

# Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2038



**Consultation Statement**

## Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION .....	3
<b>OVERVIEW OF SYDERSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ABOUT THIS CONSULTATION STATEMENT.....</b>	<b>3</b>
SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITY .....	4
SUMMARY OF EARLY ENGAGEMENT OF THE REVIEW .....	4
EARLY ENGAGEMENT - SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES RAISED .....	7
EARLY ENGAGEMENT - HOW THIS WAS CONSIDERED IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRE-SUBMISSION PLAN. ....	9
REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION .....	9
OVERVIEW.....	9
RESPONSES TO THE REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION .....	11
STATUTORY STAKEHOLDERS.....	12
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KINGS LYNN AND WEST NORFOLK .....	12
NATIONAL GAS AND NATIONAL GRID (AVISON YOUNG) .....	23
NATURAL ENGLAND.....	23
HISTORIC ENGLAND .....	23
ANGLIAN WATER.....	23
ONLINE SURVEY .....	35
LANDOWNER RESPONSES LOCAL GREEN SPACES .....	43
APPENDIX A- THE NATTERJACK SYDERSTONE COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER SPRING 2024 EDITION PAGE 3.....	44
APPENDIX B- THE NATTERJACK SYDERSTONE COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER SUMMER 2024 EDITION PAGE 8-12 .....	45
APPENDIX C- LETTER TEMPLATE SENT TO LOCAL GREEN SPACE LANDOWNERS .....	50
APPENDIX D- REGULATION 14 EMAIL/LETTER .....	52
APPENDIX E- REGULATION 14 POSTER .....	53

## Introduction

### Overview of Syderstone Neighbourhood Development Plan

1. Syderstone 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 Syderstone 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 Syderstone 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 Syderstone 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
December 2022	Area Designation	The Parish area was designated as the NDP Area in December 2022.
February 2023 onwards	Monthly Parish Council Meeting Agenda Item	The neighbourhood plan has been a standard agenda item in Parish Council meetings since February 2023 when discussions first began on developing a neighbourhood plan, finding a consultant and collecting evidence. Monthly minutes can be read on the parish council website from 2023 <sup>1</sup> .
January 2023	A Working Group of local people was organised involving Parish Councillors and the Parish Clerk.	The steering group will report to the Parish Council's monthly meetings, and there will be opportunities for everyone interested in Syderstone to be involved and have their say.  Started to work on a draft survey to gather the initial views of the community.

<sup>1</sup> [Syderstone Parish Council | Minutes & Agendas](#)

Date	Activity	Summary
September 2023	Agreed to take on Collective Community Planning (CCP) as the consultant helping develop the plan.	CCP gave a presentation to the steering group on the process of a NP, and it was agreed by the PC for CCP to support the development of the plan moving forward.
November 2023	Steering Group had been arranged (PC members and community)	The steering group meeting was arranged for 29 November 2023 with CCP to discuss movements on the plan. This included discussing developing surveys for an initial community consultation. AECOM was also contacted to provide technical support including developing Design Guidance and a Housing Needs Assessment for the parish.
December 2023/January 2024	Parish Council Meeting	<p>Cllr S Wood advised the PC that a meeting had been held with CCP and that as a result four documents had been drafted and were required to be approved by the Parish Council including a draft business and community survey. It was AGREED that any comments should be made by return of email to Cllr S Wood who would confirm their acceptability with CCP. It was noted that AECOM would be providing technical support/input for the neighbourhood plan, and they wished to meet with representatives at a date to be agreed in January to further discuss design guidance in relation to Syderstone and undertake a tour of the village. It was noted that next meeting with CCP would be held on the 9th January.</p> <p>The meeting with CCP in January helped finalise the survey and agree to go out to the community in early 2024.</p>
18 January 2024	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.
March 2024	Initial community survey consultation ran for 4 weeks between 1 March to 31 March 2024.	The Natterjack newsletter was distributed to all residents as part of the spring 2024 edition ( <b>Appendix A<sup>2</sup></b> ) encouraging the community to fill in the resident

<sup>2</sup> The Natterjack Spring 2024 Edition. Source: [e83da8\\_7d78c2b0be7945daa4e3393b5c31dadf.pdf](https://www.natterjack.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/e83da8_7d78c2b0be7945daa4e3393b5c31dadf.pdf)

Date	Activity	Summary
		<p>neighbourhood plan survey or the business survey if you owned a business in the parish.</p> <p>The newsletter explained the consultation was running throughout March and there was a drop-in session taking place at the village hall on 9 March 1-4pm for anyone to come express their views. The newsletter had a link and QR code to the online surveys.</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 surveys could be completed online, which could be found on the parish council website, or people could scan a QR code straight from the newsletter to access the survey via Smart survey. However, if people preferred to fill out a paper copy this was also possible since a copy of the survey was posted through every door in the parish.</p> <p>The main survey included 26 questions. Overall, 100 responses were received (1 from the business survey and 99 from the main survey).</p>
Summer 2024	Natterjack Summer 2024 Edition <sup>3</sup> update on the progress of the neighbourhood plan including a few pages on key topics from the consultation analysis.	<p>The Chair of Syderstone Parish Council thanked all those who contributed their views in the recent survey that was part of the consultation for the Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Pages 9-12 allowed the residents to see a breakdown of suggestion under topic headings put forward for the neighbourhood plan group to consider (<b>Appendix B</b>). Many of these topics helped develop and shape the NDP.</p>

<sup>3</sup>The Natterjack Summer 2024 Edition. Source: [e83da8\\_80f826a6ce19496681100aee1679a9aa.pdf](https://www.syderstoneparishcouncil.gov.uk/Assets/Attachments/2024/06/20240611-100826a6ce19496681100aee1679a9aa.pdf)

Date	Activity	Summary
July 2024	Parish Clerk sent out the Local Green Space letters to the relevant landowners informing them of their land being included for designation in the plan ( <b>Appendix C</b> ).	The letter informed that the landowners how their land has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for designation. They were invited to give a formal written representation at Regulation 14 if they wished to.
Autumn 2024	Natterjack Autumn 2024 Edition <sup>4</sup>	On page 3 in the newsletter note was made that work continues on the Neighbourhood Plan and the results of the survey have now been collated and presented to the Parish Council. The team are now working on the next stage.
September-October 2024	SEA/HRA Screening Opinion Consultation was led by the Borough Council of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk this ran from 4 <sup>th</sup> September to 2 <sup>nd</sup> October 2024. The decision statement was signed off on 31 October 2024.	Statutory Environmental Bodies 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.

### Early engagement - summary of the main issues raised

9. Two initial surveys were conducted with residents and people who work in the area in March 2024. One survey was distributed to businesses at Syderstone business park to understand the needs of employers based here. The other being the main survey which included 26 questions and was advertised in numerous ways including on the parish council website, within the village newsletter (Natterjack), social media platforms and hard copies were available which could be dropped off at the church. Overall, the surveys got 100 responses (1 being from the business survey and 99 from the main survey).
10. The main issues and concerns raised from the initial survey have been distributed in the Natterjack newsletter<sup>5</sup> to residents and a number of survey topics are highlighted below.

