroom) has shrunk. Prospective applicants are advised to contact Anglian Water at planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk to avoid situations where water intensive demand projects progress to site acquisition, design or planning applications without establishing that a water supply and wastewater solution is feasible.</p> <p><i>(*Water supply for toilets and welfare facilities, as well as firefighting fall with the domestic definition.)</i></p> <p>As a region identified as seriously water stressed, we encourage measures to improve water efficiency in developments. This can be achieved by a fixtures and fittings approach, including through rainwater/ storm water, harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling. Such measures to</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>improve water efficiency standards and opportunities for water reuse and recycling also reduces the volume of wastewater needing to be treated by our water recycling centres. This will help to reduce customer bills (including for other energy bills) as well as reduce carbon emissions in the supply and recycling of water.</p> <p>Given the proposed national focus on water efficiency, Anglian Water encourages Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans to cover this issue through a policy-based approach. Anglian Water has produced a Water Efficiency Protocol with other partners (the Environment Agency, Natural England and Cambridge Water) on the imperative for development plan policies to achieve tighter water efficiency standards than the optional standard of 110 litres per person per day (l/p/d) for new homes.</p> <p>This position is reinforced by the direction taken by the Government Department DEFRA which supports the need to improve water efficiency <u>Plan for Water: our integrated plan for delivering clean and plentiful water - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</u> and the Government's <u>Environment Improvement Plan</u> which sets ten actions in the Roadmap to Water Efficiency in new developments, including consideration of a new standard for new homes in England of 100 litres per person per day where there is a clear local need, such as in areas of serious water stress. It has recently been announced by Government that a review of the Water Efficiency Standard(s) within the Building Regulations 2010 (Part G2 of the Approved Documents) will be consulted on in the next few months.</p> <p><u>Comment:</u></p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>We would advocate the neighbourhood plan seeks a high standard of water efficiency for new developments for the reasons set out above. A target standard i.e. 100 litres per person per day should be included. It is appropriate that the neighbourhood plan include details in its policies to help shape the design of development in the area by promoting water efficiency. This should include positive features of water efficient fixtures and fittings, and through rainwater/storm water harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling. In addition, if water efficiency measures are promoted, this will help reduce the amount of foul drainage from developments and lessen any pressure on water recycling centres.</p>	
Sustainable Drainage	<p>Anglian Water is supportive of measures to address surface water run-off, including the preference for this to be managed using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and requiring permeable surfaces for new areas of hardstanding within developments to comply with the drainage hierarchy.</p> <p>Such measures help to avoid surface water run-off from entering our foul drainage network, and connections to a surface water sewer should only be considered where all other options are demonstrated to be impracticable. Any requirements for a surface water connection to our surface water sewer network will require the developer to fund the cost of modelling and any upgrades required to accept the flows from the development.</p> <p>We are aware that with more people opting for more paved and decked areas in their gardens we are seeing a loss of green areas, particularly in heavily populated areas, but it can also cause problems in less populated areas too. This means</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Decision not to include this as a section in the neighbourhood plan</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>rainwater has nowhere to go, increasing the amount of water travelling into the sewer which can then cause flooding. We, therefore, advocate the use of natural drainage and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to minimise surface water run-off from existing properties and new development as part of the solution to protect the sewer network.</p> <p>Anglian Water encourages the use of nature-based solutions for SuDS wherever possible, including retrofitting SuDS to existing urban areas to enhance amenity and biodiversity within the neighbourhood plan area and contribute to green and blue infrastructure.</p> <p>It has been the intention of Government to implement Schedule Three of The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to make SuDS mandatory in all new developments in England. We would welcome the policy approach to ensure SuDS measures are incorporated within new developments, until such time these measures are in place.</p>	
Policy MSJ5: Design	<p><u>Comment:</u> Criterion (j) zero carbon design or construction principles – the above comments made are regarding promoting better water savings and efficiencies through the neighbourhood plan. Request reference to water efficiency is included under Policy MSJ5.</p>	Noted.
Policy MSJ6: Policy MSJ6: Residential Parking	<p><u>Comment:</u> Part 3 - Support given regarding parking areas and driveways to be constructed of permeable surfaces. See comments under Policy MSJ5.</p>	Note the support.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
Requirements		
Design Guide and Codes	<p>It is noted the design guidance and codes were produced in 2022. The following comments are suggested to ensure improvements/ better linkages with the neighbourhood plan and reflect the policies which are currently being consulted on and refined.</p> <p>EE. Environmental and energy efficiency EE 01 Features in Dwellings - Figure 79 (page 67) illustrates different measures for low-carbon homes or both existing and new homes. This can be achieved by a fixtures and fittings approach, including through rainwater/ storm water, harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling. Under point 6 this should state "<i>highly water-efficient devices</i>" rather than "<i>highly waste-efficient devices</i>". An updated version should be sought from AECOM as this anomaly in the diagram has been corrected for other neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>It is not considered that Figure 79 is sufficient as the text under the code EE does not refer specifically to water efficiency. It should be made more explicit about promoting water efficiency and management, with such positive features as water efficient fixtures and fittings, not just through rainwater/storm water harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling.</p> <p>Checklist To ensure that the checklist is comprehensive, the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include reference to water efficiency as well as energy efficiency within the checklist to reflect the need for this to be a key 	<p>The design guide and codes document were commissioned by AECOM and was finalised and signed off by Locality in 2022. So, it is unlikely we will be able to have amendments made now.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>consideration in design proposals i.e. 1. General considerations for new development and 8. Household extensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify within the checklist the need to consider permeable surfaces i.e. under 9. Building materials & surface treatment and 10. Car parking to link with corresponding codes. 	

