

Reedham Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2038



Consultation Statement

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
OVERVIEW OF THE REEDHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN	1
ABOUT THIS CONSULTATION STATEMENT	1
SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITY	2
EARLY ENGAGEMENT IN DEVELOPING THE PLAN.....	2
EARLY ENGAGEMENT – SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES RAISED.....	3
EARLY ENGAGEMENT – HOW THIS WAS CONSIDERED IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRE-SUBMISSION PLAN.....	4
REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION	5
OVERVIEW.....	5
FEEDBACK FROM REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION	6
STATUTORY STAKEHOLDERS	6
RESIDENTS	26
APPENDIX A: STAKEHOLDER EMAIL	31
APPENDIX B: CONSULTATION POSTER	31

Introduction

Overview of the Reedham Neighbourhood Plan

1. Reedham Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Localism Act 2011, the Neighbourhood 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 Reedham Parish Council to fulfil the legal obligation of the Neighbourhood 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 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 plan.
4. It has also been prepared to demonstrate that the process has complied with Section 14 of the Neighbourhood 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 plan area:
 - i. Details of the proposals for a neighbourhood plan;
 - ii. Details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood 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 plan; and
 - c) Send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood 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 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 plan; and
 - Is made aware of how their views have informed the draft Neighbourhood plan.
6. This statement provides an overview and description of the consultation that was undertaken by the neighbourhood plan steering group on behalf of Reedham Parish Council, in particular the Regulation 14 Consultation on the pre-submission draft. The steering group have endeavoured to ensure that the neighbourhood plan 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 Reedham Neighbourhood Plan that was consulted upon as part of the Regulation 14 Consultation.
8. A significant amount of work went locally into engaging with the community early in development of the plan, so that it could be informed by the views of local people. It should be noted that development of the neighbourhood plan also builds on significant work locally to develop a Community Led Plan. Consultation events took place at key points in the development process. A range of events and methods were used.
9. An important point to note is that the plan was being developed during the Covid-19 Pandemic and therefore restrictions applied that impacted on the activities that could be undertaken. During this time the Parish Council and steering group needed to abide with national and local restrictions, adjusting the way that communication took place with the community accordingly. For example, consultation events could not be undertaken in the same way they traditionally would have been, and online became a key method of engagement, especially during 2020 and 2021.

Early Engagement in Developing the Plan

Date	Activity	Summary
April 2019	Area designation	Area designation approved by Broadland District Council and the Broads Authority
May 2019	Initial Steering group meeting	Membership of the group changed throughout the plan's development, comprising of around 10 people, a mix of parish councillors and residents. The steering group met on a regular basis throughout development of the plan, with minutes published on the website and a summary in the Outlook magazine which went to all households in the parish.

Date	Activity	Summary
June 2019	Neighbourhood Plan page established on the Reedham Parish Council website	Regularly updated throughout the process with current documents and meeting minutes.
Mid July to Sept 2021	Initial consultation and engagement with the community on issues and options for the plan	The consultation involved raising awareness of the neighbourhood plan's development, and a survey with 20 questions. Overall, there were 72 responses to the survey, around 13% of the village's population. As part of the consultation a leaflet was delivered to all households, there was content on the website, posters and social media. There was also a consultation event.
October 2021	Engagement with Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service	Mapping data of trees, hedgerow, field margins and waterbodies provided by NBIS to support development of a biodiversity policy for the plan.
November 2021 – Oct 2022	Design Codes Developed	AECOM were commissioned to develop design codes for the parish, included engagement with members of the steering group during visit to the parish
July 2022	Call for sites	Call for sites advertised and undertaken locally to seek small sites for up to 0.5ha for residential or a central village playing field. No sites were put forward.
August / September 2022	Owners of Local Green Spaces informed that their land was being considered for designation within plan	Formal letters sent to all owners of Local Green Spaces.
November - December 2022	Consultation with the Statutory Environmental Bodies on the SEA/HRA Screening Assessment	Statutory consultation, facilitated by Broadland District Council, which determined a SEA/HRA appropriate assessment would not be required.
December 2022	Informal comments from Broadland District Council and the Broads Authority	Provision of informal comments from the local authorities on the draft plan, prior to Regulation 14 consultation.

Early Engagement – Summary of the main issues raised

10. An initial consultation exercise ran for 7 weeks from 14 July to 3 September 2021. This included a survey with 20 questions. There were 72 responses which is around 13% of the village's population.

11. The main issues and concerns raised included:

- Residents have mixed views on housing development in the village. Some people support small scale development of affordable starter homes that will allow first time buyers onto the market. Some people do not want any more housing in the village.

- Preferences for size and type of future housing is quite broad with support for starter homes, family homes, affordable housing, housing for older people and eco homes in detached, semi-detached or bungalow form. 2 or 3 bed properties are the preferred size.
- Existing infrastructure in Reedham is seen to be under significant strain already – with sewerage the most cited issue. Residents want to see the current infrastructure improved to support the existing population before further development is agreed.
- Reedham residents want to see improvements to broadband and mobile phone coverage in the village.
- Residents want any future housing development to be in keeping with the village's character.
- Second home ownership is viewed by Reedham residents as having positives and negatives. Some residents are concerned that a growth in second home ownership could be detrimental to the community. Others welcome what they view as the economic boost this brings.
- Reedham is seen by residents as a special place to live. The many green spaces, heritage assets and special views are a key component of what people like about Reedham.
- There is strong support for maintaining Reedham's dark skies.
- There is support for a central playing field in the village
- Parking at the school is an issue in Reedham and residents would like to see this tackled through increasing the number of children who walk to school and increasing speed/parking restrictions near the school.
- Residents strongly support the idea of ecological networks and wildlife corridors in the village.

