

The Walpoles Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2036



Consultation Statement

Table of Contents

Overview of Walpole 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	4
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.....	7
Statutory Stakeholders.....	8
Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.....	8
Historic England.....	18
National Gas Avison Young.....	19
Peter Humphreys Associates Ltd	22
Online Survey	24
Appendix A- Initial Community Consultation Poster October 2022.....	37
Appendix B- Neighbourhood Plan Poster Update June 2023	38
Appendix C- Regulation 14 Email/Letter.....	40
Appendix D- Regulation 14 Leaflet/Poster	41

Introduction

Overview of Walpole Neighbourhood Development Plan Review

1. Walpole 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 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 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 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
Mid 2022 onwards	Monthly Parish Council Meeting Agenda Item	The neighbourhood plan has been a standard agenda item in Parish Council meetings since 2022 when discussions first began. Minutes can be read on the parish council website ¹ .
September 2022	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 to be involved and have their say. Started to work on a draft survey to gather the initial views of the community. A leaflet was produced to share with the community to get people involved and to stay up to date of future stages (Appendix A).
November - December 2022	In person event at the Christmas Tree Fair	The neighbourhood steering group linked with several events taking place within the parish to raise awareness and understand community views on the area and future development. They had a stand promoting the neighbourhood plan at

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

Date	Activity	Summary
		<p>the Christmas Fair in St Peter’s Church on the 26th November 2022. A leaflet with background on the neighbourhood plan was available and handed to those who attended the event. The leaflet explained what a neighbourhood is, the aim and vision of the plan, how people can get involved and to read further information in the Crier and on the village noticeboards at St Andrews Church, the parish hall, Chalk Road, and Jubilee Tree Island. People were also invited to join the steering group.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan also had a presence at the St Andrews Christmas tree fair on Saturday 10th December 2022. At this, residents were asked to add their views on development to baubles hanging on the tree. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More major housing in this village Walpole St. Andrew is not sustainable. • No more houses without more infrastructure. • No large developments. • The community centre being used more. • The school playground and fields need serious improvement. It floods, the climbing frame is condemned, the children have nowhere to play. • No more housing estates should be built around this village. The estate known as Springfield has caused two villages St. Peter and St. Andrew to lose their identity. • No more houses. We don't have the infrastructure. The villages have become too built up.
1 December 2022 to 26 January 2023	Initial community survey consultation ran for 8 weeks.	The activity above was followed up by a survey to consult the community on their key concerns of the area and how they wish to shape the future of the parish through the neighbourhood plan. The Walpoles residents and people who work there were consulted on key issues for the neighbourhood plan for 8 weeks from 1

Date	Activity	Summary
		<p>December 2022 to 26 January 2023. The consultation included a survey with 26 questions.</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. 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>At this stage the survey was voluntary and anonymous and that all age groups are encouraged to join in. Overall, 29 responses were received on the survey.</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 2023	Community Poster Update	As shown in Appendix B a poster/leaflet was distributed amongst the community to give an update on the development of the plan. The group shared examples of green spaces, views and heritage assets they were considering investigating. As well as other work which has been undertaken. The community were encouraged to share local information or views to help with the assessments and development of the plan.
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 website², or in hard copy from the Parish Clerk. The summary of points and concerns raised included:

- There is strong support for protecting the environment, including designating local green spaces such as the recreational field, identifying important local views such as of the churches and protecting dark skies.
- There were a number of suggestions for non-designated heritage assets including The Old Post Office and Dovecote House. Many respondents throughout referenced the historic importance of St Andrews Church and St Peters Church.
- Access into the countryside is important, people would like to see more footpaths and further routes into the countryside particularly for dog walking.
- Whilst there is not an overall desire to encourage much new development, the need for smaller scale housing was acknowledged. Residents welcome the need for more affordable homes (such as starter homes for young people), family sizes homes. The type of housing preferred was bungalows, semi-detached followed by detached and the sizes were mainly 2-3 beds followed by 4 beds.
- The design of any new housing is important, there's support for ensuring new housing is in keeping with existing development and also new development should incorporate low carbon design.
- People would like to see more facilities and activities within the villages for all age groups particularly younger people/teenagers.
- Retaining existing local services and facilities is important such as the local school and pre-school and community buildings. A number of people felt that they would like to see a general shop or post office come forward.
- There was interest in the idea of allocating land for housing or employment sites such as for local shops or other small businesses, though opinion was divided as to where this was – on the outskirts or more central to the villages. An issue around noise pollution and the road network was raised with respect to allocating land.
- There were lots of ideas on what CIL payments could be spent on. This included improving the children's play area and equipment, more dog bins and improved bus shelters.
- 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.
- Various non-planning matters were raised, which could potentially be incorporated as community actions points.

² [Walpole Parish Council | Home \(walpolecrosskeyspc.info\)](http://walpolecrosskeyspc.info)

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 green spaces and green corridors 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 C.</p>
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 D). • Printed copies of the survey and neighbourhood 	<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,</p>

Date	Activity	Summary
	<p>plan were placed in Walpole Community Centre for people to view and collect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All draft NDP documents and a link to the smart survey and QR code were published on the PC website. 	<p>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 included³:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulation 14 draft NDP Design Codes 2023 Housing Needs Assessment 2023 Evidence Base Local Green Space Assessment SEA Decision Statement
21 November 2024	Drop-in event at Walpole Community Centre Garden Rood - 10am-12pm and 5-7pm	These sessions allowed the community to turn up to share their views on the NDP.
16 December 2024	The Walpole 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.

Responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation

15. At the end of the consultation period there were 75 completed surveys, either filled in electronically, by hand or online. 3 statutory stakeholders wrote to the steering group with their comments on the draft plan in email form and one non statutory consultee.