<sup>4</sup>The Natterjack Autumn 2024 Edition. Source: [e83da8\\_f45072b1871e43a1bccf58170fd41fb4.pdf](https://www.kingslynn.gov.uk/media/1000/e83da8_f45072b1871e43a1bccf58170fd41fb4.pdf)

<sup>5</sup>[Syderstone Parish Council | News](https://www.kingslynn.gov.uk/news/2024/10/31/syderstone-parish-council-news)

Survey Topic	Summary Response
<b>Design and Housing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most respondents (81 people) think the neighbourhood plan should include design guidelines for new development.</li> <li>• Numerous respondents (67 people) think new housing should be environmentally sustainable. However, many stated that they hoped this wouldn't lead to developments being unaffordable to local people.</li> <li>• Most respondents (88 people) think the neighbourhood plan should provide guidance on the size and type of new homes built in the parish.</li> <li>• If new homes were built in the parish many said they would want more family homes, first homes and affordable homes. 71 people did not want to see any more holiday accommodation.</li> <li>• The style of new homes respondents would like to see were more semi-detached (64 people) followed by bungalows (38 people). 59 people did not want to see any apartments/flats.</li> <li>• If new homes were built in the parish many said the size of these should be 2-3 beds (70 people). 54 people would rather not see more 5+ beds.</li> <li>• 56 people supported making an allocation in the plan. Numerous people said development should be small scale and for local people.</li> </ul>
<b>Natural and Historic Environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most respondents (83 people) agreed it is important to protect existing habitats.</li> <li>• Most respondents (84 people) would support the identification of wildlife corridors.</li> <li>• 62 people supported the idea of protecting green spaces such as the allotment, common, recreation field and Womack Wood.</li> <li>• 51 people put forward ideas to protect locally important views looking within the village and beyond.</li> <li>• Most respondents (93 people) said that heritage is important with 55 people listing specific buildings.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Transport and Access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many respondents wished to see improvements to footpaths and access to services (70+ people).</li> </ul>

Survey Topic	Summary Response
Community Facilities and Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities suggested for protection included the allotments, recreation field and village hall.</li> <li>• 47 people suggested ideas they would like to see in the village such as a shop, pub, and more leisure activities.</li> <li>• Over half of the respondents are in employment with many working outside of the parish.</li> </ul>
Other Matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People raised strategic issues relating to infrastructure, such as healthcare provision, which cannot be addressed through the neighbourhood plan. However, engagement with key stakeholders could get conversations going on some of these matters.</li> <li>• Various non-planning matters were raised such as anti-social behaviour, speeding, littering, traffic concerns which could potentially be incorporated as community actions points or addressed with relevant stakeholders outside of the plan.</li> </ul>

Early engagement - how this was considered in development of the pre-submission plan.

11. Feedback from residents on housing helped shaped the conversations had with AECOM when they were developing the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) in 2024.
12. 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 January 2024 to undertake an initial walk around and identify key priorities such as parking.
13. Following feedback from residents on the importance of the local environment, the steering group decided to identify and map local green spaces, local important views and green corridors after considering comments shared throughout early engagement.

Regulation 14 Consultation

Overview

14. The consultation ran for six weeks from Monday 4 November to Monday 16 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
4 November 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emails and letters sent to stakeholders advising them of the Regulation 14 consultation and how to make representations</li> </ul>	<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 4 November. A copy of this is provided in <b>Appendix D</b>.</p>
Week commencing 4 November 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Printed off posters and arranged for the volunteer who delivers the Natterjack newsletter to every property in Parish to include the poster informing the community of the consultation (<b>Appendix E</b>).</li> <li>• Copies of the poster were put on the PC website and social media pages.</li> <li>• Printed copies of the survey and neighbourhood plan were available for people to view and collect from the Church and Village Hall.</li> <li>• All draft NDP documents and a link to the smart survey and QR code were published on the PC website.</li> </ul>	<p>Various methods were used to bring the Regulation 14 Consultation to the attention of local people including landowners/property owners. 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"> <li>• Completing an online survey.</li> <li>• Filling in a hard copy of the survey and sending this to the parish clerk.</li> <li>• Providing feedback via letter or electronically to the parish clerk.</li> </ul>

Date	Activity	Summary
		<p>The NDP documents made available as part of this process included<sup>6</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulation 14 draft NDP</li> <li>• Design Codes 2024</li> <li>• Housing Needs Assessment 2024</li> <li>• Evidence Base</li> <li>• Green Ecological Corridors Assessment</li> <li>• Local Green Space Assessment</li> <li>• Key Views Assessment</li> <li>• BCKWLN SEA Decision Statement</li> </ul>
4 December 2024	Drop-in event at the village hall from 10am-12pm	This session allowed the community to turn up to share their views on the NDP.
30 January 2025	Syderstone 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 February 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

15. At the end of the consultation period there were 45 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.

16. The next section summarises the main issues and concerns raised and describes how these were considered in finalising the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