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

12. Based on resident feedback, a call for sites was undertaken to explore the option of allocating a site for development within the Neighbourhood Plan. This requested that landowners put forward sites of up to 0.5ha for affordable housing or to be used as a village playing field. No sites were put forward for consideration so a decision was made not to allocate within the plan.
13. Feedback in relation to design, and particularly that buildings should be in keeping with existing characteristics of the area, was fed into the work on developing Design Codes. This was led by AECOM, but members of the steering group met with AECOM to undertake an initial walk around and identify key priorities. Design also has allowed different policies to reflect the design codes in developments that will come forward. This includes a policy specifically related to design of one of the sites allocated for residential development in the emerging local plan for Greater Norwich.
14. Following feedback from residents on the importance of the local environment and preserving this, the steering group decided to designate local green spaces within the plan. The steering group considered the spaces suggested by residents during consultation and assessed these in line with national policy. Local Green Space owners were also consulted separately, with their feedback considered in finalising the draft plan for Regulation 14 consultation. As well as green spaces the steering group and parish council considered how to further protect the historic environment. The plan identifies important local views and non-designated heritage assets, which were assessed in accordance with Historic England guidance.

15. A lack of parking at the school was identified as a key issue that impacts on the community at pick up and drop off times. This was investigated further and a policy developed around future parking provision, to support improvement in this area.

Regulation 14 Consultation

Overview

16. The consultation ran for just over 8 weeks from 6 March 2023 to 20 April 2023.

17. 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
2 March 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emails and letters sent to stakeholders advising them of the Regulation 14 consultation and how to make representations. This included owners of Local Green Spaces. 	<p>An email or letter was sent directly to each of the stakeholders, including statutory consultees, supplied by Broadland District Council, in addition to local stakeholders. The email/letter informed the stakeholders of the commencement of the consultation period. The email notified consultees of the NP’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 2 March. A copy of this is provided in Appendix A.</p>
2 March 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All draft NP documents and link to the online survey were published on PC website. • Hard copies of draft NP were placed in the village hall, Post Office, café, The Ship and the Vikings. 	<p>Various methods were used to bring the Regulation 14 Consultation to the attention of local people. All methods stated the consultation dates, where NP 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 or electronic version of the survey and sending this to the parish clerk. • Providing feedback via letter or electronically to the parish clerk.

Date	Activity	Summary
		The NP documents made available as part of this process included ¹ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation 14 version of the Neighbourhood Plan • Design Guidance and Codes • Local Green Space Assessment • Non-Designated Heritage Assessment • Views Assessment • Evidence Base • SEA / HRA Screening Assessment
March 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article published in the Outlook which went to every household in the parish 	Article placed in the Outlook providing necessary information about the consultation including how to respond and where to access the draft plan and supporting documents.
March 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local advertising 	Advert published in the Mercury and the EDP with posters put up around the village. See appendix B for a copy of the poster.
Saturday 18 March & Thursday 20 April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation events 	Two consultation events held in the village hall and the Vikings as an opportunity to speak to residents about the draft plan. Nine people attended the events.

Feedback from Regulation 14 Consultation

18. Fifteen stakeholders wrote to the steering group with their comments on the draft plan, either in letter or email form. In addition, 23 residents responded to the online survey.

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

Statutory Stakeholders

Broads Authority

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Summary of response - The Plan is welcomed. The comments relate to clarification mainly, but Policy 14 seems contrary to the NPPF.	Noted. See below for policy 14.
Do the images have alt text for screen reading and accessibility purposes?	Yes, have accessibility checked all documents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 12 – ‘Local Plans’ 	Made amendments