³ [Walpole Parish Council | Neighbourhood Plan](#)

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

Statutory Stakeholders

Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
General/ overall comment	<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>As a result of LPR Hearings the plan period for emerging Local Plan has been extended from 2021 to 2040, maybe this NP should consider whether they wish to extend their plan period to align with the replacement Local Plan, which it is anticipated will be adopted by March 2025.</p> <p>It is also advisable to remove references to specific Local Plan policies in the plan (e.g. para 16, where the status of The Walpoles in the settlement hierarchy is proposed to be changed from Rural Village to Key Rural Service Centre in the replacement Local Plan 2021-2040). Other paragraphs from where specific Local Plan policy references should be removed are para 46, 53, 54, 65, 72, 92, 97, 99. Instead, these should be replaced by the phrase “Local Plan policies for...”, which should future-proof the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>The NP at this stage is going to stick to the NP period due to the HNA was modelled up to the current end date and we use these % in housing policies.</p> <p>Note the comments on “must”. Recommend we do change this to “should”.</p> <p>Removed specific references to the LP policies.</p> <p>The plan makes reference to views in a number of areas due to this was something mentioned in the community survey a lot and consideration to the landscape assessment has been made such as the fact the Walpoles is characterised by The Fens.</p> <p>The landscape character assessment has been considered for the area and was included in the evidence base paper as background to the parish. Again, so was the historic environment which is a publicly available source on the parish council website which could be viewed throughout the consultation.</p> <p>The NP does not have to write policies on any particular topic such</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Conservation officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The document refers to views a lot – is this all that is important? If so, perhaps key views need to be identified on a map.</i> <i>Archaeology and Historic Environment policies are missing – is this deliberate? I cant believe there is nothing to value in the Walpoles..... I did a recent assessment for an NSIP in Walpole St Peter where there was a lot of archaeology and landscape heritage that we considered as well as key views. This is the type of thing we can give protection and recognition to in NP's.</i> <i>Have they used the Landscape Character Assessment in this? It gives a lot of detail about the historic land use of the area which adds to its importance.</i> 	<p>as archaeology or heritage. The group did not wish to do further assessments and work on heritage assets at the time in writing this plan.</p>
Policy 1	<p>1. Should this policy also consider provision of Self and Custom build?</p> <p>2. Threshold of 90% of three bedrooms or fewer may prove unviable for the decision maker, would it be better to have 5 dwellings and 80%, to make the policy meaningful (i.e. 4 of 5 dwellings would need to be <4 bedrooms)?</p>	<p>Do not wish to add it in.</p> <p>The threshold came from the suggestion in the Walpoles HNA document. Keep as it is.</p>
Policy 2	<p>It would be recommended to define what is “practicable”, and specify on the size and location of the development that would trigger the threshold for the affordable units to be delivered? It would be advantageous if this policy Is there a scope to make this policy more specific? This policy mentions keeping affordable homes for “local people” does this plan provide a guidance on what “local people” are and how could this be controlled and complied with, it is recommended to introduce a specific criterion in relation to this?</p>	<p>Practicable was used to try allowing some flexibility. However, we understand this may not be helpful. We also think it is best to take out the size and location. Removed the first sentence up to the wording “affordable housing...”</p> <p>Reworded the sentence paragraph. Local people and the local connection criteria are mentioned in the supporting text in Para 47.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Strategic Housing Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Affordable Housing mix should be as per the Local Plan tenure mix (70% rent 30% low-cost home ownership including First Homes, Shared Ownership and other forms of intermediate tenure as agreed by the council). Unsure if enough justification or evidence within the text to change the tenure mix to 60% rented, 40% affordable home ownership. • The affordable mix should only apply to s106 market affordable housing, if an exception site were to come forward the mix would depend on any identified housing need. • S106 rented affordable housing is delivered to meet a borough wide need opposed to a local need and therefore local connection criteria would not be appropriate, this would significantly reduce our ability to deliver affordable rented housing across the borough. The Local connection criteria should apply to First Homes only. • For First Homes the guidance allows NP groups to require a higher minimum discount of either 40% or 50% if they can demonstrate a need for this. Noted NP suggests setting a minimum discount of 40%, this is acceptable providing there is evidence to demonstrate the need. Does evidence support this? The guidance also gives ability to set local connection criteria. However, 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 	<p>The 60:40 split came from the HNA suggestion. Made it clearer in the supporting text Para 48.</p> <p>Policy 1 already stated that housing mix will apply to new open market residential housing. This means affordable housing is not included. So it would not affect rented housing since S106 is delivered to meet a borough wide need.</p> <p>Strategic Housing questioned if there is evidence to support a higher First Homes % being applied in line with need. The evidence is within the HNA modelling and shows from Census 2021 data and the general profile of the parish that people cannot afford to access such homes and if the % for First Homes was higher this would be more achievable.</p> <p>Supporting text in the NP already states that the local connection test applies for 3 months only in Para 47.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>for all active members of the Armed Forces https://www.gov.uk/guidance/first-homes#first-homes-in-plan-making-and-decision-making, therefore this needs to be included within the policy too.</p>	
Policy 3	<p>Criterion B: Architectural detailing and colours should respect the local vernacular of other buildings in the area as set out in The Walpoles Design Guidance. The use of brightly coloured render and inappropriate replacement <u>features such as timber sash windows with uPVC should be resisted.</u></p> <p>The underlined text in red would normally form part of supporting text, therefore we suggest moving this wording to the supporting text as guidance instead.</p> <p>Criterion C: The policy refers to a high-quality slate tiles, can this be elaborated more on how one can this be achieved? Does this policy intend to guide user to choose natural slate tiles wherever possible and viable?</p> <p>Criterion C: Repeat references to local character – should specify/ signpost the relevant part of the Design Codes, to provide a clear definition for local character. Also, wording slightly clumsy and repetitive – suggest revised wording: “Building materials should respect the local character of existing buildings, as defined by the Walpoles Design Guidance. Roofing materials should consist of slate tiles or red clay pantiles.”</p> <p>Criterion D: Hedgerows fall outside the definition for development (high hedgerows being covered by separate legislation). Probably better to state that frontage boundary walls or fences (those facing the highways) should not exceed 1.2m (other boundaries generally being permitted development, up to 2m). May also be helpful to</p>	<p>Many comments have been made on the AECOM Design Codes document and checklist which was commissioned and finalised by AECOM a separate consultant. Suggestions can be passed onto them; however, they may not make the changes anymore.</p> <p>Note the comments on criterion B. However, such features may then be ignored if this is moved to the supporting text. It is adding further detail.</p> <p>Criterion C- used the suggested wording</p> <p>Criterion D- Amended the wording in line with suggestions and also considering the detail set out in Design Code 5.</p> <p>Criterion E- Noted. Took out reference to upkeep in front gardens. Amended the wording in line with Design Code 8 which mentioned that no more than 50% of the footprint should be built on.</p> <p>Criterion G- Yes.</p> <p>The Walpoles Design Guide is a finalised document. It has not been adopted as such it sits as evidence alongside the Walpole NP. It is a</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>provide examples of boundary walls/ fences (with reference to the relevant section of the Walpoles Design Guidance).</p> <p>Criterion E: The developments are advised to consider ratio of garden and building, DC5: does not explicitly mention any ratios, it should mirror each other for clarity? Also, planting/ upkeep of front gardens is beyond the scope of the planning system.</p> <p>Criterion G: Assumed that this is intended to reference “biodiversity net gain”?</p> <p>The Design Codes document has a potential to illustrate the preferred materials for the new development. It may be something that policy maker wishes to demonstrate for clarity to the future user.</p> <p>Conservation officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What does the Walpole Design Code Document do? Is it already adopted or is it a part of the NP? Can the relevant bits be summarised? If the design code hasn't been adopted and is to be so as part of the NP, I can provide detailed comments on this separately.</i> • <i>There is a checklist of design elements in this design code document. How do they want us to use this in practise? Will every application be assessed against it and if so what happens if something doesn't meet it?</i> • <i>The checklist can't be used against every development and isn't relevant for small householder extensions. Does there need to be two lists?</i> • <i>Historic Buildings don't play a huge part in this. Do they want to define any non-designated heritage assets? They mention them in design code 3 but don't define or</i> 	<p>supporting document to help applicants when designing schemes.</p> <p>The checklist should be used to help applicants consider key questions around design in their schemes where these may be relevant. We are aware not all Q are necessary depending on the development. Can make this clearer in the appendix if not already.</p> <p>We feel that adding in a map for the important buildings in the parish would sit out of context for a general design policy and would lead to more work to make this fit in with the plan.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<i>say anywhere the buildings that they consider these should refer to. Perhaps a map showing the important character buildings in the plan area could be useful.</i>	