---

<sup>6</sup> [Syderstone Parish Council | Neighbourhood 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	<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>Several policies state that Development proposals “<b>must...</b>”. 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.</p> <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 is also advisable to remove references to specific Local Plan policies in the plan (e.g. para 13, where the status of Walpole Cross Keys in the settlement hierarchy is proposed to be changed from Rural Village to Smaller Village and Hamlet in the replacement Local Plan 2021-2040). Other paragraphs from where specific Local Plan policy/ paragraph references should be removed are para 15, 23, 26, 29, 54, 61, 62, 70. Instead, these should be replaced by the phrase “Local Plan policies for...”/ “Local Plan policies</p>	<p>Note the comments on “must”. Changed “must” to “should” where felt was needed.</p> <p>Removed specific references to the LP policies.</p> <p>Regarding the conservation teams comments- AECOM does follow a standard method when producing their design codes document and housing needs assessment. However, makes this relevant to the parish where possible.</p> <p>Regarding comments to Walpoles, CCP the consultants have written both Syderstone and Walpoles plan and certain policy wording was used in both from experience gained elsewhere when writing NP policies and getting these through examination and then a successful adoption. However, we do not feel it was fair to say these policies used recycled wording. Policy wording is only used where appropriate backed by local evidence and secondary data, additional supporting documents such as AECOM and we produce relevant supporting text to the parish with support gathered from local community consultation. AECOM documents do follow a similar format.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>covering...”, which should future-proof the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Conservation team comment:</p> <p>In general, though this is the same as the Walpoles NP that I commented on last time – does AECOM only have one set of policies and is recycling them across all neighbourhood plans? If so, I think this is a bit of a concern especially when there are issues with them. Is it worth having a word with AECOM?</p>	<p>Issues will be addressed where necessary to wording in which officers do not agree with.</p>
Policy 1	<p>Second paragraph reads more like explanatory text rather than policy, so could be included within supporting text rather than policy itself.</p> <p>Final paragraph: suggested removal of wording “In general” – layouts could be negotiated through development management process.</p>	<p>Leave the requirements relating to the second para in as this is specific to Syderstone.</p> <p>Made the changes to the final paragraph.</p>
Policy 2	<p>Well written policy and consistent with objectives within the NPPF</p>	<p>Welcome the comment. No change.</p>
Policy 3	<p>Well written policy and consistent with objectives within the NPPF</p>	<p>Welcome the comment. No change.</p>
Policy 4	<p>Suggested recommendations for clarity to the reader as follows below:</p> <p><i>Housing Mix First Paragraph</i></p> <p>It would be recommended to add text following “will be acceptable evidence, unless...”, explaining how more up to date evidence regarding housing need becomes available, as follows:</p> <p>“Housing proposals will need to reflect local housing need using the best available and proportionate evidence. The Syderstone Housing Needs Assessment (2024) will be</p>	<p>Made the changes to the first paragraph.</p> <p>The policy wording already states that housing mix should apply to open market housing. However, we added the word “only” to make this clearer in the policy.</p> <p>Second paragraph- Note the LPA do not agree with the evidence in the HNA. Removed the whole first paragraph under the affordable housing subheading.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>acceptable evidence, <u>unless more up to date evidence becomes available</u></p> <p><b>Housing Strategy Comment:</b> <i>Housing Mix:</i> this should apply to open market housing only, not s106 affordable units.</p> <p><i>Affordable Housing Third Paragraph:</i></p> <p><i>Second paragraph:</i> What defines “practicable” for the affordable housing threshold?</p> <p><u>“First Homes</u> being delivered as an affordable housing option in Syderstone should have regard to the local connection test set out in Paragraph 59. <u>NPPF.”</u></p> <p><b>Housing Strategy Comment:</b> <i>Affordable Housing</i> – AECOM’s study in itself does not provide enough justification to deviate away from the Local Plan tenure mix. S106 affordable housing is secured to meet an identified borough wide, deviating away from this would have a huge impact on the delivery of affordable housing across the borough.</p> <p>The NP group has proposed setting local connection criteria for any First Homes, 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 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/first-homes#first-homes-in-plan-making-and-decision-making">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/first-homes#first-homes-in-plan-making-and-decision-making</a> therefore this needs to be included within the policy too. Below is an example of local connection criteria wording we have previously used, this could be extended to include residents of neighbouring villages.</p>	<p>Practicable was used to try allowing some flexibility. However, we understand this may not be helpful. The paragraph was deleted.</p> <p>The reference to Paragraph 59 is so the local connection test for First Homes considers the points Syderstone have put together. Note the first homes criteria only applies for the first 3 months. This is already mentioned in Para 58.</p> <p>Reference to specialist housing for older people was added in since the HNA looked into this topic. Wish to keep this statement in the policy to highlight the importance of needing housing for elderly people in the area if this proposal comes forward.</p> <p>Do not wish to add custom and self-build to the policy at this time.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p><b>Specialist Housing for Older People</b> – It isn't clear what this policy is aiming to achieve?</p> <p>Would the policy maker consider including Custom and Self Build to this policy?</p>	
Policy 5	<p><i>First paragraph:</i></p> <p>Clarification is sought regarding whether the policy is targeting all the development types and means for 10% BNG goals or it excludes small scale developments? Policy maker may wish to say ` All development not subject to an exemption` as this is how planning are interpreting these types of policies currently.</p> <p>There is an opportunity for Neighbourhood plans to add policy to help close loops holes. I.e. Retrospective applications must provide 10% or self and custom build application must still provide an accurate baseline though Metric calculation. THIS IS NOT LEGISLATION so I do not know how it works - if they could get it in it would be very useful.</p> <p><i>It is recommended to add extra wording to the Second Paragraph:</i></p> <p>“Development proposals within or adjacent to Syderstone Common Reserve (SSSI), Syderstone Common County Wildlife Site (CWS) or areas occupied by Priority Habitats and Species including the Natterjack Toad must demonstrate they will not have an adverse impact on these <b>habitats</b>, <u>through an ecological appraisal</u> and will retain or enhance these areas as part of the development process. The use of buffer zones around these sensitive sites is encouraged”.</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate to add in further BNG wording. This is outlined nationally. The Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) states that:</p> <p><i>Planning authorities and neighbourhood planning bodies when preparing new policies in line with paragraph 185 will want to take account of the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain.</i></p> <p><i>Plan-makers should be aware of the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, but they do not need to include policies which duplicate the detailed provisions of this statutory framework. It will also be inappropriate for plans or supplementary planning documents to include policies or guidance which are incompatible with this framework, for instance by applying biodiversity net gain to exempt categories of development or encouraging the use of a different biodiversity metric or biodiversity gain hierarchy.</i></p> <p><i>Plan-makers can complement the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain by, for</i></p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Reason for suggestion is because the development that does not retain or enhance these areas as part of the development process will not be supported.</p> <p><i>Green Ecological Corridors, point 2 states the following:</i></p> <p>“Demonstrate the way in which it will incorporate suitable mitigation for any aspects of the proposed scheme which would reduce the ability of wildlife to move through the corridor, including barriers like buildings and hard surfaces, redirecting water courses, <u>adding artificial lighting</u>, and insensitive management of habitats e.g. hedge cutting in the bird breeding season.”</p> <p>It is recommended to separate this out as its own bullet point, i.e. Demonstrate how dark corridors will be retained and protected at all stages of development through an appropriate lighting scheme that is in accordance with Ecological guidance (<a href="#">Guidance Note 08/18 - Bats and artificial lighting in the UK</a>)</p> <p>Again, this is really key, there is no point creating and protecting habitat corridors if the prevailing conditions mean that fauna cannot actually use it i.e. light spill from development.</p> <p><i>Community Action 1: Local Action to Encourage Wildlife and Improve Local Habitats</i></p> <p>Another community action could be to submit any incidental biological records to the Local Record Centre (NBIS) to promote a better understanding of the local fauna and flora which would subsequently help to better protect the local species.</p>	<p><i>instance, including policies which support appropriate local offsite biodiversity sites, including whether specific allocated sites for development should include biodiversity enhancements to support other developments meet their net gain objectives in line with Local Nature Recovery Strategies.</i></p> <p><i>Plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development unless justified. To justify such policies they will need to be evidenced including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development. Consideration will also need to be given to how the policy will be implemented.</i></p> <p>Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 74-006-20240214- <a href="#">Biodiversity net gain - GOV.UK</a></p> <p>Added the extra wording in the second paragraph.</p> <p>Note the comments on green ecological corridors. Took out the wording “artificial lighting” from the second bullet point and adding a third bullet point with reference to this using the following wording:</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
		<p>“Demonstrate how dark corridors will be retained and protected at all stages of development through an appropriate lighting scheme that is in accordance with Ecological guidance (<a href="#">Guidance Note 08/18 - Bats and artificial lighting in the UK</a>)”</p> <p>Added in a third bullet point in Community Action 1 regarding sending incidental biological records to the Local Record Centre (NBIS) to promote a better understanding of the local fauna and flora which would subsequently help to better protect the local species.</p>
