

Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Plan Review 2022- 2038 Consultation Statement



Contents

Overview of Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Development Plan Review	1
About this consultation statement	1
Summary of consultation and engagement activity	2
Summary of Early Engagement of the Review	2
Early engagement - summary of the main issues raised	3
Early engagement - how this was considered in development of the pre-submission plan.	6
Regulation 14 Consultation	6
Overview	6
Responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation.....	8
Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.....	8
Historic England.....	17
Natural England	17
Anglian Water	17
National Gas Avison Young.....	23
Online Survey	23
Appendix A- Initial Community Consultation Poster 2023	36
Appendix B- Regulation 14 Email/Letter	37
Appendix C- Regulation 14 Leaflet/Poster.....	38

Introduction

Overview of Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Development Plan Review

1. Walpole Cross Keys 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 Walpole Cross Keys 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 Walpole Cross Keys 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 Walpole Cross Keys 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
January 2023 onwards	Monthly Parish Council Meeting Agenda Item	The neighbourhood plan review has been a standard agenda item in Parish Council meetings since late 2022 when discussions first began. Minutes can be read on the parish council website from January 2023 ¹ .
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 Walpole Cross Keys to be involved and have their say. Started to work on a draft survey to gather the initial views of the community.
March 2023	Initial community survey consultation ran for 4 weeks.	A letter was sent to all residents (Appendix A) encouraging the community to give their opinion on what they would like to see improved in the area. The letter explained at this stage the survey

¹ [Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council | Minutes & Agendas](#)

Date	Activity	Summary
		<p>was voluntary and anonymous and that all age groups are encouraged to join in.</p> <p>The survey could be completed online, which could be found on the parish council website, or people could scan a QR code straight from the letter to access the survey via Smartsurvey.</p> <p>However, if people preferred to fill out a paper copy this could be arranged with the parish clerk who would then get this delivered to individuals.</p> <p>The consultation included a survey with 22 questions. Overall, 83 responses were received on the survey. The results are on the website².</p>
7 th December 2022	AECOM Design Codes walkabout around the parish to understand the character of the area.	This interactive session involved NDP steering group members including some from the parish council to develop a design guide for the parish.
June-September 2024	SEA/HRA Screening Opinion Consultation was led by the Borough Council of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk this ran from June-July 2024. The decision statement was signed off in September 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. Consultation in the early stages of review included a letter and survey sent to all households in the parish, encouraging them to give their views on what they would like to see improved in the area. The letter explained at this stage the survey was voluntary and anonymous and that all age groups are encouraged to join in. The survey could be completed online, via a link or QR code, was available from the Parish Council website³, or in hard copy from the Parish Clerk. This survey included 22 questions specifically related to the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Overall, 83 responses were received.

The summary of points and concerns raised included:

- In Q3, respondents liked the community feel in the village stating residents were

² [Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council | Neighbourhood Plan](#)

³ [Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council | Home \(walpolecrosskeyspc.info\)](#)

friendly and people felt safe. Many commented on how they liked that the parish was not too built up and how it is quiet and wished for the area to remain having a village feel.

- In Q4, respondents had mixed views, and said that the area could be improved in a number of different ways including improving infrastructure/amenities, not developing any more housing, or, addressing the need for affordable housing or having housing of a better design.
- Concern was raised throughout about traffic issues such as speeding, people not paying attention to speed signs, bad quality of road surfaces and the lack of public footpaths. There was particular concern raised about parking around the school, not just at school times, and wish for this issue to be addressed.
- Respondents raised throughout strategic issues relating to infrastructure, such as road and transport improvements, drainage, broadband, capacity issues with healthcare provision, some of which cannot be addressed solely in the neighbourhood plan. However, engagement with key stakeholders could get conversations going on some of these matters and community action points taken forward.
- Respondents' opinion on the design of recent housing development in Q5 was mixed which is common since people have a different perception of what is considered a nice building. Several respondents said that some of the new development have been of a good design and have improved the village when adding to infrastructure such as new pavements. Other respondents felt that design of some new development has been ok including the addition of off-road parking; whereas others said it is of a poor quality, has added to parking and traffic issues and concerns of flooding and dyke maintenance/filling.
- The majority of respondents in Q6 agreed for the neighbourhood plan to have design guidelines for new homes. Q7 also got a majority of a vote for new housing to be environmentally sustainable incorporating low carbon technology. However, some raised this could be unviable, expensive, and restrictive. Also raised was the importance of the neighbourhood plan considering drainage and flooding concerns.
- The survey results highlight that the community has mixed views in relation to future housing development. A number of people are supportive of new development particularly if this is affordable to locals, allowing people to get on the housing ladder and brings new people into the village. Some respondents agreed to see a mix of housing types and sizes and did not want to limit this to just 1-2 bedrooms as the HNA recommended to allow for local circumstance such as growing families (Q8). People felt in Q9 that there needed to be a few more houses which were first homes, family homes, affordable followed by sheltered housing and holiday accommodation was least favoured. Q10 also saw respondents generally agree the acceptance of needing people to start from somewhere and to provide more affordable housing would be favourable.