Policy 4	<p>This policy mentions “Priority Habitats” does this NP identify those, if not why and what are we protecting exactly? Does this allude to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, through which “Priority Habitats” should be defined? In this case it may pay to await publication of this (by spring 2025) before submitting the Plan which will provide greater clarity for Policy 4.</p> <p>Could the policy maker clarify on what is considered as an improvement in habitat connectivity, can examples be shown as to what is acceptable? What methods should be used to enhance the green corridors?</p> <p>Who decides what is ‘appropriate’? Is there a buffer area, and if not who decides what this buffer would be?</p>	<p>There is a map which identifies where priority habitats are within the area. This is also detailed in the Walpoles Evidence Base Paper which was made available to read throughout the Regulation 14 consultation and is still in the public domain on the parish council website.</p> <p>The policy was not alluding to the LNRS. However, note this is a publication coming out next year.</p> <p>Change the wording too:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrate an improvement in habitat connectivity such as planting or restoring missing sections of hedgerow. - Where practicable enhance the function of the corridor such as overcoming areas of existing habitat fragmentation or creating additional habitats. <p>We consider that the decision maker and necessary stakeholders such as the ecologist should agree and decide what is appropriate in regard to the site in question.</p>
Policy 5	The first paragraph could be enhanced by incorporating the topic of hedgerows in the title, as it also addresses this subject. Alternatively, if	Note the comments. Taken out reference to hedgerows.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>the policy maker intends to treat trees and hedgerows as separate considerations, the title could be revised as follows:</p> <p><u>“Existing Trees and Hedgerows”</u></p> <p>Existing trees and hedgerows on development....</p> <p>The policy maker should be aware that the Hedgerows do not constitute “development” so are a separate matter to planning consideration and are instead controlled through High Hedgerows legislation.</p> <p>Additionally, the third paragraph could be improved and give some flexibility with the inclusion of the following text (currently underlined):</p> <p><u>“Replacement Trees</u> Replacement trees must be native British species of local provenance. Developers should ensure local ecological connectivity is maintained and sufficient space is made available on the development site for this unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.</p> <p>Developers should replace trees on a 2 to 1 ratio requirement unless evidence suggests this would make the scheme economically unviable, <u>or site constraints.”</u></p> <p>For the fourth paragraph, the final sentence (currently underlined) could be more appropriately relocated to the supporting text:</p> <p><u>“New Trees</u> 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, and to provide gateway and landmark trees that contribute to local</p>	<p>Loss of value will be determined in an AIA and judgement can be made at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Added All new net development, excluding householder applications, for the replacement part.</p> <p>Amended the wording in para 3 replacement trees with the additional red wording.</p> <p>Amended the wording in para 4 new trees with the additional red wording.</p> <p>Note the comments on replacement trees and native British species. Changed the wording to “<i>replacement tree should be appropriate for the location with a presumption in favour of native trees where suitable.</i>”</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>distinctiveness. <u>This should be informed by relevant ecology and arboricultural assessment(s).</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is meant by ‘development site’? It would be beneficial if the policy maker could further clarify which types of developments are subject to the thresholds outlined in this policy. Specifically, it would be useful to define whether this policy applies only to larger developments, new developments, or minor householder projects, or if it encompasses all types of development. 2. Additionally, consideration should be given to the threshold for scenarios where the removal of a tree is necessary to accommodate a small-scale development, such as the construction of a garage, workshop, or porch. <p>There appears to be conflict between replacement trees with the first paragraph relating to replacement trees stating replacement trees would be informed by the quality and size of the trees lost, and the second paragraph relating to replacement trees stating replacement on a 2 to 1 ratio.</p> <p>Conservation officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What is a ‘loss of value’? How do we define this? What is value? It is assumed that this has come from BS 5837 which assesses the value of trees but this isn’t stated anywhere.</i> • <i>What is “arboricultural biodiversity value”?</i> • <i>Replacement trees should be “native British species of local provenance”. Not sure this should always be the case. Our native trees don’t always survive well in built up areas. It might be best to just say</i> 	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p><i>that the replacement tree should be appropriate for the location with a presumption in favour of native trees where suitable.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Veteran trees and notable trees should be mentioned. They may wish to mark on a map where the notable trees are in the district to aid identification.</i> 	
Policy 6	<p>Proposed Local Green Spaces should be supported by evidence to demonstrate these meet the national policy requirements (2023 NPPF para 106).</p> <p>Additionally, there appears to be some typographical errors within the policy text as follows please ensure that the text is consistent with the aims and objectives of the Development Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LGS3- The Church Yard of St Andrew <p>Development proposals in the three? designated Local Green Spaces listed above will be managed in accordance with national policy for Green Belts.</p> <p>Policy 6 refers to three designated Local Green Spaces but lists four</p>	<p>The proposed LGS have been supported by evidence gathered from the NP group and have followed the NPPF criteria. Detail was set out in the supporting text referring to this. The main detail is set out in the LGS assessment which was a supporting document available at Reg.14 and in the public domain.</p> <p>Note that three green spaces were stated in the policy but there were four. This was an error, and the spaces have been amended now. It was agreed to remove Wingsfield the previous LGS1.</p> <p>The assessment, maps and policy have been amended.</p>
Policy 7	<p>1st and 3rd paragraphs – It may be helpful to refer to the relevant parts of the Walpoles Design Guidance for examples of best practice, in the interests of clarity.</p> <p>It is also 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</p>	<p>Note the comments. There is not a specific design code on lighting.</p> <p>Separated the final paragraph in line with their suggestion.</p> <p>Prominent locations would be visible from the surrounding landscape as it says. Rural/dark etc. Added in a footnote.</p> <p>Internal light spill will be addressed in proposals by mitigating pollution</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>avoiding artificial lighting impacts on bats, birds and other species.</p> <p>Separate paragraph:</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>Could the term ‘prominent location’ be defined for clarity?</p> <p>Conservation officer:</p> <p>Internal light overspill – how is this addressed? The design code doesn’t address mitigation for dark skies.</p>	<p>from light sources. This can be addressed in the design stage with the decision maker.</p>
Policy 8	<p>It is recommended that policy text that includes word “must” is replaced by “should”.</p> <p>Policy refers to “all new development” this can be challenging for a new porch (as an example) especially given the examples shown, if it is deemed to be necessary to include small household extensions policy should include examples such as water butts.</p>	<p>Changed must to should</p> <p>Note the comments. Changed the wording to “all new development where required”.</p>
Policy 9	<p>BCKLWN are at their last stages of the adoption of a new local plan, as such it would be advisable to refrain from quoting policies from the existing Local Plan: This policy could read as follows:</p> <p>“The following community facilities and services are designated as Community Facilities in accordance with Local Plan policies for protecting community facilities and are:</p>	<p>Note this. Reworded the policy to take the points raised in mind.</p>
Policy 10	<p>Criterion A: Replace “must” to “should”</p>	<p>Changed must to should.</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation		NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Criterion D: This is not something that could be included for development management purposes. Instead, this could be moved into the supporting text, to explain the importance of engagement with the community in developing renewable energy proposals.</p> <p>LVA required regardless of scale of development, may be too challenging for porch extension, as an example?</p> <p>Suggest amending last para of this policy text. Using a word “encouraged” may feel like an ambition rather than a goal, it would be suggested to rephrase the last para of this policy text to read as follows:</p> <p>"New, replacement, or existing developments should incorporate low carbon technologies into the scheme layout, where appropriate to the scale of the project, and ensure that these technologies do not have an adverse impact on the character of the area."</p>	<p>Moved criterion D to the supporting text Para 109.</p> <p>Note the LVA comment. Referred to large scale development which have been the concern in the area.</p> <p>Rephrased the last paragraph.</p>
Appendices	Appendix B – checklist could be better produced as a downloadable pro-forma.	Appendix B comes from the full Design Codes Document. Applicants can read the AECOM document instead if easier.