Policy 6	<p><i>Existing Trees:</i></p> <p>General Support: The emphasis on protecting existing trees with good arboricultural and biodiversity value aligns well with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which encourages the protection of irreplaceable habitats and prioritises biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Suggest adding specific reference to BS5837:2012 (to be revised in 2025) Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction to ensure that professional standards are followed throughout the design process. This can help clarify how developers should approach tree protection.</p> <p>Suggest define what constitutes "good arboricultural biodiversity value", or change it to good Arboricultural and good biodiversity value. This avoids ambiguity gives slightly clearer guidance.</p> <p>Lastly, the loss of irreplaceable veteran trees should be avoided and provide habitat for protected species (i.e. bat roosting potential).</p>	<p><b>Existing trees</b></p> <p>Keeping in reference to hedgerows/hedges in this policy.</p> <p>Added in specific reference to BS5837:2012 in the supporting text under Para 79. Create a new paragraph giving some detail.</p> <p>Changed the wording to “ good Arboricultural and good biodiversity value”.</p> <p>Added in the existing trees section</p> <p>“ the loss of irreplaceable veteran trees should be avoided and provide habitat for protected species (e.g bat roosting potential).”</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>This is key and would provide a good link in between trees and the Habitats Regulation requirements.</p> <p><i>Replacement Trees</i></p> <p>Requiring native British species of local provenance supports both the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP) and climate adaptation goals, locally sourced species should be better suited to the historic ecological conditions, but may not be the best for climate resilience and future proofing.</p> <p>Suggestion: Consider specifying that developers should use an appropriate mix of native species of local provenance alongside other species resilient to future climate conditions, guided by resources like the Forestry Commission's Climate Change Tree Species Selection Tool.</p> <p>Ratio Clarification: The 2:1 replacement ratio is commendable and consistent with increasing canopy cover goals. However, the exception clause ("robust evidence suggests this would make the scheme economically unviable") might undermine the policy if not clearly defined.</p> <p>Suggestion: Specify what constitutes "robust evidence" and clarify whether off-site planting or any other contributions to local tree planting schemes might be an acceptable alternative in constrained cases.</p> <p>Policy maker may wish to add that trees should be replaced outside of residential gardens with a preference for provision in the public realm.</p> <p>"....where trees are provided in gardens with new development they are quite frequently removed by the purchaser. A preference for public trees (particularly on large</p>	<p><b>Replacement trees</b></p> <p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Changed the second paragraph to:</p> <p>"When replacing trees developers must use an appropriate mix of native species of local provenance alongside other species resilient to future climate conditions, guided by resources like the Forestry Commission's Climate Change Tree Species Selection Tool."</p> <p>Changed the third paragraph under Replacement Trees too: "<i>Developers must replace trees on a 2 to 1 ratio. Where replacement trees will be onsite preference will be for these to be in the public realm, but if this is not possible on site due to known constraints, replacement trees should be provided in the public realm of Syderstone such as within the recreation ground.</i></p> <p><b>New Trees</b></p> <p>Reviewed the KL&amp;WN Tree and Woodland Strategy- <a href="#">Tree and Woodland Strategy   Tree and Woodland Strategy   Borough Council of King's Lynn &amp; West Norfolk</a>. Did not feel it added enough detail to give a specific tree canopy cover. The document runs until 2027 and has a focus on Kings Lynn. It would be good to see the KLWN Tree Strategy</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>developments) allows trees to be more easily secured”.</p> <p><i>New Trees</i></p> <p>Support for Tree Canopy Increase: Supporting new tree planting across the Neighbourhood Area reflects best practices for climate resilience and urban greening outlined in the Tree and Woodland Strategy for England.</p> <p>Suggestion: Include a specific canopy cover target for the Neighbourhood Plan, aligned with guidance from initiatives such as the Urban Tree Manual or KL&amp;WN Tree and Woodland Strategy.</p> <p>Landmark Trees: The proposal for gateway and landmark trees is excellent for promoting local distinctiveness. Consider including language that encourages the use of species or forms with cultural or historical significance to the area, which could strengthen local connections.</p>	<p>reviewed with more evidence for parishes to work with when developing neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>First Para</p> <p>“New tree planting, in development proposals and throughout the built and natural environments of the Plan area, will be supported to maintain and increase the overall tree canopy cover of the Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>Second Para added:</p> <p>“New tree planting should provide gateway and landmark trees that contribute to local distinctiveness. This should be done by using species or forms with cultural or historic significance to the area and be informed by a relevant ecology and arboricultural assessment.</p>
Policy 7	<p>Policy wording clear and succinct. It is important to note that any proposed LGS designations should be supported by sufficiently robust evidence to demonstrate these fulfil national policy requirements (2023 NPPF paragraphs 105-107).</p>	<p>Note the comments. We feel they are, and this is justified within the LGS assessment 2024 document which was available to view throughout the Reg.14 consultation and is still on the parish council website.</p>
Policy 8	<p>Clear and concise policy safeguarding the visual quality of the local environment. It effectively preserves key views from development.</p> <p>Could these views be clearly shown on an inset map/ on the policies map in the plan for clarity.</p>	<p>Note the comments. The views are clearly mapped in the Figure. They are also shown within the Important Local Views Assessment separately which supports the NP and was available to view throughout the Reg.14 consultation and is still on the parish council website.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
Policy 9	<p>Overall, the policy is a strong and forward-thinking approach to managing light pollution, promoting environmental sustainability, and protecting both wildlife and residential amenity.</p> <p>It is recommended to separate the final paragraph of the policy in order to distinguish the indoor lighting policies from the outdoor lighting policies, as follows:</p> <p>“Development proposals should demonstrate compliance with best practice guidance for avoiding artificial lighting impacts on bats, birds and other species.</p> <p><u>New para:</u></p> <p>Where internal lighting is likely to cause harm to the landscape, or disturbance and risk to wildlife, proposals will be sought for mitigating pollution from internal light sources. Large windows, roof lights and large areas of glazing are particularly relevant in this context.”</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Separated the final paragraph.</p>
Policy 10	<p>The policy lacks clarity in certain areas, such as defining what constitutes "employment services" and providing more detailed guidance on community spaces. Expanding these points could reduce ambiguity and help stakeholders understand the policy's intent.</p> <p>There is limited consideration of long-term maintenance and flexibility, particularly for protected community facilities like Amy Robsart Hall, which may require updates to stay functional in a modern context. Perhaps the policy could explain that Amy Robsart Hall will be protected as a community facility in</p>	<p>The employment services in the business park are already listed in the supporting text in Para 95.</p> <p>Community spaces in regard to paragraph one is not relevant.</p> <p>Community spaces in Para 2 list wishes of the parish e.g. a café or reestablishment of the pub. Not sure it is relevant we add in wording on long term maintenance this would be up to the landowner.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	accordance with Local Plan policies for the protection of community facilities.	<p>Changed the wording for Amy Robsart Hall to say:</p> <p>“Amy Robsart Hall will be protected as a community facility in accordance with Local Plan policies for the protection of community facilities.”</p>
Policy 11	<p>While the policy calls for improvements suitable for all weather conditions, it does not define what specific measures should be taken. For example, will these improvements require specific materials (such as non-slip surfaces or drainage systems)? Clarifying these aspects could provide clearer guidelines for developers. “Accessible for all” could further elaborate on disability, pram and pushbike users etc. Rather than specify “all weather conditions”, the policy could state that active travel routes should deliver improved accessibility and connectivity.</p> <p>It is assumed the policy seeks to broaden the scope beyond public rights of way, to cover all routes that provide linkages for active travel (e.g. permissive paths, pavements etc)?</p> <p>While the policy aims for inclusive and safe infrastructure, the specific responsibility placed on new developments could be seen as burdensome for developers, particularly if the footway network is underdeveloped in the first place. Clarifying the scale of this requirement could help developers understand the potential costs or efforts needed.</p> <p>This policy could benefit with clearer definition of “new built development”, would an erection</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Made the policy clearer.</p> <p>Added in the reference to disabled, pram and wheelchair users etc after accessible for all.</p> <p>Changed the wording state that active travel routes should deliver improved accessibility and connectivity. Added the requirement for specific materials such as non-slip surfaces.</p> <p>Made it clearer that new built development means any net new development should be responsible in helping to create all safe footpaths. Added in this excludes householder applications.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	of garage trigger threshold to improve the footpaths?	
Design Code Document	<p><b>Design Code 3.6</b></p> <p>Be careful with this section. Listed Buildings in most cases won't be able to meet the checklist for sustainability so there should be mention of this. Perhaps there should also be a reference to the fact that other sections of the code will also need to be met – sustainability does not override the need to ensure quality and character. In general, the heritage policies here are appropriate.</p> <p>Also, I don't think this is a design code – there is a lot of 'where possible'. A code doesn't do this, it has strict rules and you have to abide by them or it doesn't meet the code. Is this the right thing to call it?</p> <p><b>Page 18</b></p> <p>Same as above for design code 3:6</p> <p><b>Checklist</b></p> <p>There is a good explanation of this checklist and how it is to be used. In practise though, does it fall to the planning department to look at what the applicant has missed and ask them to address it? What happens if the applicant cant demonstrate they have met the code? Do we have to apply the checklist in decision making?</p>	Note the comments. AECOM commissioned the document. The design code document is the guidance and putting information in the policy is the important part.