¹ <https://Reedhamparishcouncil.norfolkparishes.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 16 ‘In the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan...’ • Para 29 – ‘Local Plans’ 	
<p>Page 11 to 20 – there is no need to repeat the policies here. It adds ten pages to the document and without their supporting text, they will be read without the necessary context. Perhaps list the names of the policies and their page numbers, but I don’t think you should repeat the policies. Also makes it difficult if you make a change to a policy in one place and then forget to make the change in the other.</p>	<p>Wish to leave it in</p>
<p>Para 35 – policy 5 of which document?</p>	<p>Reviewed and updated text-GNLP.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More 2021 Census information is released now and there may be some data relating to the Plan, rather than relying on the 2011 Census. • Some pieces of data are from 2021 and it is now 2023. 	<p>Update all with what is available, but Census 2021 data at a parish level has not got a specific release data yet when we asked the ONS Census customer service team in April 2023, so accurate figures at a parish level for 2021 cannot be confirmed as of yet.</p>
<p>Figure 10 says the date of the data is 2020, yet Policy 2 says the document’s date was 2022. Can the dates be clarified?</p>	<p>Typing error should have said 2020. Amended.</p>
<p>Policy 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the reason for excluding conversions from this policy requirement? • by saying ‘3 bedrooms or fewer’, I would suggest the developer will go for three bedrooms. Yet your data indicates more new housing should be 2 bed rather than 3 bed. To me, as written, I don’t think the policy represents the evidence. You may want to check and maybe explain things a bit more? 	<p>Conversions – because the size of the structure is already set, this limits options on number of bedrooms.</p> <p>Three beds – first part of policy requires proposals to meet local housing need and so this should ensure that proposals are not for 3 bed only.</p> <p>Added some further explanation in supporting text along these lines as how it could work.</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 52 – perhaps say, maybe in a footnote, that the BA have regard to/defer to the thresholds and standards of the relevant district, although do seek off site contributions for schemes of 6-9 dwellings. Para 53 – suggest a footnote that says First Homes cannot come forward in the BA Executive Area. 	<p>Noted – made changes to the relevant paragraphs.</p>
<p>Policy 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> says this applies to all new development – so schemes like new windows or signs? You may want to check the threshold for this policy. Policy 4 f – says ‘improve net gain’ – would ‘provide net gain’ be better? 	<p>Changed wording to all new built development</p> <p>Updated 4f.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 67, last sentence – if this is the Greater Norwich Local Plan, suggest you say that. Para 70 – says ‘the Local Plan’ – which one? Or should it be ‘plans’? 	<p>Amended and reviewed wording where appropriate.</p>
<p>Policy 6 – last few words – when you say deep, do you mean under the ground? You might want to check what you mean/write.</p>	<p>Reviewed wording- this was used in the AECOM Design Codes document so wish to keep this to conform with the wording in DC.09. It does not mean underground but just the structures depth. Added footnote/ an illustrated diagram as an example.</p>
<p>Policy 7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Examiner removed the BNG 10% requirement from Hemsby Neighbourhood Plan – you may wish to look into that and see if you need to change your policy if you wish the standard to remain. Equally, BNG standard of 10% has remained in some other made Neighbourhood Plans. how did you want people to show BNG of 10%? Using the most up to date Metric? Did you want to say that? Para 81 – BNG will be a requirement from November 2023, although small sites has been delayed until April 2024. 	<p>Retain the 10% BNG requirement, to be determined by the examiner.</p> <p>Added in reference to the most up to date metric.</p> <p>Updated para 81</p>
<p>Para 102 – says ‘there’s a probably of 1 in 1000 of flooding’ – probability</p>	<p>Made the change in the appropriate place.</p>
<p>Policy 14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting town centre uses in redundant farm buildings appears contrary to the NPPF and local policy. Para 87 for example of the NPPF says town centre uses should be in the 	<p>Class E uses and NPPF main town centre uses are different, though there is an overlap.</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>town centre. And then the glossary on page 68 says what a town centre use is and that list is very similar to Class E uses. I would suggest that this policy needs to be checked for consistency with local and national policy as it seems contrary to it at the moment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first sentence says that extensions to redundant farm buildings will be looked on favourably, but shouldn't that refer to being subject to other development plan policies as perhaps the design and impact on landscape as well as works and impact on, say, roosting bats all are important considerations. 	<p>Remove reference to offices and included text "...except where this would be deemed a main town centre use" as defined by the NPPF."</p> <p>Referred to subject to other development plan policies.</p>
<p>Policy 15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> you mention in the text the issue of a lack of standard for cycle parking for pupils – do you want to address that so that any development at the school needs to ensure cycle spaces for pupils? you don't mention scooting in any of the policy or supporting text – lots of children scoot to school and as such, do you need to have mention of the need for scooter parking? I read the policy and it is mostly about finding extra cycle provision for the school, with one small line about elsewhere in Reedham. I wonder if this policy is really clear in to what and where is applies? 	<p>No, standards likely in NCC guidance docs, which have been updated since 2007 - 2022?</p> <p>Do not wish to add reference to scooting- the NCC guidelines refers to one scooter/cycle space per 10 pupils for primary schools.</p> <p>Amended the title and rejigged the policy so there are subheadings to refer to the parish and the school clearer.</p>
<p>Community Action 4 – it sounds like a school travel plan needs to be produced or if there is one, improved and implemented. Should the Community Action refer to school travel plans?</p>	<p>Do not wish to do this.</p>
<p>SEA and HRA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This document quotes data from the evidence base – some evidence is a few years old now and should be updated. 	<p>Noted. Will update the data where possible in the baseline chapter following an update to the evidence base paper.</p>
<p>Design Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the images have alt text for screen reading and accessibility purposes? Section 4.6 onwards seem to be relevant to all development in the Broads, but is under the chapter that starts only talking about the two allocated sites. You may need to make it clear which bits are relevant to the entire Reedham area and which bits are only relevant to the allocated sites 	<p>This document was signed off by AECOM so we can not make specific changes.</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Evidence Base:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document is dated 2022. I would suggest it needs updating for the next version. • For example, more 2021 Census information is released now and there may be some data relating to the Plan, rather than relying on the 2011 Census. • Other pieces of data are from 2021 and it is now 2023. • Did you want to include parts of the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan as well as the 2015 plan? • Do you need an OS Copywrite for the maps? • Do the images have alt text for screen reading and accessibility purposes? 	<p>Noted. Will update the data where possible in the document.</p> <p>However, at a parish level Census 2021 is not available and when contacting the Census team last month on this query they said this data will not be available until late 2023.</p> <p>Yes, an OS copyright is needed for the maps and a license number is obtained. This is made clear in the text within the maps at the bottom.</p> <p>There is already mention in places to the emerging GNLP.</p> <p>The images have been checked for accessibility.</p>