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.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Grimsby to Walpole Scheme</p> <p>The Grimsby to Walpole (G2W) proposals are part of the Great Grid Upgrade. The first stage of public consultation aimed to introduce NGET and explain why an upgraded grid requires work in this area and outline our early proposals for a new electricity transmission line between a new substation at Grimsby and Walpole, along with three further new substations along the route.</p> <p>NGET are proposing to build a new high-voltage electricity transmission line and associated works between a new substation at Grimsby West in Northeast Lincolnshire and a new substation in the Walpole area, in Norfolk. NGET are also proposing two new connection substations near the Lincolnshire coast and a new substation at Weston Marsh in Lincolnshire.</p> <p>Paragraph 107 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan refers specifically to the G2W Project, it acknowledges that a new substation is proposed in Walpole. Paragraph 108 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan refers to a residents survey undertaken in 2022/3 which suggests that residents are not in favour of further battery storage, solar farms or electricity substations citing the harmful impacts on views being a concern for residents. Following this Policy 10: Renewable Energy, Low Carbon Technologies and Associated Infrastructure seeks to ensure that applications for renewable energy or associated infrastructure, including substations consider design, visual impact and landscape implications.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Green Corridors</p> <p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan <i>Policy 4: Biodiversity and Green Corridors</i>, identifies a series of green corridors. A Green Corridor has</p>	<p>Welcome the response.</p> <p>Note that there could be a potential opportunity for further enhancement of the green corridors along Frenchs Road, Walpole Marsh since this is adjacent to the G2W project. Enhancements would be welcomed.</p> <p>Added further wording in now Para 106 on the critical national priority. Amended the wording in Para 106 from “generate” to “transmitted”.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>been identified within the neighbourhood plan located at French's Road, Walpole Marsh, which lies adjacent to an area that the G2W project has identified for possible mitigation/BNG. The preamble to the policy details that Green Corridors link key blocks of habitat in the area and explains how green corridors are considered to be of benefit to both wildlife and people. We highlight Policy 4 as there is a potential opportunity for the further enhancement of the Green Corridor identified within the Neighbourhood Plan at this location as the potential BNG/mitigation area being proposed as part of the G2W Project could join up with and extend the Green Corridor continuing the proposed linkage further south outside of the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>Eastern Green Link 3 and 4 Schemes</p> <p>In addition to the G2W scheme, Eastern Green Link 3 (EGL 3) Eastern Green Link 4 (EGL 4) are two projects that are part of the Great Grid Upgrade. They are being developed by NGET together with Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission Ltd (SHE-Transmission), who are operating and known as Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks Transmission (SEEN Transmission), and Scottish Power Transmission (SPT), who are operating and known as Scottish Power Energy Networks (SPEN), respectively. Both EGL 3 & EGL 4 comprise a 2GW High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) link to reinforce the electricity transmission system between Scotland and England. EGL 3 and EGL 4 are separate projects, independent of one another; however, they follow the same onshore cable route in England for the majority of their length and will have a common connection point to the existing transmission network in Norfolk. This connection point - the new proposed Walpole substation - is needed for EGL 3, EGL 4 as well as the G2W scheme. EGL 3 and EGL 4 will also</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>require two new converter stations in the vicinity of the existing Walpole substation.</p> <p>Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies</p> <p>NGET welcomes the acknowledgement of the role of the Great Grid Upgrade in paragraph 107 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and NGET would like to see expansion on this within the Neighbourhood Plan around the critical role that electricity transmission infrastructure has in the UK's target to become net zero by 2050. UK Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure, which includes power lines including network reinforcement and upgrade works, and associated infrastructure such as substations.</p> <p>Further, it is noted that the first sentence in paragraph 107 states that 'The Great Grid Upgrade is now underway, with the National Grid making changes to the way electricity is generate(sic), including the network of overhead lines, pylons, cables, and other infrastructure that transports electricity around the country.' NGET respectfully asks that the word 'generate' is replaced with 'transmitted', as NGET does not own or operate assets for electricity generation.</p> <p>The G2W, EGL 3 and EGL 4 projects are being delivered in response to an identified national need to decarbonise the energy system in line with national commitments to reach net zero carbon emissions by 2050. National policy has acknowledged that, energy security and net zero ambitions will only be delivered if we can enable the development of new low carbon sources of energy at speed and scale. The Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure which as stated within National Policy Statement EN-1 includes for</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>electricity grid infrastructure, all power lines in scope of EN-5 including network reinforcement and upgrade works, and associated infrastructure such as substations.</p> <p>Further Advice NGET would be happy to work with the Neighbourhood plan team on any future developing plans and provide advice and guidance to the Council in relation to any technical advice on the electricity network, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, NGET wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets and future proposals. Please remember to consult NGET on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect NGET's assets. We would be grateful if you could check that our details as shown below are included on your consultation database.</p>	