- Many respondents throughout did not support additional housing coming forward since there is not the right infrastructure in place to cope with existing or future housing and there is a lack of amenities on offer for the community. For example, no places for children to go, no local shop/pub, difficult to access services if you have no car due to the bus service is limited.
- For Q11 a majority supported the plan making a housing allocation and people suggested sites such as the former onion factory site with a mix of properties and a play area for children.
- There is strong support for protecting the environment including the importance of natural habitats/wildlife, existing green spaces, and the open views of fenland countryside. A majority of respondents supported the idea of designating local green spaces such as areas around Sutton Road, Station Road and near the garage in Q12. A number of respondents also favoured identifying important local views and gave various suggestions for the parish council to consider in Q13.
- There were a number of suggestions for non-designated heritage assets in Q14 including the village school, former St Helens Church, and the former old chapel.
- Regarding movement around the village, most respondents in Q15 would like to see an improvement to existing paths or to have more public footpaths in the village. This was raised to allow people to walk safely off the road with children and dogs for example. Some respondents did not agree with the idea of cycle paths due to the roads are narrow and were not sure if a designated car park was needed. However, some respondents throughout the survey thought a car park near the school would be a good idea.
- The results of Q16 showed that retaining existing local services and facilities is important such as the local school and village hall.
- The results of Q17 showed that respondents would like to see more facilities and activities within the villages for all age groups particularly children such as having a playing area or field. Many respondents would also like to see community facilities/employment services come forward in the village such as village shop, pub, or post office.
- A number of respondents from Q18 were in favour of allocating land for the purpose of community use/employment to improve the amenities available for people in the village so people did not have to adventure further afield. Though opinion was divided as to where this was in Q19- a number of comments said preferably in the centre of the village, so people didn't have to drive, or extending this idea at the village hall or on the former onion factory site.
- In Q20, there were lots of ideas on what CIL payments could be spent on. This included improving traffic measures in the village, creating a children's play area, having more dog/litter bins, and improving bus shelters/bus stop areas.
- Various non-planning matters were raised, which could potentially be incorporated as community actions points, such as keeping the village tidy, improving advertising

of events, and hosting more village events/projects, which can build on the need for a sense of community.

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

10. Feedback from residents on housing helped shaped the conversations had with AECOM when they were developing the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) in 2022. This was finalised in 2023.
11. 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 2022 to undertake an initial walk around and identify key priorities such as parking. This was finalised in 2023.
12. Following feedback from residents on the importance of the local environment and preserving, the steering group decided to identify local important views investigating the ideas and comments shared throughout early engagement.

Regulation 14 Consultation

Overview

13. The consultation ran for six weeks from 21 October to 2nd December 2024.
14. The activities undertaken to bring the consultation to the attention of local people and stakeholders is set out below. This meets the requirements of Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 in Regulation 14.

Date	Activity	Summary
22 October 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emails and letters sent to stakeholders advising them of the Regulation 14 consultation and how to make representations 	<p>An email or letter was sent directly to each of the stakeholders, including statutory consultees, supplied by BCKLWN, in addition to local stakeholders. The email/letter informed the stakeholders of the commencement of the consultation period. The email notified consultees of the NDP's availability on the website, alongside supporting materials, and highlighted different methods to submit comments. This meets the requirements of Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 in Regulation 14. This was sent on 22 October. A copy of this is provided in Appendix B.</p>

Date	Activity	Summary
Week commencing 22 October 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaflets delivered to every property in Parish by volunteers on the parish council (Appendix C). • Printed copies of the survey and neighbourhood plan were placed in Walkers Garage & Samuels Farm Shop for people to view and collect. • All draft NDP documents and a link to the smart survey and QR code were published on the PC website. 	<p>Various methods were used to bring the Regulation 14 Consultation to the attention of local people 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"> • Completing an online survey. • Filling in a hard copy of the survey and sending this to the parish clerk. • Providing feedback via letter or electronically to the parish clerk. <p>The NDP documents made available as part of this process included⁴:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation 14 draft NDP • Design Codes 2023 • Housing Needs Assessment 2023 • Evidence Base • Key Views Assessment • SEA Decision Statement
13 November 2024	Drop-in event at Jephson Hall - 10am-12pm and 5-7pm	This session allowed the community to turn up to share their views on the NDP.
12 December 2024	The chairman of the Walpole Cross Keys NDP Steering Group and Parish Clerk met with CCP to review the representations received and agree amendments to be made to the plan in advance of the parish council meeting in early 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.
Early 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.

⁴ [Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council | Neighbourhood Plan](#)

Responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation

15. At the end of the consultation period there were 47 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.

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 “must...”. Use of the word “must” within development plan policies is generally inappropriate, as everything in a Plan policy is negotiable through the development management system, dependent upon development viability etc. It is not possible to require (“must provide” etc) something (e.g. item of local infrastructure) that is not obliged under legislation.</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/</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Recommend the NP at this stage sticks to the NP period due to the HNA was modelled up to 2038 and we use these % in housing policies.</p> <p>Note the comments on “must”. However, wish to keep them in due to this was a key reason for doing a NP review.</p> <p>Remove specific references to the LP policies. Para 13 did not state WCK designation was going to change in the emerging plan.</p> <p>Decided to remove previous Para 15 due to this referred to a section of the Local Plan which was removed in examination.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>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 covering...”, which should future-proof the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
Policy 1	<p>It is great that this policy supports small scale starter home-type schemes, however the criteria could be more specific, for example, it could clarify that it means homes that are affordable, or meet specific local housing needs, or are aimed at first time buyers. NPPF suggests that new streets are tree lined, would this be something that this NP would be keen to address and work towards for new development proposals?</p> <p>Preamble: “...where they score positively” is unconventional wording. Suggest this is replaced with “...where they fulfil all the following criteria:”.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 (following criterion c): suggest removal of text: “Providing all of the above criteria is met”, as this represents repetition of the preamble. Also, suggest replacing the wording “...is encouraged, particularly in locations...” will be supported in locations...”.</p> <p>Lots of consideration in table 1 could be covered by appropriate review of Development boundaries as currently the table does not correlate to policy criteria; i.e. some location within the dev boundary would not be consistent with the table above.</p> <p>Last sentence: Brownfield sites maybe considered suitable for new residential development where</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Removed the last column in Table 1 since the new LP will be adopted in springtime 2025.</p> <p>Reworded the preamble sentence. Reworded criteria A.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 – Amended the wording.</p> <p>Removed the previous last sentence.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>existing use is no longer viable or is otherwise inappropriate.</p> <p>Strategic Housing comments – It should be noted that by limiting any development coming forward within the identified Neighbourhood Development Plan to 5 or less dwellings, little to no affordable housing will be provided as the threshold won't be met.</p>	
Policy 2	<p>Clarification is sought regarding whether the policy is intended to cover outbuildings and other householder developments that are not extensions. Additionally, the policy references commercial use, which appears to be outside the primary focus on extensions and conversions.</p> <p>Criterion 3 could either be presented as a separate policy or integrated with Policy 1.</p> <p>With respect to Policy 2, if a specific policy for conversions is desired, the policy could be revised to address this. However, in its current form, it does not appear to provide additional guidance beyond what is already covered in Policy 5.</p>	Amended the policy.
Policy 3	<p>Paragraph 1: Clarification is sought regarding whether additional evidence materials, such as the local housing register or census data, can be used to assess local housing needs.</p> <p>Suggest slight amendment to the policy wording to read as follows:</p> <p>“Housing proposals will need to reflect local housing need using the best available and proportionate evidence such as the Walpole Cross Keys Housing Needs Assessment 2022, unless more up to date robust evidence identifies different local housing need.”</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Keep as it is. Just one example that can be used the wording does already say using the best available and proportionate evidence.</p> <p>The threshold was set to 90% in line with the WCK HNA 2022. Clarification was given in the supporting text on Page 22-23. Also, the wording has been made more flexible to include 3 bedrooms as well since the HNA only stated 1-2 bedrooms. This was done due to the</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Preamble: It is suggested that the wording “will need to reflect...” be replaced with “should reflect...”, to align with standard planning policy language.</p> <p>Further clarification is sought regarding the justification for the threshold of 90%. Could a threshold of 80%, with a minimum of five dwellings, be considered instead? Additionally, it would be helpful if the policy could specify whether it applies only to the net increase in residential units or if it also includes replacement dwellings.</p> <p>It is also requested that the policy clarify the definition of "small-scale starter homes". Specifically, does this refer to one- or two-bedroom dwellings? For greater clarity, please refer to footnote 12 under Policy 1.</p> <p>It is suggested that the second paragraph be rephrased for improved clarity as follows: “New residential development, except for conversions, should offer...”</p> <p>Additionally, in cases where schemes are proven to be unviable, would applicants be required to provide a detailed viability assessment to support their position?</p> <p>Third Paragraph: It is recommended that the wording “will be encouraged” be replaced with “will be supported” to reflect a stronger and more supportive stance within the policy.</p> <p>Strategic Housing comments –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “new residential development should offer a housing mix whereby at least 90% of homes are three-bed or fewer...” If this requirement is retained, it should apply to open market housing only; this is important for any s106 affordable 	<p>community wanted to see more 2-3 beds in the area. Changed the wording around 90% to only apply on open marking housing only.</p> <p>Amended wording to the second paragraph stating in cases where schemes are proven to be unviable, applicants should be required to provide a detailed viability assessment to support their position.</p> <p>Removed the reference to starter homes in the last sentence and called these smaller unit housing which is defined in this NP as 3 beds or lower.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>housing coming forward which is secured to meet a borough wide need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding the reference to the development of small scale 'starter homes', can it be clarified what this actually means? If the wording refers to the NPPF starter homes, this should be replaced with First Homes however, if it's meant smaller more affordable homes please remove starter homes terminology. 	