### National Gas and National Grid (Avison Young)

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation		NDP Response
Item	Comment	
National Gas	No record of such assets within the NPA.	Noted
National Grid	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	
	We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, especially the emphasis it places on the heritage and character of Syderstone and its use of a design code to guide future development. We do not, however, consider it necessary for Historic England to be involved in the detailed development of your strategy at this time.	Noted

### Anglian Water

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation		NDP Response
Item	Comment	
Preamble	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.	General comments. Noted.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<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 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 - <a href="http://www.anglianwater.co.uk">Strategic Growth and Infrastructure (anglianwater.co.uk)</a> The guidance also has sign posting/ links to obtaining information on relevant assets and infrastructure in map form, where relevant.</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<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.</p> <p>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> <p>The infrastructure we deliver is primarily funded in two ways, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>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"> <li>• Address a rapidly growing population;</li> <li>• Ensure we are resilient to impacts of climate change;</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance our environment to reach the environmental destination agreed with customers and regulators; and</li> <li>• Secure future water supplies.</li> </ul> <p>Anglian Water’s plans are reviewed every five years and include business plans for our investments through the Water Resources Management Plans (WRMP) <a href="#">Water resources management plan</a> and Drainage and Wastewater Management Plans (DWMP) <a href="#">Drainage and wastewater management plan</a> and a Long Term Delivery Strategy (LTDS) <a href="#">Our strategies and plans</a>. These provide a 25-year long term view to 2050, which also corresponds with the Government’s net zero commitment.</p>	
<p>Paragraph 15 Infrastructure Provision</p>	<p><i>Infrastructure capacity</i></p> <p>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 10: Community Facilities and Employment Services.</p> <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 Sculthorpe-Raf Camp Sewer Catchment Area served by the local water recycling centre (WRC) of Sculthorpe-Raf Camp. Anglian Water provides water supply services across the area. (Please see further comments below about water</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Added in wording to Policy.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>resources supply.) Map information of Anglian Water’s assets detailing the location of our water and water recycling infrastructure are available at: <a href="http://www.utilities.digdat.co.uk">www.utilities.digdat.co.uk</a></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 include sustainable points of connection (SPOC) to our water supply and wastewater networks to minimise impacts on existing communities and the environment.</p> <p>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><b><u>Comment:</u></b>  <b>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 a SPOC to the water supply and wastewater infrastructure and network.</b></p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
Water Resources	<p>Anglian Water has a statutory duty to supply water for domestic purposes only. This means we are legally obliged to supply water to all household properties 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 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.</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>	Note the general comments.

	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 20m<sup>3</sup> 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 <a href="mailto:planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk">planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk</a> 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>(*Water supply for toilets and welfare facilities, as well as firefighting fall with the domestic definition.)</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</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>recycling. Such measures to 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 (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>)</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>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
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. There are examples of this under Policy 1 criterion (a) and Design Code AM.04- Access &amp; Parking.</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. 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 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>	Note the support and general comments.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<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 1	<p><i>Water efficiency</i>  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> <p>Policy 1 refers to Design Code SU.02 Biodiversity but this is not found in the accompanying guidance document.</p> <p>A reference is made to a Figure 6, should this be Figure 11?</p>	<p>NPs should be in general conformity with national and local policies. It is felt that we should follow the Local Plans target standard due to NPS can only produce non-strategic policies.</p> <p>SU.01 and SU.02 are the design codes in the AECOM Design Code and Guidance Document.</p> <p>Amended figure reference number. This was an error.</p>
Design Guide	<p>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>Note the comments for improving the design codes document. This was commissioned by AECOM and has already been finalised and signed off by Locality. There</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>SU.01 Energy Efficiency            EE 01 Features in Dwellings - Figure 49 (page 33) helpfully illustrates different measures for low-carbon homes for existing as well as new buildings. See under point 6 '<i>highly water-efficient devices</i>' for existing buildings and point E '<i>water management and cooling</i>' for existing and new buildings.</p> <p>It is not considered that Figure 49 is sufficient as the text under the code SU.01 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>SU.02 Biodiversity            This appears to be missing from the document.</p> <p>Checklist (also included in Appendix B of the main neighbourhood plan document)            To ensure that the checklist is comprehensive, the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include reference to water efficiency as well as energy efficiency within the checklist to reflect the need for this to be a key consideration in design proposals i.e. 1. General considerations for new development and 8. Household extensions.</li> <li>• Specify within the checklist the need to consider permeable surfaces i.e. under 9. Building materials &amp; surface treatment and 10. Car parking to link with corresponding codes.</li> </ul>	<p>may not be an opportunity to amend this.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
Policy 5	<p>Anglian Water supports the policy and prioritising the delivery of biodiversity net gains within the neighbourhood planning area to support habitat recovery and enhancements within existing and new areas of green and blue infrastructure. We would also support opportunities to maximise green infrastructure connectivity including through opportunities to minimise surface water run-off from existing urban areas through the creation of rain gardens for example.</p> <p>As the neighbourhood plan progresses, there may also be benefit in referencing the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Norfolk <a href="#">Local Nature Recovery Strategy - What a Local Nature Recovery Strategy is - Norfolk County Council</a> as this will identify priority actions for nature and map specific areas for improving habitats for nature recovery.</p> <p>Anglian Water has made a corporate commitment to deliver a biodiversity net gain of 10% against the measured losses of habitats on all AW-owned land.</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Made reference to the emerging LNRS in the supporting text Para 70.</p>
Policy 7	<p>The policy designates areas of Local Green Spaces (LGS). Anglian Water does have assets forming part of our water recycling network (e.g. rising mains and sewer pipes) located in or in the vicinity of these areas. It is helpful that the neighbourhood plan clarifies that the planning policy for managing development relates to national policy on the Green Belt as set out the NPPF*; we do not consider that any operational works or enhancements to our assets should be prevented.</p> <p>For information, maps of Anglian Water's assets detailing the location of our water and</p>	<p>Note the NPPF has been amended. However, there is a transition period so if this plan is submitted to the BCKLWN (Reg.15) before 12 March the plan does not need to reference the latest version. The policy would not affect any operational works to assets or prevent this.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>water recycling infrastructure are available at: <a href="http://www.utilities.digdat.co.uk">www.utilities.digdat.co.uk</a></p> <p>*This was in paragraph 107 of the 2023 version and is now in paragraph 108 of the new NPPF published on 12/12/24.</p>	