Peter Humphreys Associates Ltd

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
Paragraph 17 of the document	<p>Many thanks for forwarding over the Walpole Neighbourhood Plan Review draft, and well done on getting to the next stage and completing this document.</p> <p>My comments are solely based around para 17 of the document.</p>	<p>Welcome the useful comments.</p> <p>Decided to make no changes to the policies at this moment in time. The emerging local plan will set out more detail on expectations in due course.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p><i>“a call for sites was held between August and September 2023, for local landowners to put forward potential sites. There were 12 sites put forward and assessed on suitability. However, after further reflection the parish council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group decided not to allocate any sites at this time since there is no absolute need, and sites could come forward in the parish as windfall development such as infill plots”.</i></p> <p>I appreciate the above might work for neighbourhood plan itself, but in general planning terms there is no support within the council’s current Local Plan for infill sites, the council will generally refuse most of sites outside of the defined development area boundary - unless there is functional need for that development, or if its considered a sustainable location, then sometimes an exception is made, but its rare.</p> <p>Therefore, if no formal allocations are to be made within the village, we would appreciate if the neighbourhood plan could define the criteria for the limited growth sites they might accept, (such as infill or logical extensions of the built form – for example), so that it holds weight in line with policy and can be referred to within our submissions.</p> <p>The neighborhood plan is held in high regard with planning officers, but at the same time they aren’t generally too receptive to draft neighborhood plans that simply block all new development. All settlements need to cater for growth, therefore I think its key for the document to set out the criteria for the limited development it is willing to support.</p> <p>I actually support the logic of not formally allocating any sites, as my experience with other village’s plans is that they allocate say 10 sites, and then within a year they are all brought</p>	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	forward, leaving a neighbourhood plan is essentially redundant, full of sites that are now built and in need of further review. Whereas a plan that includes a format for acceptable limited growth is a far more sustainable approach, one that won't rapidly become out of date.	

Online Survey

There was a total of 75 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 and 7 stated they were also landowners.

Housing Policies

(Policies 1 to 3)

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: Housing Mix	12	18	16	7	3	56	
2	Policy 2: Affordable Housing	10	26	10	7	3	56	
3	Policy 3: Design	10	25	10	9	1	55	
Please provide any comments you have in relation to these policies:							14	
							<i>answered</i>	56
							<i>skipped</i>	19

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	There was a mixture of opinions on supporting Policies 1 to 3.	Welcome the response.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>Policy 1- 53% supported the policy Policy 2- 64% supported the policy Policy 3- 64% supported the policy</p> <p>15 comments were left in Q5 which have been summarised below. Some comments alluded to the fact they haven't read the plan so this may have played a part of why a number of people clicked not sure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing needs to be better designed. Social housing is needed in the area and disabled friendly bungalows. • Do not build on farmland. • Infrastructure cannot cope in the village such as school and the roads. The area needs more community services to support the area e.g. dentist, regular bus service. • Like to see buildings with varied design, open space, trees and self builds. • Strongly agree with Para 36. • Wish to see mention of self-build opportunities in the policy for families in the area who want to build their own home. • Wish to see mention on considering infill sites in the area since no site allocations were included in the plan. What will be classed as infill and where should they go? • Village is best served with a mix of ages and backgrounds. • Regarding Policy 2- Question asks why the plan hasn't identified a site in the NP if the HNA states that Walpoles requires roughly 22 units of affordable rented housing and 48 units of affordable home ownership over the Plan period. • Regarding Policy 3 some design considerations are welcomed but some 	<p>It is felt from the feedback given that some respondents have maybe completed the survey without reading the NP policy itself.</p> <p>Residents had information regarding the consultation, where to read the NP document and answer the survey, posted through their doors as well as this being advertised online and social media platforms. So, it is unfortunate some may have answered without reading the full detail.</p> <p>Some comments were not specifically related to the policies but general wants/concerns.</p> <p>A call for sites was undertaken in Walpoles to consider the suitability of sites in the area to put in the local plan. However, the parish council felt at this time they did not want to take this further since there was no absolute need, and a housing requirement figure was not given to Walpole since it did not need to allocate.</p> <p>The Local Plan already covers detail on infill.</p> <p>Added into Criterion G that " New developments should integrate new trees and vegetation to improve biodiversity net gain and wildlife without blocking existing widespread open views and future views, particularly those identified in Policy 4"</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>are unenforceable. e.g. part b. materials of windows cannot be controlled unless, for example, they result in a material change to the appearance of a property or relate to a listed building; or part d. where the height of hedges cannot be controlled. Unsure what is the purpose of 'without blocking future views' in part g. as unsure what this means. Views of what, and why is this important? Why are existing views not safeguarded but future ones are?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is noted that the neighbourhood plan proposes no boundaries or settlement limits within the Designated Area. Limits to development/settlement boundaries provide clear, defensible boundaries around settlements within which development will normally be confined. Is the NDP saying that it would be acceptable for development anywhere within the red line of the Walpoles Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area? Or is it reliant upon the Local Plan or Local plan Review boundaries? It is not clear within the supporting text or within the Policies if they relate to housing proposals within the settlement boundaries within the local plan or housing proposals within the designated area. suggest there should be a clear policy saying that planning applications for new residential development will be resisted outside the settlement boundary defined in the BCKLWN Adopted SADMP (2016) or the emerging local plan. it is of note that a few years ago BCKLWN was found not to have a five year housing land supply so instead of planning applications being decided based on what 	<p>Development boundaries have already been set within the NP area under the BCKLWN adopted Local Plan. The boundary of the neighbourhood designated area relates to the Walpoles parish boundary and NP policies will only be relevant in the parish. It can be made clearer in the supporting text/policy that the policy is reliant upon the Local Plan boundaries defined in the adopted plan.</p> <p>Regardless of if the NP sets development boundaries or not the adopted Local Plan already has these set. As stated, if the Local Authority does not have a five-year housing land supply this does mean that there is more chance for speculative development to come forward in the parish and district due to the case that housing numbers are not being met. However, it cannot be confirmed if this will happen or not.</p> <p>The policies will have to be considered by the decision maker alongside the Local Plan so we do feel that the policies will have influence over the design and type of housing. As stated in the BCKWLN response the Local Authority do not like parish councils having strict wording in policies so wording such as “should” has to be used to allow flexibility which we understand to some makes the policy look weaker, but it will still part an important role. It is for the parish council to advocate the policies when planning applications come forward.</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>the local plan policies said, national policies took precedence. This meant that sites for residential development that were considered to be sustainable development were granted planning permission and many dwellings were permitted in locations that were outside the settlement boundaries. If the NDP does not include settlement boundaries could this happen again?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 23 states that 'The Policies contained within this Plan will enable us to influence the design and type of any new homes being delivered in the Parish, as well as ensuring infrastructure improvements are delivered alongside growth to maximise community benefit.' Unfortunately I cannot see that this will be achieved through the wording of the proposed policies. 	