Policy 4	<p>Preamble: It is suggested that the wording "will need to reflect..." be replaced with "should reflect..." to align with standard planning policy language.</p> <p>Criterion 2: It is recommended that Criterion 2 specify that it pertains to rural exception housing.</p> <p>Criterion 3: The requirement for a local connection should be considered in relation to the Borough Council's affordable housing policies (available at: https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20001/housing/269/housing_strategy_policies_and_information). However, there may be scope to apply additional local connection criteria for rural exception schemes (see Strategic Housing comments below: strategic.housing@west-norfolk.gov.uk).</p> <p>Criteria 4 and 5: The wording "Schemes must..." should be replaced with "Schemes should...", as development plan policies should not impose mandatory requirements where not explicitly required by legislation or regulations.</p> <p>Furthermore, as the requirements in these criteria are already covered under Policy 5, it may</p>	<p>Changed the wording in the preamble.</p> <p>Changed criterion 2.</p> <p>Note the comments from the strategic housing team. However, other NPs adopted in BCKWLN have been allowed to have local connection test criteria linked to First Homes as set out in National Guidance. Para 55 makes clear that the local connection test criteria in the supporting text is only for First Homes, so it does not impact the delivery of other affordable housing at the district level.</p> <p>Took out criteria 4 and 5 in Policy 4 and incorporated them into Policy 5.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>be more appropriate to incorporate them into Policy 5 instead.</p> <p>Strategic Housing comments –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tenure mix for s106 affordable housing should read 5% shared ownership as per the local plan instead of rent to buy. • S106 affordable housing is required and delivered to meet a borough wide need opposed to a local need and therefore a local connection criterion would not be appropriate (unless for First Homes). A local connection criterion for s106 housing would significantly impact the delivery of affordable housing across the borough. • Points 2 & 3 suggest the NP group would be supportive of Rural Exception Sites, in which case suggest a separate specific policy is created –local connection criteria would be applied to any affordable housing delivered under a rural exception site however the tenure mix would depend on a housing need evidenced by a Housing Needs Survey. 	
Policy 5	<p>Criterion A: Point 2 refers to no buildings to be built at the back of the plots – does this also mean, no sheds, outbuildings, workshops, office building, annexes or any other form of buildings at all (mostly permitted development in any event? Suggested wording: except for incidental or ancillary uses.</p> <p>Criterion B: Suggest adding following wording for clarity: <u>“Except for incidental or ancillary uses..</u> Buildings should be designed to front onto streets and ensure that streets or public spaces have</p>	<p>Changed Criteria A and B.</p> <p>Criteria D- Do not wish to list specific materials since there is a real mix in the parish.</p> <p>Criteria E- No change wish for this to be relevant to frontage and back of developments.</p> <p>Criteria F- Removed reference to ratio and amended wording.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>good levels of natural surveillance from adjacent buildings.</p> <p>Criteria A and B – It is accepted that these criteria offer local distinctiveness. However, whilst this kind of approach can offer some advantages in terms of connectivity, this method can result in increase in traffic congestion due to dependency on one corridor, disconnected community and limit walkability due everything being stretched out along one line.</p> <p>Criterion D: List of local materials could strengthen this policy.</p> <p>Criterion E: This could specify whether it is for frontages or back.</p> <p>Criterion F: The design code 5 doesn't specify any ratio, so it needs to defined in the policy itself.</p> <p>Criterion H: Suggest adding following wording for clarity: "<u>Where possible, new</u> developments should integrate new trees and vegetation to improve net gain <u>deliver Biodiversity New Gain, In accordance with the legal requirements</u> without blocking future views, particularly those identified in Policy 8.</p> <p>Last paragraph: Suggest following amendments to the policy wording:</p> <p>"Development should ensure of a good standard of residential amenity. Developments will be carried out in such a way that is mindful of the safety of road users. (DM15) demonstrate that adequate... safe access/"</p>	<p>Criteria H- suggest using the recommended wording</p> <p>Amended last two paragraphs.</p>
Policy 6	<p>It is suggested that the policy further clarify whether off-road parking is preferred over on-plot parking. Additionally, it may be helpful to specify where garages and similar structures are permissible.</p>	<p>Reworded policy to state preference is off road, garage or courtyard parking with consideration to the design code.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
		Added further detail.
Policy 7	This policy could further clarify on preferred planting, that are preferred and native to the locality.	No change.
Policy 8	Clear and concise policy safeguarding the visual quality of the local environment. It effectively preserves key views from development.	Noted.
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>Preamble/First section: The wording could be revised for greater clarity. A suggested amendment is as follows: “New development proposals involving the use of external lighting should...”</p> <p>Additionally, the final bullet point could be amended to: “For developments including new street lighting, the extent of lighting should be limited to within...”</p> <p>It is recommended that the policy include additional wording addressing development in the countryside, to ensure its applicability in these areas.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>First section- recommend amendment</p> <p>The policy should apply everywhere meaning development in the built up area and countryside should consider the lighting principles.</p>
Policy 10	<p>It is suggested that the policy define what constitutes "suitable sites". Additionally, it may be beneficial for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify these sites or provide further clarification on the thresholds for compliance with this policy.</p> <p>Criteria A and B –It is recommended that the wording “is encouraged” be replaced with “will be supported” to reflect a more proactive and supportive stance.</p>	<p>Suitable sites will be dependent on considering a number of points set out in the paragraph. No particular definition.</p> <p>Changed the wording in criteria A and B.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
Policy 11	<p>Should these be called site allocations as this gives a plan great way to gravitas?</p> <p>It would be useful to have number of houses to go on the site (capacity). Is this policy specifically covering B2 uses on the former station site? In which case, the policy should specify “general industrial uses” or similar wording.</p> <p>If the sites are treated as separate housing and employment/ industrial allocations, they ought to be covered by separate site-specific policies</p>	<p>Do not recommend calling these site allocations. Since the NP will have to go through the process again delaying movement on the plan.</p> <p>Removed the second paragraph. Not relevant now since the site formerly known as the onion processing site is being built out so we have changed the policy wording and changed the map.</p> <p>Do not think the site at Old Station would be suitable for residential development we support it for industrial development.</p> <p>The policy was supportive of development coming forward on these sites.</p>
Policy 12	<p>This policy provides strong protection for key community facilities, ensuring that essential local infrastructure is safeguarded from development pressures.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Policy 13	<p>Clarification is requested regarding who will be responsible for the required improvements and whether there is a specific threshold that, once met, would trigger the need for road improvements. While the policy encourages road improvements, it does not specify which types of improvements are considered acceptable or desirable. There is also an opportunity for the policy to address modern transport needs, such as provisions for cycling, walking, and electric vehicle charging stations.</p> <p>Criterion B - Further clarification is sought on how "harm" to the highway network is defined. Does</p>	<p>It would be considered that Norfolk County Council would be responsible for improvements to the road network.</p> <p>Not up to us to decide a specific threshold. This would be dependent on an application and decisions made in the planning process.</p> <p>Criteria B- harm to the network has considered existing local wildlife present, traffic movements.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>this refer to traffic movements, or is it also concerned with impacts on biodiversity along highway verges, boundary hedges, or ditches?</p> <p>It appears that this policy is already addressed within other policies in the plan, such as Policy 5 and Policy 7.</p>	Added Criteria C to add further detail regarding PRoW.