Broadland District Council

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Please make sure that all photos/graphics/charts and diagrams all have appropriate titles and cite the source. Please also check that all of the documents meet the accessibility guidelines.</p>	<p>Check all of these.</p>
<p>Figure 2 (p.5)- Suggest the caption reads 'Reedham Site Allocations in the submitted GNLP (2020)</p>	<p>Amended.</p>
<p>Paragraph 30 (pg.11 -19)- It may cause confusion to have a paragraph listing the policies and community actions separate to the policies themselves. A reader may glance at the contents page, look at the summary section and not look at the policy where it sits with the important supporting text. This may cause confusion out of context. You will also see that there are further points raised in our comments that highlights discrepancies.</p>	<p>Keep as is</p>
<p>Policy 1: Notes the additional policy Reedham Village Gap.</p>	<p>The concerns were discussed and noted by the steering</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The defacto intent of the policy is to prevent any future development on Middle Field. • It would be useful to explain why this site hasn't been considered or proposed as a LGS given the clear intention to substantively restrict development on this land? • The policy as written appears more restrictive than a LGS as it would not benefit from exceptions. Such high-level restriction should require very strong justification which the BDC cannot see currently exists. • As set out in paragraph 101 of the NPPF, if it were considered as a local green space, it would be necessary to be able to show that the designation would be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs, and other essential services. The Council considers justification that considers these specific issues should be demonstrated to justify the policy. • there appears to be no proportionate assessment of whether it is actually necessary to designate the whole area or provide the very high levels of protection set out in the policy. • consideration should be given to whether restriction of all types of development is necessary within the area- such consideration could be taken into account with regard to the meaning of development. 	<p>group. It has been decided not to have a village gap policy which is restrictive of all development, but one that supports Middle Field remaining open unless proposals come forward that will have a community use.</p>
<p>Para- 32 references to the Broadland Local Plan could benefit from further clarification, given the previous explanation of the current Local Plan and the emerging one. For example, 'The current Broadland Local Plan'; 'Policy 15 – Service Villages (Joint Core Strategy 2014)'. Likewise, the final sentence should be ascribed to the JCS.</p>	<p>Noted. Made amendment.</p>
<p>Policy 2: Please see comments on Policy 3 and the HNA as this will impact on this policy</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Para 35-The sentence doesn't read correctly. We would recommend changing this to "The emerging GNLP Policy 5 requires 33% affordable on sites of at least 10 dwellings or 0.5Ha in size"</p>	<p>Noted made amendment.</p>
<p>Policy 3 (pg.29):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the 60:40 split it may be better to state 60% affordable housing rent rather than specifying % for social rent (40%) and affordable rent (20%). • Same regards to 40% home ownership (15% shared ownership and 25% first homes) may be too specific - particularly as BDC is 	<p>The policy now specifies 60% affordable rent, 40% affordable home ownership. However, in the supporting text it says that ideally it would be the more detailed</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>at present Policy neutral around First Homes. So the Parish may be tying themselves to delivery of a tenure that developers may not wish to deliver (owing to the administrative burden and additional legal costs placed on ALL parties.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Lettings / eligibility criteria proposed looks to be an amalgamation of the Broadland S106 local connection criteria and an exception site cascade. The local eligibility criteria would work well in ensuring current, former and others with a local connection can return to the Parish –but only work well with those living in rented accommodation or with family. It would exclude any persons wishing to return but living in the matrimonial home which is being sold due to a relationship breakdown. • Caring responsibilities would need to ensure this covers ‘giving or receiving support from family’ such as childcare support for grandparents (so may want to expand or clarify this point) • Local eligibility criteria-suggest ‘working in the parish for at least a year’ to ensure consistency. 	<p>split set out in the Reedham HNA.</p> <p>Disagree with matrimonial one and caring responsibilities. At least a year working in the parish is ok to include which has been made more obvious in criterion d.</p>
<p>Policy 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend reference to minimum housing space standards (such as NDSS) – particularly for any affordable units. So as to ensure they will meet the Design and Quality requirements of RP’s operating within Broadland • Design codes and checklist (appendix c)- concern this is too detailed for the scale of development likely to come forward and add a disproportionate requirement into the process that doesn’t appear to be justified. Recommend the second paragraph of the policy should be re-worded to state that applicants should take account of the Design Codes and the Checklist in formulating their proposals. 	<p>Referred to the NDSS in Broadland</p> <p>Reworded that the checklist should be used.</p>
<p>Policy 5: Previous comments on the draft plan still apply regarding criteria c and being clearer on what the policy is seeking to achieve here with regard to off road access.</p> <p>Whilst the BDC welcome the additional wording the BDC recommends that the plan provides information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what the national space standards are, and evidence is referenced. • clarify whether the plan expects the site to meet these standards irrespective of any changes to such guidance or if the policy just expects the site to meet the prevailing national standards 	<p>Avoid the detail. Supporting text – says this should be achieved unless the developer shows that it is not possible.</p> <p>Add further detail on the national space standards as suggested.</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
(whatever they may be) at the time a planning permission is granted.	
Para 70- Reference is made to Policy 5 in this paragraph – believe this should be Policy 6?	Amended.
<p>Policy 6: The policy states that “all parking areas and driveways should be constructed using impervious surfaces such as permeable paving”. This sentence does not appear to make sense.</p> <p>Permeable paving is not an example of an impervious surface. Is the policy intended to say that “all parking areas and driveways should be constructed using permeable paving”? If so would it be better to phrase it in this way?</p>	Amended the wording
<p>Policy 7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy could point applicants to relevant sources of environmental data such as the Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service and DEFRA mapping service. • It is unclear what the policy is seeking to achieve beyond the emerging requirements of the GNLP Policy 3 and provisions of the environment act? Given that the GNLP policy is not yet in place and that the Environment Act is not yet enacted, and may be subject to change, it may nevertheless be legitimate to include a policy to reflect a local ambition. However, if there is, or could be, any local nuance to the implementation of the policy then that would be of benefit. • Ecology officer welcomes mention of a minimum of 10% BNG • Examples of positive wildlife interventions the NP group can consider when refining the policy have been included as a means of delivery to BNG including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) SuDS which are designed for the benefit of wildlife see https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/documents/positions/planning/sustainable-drainage-systems.pdf and to prevent amphibians from being trapped b) lighting complies with best practice guidelines including: Guidance Note on Bats and Artificial Lighting and https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-1-for-the-reduction-of-obtrusive-light-2021/ c) Incorporation of hedgehog gaps beneath garden fences d) Incorporation of bee bricks in every dwelling 	<p>Para 85 points applicants to useful sources.</p> <p>Include the references to relevant sources recommended by the place shaping team and ecology and biodiversity officer.</p> <p>The key areas of local difference with this policy relate to BNG being delivered within the parish boundary where not possible on site, and recommendation in relation to enhancing etc. green infrastructure, priority habitats within the parish.</p> <p>Incorporated suggestions from the biodiversity officer, in the policy and supporting text, wherever appropriate. Also added further text regarding reducing edge effect from fragmentation.</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>e) With regards to bird boxes, may I suggest 1 bird box per dwelling in line with the new British standard BS 42021:2022, with a preference for swift boxes (there are swifts mapped in Reedham on Swift Mapper)</p> <p>f) FYI, information on conservation covenants was recently published by the government https://www.gov.uk/guidance/getting-and-using-a-conservation-covenant-agreement</p> <p>g) Perhaps there is scope to also request installation of water butts and compost bins.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Infrastructure Officer stated there could be more consideration given to the inclusion of GI elements in Policy 7. The officer mentioned how Reedham has the potential for many GI links to the Wherrymans Way Long Distance Trail, the Broads and to include permissive paths to improve walking connectivity. Also, reference could be made to the East Broadland GI Project Plan and in particular Project 4, which includes Reedham. GI officer also mentioned how it would be sensible to consider how people can access the important habitat around the parish (SSSIs, SPAS, SACS) or how the parish could help provide alternative routes to alleviate pressure on the Broads. 	<p>Incorporate suggestion with regard to GI infrastructure into the policy.</p>