Natural Environment Policies (Policy 4-8)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policy related to natural environment?							
Answer Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total	
1 Policy 4: Biodiversity and Green Corridors	14	17	10	3	0	44	
2 Policy5: Trees and Hedgerows	13	21	7	2	0	43	
3 Policy 6: Local Green Spaces	16	17	6	4	0	43	
4 Policy 7: Dark Skies	16	12	13	2	0	43	
5 Policy 8: Water Management (SuDS)	15	16	11	0	0	42	

Please provide any comments you have in relation to these policies	12
<i>answered</i>	44
<i>skipped</i>	31

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 4- 70% supported the policy Policy 5- 79% supported the policy Policy 6- 77% supported the policy Policy 7- 65% supported the policy Policy 8- 74% supported the policy <p>There were 12 comments left in Q6. These have been summarised below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep Walpoles the way it is. No more development. <p>Policy 4- Green Corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Roads should be green corridors; however, some people do not want roadsides being cut/mowed. Should listen to people from the parishes. More should be identified Green Corridors have been identified which follow many of the roads within the villages. However, there are none identified to the eastern side of Walpole St Andrew or Walpole St Peter e.g Chalk Road and it is not clear why. These parts of the Walpoles also provide important biodiversity corridors and habitat benefits which should be retained. Green corridors that should be included include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pyecroft Lane and green lane across field to Bustard’s Lane Footpath from Chalk Road (opposite Pyecroft Lane) across to School Lane 	<p>Note all the useful comments.</p> <p>The green corridors were established considering data available of where existing locally important habitats are within the parish as well as trees, hedgerows, hedgerow margins and water bodies. Most corridors at the moment were considered along the roadside since this is where future development is likely to come forward. Detail of how these were identified was set out in Para 66 of the plan. Also, the evidence base paper another supporting document sets out in the natural environment section maps which show areas for habitat networks, potential habitat creation areas and priority habitats.</p> <p>We recognise the residents have proposed other areas they think are locally important to be included in the plan. Added these areas to the map and explained in the supporting text that these areas have been added as being identified as important in the community survey.</p> <p>Regarding Policy 5 this has been amended with the BCKLWN comments in mind too.</p> <p>Policy 6- note the error on listing 3 spaces instead of 4. A central point was chosen within the built-up area</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section of Chalk Road between Fritch House/entrance to Black Barn House and Dunton on eastern side of road • Bustards Lane <p>Policy 5- Trees and Hedgerows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area needs more trees along the roadside and green spaces to improve the environment and appearance. • Policy 5: The wording for this policy should be stronger. It should say that all trees should be retained and protected in accordance with BS 5837 (2012) – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction. There should be a default for the retention of hedges, with reference to Policy 4, but also useful to provide some guidance on what constitutes a hedge 'which demonstrate good arboricultural, biodiversity value' for clarity. • TPO maybe ok until you get 5/6 trees you can't control freely. <p>Policy 6- Local Green Spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 6: policy text refers to 3 designated sites, but 4 are listed. • What is a LGS centre point as shown on Figure 17? What does this refer to and why is it relevant? • Grass field 1 , is a farmers field, who knows what will happen in future years, there are several more grass areas all privately owned not on the plan. • Concern that one of the green spaces is private land. Wingsfield site (LGS1) does 	<p>of the parish when considering the NPPF criteria and ensuring that green spaces were within a reasonable walking distance from residential homes and community facilities. Removed the previous LGS1.</p> <p>Policy 7 note the differing comments. There is a need for lighting for security reasons. However, the policy is promoting better design principles when it comes to lighting in external or internal areas amongst development. So, if lighting is needed this should be facing downwards etc to ensure only the necessary area such as a doorway is lit up and this does not spill into the landscape unnecessarily.</p> <p>Any future development including battery storage applications etc will have to consider the lighting principles. National Grid did give representation so are aware of the desired NP policies.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to add in a policy that references BNG % or expects exempt applications to provide 10%. 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>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<p>not want the field included. Unaware this was being included.</p> <p>Policy 7- Dark Skies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are too many security lights on all night from a number of residential and commercial businesses in the area • Lot of lights are put up for security reasons • Needs to be restrictions on the lights being fitted around the substation and battery storage areas. • There should be NO dusk to dawn lighting except motion activated for ALL new developments not just avoid there use. <p>Policy 8- Water Management SuDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dykes & Field ditches should not be fully piped for any distance other than that needed to access the individual properties. <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearly all planning applications will need to demonstrate the provision of 10% BNG. However, some are exempt, and this would be the opportune time to include a policy to say that all development, other than perhaps household development, should be improving the biodiversity of the site once it is complete by 10%. In a rural area this is important to maintain the character of the area. 	<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 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. 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>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
		Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 74-006-20240214- Biodiversity net gain - GOV.UK

Community Facilities and Services (Policy 9 and 10)