Historic England

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	Don't consider the need to involved in the detailed development of the strategy. Generic advice given.	Noted. No changes.

Natural England

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	No specific comments on the NP.	Noted. No changes.

Anglian Water

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
Objectives	We support the objectives, particularly those aspects listed under numbers 2, 4 and 5.	Welcome the support.
Policies 1, 2, 10 and 11	Para. 20 states that the updated neighbourhood plan will reflect local and national policy changes and will help to influence the design and type of any new homes being delivered in the Parish, as well as ensuring infrastructure improvements are	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Regarding Table 1 & Hankinson's Estate – made reference to AW concerns around descriptive works</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>delivered alongside grown to maximise community benefit.</p> <p>It is noted that neither the emerging Local Plan Review or this review neighbourhood plan make specific allocations for housing and other commercial development but includes some specific policies for consideration of different development proposals which may come forward.</p> <p>In accordance 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>Referring to Figure 4 and Table 1 of the draft document, there are different groupings of built-up areas/ properties. In relation to wastewater services, it is only the Hankinson’s Estate that is connected to Anglian Water’s network and local water recycling centre (WRC). Other properties appear to be served by septic tanks. Anglian Water provides water supply services more widely across the Parish. (Please see below under Policy 5 further information about water resources supply.)</p> <p>Map information of Anglian Water’s assets detailing the location of our water and water recycling infrastructure are available at: www.utilities.digdat.co.uk</p> <p>In cases where a supply or connection are be requested from Anglian Water, developers must undertake pre-planning engagement at the earliest opportunity to assess infrastructure capacity, and any specific requirements that may</p>	<p>and Hankinson’s Estate not being a suitable place for further development.</p> <p>Added wording in the NP Policy 7 to overcome concerns by AW. Also renamed the section Flood Risk and Water Management and changed the titles name to Flood Risk and Water Management. Wording for the preamble:</p> <p><i>“ Development proposals must demonstrate and ensure that any new development does not have a detrimental impact on our water infrastructure, including sewers, surface water and other flooding. Also taking account of climate change.”</i></p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>be needed to deliver the proposed development, which may include sustainable points of connection to our water supply and wastewater networks to minimise impacts on existing communities and the environment.</p> <p>Table 1 states that in the consideration of further development in the built-up area of Hankinson’s Estates <i>“Further development possible but some work would be required to upgrade the sewerage system on the estate if new development was to take place”</i>. The Hankinson Estate Water Recycling Centre (WRC) is a small facility with descriptive permits. Such permits apply to small WRCs serving a small number of properties or small settlement – often collectively referred to as <i>“descriptive works”</i>.</p> <p>As a result of the limited and sometimes very constrained parameters for descriptive permits, there is a risk that incremental housing growth within or close to the WRC catchment could exceed the capacity of these small WRCs and potentially cause environmental harm. Such works are not designed to accommodate additional flows that may arise and therefore there is a presumption that there is no existing headroom to minimise environmental harm. Anglian Water recommends that areas served by descriptive works are excluded for growth where a connection to a public sewer is likely to be required; OR if very small-scale growth to meet local needs through infill development is proposed a policy measure must require the developer to monitor flows for one year to prove that there is capacity for the proposed development to connect or alternative sewerage treatment is provided.</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>We request that suitable wording is added to the neighbourhood plan to cover these factors, in order that such development proposals demonstrate this and to ensure that development does not result in a detrimental impact on water infrastructure, including sewers and surface water and other flooding. This should also take account of climate change.</p>	
Policy 5 - Design	<p>We would advocate the neighbourhood plan seeks a high standard of water efficiency for new developments for the reasons set out above. A target standard i.e. 100 litres per person per day should be included.</p> <p>The relevant basic conditions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be appropriate having regard to National Policy • Must contribute to the achievement of sustainable development <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 158 is clear that <i>“Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures. Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and infrastructure.”</i></p> <p>It is, therefore, 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</p>	<p>Note the comments and understand the advocacy to go above current set targets.</p> <p>Added in the policy support will be given to developments which go above the target standard of 100 litres per person per day where these conform with other policies.</p> <p>AECOM commissioned and finalised the NP Design Code Document and Checklist. Can pass on the comments to see if they will make any amendments. However, may not be possible at this stage.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>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><u>Comments on Appendix B: Design Codes Checklist for New Development</u></p> <p>The following comments are provided for improvement to ensure better linkages with the policies and proposals of the neighbourhood plan which are currently being consulted on and refined.</p> <p>Design Code 6 Parking and Utilities (p.37) – We welcome requiring parking areas and driveways to use permeable paving as a result of hard-standing surfaces.</p> <p>Design Code 9 SuDS (p.39) – Welcomed.</p> <p>Design Code 10 and 11 (p.40 - 41) - This does not refer specifically to water efficiency and only gives rainwater harvesting as an example. It should be made more explicit about promoting water efficiency and management, with such positive features as fixtures and fittings, and through rainwater/storm water harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling.</p> <p>Figure 73. illustrates different measures for low-carbon homes or both existing and new homes. This can be achieved by a fixtures and fittings approach, including through rainwater/ storm water, harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling. Under point 6 this should state “<i>highly water-efficient devices</i>” rather than</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>"<i>highly waste-efficient devices</i>". An updated version should be sought from AECOM as this anomaly in the diagram has been corrected for other neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Checklist - to ensure that the checklist is comprehensive, the following amendments are recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specify within the checklist the need to consider permeable surfaces i.e. under 5.5 and 5.6 to link with corresponding codes. ▪ 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. under 5.7. 	
Policy 6	The inclusion of reference to the use of permeable paving in new parking areas and driveways is welcomed.	Welcome the comment. No change.
Policy 7	<p>Anglian Water is supportive of measures to address surface water run-off, including the preference for this to be managed using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and requiring permeable surfaces for new areas of hardstanding within developments to comply with the drainage hierarchy.</p> <p>Such measures help to avoid surface water run-off from entering our foul drainage network, and connections to a surface water sewer should only be considered where all other options are demonstrated to be impracticable. Any requirements for a surface water connection to our surface water sewer network will require the developer to fund the cost of modelling and any upgrades required to accept the flows from the development.</p>	Welcome the comment.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Anglian Water encourages the use of nature-based solutions for SuDS wherever possible, including retrofitting SuDS to existing urban areas to enhance amenity and biodiversity within the neighbourhood plan area and contribute to green and blue infrastructure.</p> <p>It has been the intention of Government to implement Schedule Three of The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to make SuDS mandatory in all new developments in England. However, we welcome the policy approach to ensure SuDS measures are incorporated within new developments, until such time these measures are in place.</p>	