### Online Survey

There was a total of 45 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. All respondents were residents, 2 stated they were also landowners, 3 stated they also work in Syderstone and 1 is a statutory consultee.

### Design Policies

To what extent do you agree with planning policies related to heritage and design?							
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1 Policy 1: Syderstone's General Design Codes	13	16	0	0	0	29	
2 Policy 2: Design (Character Area 1 - Historic Core)	15	12	0	1	0	28	
3 Policy 3 - Design (Character 2 - Post War Development)	11	14	3	0	0	28	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to these policies:						4	
						<i>answered</i>	<b>29</b>
						<i>skipped</i>	<b>16</b>

### (Policies 1 to 3)

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	Policy 1- % 100 supported the policy	Welcome the response.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 2- 96% supported the policy Policy 3- 89% supported the policy</p> <p>4 comments were left in Q5 which have been summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings should be in keeping with their surroundings</li> <li>• Listed buildings must be preserved and the architectural beauty of buildings</li> </ul>	

### Housing Policy (Policy 4)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to housing?							
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1 Policy 4: Housing	8	10	9	0	0	27	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy						6	
						<b>answered</b>	<b>27</b>
						<b>skipped</b>	<b>18</b>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 4- 66% supported the policy</p> <p>6 comments were left in Q6 which have been summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing is a contentious issue and ideally there would be accommodation for single parents , the lower paid and elderly , in every village or town . For most of this group it would need to go hand in hand with local facilities ,</li> </ul>	<p>Welcome the response. Most the comments referred to the fact they wanted to see a principle residency policy. The evidence is not robust enough to support the need for a principle residency policy at this time.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>shops , schools , clinics . By definition anyone living in Syderstone needs transport . Any bus service is likely to be inadequate . Most villages on the periphery of towns such as Fakenham provide suitable accommodation for those travelling to and from but by car not bus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New housing should be left to the free market with minimal regulation.</li> <li>• Should be consideration given for a restriction on principle residency housing on new development. The area already has a high number of people with no permanent residents and if this number increases further this may have a detrimental impact on the village.</li> <li>• Having a policy on principal residency would help deliver the vision and objectives behind the NP including helping to strengthen the community, meet local need and retain residents. New houses represent a tiny proportion of the total housing stock in the village and the large majority of existing houses will remain free to buy from second homeowners. Another reason that the plan should have a principal residency policy is from reading the NP supporting documents it says that no usual residents rose from 20% to 25% between 2011-2021 by putting in a policy now will allow the village to make a statement that housing needs to be protected for principle residents to retain a sense of community before we exceed % other parishes are having around the coast. Adding this policy is not believed to have an adverse impact on property values in the village.</li> </ul>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	

### Natural Environment Policies

To what extent do you agree with the planning policies related to natural environment?								
Answer Choice		Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1	Policy 5: Biodiversity and Green Ecological Corridors	17	8	1	0	0	26	
2	Policy 6: Trees and Hedgerows	18	7	1	0	0	26	
3	Policy 7: Local Green Spaces	19	6	1	0	0	26	
4	Policy 8: Protection of Important Local Views	19	6	1	0	0	26	
5	Policy 9: Dark Skies	21	5	0	0	0	26	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy							4	
							<b>answered</b>	<b>26</b>
							<b>skipped</b>	<b>19</b>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 5- 96% supported the policy  Policy 6- 96% supported the policy  Policy 7- 96% supported the policy  Policy 8- 96% supported the policy  Policy 9- 100% supported the policy</p> <p>4 comments were left in Q7 which have been summarised below:</p>	<p>Welcome the response. Note the comments.</p> <p>Being within a green corridor doesn't mean you need to maintain your garden any differently. It is more of a development consideration for</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dark night skies with clear unobstructed vistas are important for the villagers mental wellbeing. Vital to preserve the environment.</li> <li>• Green corridors. Ok in principle but most shown are privately owned. Part of RB6 is within my garden so maintained as I see fit and at my own cost. That route appears to be in 7 different ownership within the Parish so any ecologically viable management regime would be complex. I think, whilst the concept is noble, it is a hollow policy and should be reconsidered in terms of its practical purpose.</li> <li>• Fig. 24 The key is placed over the end of Ashside. Perhaps I am too late but the view from the end of Ashside across the fields (North) is certainly worth preserving. From 10 cottages onwards there seems to be a lack of views considered.</li> <li>• Well maintained hedges vital as wildlife shelter/ corridor.</li> </ul>	<p>new development to avoid fragmentation along areas where there are current habitats etc.</p> <p>Will look into further views in a future review of the neighbourhood plan as outlined in the monitoring section.</p>

### Community Services and Facilities

#### To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to community services and facilities?

Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1 Policy 10: Community Facilities and Employment Services	14	6	5	0	0	25	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy						5	
						<b>answered</b>	<b>25</b>
						<b>skipped</b>	<b>20</b>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 10- 80% supported the policy</p> <p>5 comments were left in Q8 which have been summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could we go further and say that any proposals for a change of use of the Lynn Arms PH particularly to residential will be strongly resisted?</li> <li>• The re-establishment of the Lynn Arms would create serious parking problems on an already difficult stretch of road.</li> <li>• Ideally employment should be provided locally but that is generally not what happens. As the employment is centred more in towns. Of course this should be encouraged. Provision of local facilities are difficult.</li> <li>• Village hall is a vital community space. The only secular meeting place in the village. It must be protected.</li> </ul>	<p>Welcome the response. Note the differing comments.</p> <p>The proposed wording for the Lynn Arms PH is most likely too restrictive.</p>