To what extent do you agree with the planning policies related to community services and facilities?							
Answer Choice		Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
1	Policy 9: Protection of Community Facilities	20	15	4	1	1	41
2	Policy 10: Renewable Energy, Low Carbon Technologies, and Associated Infrastructure	9	16	7	6	3	41
Please provide any comments you have in relation to these policies							11
							answered 40
							skipped 34

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
	<p>The majority of respondents supported both Policy 9 and 10. 86% supported Policy 9 and 61% supported Policy 10.</p> <p>There were 11 comments left on Q7 which has been summarised below.</p> <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should also include the parish churches of Walpole St Andrew & Walpole St Peter. • Not sure what community facilities there are • para 96 - 'With this in mind only two have been listed in Policy 9' – incorrect – 3 have been listed in Policy 9. <p>Renewable Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern of the dangers of renewable energy and if there is a fire there is not plans in place to protect this. • Does the policy cover all battery storage sites? • Do Battery Storage Units come under the 3 year rule for development? • Only option in Walpoles is oil or electric • In addition to the visual impact of the renewable energy projects for solar farms, battery storage facilities and associated infrastructure that have been approved in recent years, there has been local opposition to the impact upon the highway in terms of increased traffic, the damage to the roads and construction/service vehicles not adhering to the routing agreements. This is the ideal time to include additional guidance within the policy to state that any new applications should also include information relating to traffic and highway condition surveys, repair and monitoring of carriageways, adherence to transport routes, liaison with local residents, in 	<p>Welcome the useful comments.</p> <p>There are a number of community facilities in the Walpoles area as detailed in the plan and evidence base paper. Added churches to the policy and maps.</p> <p>Regarding renewable energy, major infrastructure projects relating to energy, transport, water and waste are treated as nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPS) and these fall under the Planning Act 2008 and require a “development consent order (DCO)” from the relevant secretary of state. DCOs have a 10-year rule. This would include the National Grid upgrades where one scheme is covering the Walpole area. Extensive local consultation has to take place but outside of the usual planning process- Planning for nationally significant infrastructure projects - House of Commons Library</p> <p>The size of the scheme will depend on if an application falls into the scope of an NSIP or a normal planning application. For example, Solar farms (solar photovoltaics panels) would be considered an NSIP if the threshold is above 50MW. If it is below this then solar farms will require planning permission from the local planning authority (LPA); under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.</p> <p>Battery storage (a technology that stores electricity as a chemical energy) was removed from the NSIP procedure under the Infrastructure</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
	<p>addition to details of landscaping around the site boundary, their maintenance, consideration of impact on views from local properties, demonstration of scale of structures in landscape, biodiversity net gain, quality design of associated buildings, use of high quality materials etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 109. says that Q8 of the community survey asked if respondents agreed that new housing should be environmentally sustainable incorporating low carbon technology such as solar panels. 85% of respondents said yes. Why is there no policy to encourage the use of solar panels and sustainable energy when this is what the majority of the community asked for? What about a policy to encourage reuse of materials and recycling e.g. grey water? • The use of heat pumps are considered expensive • Considers a policy on this isn't worth it because people have no say over the matter. • Floodlights for these sites should be no higher than the buildings they protect & directed / shielded so as not to affect neighbouring / nearby properties. <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial and employment use • The NDP is silent on future employment growth. Para 95 identifies that from a sustainably perspective, there is a lack of core services locally, including medical facilities, higher education, supermarkets, and a wider variety of employment opportunities. Par 98 of the document 	<p>Planning (Electricity Storage Facilities) Order 2020⁴ and instead are subject to the planning permission from the LPA under the TCPA 1990.</p> <p>Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA 1990) requires planning permissions to contain a planning condition limiting the time within which the permission can be implemented.</p> <p>The relevant time limit for beginning the development in the case of a full planning permission is not later than the expiration of three years in England. This time frame will occur for other applications too including minor and major which relate to renewable energy and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the NP policy will not be able to have an influence over NSIPS. National Grid gave representation to Reg.14 and have considered the policies and information which could play a positive role in their plans in Walpole.</p> <p>The Walpoles did a call for sites no sites came forward for economic use and we feel that the economy is covered in national and local policies already. No need to repeat wording.</p>

⁴ House of Commons 2022 Planning for solar farms and battery storage solutions. Source: [CDP-2022-0102.pdf](#) Note the NPPF has been updated since this research brief.

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
	<p>states that “Respondents also thought it would be good to have more small-scale local employment units in the area such as a farm shop, public house, or start up businesses.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even though providing a viable rural economy is not listed as part of the Vision for the Walpoles, this would be an opportunity to include a policy to encourage rural enterprise and give guidance for prospective businesses. Para 99 relies on Policy CS10 and emerging Policy LP07 and notes some of the considerations should a planning application for economic development be received. But an opinion could be given on the type of commercial activity that may or may not be appropriate in a rural area, its scale, materials for any new build, need to demonstrate traffic generation, provide parking spaces for example. Even allocating a site to provide The plan encourages parishes to consider allocations (17).The survey said people may support an allocation (would have thought they did or didn't). However, it was reflected that none of the 12 sites put forward would be allocated as there was no absolute need although G109.1 granted back in 2016 will be carried forward. • Instead windfall development will be the way forward..."sites become available for development unexpectedly and therefore not included as allocated land in development plan'. In essence I feel that nothing has been agreed the status is quo, in relation to identifying possible land. 	

Favour of the Neighbourhood Plan

I am generally in favour of the Walpole Neighbourhood Plan		
Answer Choice	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Yes	81.5%	31
2 No	18.5%	7
Please provide any comments which explain your answer:		5
<i>answered</i>		38
<i>skipped</i>		37

The majority of respondents who answered this question were in favour of the plan.