<p>Policy 8: BDC previously commented that having lists using the same numbering convention is potentially confusing under the same policy. Subject to amendments in relation to the above comments. Whilst there is now numbers and letters, the numbers seem illogical (5-8) and do not match the numbering of the sites in Fig.14</p>	<p>Updated numbering/lists.</p>
<p>Para 95- The wording in the bullet points is a little awkward. Perhaps the first bullet could be re-worded to something like, 'limitations in the scope of the view from the areas suggested'. The second point could perhaps be re-worded such as, 'the views only being possible from certain individuals' properties in the parish and therefore not being of benefit to the wider community.'</p>	<p>Updated the wording in the appropriate paragraph.</p>
<p>Policy 9: In order to ensure that the policy is proportionate, the final paragraph of the policy would be better placed to refer to "significantly" adversely affect and any "significant" harm.</p>	<p>Updated the wording.</p>
<p>Policy 10: Avoiding light spill from internal lighting will be difficult to enforce, given that householders may choose lighting sources and placement within their own homes. BDC suggest this final paragraph is revised and, in terms of the aspiration to avoid disturbance to wildlife, the Dark Skies policy within the recently</p>	<p>Added in new proposed wording in the last paragraph. 'Proposals including prominent lighting visible from the surrounding</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>adopted Tivetshalls Neighbourhood Plan might provide a useful reference for the steering group.</p>	<p>landscape will not be supported, unless it can be demonstrated that such lighting is required in the interests of safety and security. Proposals including lighting likely to cause disturbance or risk to wildlife or the dark skies landscape should seek to mitigate such disturbance or risk.'</p> <p>Made use of the Tivetshalls NP policy but it is still not just about the impact on wildlife, it is also about dark night-time skies and being able to see the stars. So wording was slightly amended.</p>
<p>Policy 13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Example (a) within the policy could be made clearer by inserting the following: '...for the use of all which will, ideally, be centrally located.' • What is meant by the term 'appropriate'? It may be useful to expand on what is meant. • It may be better to set out that the types of development specified will normally be permitted in relation to a positive criteria as to where this will apply, and thereby limit the application of the policy. This will ensure the policy is unambiguous and that it is evident how a decision maker should react to a development proposal in accordance with paragraph 16(d) of the NPPF. • it may be better to say "significant weight should be given to the development of additional recreational provision" rather than particular support. This will help the decision maker understand the weight that should be given to such proposals in the planning balance for a particular development proposal. • It would be in the interest of the NP group to define what is meant by social opportunities to give clarity on the term to avoid risk that an inferred meaning given to the policy is different to that intended. 	<p>Updated criterion a</p> <p>Footnote the term- Appropriate which for this NP means for a rural area and so not main town centre uses which is defined in footnote 46.</p> <p>Updated the criteria so reflected positively as suggested.</p> <p>Include significant weight within the policy.</p> <p>Examples of social opportunities- Opportunities for social interaction</p> <p>Updated the policy as suggested in final bullet point.</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BDC encourage the NP group to set out the weight given to such proposals or to set out a positive policy for circumstances in which proposed development should be approved. E.g. <i>“proposals for new recreational open space will be permitted where they are: centrally located within or otherwise easily accessible from the existing settlement of Reedham; and/or, would effectively provide open space that could be used by Reedham Primary School”</i> 	
<p>Policy 14: Whilst some changes have been made from previous comments on the draft plan there may still be confusion in terms of the Use Classes.</p> <p>The BDC accepts some clarification is provided in the second paragraph. However, it would be helpful if the policy was clearer about what the “certain types of commercial and community uses” the policy would support, this could be in relation to specific types of uses or, probably more sensibly, their characteristics e.g. where the use can be carried out without causing detriment to the amenities of the area and where any impacts on the transport network or on highway safety can be mitigated to an acceptable degree.</p>	<p>See decision in Broads Authority section.</p> <p>Not include reference to highway safety etc – these are normal material considerations that would be taken into account anyway.</p>
<p>Policy 15: The BDC note that the NDP incorporated the suggested text regarding the parking provision from previous comments. However, the NP still has left the first paragraph which appears to support any development proposal that includes (potentially as part of a wider development) proposals to improve or expand parking provision for the Primary School or aid car parking issues.</p> <p>The BDC would still recommend separating these elements so as this policy does not get caught up in lending support to what are potentially unknown “enabling” development proposals.</p> <p>The advice of the highway authority should be considered in respect of the final paragraph of the policy.</p>	<p>Add in terminology, subject to meeting other policies in the development plan.</p> <p>Separate the elements of the policy as suggested.</p>
<p>Policy 16: Heritage and Design Officer suggests that Policy 16 may need to be separated into two parts- development that directly affecting the NDHA e.g., extensions where the character should be preserved, and development within the setting that needs to take into account the impact on the significance of the heritage asset (see Para 203 of NPPF).</p>	<p>Separate Policy 16 into two parts regarding development directly affecting the NDHA.</p> <p>Recommend amending the NDHA to reflect the</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Regarding the NDHA assessment and landmark status category. The heritage officer notes that the landmarks box has not been ticked even though some of the identified NDHAS arguably have strong communal or historic associations e.g., school, railway station, the chapel and American war memorial.</p>	<p>comments around the landmark status.</p>
<p>LGS Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 11 (pg.4) - There is no corresponding footnote to the number used in this paragraph. • LGS1 – As this site is leased from the Diocese of Norwich, please can you confirm if they have been consulted on this proposal? 	<p>Amended para 11.</p> <p>The Diocese of Norwich were contacted but never responded. They were contacted the same date as other landowners.</p>
<p>Important Views Assessment:</p> <p>View 7 includes a private grassed area – can this be included?</p>	<p>Yes, this private grassed area can be viewed by the public.</p> <p>Changed the text to include a 'private garden' for the picture on p53. Make sure this is reflected in the list of LGSs in policy 8, mentioning 'private garden', and in the map of LGSs.</p>
<p>Housing Needs Assessment</p> <p>These comments were made previously on the draft document but do not appear to have been updated for Regulation 14 so are being submitted again.</p> <p>Housing Enabling Officer Page 5 (Statement 6 and therefore 7 and later calculations) state that 40% of new housing will be Affordable rather than the 33% in JCS or 28% as per the previous SHMA (or reverting back to 33% as per the emerging Local Plan). It seems that the figure may have been taken from the Affordable Housing supplementary planning document, some elements of which are now out of date. We have not had 40% AH since the JCS (Policy 4) was adopted in 2014. This will mean any calculations within the HNA will need to be updated, as will the relevant planning policies in the main NP.</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>However, the HNA was provided by an external consultant, AECOM, and this final document has already been signed off and completed so we cannot influence editing this at this stage.</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Design Guide: These comments were made previously on the draft document but do not appear to have been updated for Regulation 14 so are being submitted again.</p> <p>Senior Heritage and Design Officer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath map on p15 is missing FP17 which is quite a key route to the school • P15 – could mention that this is the only road crossing on the Yare between Norwich and Yarmouth. This is mentioned on p16 in the landscape character and wildlife section but might be better on p15. 10 Section Response Also the Wherryman’s Way is a significant county footpath/trail through the area. This is also mentioned on p20 but it seems right to include it on the footpath map in this section. • P16 There is quite a lot of history of grazing on the marshes and associated farming which could be mentioned – the section seems to be wildlife orientated but there is ‘way of life’ in farming practices and some barns were specifically designed for stock grazing on the marshes. • P29 – if cul-de-sacs are private drives then it is better to separate footpaths. • P30 – there is a statement that says there should not be 3+ terraces as it does not reflect the character of Reedham – however photo top right shows a terrace of six houses - so the guidance appears contradictory – even though this is the only longer terrace in the settlement. • P31 – it should say low flint walls and not refer to them as stone to avoid misinterpretation. • P32 – I would suggest adding the following to the sixth bullet point. “The use of flint, timber and weatherboarding, normally as a secondary material, to add distinctive features to buildings is preferred;” • There does not seem to be much detail on achieving tenure blind or integrated development – particularly as there is quite a high proportion wanted to be achieved for affordable housing, so you might want to consider this further. 	<p>Note the comments. However, the Design Codes document was developed by AECOM and this final document has already been signed off and completed so we cannot influence editing this at this stage.</p>