National Gas Avison Young

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	General response. No records of National Gas Transmission in the NP area.	Noted. No changes.

Online Survey

There was a total of 47 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. The majority of people respondents were residents and 1 stated they were a landowner.

Housing Policies

(Policy 1 and 2)

To what extent do you agree with planning polices related to housing?						
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
1 Policy 1: New Residential Development in the Neighbourhood Plan Area	5	9	7	4	7	32
2 Policy 2: Extensions and Conversions (including residential and commercial use)	7	20	5	0	0	32
Please provide any comments you have in relation to these policies:						11
						answered 32
						skipped 15

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>There was a mixture of opinions on supporting Policies 1-2. Around 50% of respondents supported Policy 1 and around 84% supported Policy 2.</p> <p>11 comments were left in Q5 which have been summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not need more homes since the onion factory site will soon have 16 homes on the market. Infrastructure cannot cope in the village. Cannot support further large-scale development. If there is further development this needs to come with more amenities. More development will destroy the villages ruralness and beauty Concerns of traffic and speeding issues in the village and wishes the NP would address this. Such as limiting the speed. Do not object to future housing but if 	<p>Note all the comments and support for the policies.</p> <p>Note there has been recent development in the village and we have a lack of amenities for the community so support future development coming forward which could attend to these needs e.g. public green space.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>there is any wish to not have more vehicles especially commercial due to the road is unsafe to walk along with no footpaths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports new housing and lives within new development in the village. Focus on developing existing sites before greenfield. However, thought needs to be given to the lack of parking for the school and amenities including park. • Welcomes growth if the emphasis is for local growth such as local companies and employment. 	

Policy 3 (Housing Mix)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to housing mix?							
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1 Policy 3: Housing Mix	5	8	12	2	3	30	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy						8	
						answered	30
						skipped	17

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>There were a real mix of opinions on this policy.</p> <p>8 comment were left on Q6. Many said they didn't no what housing mix means or cannot comments since they haven't seen the policy. Other comments summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good mix is needed. 	<p>Welcome the response. Note the need for a good mix of housing.</p> <p>It is felt from the feedback given that many respondents have maybe completed the survey without reading the NP policy itself. Since many were not sure and commented they didn't understand what housing mix means.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been a good mix of affordable and high-end housing in new developments. • There remains a need for smaller "affordable" houses in the village, so that the younger generation can entertain some hope of getting on to the housing ladder. • It seems that we have enough of the larger houses to meet demand, especially with the new development under way opposite Low Road. 	<p>Housing mix in this NP refers to the different size of homes new development should provide such as 1 beds or 4 beds. Further detail can be read in the HNA which is publicly available or within the NP which again respondents can read online and were guided in leaflet drop offs to each residential home to read online or get a hard copy at public facilities.</p>

Policy 4 (Affordable Housing)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to affordable housing?								
Answer Choice		Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1	Policy 4: Affordable Housing	6	12	7	4	1	30	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy							5	
							answered	30
							skipped	17

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>There were a real mix of opinions on this policy. 60% supported Policy 4.</p> <p>5 comment were left on Q7. One hasn't seen the policy. Other comments summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing is a must. 	<p>Welcome the response. Note the need to try and give affordable housing to local people. We hope a local connection test will help this concern. However, we should welcome other people in the local area who needs affordable housing in the parish to if needed.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be evidenced for local people within the parish and consideration for them first. • Village doesn't have the facilities for more housing such as parking 	.