### Transport and Access Policy

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to transport and access?							
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1 Policy 11: Walking and Access	18	6	1	0	0	25	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy						2	
						<b>answered</b>	<b>25</b>
						<b>skipped</b>	<b>20</b>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 11- 96% supported the policy</p> <p>1 comment was left in Q9:</p> <p>Longer circular paths are an idea. You could have a transport system that was in demand. Bus services have suffered due to lack of use ie market forces. These drive everything except if you provide big subsidies. To see a bus with one passenger cannot be right.</p>	<p>Welcome the response.</p> <p>The policy does not focus on bus services. This provision falls outside of the scope of a neighbourhood plan.</p>

### Favour of the Neighbourhood Plan

I am generally in favour of the Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan			
Answer Choice		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	100.0%	24
2	No	0.0%	0
Please provide any comments which explain your answer:			5
			<b>answered</b>
			<b>24</b>
			<b>skipped</b>
			<b>21</b>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>All respondents who answered this question were in favour of the plan. 5 comments were left in Q10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As these things go it is a fair assessment for the purpose but not user friendly.</li> <li>In terms of the built environment, I think the horse has bolted. With such an eclectic mix of housing stock any vestige of village or Norfolk style would be difficult to insist on.</li> </ul>	<p>Welcome the responses and kind words of support.</p> <p>Regarding figures not being up to date to include the new housing on Tattersett Road this is because the map in Figure 2 is taken from the SADMP 2016 document. This figure is to show where the allocation was based before any houses were built.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A very detailed and carefully considered document which accurately reflects the views and comments of local residents. The plan is very comprehensive and illustrates features of the village of which some residents may not be aware. All those involved in the preparation of this document should be congratulated and thanked for their contribution to it's completion.</li> <li>• Fantastic work by a committed group of individuals.</li> <li>• Most of the maps Fig 1 is not up to date and the new housing on Tattersett Road seems to be missing. Would be good to have an up-to-date picture of the housing in the village eg in Fig 1/Fig 2 as in Fig 23 are the new houses within the site allocation?</li> <li>• This is a brave and excellent attempt to develop a plan and use a village questionnaire to dictate what is favourable to be developed. Any questionnaire relies on a majority answering . Through nobody's fault only 25% answered . Their ideals proposed are to be complemented and I would support. The obstacles faced are significant and are surely similar for surrounding villages . The balance between providing suitable housing accommodation and maintaining the environment is by nature problematic .</li> <li>• Look forward to hearing how this progresses.</li> </ul>	<p>Note the plan is not always user friendly. However, at times technical language or evidence being presented to provide a policies case may not always be the easiest to interpret but is necessary to write.</p>

## Landowner Responses Local Green Spaces

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>No official representation was made within the Regulation 14 consultation by the proposed landowners of the Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>However, in the drop-in session within the consultation period it was made apparent there was concerns over the previous LGS8- Land North of Lancaster Road in the NP and a potential dispute over who owns the land.</p> <p>Aswell as this the landowner for the previous greenspace LGS5- Churchyard raised concerns of including the site.</p>	<p><b>Previous LGS8-</b> It was felt appropriate at this stage to remove the LGS and investigate and review adding this LGS in at a future date.</p> <p><b>Previous LGS5-</b> It was felt appropriate to remove this site. It was included due to community consultation showed people wanted to see this space protected. However, the site is protected to a certain extent and can always be investigated in a future review.</p>

## **Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan**

**Get Involved - Consultation runs from 1 March to 31 March**

**Drop in event at the village hall on 9 March 1pm to 4pm**

If you live or run a business in Syderstone now is your opportunity to voice your opinion on how the parish should develop over the next 15 years. Syderstone Parish Council is developing a Neighbourhood Plan, which will become a key planning document produced by residents to influence the future type and location of new development in the parish.

**What is a Neighbourhood Plan?** It is a way of recording the preferences and wishes of our village community in a way that should help to protect and improve it.

**Why do we need a Neighbourhood Plan?** A Neighbourhood Plan is our way of having a say in the future of our village. It will be an important document which will sit alongside the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Local Plan. It will represent the views and aspirations of our community and can be referred to regarding local issues that are not covered by the Borough's plan.

There will be plenty of opportunities to input into the plan's development. We are running a consultation throughout March, which includes a survey that asks you about a range of topics important to residents and business owners. Each person in a household is invited to complete a survey. Copies have been posted, along with this publication, through every door in the parish.

Links to access the surveys are given below. You can contact the neighbourhood plan group at [syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook.com](mailto:syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook.com) if you would like another copy of the survey. **There will be a drop in event at the village hall on Saturday 9 March 1pm to 4pm where people from the steering group will be on hand to answer any questions you have about completing the survey.**

Business Survey:



<https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/PHWX1B/>

Resident Survey:



<https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/3QBMN6/>

**Deadline for responses 31 March**

**Drop off your completed copies of the survey at the village hall or church**

### **An update on the Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan...**

**...from Dawn Niemann, Chair of Syderstone Parish Council**

Thank you to everyone who contributed their views in the recent survey that was part of the consultation for the Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan. This will become a key planning document produced by the parish council to influence the future type and location of new development in the parish. A Neighbourhood Plan is a way of recording the preferences and wishes of our village community in a way that should help to protect and improve it - our way of having a say in the future of our village. It will be an important document which will sit alongside the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Local Plan. It will represent the views and aspirations of our community and can be referred to regarding local issues that are not covered by the Borough's plan.

In centre pages of this issue of The Natterjack we are pleased to be able to bring you the results from the survey carried out during March this year.

#### **Syderstone Parish Councillors**

Dawn Niemann – Chair	01485 576217
Dave Daly – Vice-Chair	01485 576222
Paul Welland	01485 576249
Debs Candy	07951 317570
Sade Ojelade	07564 664886
Simon Wood	01485 576297
Vacancy	
Parish Clerk, Sarah Harvey	01328 823391

#### **Parish correspondence:**

By post: Parish clerk at Byanoak, Leicester Road, South Creake, NR21 9PW

Email: [syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook.com](mailto:syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook.com)

Website: [www.syderstonevillageandpc.info](http://www.syderstonevillageandpc.info)

#### **Parish Council meetings - all take place at 7.30pm:**

**20 June / 18 July / 19 Sept**

Members of the public are welcome and there is an opportunity to make comments or ask questions of the Council during the first part of the meeting.

## Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan

Syderstone Parish Council is in the process of developing a neighbourhood plan. A Neighbourhood Plan is a community-led plan and gives residents an opportunity to have a say in how the village develops, ensuring future development aligns with community needs. It can protect valued assets and influence the type, design and location of developments whilst promoting sustainable growth.