Online Survey

There was a total of 41 responses on the online survey with people either completing the survey in full or partially. Some partial responses were purely to leave their personal details so they can be kept in the loop with future engagement and movement of the plan. Responses have been summarised below. Most respondents were residents (40 people), 12 people stated they were also landowners and 4 people also worked in the parish.

Infrastructure Policies

To what extent do you agree with planning polices related to infrastructure?							
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1	Policy 1: New Services, Facilities and Employment Opportunities	10	6	3	3	1	23
2	Policy 2: Protection of Community Facilities	13	5	3	2	0	23
Please provide any comments you have in relation to these policies:							7
						answered	23
						skipped	18

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 1- 69.5% supported the policy Policy 2- 78% supported the policy</p>	Welcome the response. Note the concerns.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>7 comments were left in Q5 which have been summarised below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the most pressing concerns in the village may have not been fully addressed. Issues of road safety and access to public transport could be given more attention since this is an infrastructure concern. Need to have more enforceable speed cameras or traffic calming as part of village infrastructure and address the excessive speed along Smeeth Road near the school. • Change the speed limit to 40mph • Concerns that if more housing and businesses are introduced into the area this will have a detrimental effect on traffic, pollution, pedestrian safety, crime (ASB) and people moved here for the semi-rural peaceful village life. • Questioned what community facilities, employment facilities and opportunities? • The area needs more infrastructure to cope with the houses being built e.g. village needs a school and shop. 	<p>The neighbourhood plan cannot address strategic issues in their policies or have influence over public transport etc.</p> <p>Para 83 already states that the parish has reduced the speed limit.</p> <p>The NP is not allocating any sites within the parish for either housing or commercial use. However, if any applications come forward will play a role in how these are designed etc.</p> <p>The NP cannot stop development coming forward in the area. Nationally there should be a presumption to favour sustainable development coming forward.</p>

Housing Policies

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to housing mix?						
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
1 Policy 3: Housing Mix	6	7	5	2	3	23
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy						2
						answered
						23
						skipped
						18

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 3- 56% supported the policy</p> <p>2 comments were left in Q6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear demand for affordable housing, but there is also a need to maintain higher value housing numbers. MSJ can benefit from the large disposal incomes of those households and should be encouraging smaller scale development of high value homes, retaining large developments to maintain affordable housing quotas. • If too many big family houses are built where are the children going to school? 	<p>Welcome the response. Note the comments.</p> <p>The housing mix has been stipulated in line with the evidence given in the HNA.</p> <p>Any capacity issues with school numbers would be addressed by the relevant stakeholder in planning applications.</p>

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to affordable housing?						
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
1 Policy 4: Affordable Housing	8	5	4	2	2	21
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy						7
						<i>answered</i> 21
						<i>skipped</i> 20

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 4- 61% supported the policy</p> <p>7 comments were left in Q7:</p>	<p>Welcome the response. Note the differing comments and all raise valid points.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement there is a need for affordable housing. Need also for more rented homes since some cannot afford to buy. • Comments that people wish for housing to also be for working people • Continue to feel strongly that the area should provide more affordable homes for those who want to stay in the village and to encourage younger families which would add to the dynamics of the community. • Define what is affordable and emphasis this. • There is a clear need for affordable housing, but I would argue the evidence provided around demographics is not due to housing cost, but due to a lack of appeal in the area and the lack of employment and infrastructure supporting careers as well as social facilities being non-existent. Why would ages 20-35 want to move here? For an isolated tranquil countryside life? • Too many houses being built without the necessary infrastructure. 	<p>We recognise that certain people can only access different parts of the housing market whether this is for affordable rent, affordable home ownership or other options including private rent (where available) or through market housing. Need to cater housing to suit all types of people/groups dependent on age, occupation and personal needs.</p> <p>Affordable housing definitions are set in the NPPF (December 2024) and there is an emphasis now on social rent. Added a glossary.</p> <p>Note that the area may not be desirable for certain age groups but the HNA makes assumptions from top down demographic data when looking into affordability.</p>