Policy 5 (Design)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to design?						
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
1 Policy 5: Design	5	12	6	3	2	28
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy						4
						<i>answered</i> 28
						<i>skipped</i> 19

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>There were a real mix of opinions on this policy. 60.7% supported Policy 5.</p> <p>4 comment were left on Q8. One hasn't seen the policy. Other comments summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern semi-detached and terraced houses in Sutton Road are a bit of a disappointment in this regard. • A "guiding hand" from the Parish and KL Councils would be welcome • No issue with the village and how it looks • Over recent years there have been new housing what does not fit in with 	<p>Welcome the response. Note that design and the styles of buildings can be subjective.</p> <p>Do not wish to change the policy on detailing materials. Applicants can have regard to the design code and the surrounding area to the site proposal.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	existing dwellings. Needed development with different styles. Wrong colour brick is being used. Should use red brick or darker to keep in with the surrounding.	

Policy 6 (Residential Parking Standards)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to parking and design?						
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
1 Policy 6: Residential Parking Standards	3	14	6	3	2	28
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy						4
						<i>answered</i> 28
						<i>skipped</i> 19

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>There were a real mix of opinions on this policy. 60.7% supported Policy 6.</p> <p>4 comment were left on Q9. One hasn't seen the policy. Other comments summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General lack of parking in the area especially around the school. This is difficult for people in school peak hours. • People should not be parking on the paths and roadsides. 	<p>Welcome the response. Note the concerns with parking in and around the school.</p> <p>.</p>

Policy 7 (Managing and reducing flood risk)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to flood risk?							
Answer Choice		Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
1	Policy 7: Managing and reducing flood risk	11	8	3	3	1	26
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy							4
							<i>answered</i> 26
							<i>skipped</i> 21

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>73% supported Policy 7. 4 comment were left on Q10. One hasn't seen the policy. Other comments summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk must be effectively managed so it is imperative any new development does not exacerbate existing problems in the Parish as with the impact of climate change happening more frequently than when the NP was first written. Important policy in the plan. If the dykes where properly maintained and the road drains where cleared out then there wouldn't be flooding. No developer should be allowed to fill in dykes on any future developments as it has in the past. 	<p>Welcome the response. We agree that the policy is important.</p>

Policy 8 (Important Local Views)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to important local views?							
Answer Choice		Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
1	Policy 8: Protection of Important Local Views	15	5	4	0	0	24
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy							6
							<i>answered</i> 24
							<i>skipped</i> 23

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>83% supported Policy 8. 6 comments were left on Q11. One hasn't seen the policy. Other comments summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enjoy the local views. Moved to the area for the views. • Open spaces and views are so important to residents for their wellbeing and mental health. • There are several other candidates for local views that should be preserved for their beauty, e.g. to the west of Station Road North from the A17 approaches. • I agree in many cases but when it is locals filing complaints who have unkept untidy properties or properties that to the majority would look worse than what they are objecting I feel there needs to be more disgression on these views. 	<p>Welcome the response. We agree that the policy is important.</p> <p>No changes.</p>

Policy 9 (Dark Skies)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to dark skies?							
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1 Policy 9: Dark Skies	8	9	5	0	1	23	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy						4	
						answered	23
						skipped	24

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>73.3% supported Policy 9. 4 comments were left on Q12. One hasn't seen the policy. Other comments summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern for children at the moment going home before the lights go out on narrow roads. New led lighting enables lighting to be more accurate and not pollute the sky, these light should be where bus shelters and dangerous junction's are to protect pedestrians. No lighting has to be balanced with some subtle lighting for health and safety as these country roads in the dark are dangerous for walkers such as children, dog walkers, as there are no or little pathways and mainly ditches and dykes. 	<p>Welcome the response.</p> <p>Important points raised. The policy is not stopping external lighting which is necessary for safety concerns, but states lighting should meet suitable principles such as be downwards etc to ensure little light pollution should spill into the landscape. Lighting should focus on the area that needs to be lit e.g. a footpath/alleyway/corner for safety.</p>

Employment Uses (Policy 10 and Policy 11)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policies related to employment uses?							
Answer Choice		Stro ngly agre e	Ag ree	N ot su re	Disa gree	Stro ngly disa gree	Resp onse Total
1	Policy 10: Employment related or Agricultural and Horticultural related development	5	8	9	0	0	22
2	Policy 11: Brownfield Sites	3	9	7	1	1	21
Please provide any comments you have in relation to these policies							3
							<i>answered</i> 22
							<i>skipped</i> 25

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>There were a mix of opinions for Q13 regarding Policies 10 and 11. The majority supported both. 3 comments were left. One hasn't seen the policy.</p> <p>Other comments summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing in employment options would be good for the village but not incinerators or solar farms. • Agree in theory but the PC needs to consider the traffic concerns this could bring such as extra lorries especially down Station Road North. Residents are concerned on the speeding should lower the speed from 60 to 20nph. 	<p>Welcome the responses.</p> <p>No changes.</p>

Policy 12 (Protection of community services)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to community facilities?							
Answer Choice		Strongly agree	Agree	No t sur e	Disagr ee	Strong ly disagr ee	Respon se Total
1	Policy 12: Protection of Community Services	9	9	2	0	0	20
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy							2
							<i>answered</i> 20
							<i>skipped</i> 27

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>The majority supported Policy 12 (90%). 2 comments were left.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be good for the area to have more facilities such as a park, green space, shop or retail outlet • Important but the area has lost a number of facilities. This isn't helpful for elderly people who have no-one to rely on. It desperately needs a shop selling everything, farmers should be encouraged to sell their local produce to local people, without the fear of it being stolen. One respondent is a Norfolk Master Composters and would love to see the community here get involved, either join us or help set up a project for the local community with composting bins, or advise residents personally. 	Welcome the responses.