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Ecology	
Visions and objectives: Objective B strongly supported.	Welcome the support
<p>Policy 7: Supported however item b wording may be too restrictive since it could not be guaranteed that registered net gain providers would be available within the parish boundary. Recommend changing this to:</p> <p><i>Delivery of biodiversity net gain on site wherever possible and if it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible then delivery elsewhere in the Parish boundary or suitable available locations in the local area</i></p>	Updated
<p>Para 81- This could be updated to: <i>Mandatory BNG is expected to come into force from November 2023, with secondary legislation and detail due by summer 2023.</i></p>	Updated
Community Action 1: Strongly supported	Welcome the support
Lead Local Flood Authority	
<p>LLFA welcomes reference to various sources of surface water and fluvial flooding. However, there is no reference to groundwater flooding. Policy 11 and the supporting text and Community Action 2 could have particular relevance to this.</p>	<p>Added in more detail in the appropriate places regarding groundwater flooding where feasible.</p> <p>No available mapping data sets which are free/open source for groundwater flooding.</p>
<p>LLFA welcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the inclusion of Objective H within the vision and objectives • consideration to flooding in Policy 4 supporting text and the design guidance checklist within Appendix C • reference made to sustainable drainage within the flood and surface water management section. • reference to the Greater Norwich SFRA Final Report Level 1 2017 • recognition of Para 102 and that flooding can cause serious damage/impact • reference made in the NP supporting the delivery of the strategic policies contained in the NPPF and Local Plans. • the inclusion of community action 2 and being proactive with appropriate stakeholders. 	Noted.