We are currently in the early stages of preparing this plan and have just undertaken our first initial consultation to gather community views. A total of 95 people answered the surveys. Key topics are summarised on the following pages.

### The best things about Syderstone





**NEXT STEPS**

The parish council/steering group are now starting to draft a neighbourhood plan as well as its supporting documents. The plan will take into consideration the views shared within the initial survey including topics around housing, design, employment, and the historic and natural environment.

## Design and Housing

- Most respondents (81 people) think the neighbourhood plan should include design guidelines for new development.
- Numerous respondents (67 people) think new housing should be environmentally sustainable. However, many stated as long as this doesn't lead to developments being unaffordable to local people.
- Most respondents (88 people) think the neighbourhood should provide guidance on the size and type of new homes built in the parish.
- If new homes were built in the parish many said they want more family homes, first homes and affordable homes. 71 people did not want to see any more holiday accommodation.
- The style of new homes respondents would like to see were more semi-detached (64 people) followed by bungalows (38 people). 59 people did not want to see any apartments/flats.
- If new homes were built in the parish many said the size of these should be 2-3 beds (70 people). 54 people would rather not see more 5+ beds.



## Natural/Historic Environment

- Most respondents (83 people) agreed it is important to protect existing habitats.
- Most respondents (84 people) would support the identification of wildlife corridors.
- 62 people supported the idea of protecting green spaces such as the allotment, common, recreation field and Womack Woods.
- 51 people put forward ideas to protect locally important views looking within the village and beyond.
- Most respondents (93 people) said that heritage is important with 55 people listing specific buildings.

## Transport/Access

- Many respondents wished to see improvements to footpaths and access to services (70+ people).

## Community Facilities/Employment

- Facilities suggested for protection included the allotments, recreation field and village hall.
- 47 people suggested ideas they would like to see in the village such as a shop, pub, and more leisure activities.
- Over half of the respondents are in employment with many working outside of the parish.



## Appendix C- Letter template sent to Local Green Space Landowners

Dear landowner,

### Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan – Local Green Space

Syderstone Parish Council is currently developing a Neighbourhood Plan for Syderstone. Neighbourhood planning is a way for communities to have a say in the future of the places where they live and work. It gives the community the power to produce a plan that can shape development in a local area whilst protecting its heritage sites and green spaces.

Your piece of land "**LGS NAME**" has been identified by the local community as adding special character to the village by contributing to:

- the tranquillity and beauty of the area
- biodiversity and the preservation of native species
- healthier lifestyles and recreational value for the community
- the historical character of Syderstone and identified historic assets

As such we would like to identify it as Local Green Space within Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan. This is a way of giving protection to Syderstone's green, wild, and historic areas, and thus preserving the character of the village, in accordance with the views of the village (expressed in a community survey undertaken by the Parish Council in March 2024) and discussed further by the neighbourhood plan steering group and parish council. We would like to reassure you that there will be no costs or added responsibilities for you the landowner.

The neighbourhood plan policy looks like this:

<b>Policy 7: Local Green Spaces</b>
<p>The areas listed below and shown in Figure 23 are designated as Local Green Spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LGS1- Syderstone Common North (County Wildlife Site)</li><li>• LGS2- Syderstone Village Sign Green Space</li><li>• LGS3- Womack Woods</li><li>• LGS4- Syderstone Recreation Ground and Play Area</li><li>• LGS5- St Mary's Church Memorial Grounds, North of The Street</li><li>• LGS6- Village Sign Greenspace, Corner of Norman Way</li><li>• LGS7- Allotments North of The Street</li><li>• LGS8- Grassland North of Lancaster Road</li></ul>
<p>Development proposals in the three designated Local Green Spaces listed above will be managed in accordance with national policy for Green Belts.</p>

There is further information about how Local Green Spaces will be treated in national planning policy guidance: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and->

[recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#Local-Green-Space-designation](#)

We are currently working on the draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan, which will be submitted to the Borough Council in due course. As the owner of a green space, we wish to designate we would like to provide you with an opportunity to have your say on its inclusion in the plan. We will consider your feedback at the formal public consultation stage on the draft plan (known as the Regulation 14 consultation).

Beyond this there will be further opportunities to provide comments, as identified below:

- The Regulation 14 consultation on the draft plan will run for a minimum of 6 weeks. We will contact you to make you aware of when this is happening. This will be the first-time formal representations can be made.
- After Regulation 14, we will review all of the comments received and consider how they should be considered in finalising the plan for submission to the Borough Council. We will summarise this within the Consultation Statement that is submitted alongside the neighbourhood plan.
- Once we submit the plan to the Borough Council, they will undertake further consultation on the plan (Regulation 16), where you will be able to make further formal representations should you wish.
- Any representations made at Regulation 16 will be sent directly to an independent examiner. It is their job to examine the neighbourhood plan and recommend any changes that need to be made to ensure it meets the basic conditions. As part of this they will review any representations received at the Regulation 16 stage.
- After any changes have been made, the plan will go to public referendum where residents of Syderstone will be able to vote on its adoption.

If you'd like to express comment about the inclusion of your land in the Syderstone Neighbourhood Plan, please contact the Parish Council Clerk: Sarah Harvey, at [syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook.com](mailto:syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook.com).

Yours Sincerely,

Syderstone Parish Council

## Appendix D- Regulation 14 Email/Letter



Syderstone Parish Council <syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook.com>

To: syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook; Katie Evans



Mon 11/4/2024 8:00 AM

Dear Stakeholder,

Syderstone Parish Council, as the qualifying body, are now consulting on their Pre-Submission Draft of the neighbourhood plan for Syderstone 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 Monday 4<sup>th</sup> November to Monday 16<sup>th</sup> 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 Monday 16<sup>th</sup> 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://www.syderstonevillageandpc.info/neighbourhood-plan>

Should you wish to provide comments you can send these to the Parish Clerk, Sarah Harvey by return of email or via post to Syderstone Parish Council, Byanoak, Leicester Road, South Creake, Fakenham, NR21 9PW.

Kind regards,

Sarah

## Syderstone Residents Shape the future of your village

### Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation

Syderstone Parish Council is currently developing a Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council are now at the Regulation 14 Consultation (Pre-Submission) Stage where we want to gather the community's views on the draft neighbourhood plan.

<https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/R5U3XD/>

**The community survey where we want your views is running between Monday 4 November and Monday 16 December.**

Please find an online copy available in the link above and when scanning the QR code below. Hard copies of the survey will be available to pick up and drop off at the Church and Village Hall.



You can look at the draft plan and supporting documents on the Syderstone Parish Council website-

<https://www.syderstonevillageandpc.info/neighbourhood-plan> and printed copies are available to view at the Church or Village Hall.

Please contact the Parish Clerk, Sarah Harvey at [syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook.com](mailto:syderstoneparishcouncil@outlook.com) or by telephone 01328 823391 if you are in need of a copy of the neighbourhood plan.

**A drop in session will take place on Wednesday 4th December between 10am-12pm at the Village Hall back room.**