Policy 13 (Transport and Access)

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 13: Transport and Access	5	9	2	1	0	17	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to this policy							3	
							<i>answered</i>	17
							<i>skipped</i>	30

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>The majority supported Policy 13 (82%). 3 comments were left.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area needs to stay the same • Plan strikes the right tone and balance, however, traffic still permitted to travel at 60mph from A17 junction and Station Toad North. This is a concern for speeding and safety. Concern for residents. • Policy 13 doesn't go far enough to consider the traffic and access to the village by huge lorries, trucks, vans, treble lorries, even though the signage near A17 entrance states not suitable for heavy goods vehicles, these are ignored. 60mph as stated previously is dangerous and totally unsuitable for ALL the roads into the village. 20mph into Station Road North perhaps then proceeding to maximum of 30mph would possible be more acceptable, which would make traffic flow better into the school road. We and our neighbours would love this to be a 	<p>Welcome the responses.</p> <p>Added in a community action saying the PC will liaise with appropriate statutory bodies such as Norfolk County Council on investigating safety concerns and reducing speed limits and managing existing public rights of way. This has been a repetitive concern throughout.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	priority to lower the speed limit. It's now the best time to get this done before a serious accident happens.	

Favour of the Neighbourhood Plan

I am generally in favour of the Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Plan		
Answer Choice	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Yes	80.0%	12
2 No	20.0%	3
Please provide any comments which explain your answer:		4
<i>answered</i>		15
<i>skipped</i>		32

The majority of respondents who answered this question were in favour of the plan. One said they haven't seen the plan and other comments stated they hope the policies are adhered too, they wish for the village to stay a small community and does not want the plan to overly burden the makeup of the village.



Clerk: Mrs. Caroline Boyden
walpolecrosskeyspc@gmail.com

2 Abbeyfields
Abbey Road
Great Massingham
PE32 2JE

07368 861696

Dear Walpole Cross Keys Parish Resident,

The Parish Council would like your help with updating our Neighbourhood Plan. We need everyone's opinion and ask that you to spare a moment to complete a simple survey.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan? A Neighbourhood Plan is a way of recording the preferences and wishes of our Village Community to help protect and improve it. We already have a Neighbourhood Plan that was introduced in 2017 and is valid until 2026, but it is apparent that an update is overdue. You can see it here: walpolecrosskeyspc.info or search for "Walpole Cross keys Neighbourhood Plan" online.

Why do we need a Neighbourhood Plan review? Our village has changed considerably since 2017 and we must ensure that the plan is still meeting our needs. So, it's important to review it to include up to date information and more detailed policies. Its policies, amongst others, are used to determine planning applications. This will allow us more influence over the type, size, and location of development in the Parish.

Completing the survey: Please encourage all members of your household to complete the survey individually – we would like responses from those under 18 years of age as well as adults, permanent residents, second homeowners and businesses. There are no right or wrong answers or opinions. Please answer the questions as best as you can. If you think something does not apply to you, just move on to the next question. Participation is voluntary and anonymous*

Please complete the survey online if possible. You can find a link to it on: www.walpolecrosskeyspc.info or there's a QR code below. If you would prefer to complete a paper copy, please get in touch with the Parish Clerk who will arrange for one to be delivered to you. The survey is available for completion until the end of March.

If you would like to find out more or be involved with the Neighbourhood Plan, please contact the Parish Clerk, Caroline Boyden.

Thank you on behalf of Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council.
Nick Dyble. Chairman.

*By completing the survey, you consent to allowing your responses to be used by the Neighbourhood Planning project. All information will be stored securely on UK-based servers, compliant with GDPR rules.



Appendix B- Regulation 14 Email/Letter

Subject:Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Plan Review Pre-Submission Regulation 14 Consultation

Date:2024-10-22 16:15

From:Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council <clerk@walpolecrosskeys-pc.gov.uk>

To:

Dear Stakeholder,

Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Plan Review Pre-Submission Regulation 14 Consultation

Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council, as the qualifying body, are now consulting on their Pre-Submission Draft of the neighbourhood plan review for Walpole Cross Keys. 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 21 October to Monday 2 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 2 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:
www.walpolecrosskeys-pc.gov.uk.

Should you wish to provide comments you can send these to the Parish Clerk via email at clerk@walpolecrosskeys-pc.gov.uk or
c/o 2 Abbeyfields, Abbey Road, Great Massingham. PE32 2JE.

Best regards
Caroline Boyden
Parish Clerk
For and on behalf of Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council

This email transmission and all attached files contain information intended for the designated individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of this email or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete the original message without making any copies.

--
Best regards
Caroline Boyden
Parish Clerk
For and on behalf of Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council

This email transmission and all attached files contain information intended for the designated individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of this email or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete the original message without making any copies.



Neighbourhood Development Plan

Shaping the future of our village
Regulation 14 Consultation
on the pre-submission draft Plan takes place on
21st October to 2nd December 2024

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

Please find an online copy available in the link above and when scanning the QR code.



Several hard copies of the survey will be made available to pick up and drop off at Walkers Garage and Samuels Family Farm Shop.

View the draft plan and supporting documents on Walpole Cross Keys Parish Council website www.walpolecrosskeys-pc.gov.uk or request a printed copy of the plan from the Parish Clerk, Caroline Boyden, at clerk@walpolecrosskeys-pc.gov.uk or by telephone 07368 861696 if can not get access to a digital copy.

Come along to our drop in sessions at Jephson Village Hall on Wednesday 13 November at 10am-12pm or 5pm-7pm.