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>LLFA recommends that a full review of flooding within the Parish should be carried out to assess all forms of flood risk in the area, including flood risk from surface water, groundwater, and ordinary watercourses, supported by relevant mapping.</p>	<p>Noted will look into updating the NDP and evidence base including mapping.</p> <p>No available mapping data sets which are free/open source for groundwater flooding. However, the other forms of flooding where data sets are available are up to date.</p>
<p>Recommend Policy 11 is strengthened and makes reference to all sources of flooding including the four pillars of SuDS and set out the role that sustainable drainage systems can play in contributing towards other benefits such as sustainable development and wildlife.</p>	<p>Added further detail/source regarding four pillars and strengthening the policy.</p> <p>Reference to SuDS benefiting wildlife is addressed in the biodiversity policy.</p>
<p>The LLFA also note that large areas of the Parish lie within Internal Drainage Board Areas, namely the Waveney Lower Yare and Lothingland IDB, The Broads IDB, with Reedham also lying on the north bank of the River Yare (Environment Agency main river) with parts of the Parish located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Recommend adding in reference to the IDB areas within the NDP and mapping on this matter.</p>	<p>Included within the plan reference to IDB areas in the text. Other information already was within the supporting text.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends inclusion of EA flood mapping for surface water flooding and surface water flowpaths • Recommends the most up to date version of the NCC LLFA Statutory consultee for planning guidance document at time of adoption - Information for developers - Norfolk County Council 	<p>Included within the plan and evidence base.</p> <p>Added in updated planning guidance.</p>
<p>Community Action 2 - The LLFA comments that whilst the LLFA have powers to enforce maintenance on ordinary watercourses that are not within Environment Agency or IDB areas, the LLFA do not have any responsibility for maintenance these watercourses. This is the responsibility of riparian owners. Where there is evidence that a lack of maintenance is causing flooding that meets LLFA impact thresholds the LLFA will seek to resolve the situation by means of negotiation with the person responsible</p>	<p>Noted. Added this in as a footnote for community action 2.</p>
<p>No comments were left in the representation from the NCC Historic Environment Team.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Anglian Water