Design Policies

To what extent do you agree with the planning policies related to design?							
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1 Policy 5: Design	7	5	3	3	2	20	
2 Policy 6: Residential Parking	9	5	3	1	1	19	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to these policies						5	
						answered	21
						skipped	20

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 5- 60% supported the policy Policy 6- 73% supported the policy</p> <p>5 comments were left in Q8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All properties should have adequate parking to avoid parking on the road (at night with no lights on) • Backfill creating estate-style development should be avoided. Such development would alter the general character of the Parish. Parking on Smeeth Road without lights is a hazard already. • Do not want the village to turn into a town • Dislike people parking on the road when they have driveways • Lack of parking near the school, for the school and new housing • Questioned what design since most houses are different with no structure. 	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Agree that properties should have adequate parking off road.</p> <p>Understand there are existing issues with parking on the street such as Smeeth Road which can be a hazard. The NP will address new properties.</p> <p>This is an ongoing concern referenced it within the text under transport. Added into the text work done to address this – with highways and the head teacher. Signs gone up around where you can park.</p>

Transport and Access Policy

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to transport and traffic?								
Answer Choice		Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1	Policy 7: Footway Improvements	12	3	2	1	2	20	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy							6	
							answered	20
							skipped	21

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 7- 75% supported the policy</p> <p>6 comments were left in Q9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpaths should be wide enough for two people to walk along or for those with pushchairs, mobility scooters and wheelchairs • Need to control the current flow and speed of traffic through the village not introduce more • Need better footpaths • Parking on existing paths/footways is a hazard to pedestrians already • Village has grown in numbers over the years but we don't have a bus stop • What transport is in the parish 	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>The policy is about footpath improvements, so some concerns are not relevant. However, have been made in previous policies and may be addressed elsewhere.</p>

Favour of the Plan

I am generally in favour of the Marshland St James Neighbourhood Plan		
Answer Choice	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Yes	83.3%	15
2 No	16.7%	3
Please provide any comments which explain your answer:		6
	answered	18
	skipped	23

Final comments have been summarised below:

- Do not wish to see the area turn into a town
- More emphasis should be placed on encouraging social facilities for younger demographic and transport links. Dial a bus is a poor answer and inadequate for

future growth. Such an answer contradicts with the want for more affordable housing.

- Need to view the plan- where can this be read?
- The plan does not mention traffic infrastructure
- The parish needs a shop

Most of these comments have been mentioned in previous parts of the policies. The plan was advertised to be read on the parish council website or hard copies could have been collected.



Marshland St James Parish Council

*Your chance to shape the
future of your area*



Have your say!

Visit:
www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/MSJPLAN/
or scan the QR code

Appendix B- Regulation 14 Email/Letter

From: Neil Watson <clerk@marshlandstjamesparishcouncil.gov.uk>
Sent: 31 October 2024 09:40
To: Neil Watson <clerk@marshlandstjamesparishcouncil.gov.uk>
Subject: Marshland St James Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Regulation 14 Consultation

Some people who received this message don't often get email from clerk@marshlandstjamesparishcouncil.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)
EXTERNAL MAIL - Please be aware this mail is from an external sender - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Dear Stakeholder

Marshland St James Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Regulation 14 Consultation

Marshland St James Parish Council, as the qualifying body, are now consulting on their Pre-Submission Draft of the neighbourhood plan for Marshland St James Parish. This consultation is in line with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012) and will run for a period of 6 weeks from Friday 1 November to Friday 13 December 2024.

The consultation offers a final opportunity for you to influence the Neighbourhood Plan before it is submitted to the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk.

All comments received by Friday 13 December 2024 will be considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Parish Council and may be used to amend this draft. A Consultation Statement, including a summary of all comments received and how these were considered, will be made available alongside the amended Neighbourhood Plan at a future date.

The Pre-Submission Plan and supporting evidence can all be found online: <https://marshlandstjamesparishcouncil.gov.uk/>

Should you wish to provide comments you can send these to the Parish Clerk via email at clerk@marshlandstjamesparishcouncil.gov.uk or by post to 78 Highstock Lane, Gedney Hill, Spalding, PE12 0QQ

Yours faithfully

Neil Watson
Clerk & RFO
Marshland St James Parish Council

07784 308575
<https://marshlandstjamesparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Marshland St James Residents Shape the future of your village

Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation

Marshland St James Parish Council is currently developing a Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council are now at the Regulation 14 Consultation (Pre-Submission) Stage where we can gather the communities views on the revised neighbourhood plan.

<https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/MarshlandStJames/>

The community survey where we want your views is running between Friday 1 November and Friday 13 December 2024.

Please find an online copy available in the link above and when scanning the QR code. Hard copies of the survey can be collected and dropped off at Marshland Hall.



You can view the draft plan and supporting documents on Marshland St James Parish Council website - <https://marshlandstjamesparishcouncil.gov.uk/> and a printed copy of the plan will be available at Marshland Hall.

Drop in sessions will take place at Marshland Hall on Friday 22 November 10am-2pm.