Further comments were given which have been summarised below:

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Item	Comment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not know where to read the policies • Fully support the plan • Hopefully this will give more control and voice to the actual residents of the villages. The information compiled on the plan is very detailed and impartial but fair. • NP is a bad thing if its allowing more homes and solar farms • This neighbourhood plan seems very poor compared to other neighbourhood plans I have read within the borough. Some stand out as far superior, including Holme-next-the-Sea Neighbourhood Plan, which was commended for excellence - Holme-next-the-Sea Neighbourhood Plan 	<p>Leaflets were dropped through residents doors to tell them where to reads the plan either online or a hard copy version.</p> <p>The NP is not allocating land for any types of development. The policies are to inform any future developments that may come forward in the area.</p> <p>Regarding the site allocations the parish council did not want to take forward this at this point in time.</p> <p>Note that the respondent feels other NPS are considered to better examples. However, HNTS has a completely different set of issues locally to what Walpoles have so their excellence particularly around</p>

	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
	<p>(holmentspc.com) ; Part-B-The-Policies.pdf (holmentspc.com) .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even though I used to be a parish councillor, I have found that the communication regarding the drafting of the Walpole NDP has been very poor and it has been hard to find dates of public events. These were few and far between and many of my neighbours in the village commented that they were only aware after the events had been held when they had been reported in the village Crier magazine. The working party meetings were closed meetings and when I put forward some comments at a parish council public meeting at draft stage several months ago, I was told it was too late to make any changes. • I appreciate the opportunity to make comments to this important document that will influence the future of the village for many years to come. The decisions we make today will affect our children, their children and children of the future so we need to get it right. We are all guardians of the village and it is important that everyone has a fair hearing about their ideas for the future of the Walpoles, and not just a very small few. 	<p>the environment is not relevant to our parish.</p> <p>Participation with the community has been made public and will be specified in the consultation statement on the methods used.</p>

Walpoles Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022-2036

Walpoles Parish are currently in the process of creating a neighbourhood plan for the village with the help of an enthusiastic team of local people.



Photo source: Locality, 2014

So, what is a neighbourhood plan?

A Neighbourhood Plan is a community led plan that influences how the parish develops over the next 15-20 years. The plan can help influence topics such as:

- Housing
- Design
- Protecting community facilities
- Protecting the natural and historic environment (e.g., Local Green spaces, important views)



Photo source: Google maps, 2022

What is the aim/vision of the plan?

By 2036 Walpoles will have grown in-line with the community's plan and needs, preserving the environment, important community features, providing housing of high-quality standards which suit the local's character and services that help sustain and build our local economy.



Photo source: Locality, 2014

How can the local community get involved?

We encourage all to have their say on how you wish the neighbourhood plan is shaped and what you would like the team to consider.

- Find further information within the crier and on the parish council website- <https://walpolepc.norfolkparishes.gov.uk>
- Keep an eye out on the village noticeboards at St Andrews Church, Parish Hall, Chalk Road, and Jubilee Tree Island.
- Contact the parish clerk if you are interested in joining the steering group.

Walpoles Neighbourhood Plan 2022- 2036

Walpoles Parish are currently in the process of creating a neighbourhood plan which is a community led plan that will help influence how the parish develops over the next 15-20 years.

Update on the first community consultation survey 2022/2023

The Walpoles residents and people who work there were consulted on key issues for the neighbourhood plan for 8 weeks from 1 December 2022 to 26 January 2023. The consultation included a survey with 26 questions which asked for people to share their thoughts on what they liked, disliked and ideas of how the area could be improved.

A neighbourhood plan has the ability to protect and influence development in a number of ways such as protecting demonstrably special local green spaces, important local views, and non-designated heritage assets.

It also can allocate land for development growth as well as having various policies to help set criteria for planning applications moving forward on themes including housing, design, natural environment and so on.

Examples from the survey of green space, areas with nice views and potential non-designated heritage assets are listed in the table at the back of this letter.

If you have any information to share on why a case could be made to include such spaces in the plan and assess their importance, please do share this with the parish council for further assessment.

If you disagree with any suggestions also share your views too. Not all suggestions given will necessarily meet the national criteria but will be assessed and taken forward where appropriate.

Call for sites consultation 2023

A neighbourhood plan can allocate suitable sites, if any come forward, for residential or employment growth. The parish council wish to give landowners the opportunity to put any land forward within the area for assessment preferably to cater for smaller scale development on the roadside. The consultation will run for 6 weeks between 14 August and 25 September. Forms can be downloaded on the parish council website or requested from the parish clerk.

How can the local community get involved?

We encourage all to have their say on how you wish the neighbourhood plan is shaped and what you would like the team to consider.

1. Find further information within the crier and on the parish council website- <https://walpolepc.norfolkparishes.gov.uk>
2. Keep an eye out on the village noticeboards at St Andrews Church, Parish Hall, Chalk Road, and Jubilee Tree Island.
3. Contact the parish clerk if you are interested in joining the steering group.

Local Green Spaces	Locally important views	Non-designated heritage assets
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenspace in front of St Andrews Church • Fields surrounding the Community Hall in Walpole St Peter • Recreational field • The Old Orchard on East Croft Lane and land east of the Walpole St Peter Old Rectory • Allotment land behind Church Road • Perrins land on Jubilee corner and Pit corner - end of Frenches Road. • Field uses as parking during flower festival - to side of WSP Church. • The field along Wisbech Road opposite the church and the Horse field on Wisbech Road. • Swing field and area between St John's bank and Roman Bank. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Andrews Church and St Peters Church • Wide open views at Walpole Marsh • Open views around the outer Parish environs including general farmland scapes and agricultural views around the parish and groups of wooded areas. • The views to both sides of Eastlands Bank along all of its length. • Swing fields • Community centres and associated field • The view from Follens Rd towards the river (West) • The views to both sides all along Bustards Lane • The view from Church Rd towards the school (North) • The views across the Horse Field on Wisbech Rd 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The old post office, the old pubs, and the old school. • Hughenden House on Market Lane. • Farmhouses and old barns such as on Gooses Lane, Walpole Marsh, Pigeon Street and on Eastlands Bank. • Dovecote House in Church Road • The Alms Houses at WSA Church.

Appendix C- Regulation 14 Email/Letter

From Parish Clerk <parishclerk@walpole-pc.gov.uk>

Date Tue 10/22/2024 4:35 PM

Dear Stakeholder,

Walpole Neighbourhood Plan Review Pre-Submission Regulation 14 Consultation

Walpole Parish Council, as the qualifying body, are now consulting on their Pre-Submission Draft of the neighbourhood plan review for the Walpoles.

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: <https://www.walpole-pc.gov.uk/>

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

Caroline Boyden
Clerk to the Parish Council
07908 772324

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.

Walpole Residents... Shape the future of your village

Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation

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

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

The community survey where we want your views is running between Monday 21 October and Monday 2 December . Please find an online copy available in the link above and when scanning the QR code. Hard copies of the survey can be collected from Walpole Community Centre. To return hard copies please ring the Parish Clerk, Caroline Boyden on 07908 772324 to arrange collection.



You can view the draft plan and supporting documents on Walpole Parish Council website at <https://www.walpole-pc.gov.uk/neighbourhood-development-plan> or a printed copy will be available to view at Walpole Community Centre.

Drop in sessions will take place at Walpole Community Centre Garden Room on Thursday 21 November at 10-12am and 5-7pm