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Policy 6: Welcome the policy requirements for all parking areas and driveways to be constructed using permeable paving to minimise surface water runoff. We suggest that the sentence is amended to remove the word ‘impervious’ as this suggests the surface should be impermeable rather than permeable. Suggested change:</p> <p>All parking areas and driveways should be constructed using impervious permeable surfaces such as permeable paving to minimise surface water runoff.</p>	<p>Noted and made the change AW suggested.</p>
<p>Policy 8: AW assets are located within or close to the boundaries for sites LGS2, 3, and 4. Policy considered adequate to enable AW to access infrastructure where required, eg for maintenance and repairs.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Policy 11: Supports the aim of the policy to minimise the risk of surface water flooding through the use of SuDS. The policy or supporting text could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the surface water drainage hierarchy with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to a suitable watercourse and then connection to a sewer. • Refer to the Government’s intention to implement Schedule Three of The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to make SuDS mandatory in all new developments in England in 2024. • Mention that AW requires any connections for surface water to be modelled to assess whether there is capacity in our network to accept the flows and any upgrades that may be required are at the developer’s expense. 	<p>Noted added in reference to the surface water drainage hierarchy.</p> <p>Added in the points where necessary including supporting text and footnotes.</p>
<p>Community Action 3: Note the Parish Council’s intention to work with Anglian Water to improve the maintenance of the sewerage system in Reedham. AW welcome engagement to discuss any concerns the Parish Council and wider community may have with the network.</p>	<p>Noted and welcome engagement.</p>
<p>Overall comments: Anglian Water is supportive of the aims of the Reedham Neighbourhood Plan subject to the clarifications highlighted.</p>	<p>Noted will take these points on board.</p>

National Gas Transmission

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission's assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure.</p> <p>National Gas Transmission has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area. National Gas Transmission provides information in relation to its assets at the website below. · https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/network-route-maps</p>	Noted.

National Grid

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to NGET's assets which include high voltage electricity assets and other electricity infrastructure. NGET has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	Noted.

National Highways

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
No comment	Noted

NHS- Norfolk and Waveney (on behalf of Norfolk and Waveney ICS, incorporating Norfolk & Waveney Integrated Care Board (ICB), Norfolk Community Health and Care (NCHC), Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust and the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST))

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Comments on existing healthcare position proximate to the development plan area:</p> <p>The provision of healthcare services is currently serviced by Acle Medical Partnership, Reedham Branch. In terms of premises space, the demand and capacity data indicate that this practice is marginally constrained and the majority of residents within the Reedham neighbourhood plan boundary from new developments, will be expected to register and visit a local GP. In terms of limited premises space, and with the addition of new developments in and around the area in the near future, capacity issues have potential to arise.</p> <p>The Primary Care Network are looking at ways to better integrate community teams with primary care provision.</p>	<p>Added to the supporting text.</p>
<p>Welcomes the inclusion of the objective “Protect and enhance important community facilities including recreational opportunities that are accessible to all ages”</p>	<p>Noted and welcome the support.</p>
<p>Supportive of Policy 12 and welcomes the inclusion of the local doctor’s surgery designated as a community facility for protection.</p>	<p>Noted and welcome the support.</p>
<p>Para 13 refers to Reedham as an appropriate area for limited growth. The local GP practice is constrained, and any further growth would place additional pressures on their services which could have an impact on the local residents.</p> <p>The ICS would welcome acknowledgement that to protect and maintain a sustainable healthcare service in the area, contributions via the local parish CIL funding may be required for reconfiguration or extension of local healthcare facilities to manage the additional impacts in the future.</p> <p>The ICS would welcome the addition of a simple statement to confirm that Reedham Parish Council will support the ICS for the residents of Reedham through the utilisation of local CIL.</p>	<p>Noted comments on the GP being constrained added this into para 13.</p> <p>No, this is what the main body of CIL is for, not parish CIL, as this is more of a strategic infrastructure matter.</p>

Water Management Alliance

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Reedham falls partially within parts of the Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) of the Broads Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and the Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland IDB, members of the WMA. Therefore, the Board's Byelaws apply to any development within a Board's area.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Two sites have been allocated in the GNLP - whilst sites have not been allocated within the Reedham neighbourhood plan, in order to avoid conflict between the planning process and the Board's regulatory regimes and consenting processes, please be aware of the following where developments are proposed within or partially within the Board's IDD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Byelaw 3, Byelaw 4, Byelaw 10, Byelaw 17 and S.23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 <p>Byelaws are separate from planning, the ability to implement a planning permission may be dependent on the granting of these consents. As such I strongly recommend that the required consent is sought prior to determination of the planning application.</p>	<p>Noted will keep advice in mind offered by the WMA.</p>
<p>Policy 11: Welcome the inclusion of SuDs</p>	<p>Noted and welcome the supportive comment.</p>
<p>Community Action 2: Welcome the PC working with appropriate bodies to ensure maintenance of watercourses particularly LLFA.</p> <p>Recommend including reference to the Internal Drainage Boards specifically as regulators of riparian watercourses within their districts. This is because works to watercourses (such as surface water discharges and/or any alterations of said watercourses) will require consent from the relevant regulatory body (the Board where within an IDB district) therefore it would be beneficial for the Boards to be included in the plan.</p>	<p>Noted and included reference to the IDBS in community action 2.</p>

Freethorpe Parish Council

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Parish Council supported and admired the plan. No adverse impacts on Freethorpe parish were identified.</p>	<p>Welcome the comments.</p>

Savills on behalf of Middle Field Landowner

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Regulation 14 draft version sought to provide protection against development in the village gap identified in Policy 1.</p> <p>As identified in national policy a neighbourhood plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies within the development plan for the area. The adopted JCS plan for Broad or the emerging GNLP does not refer to village gaps, and it is difficult to understand where the term is derived from and if it holds any weight in supporting local plan policies.</p> <p>The landowner does not feel that Middle Field is an appropriate or logical location to adopt as a village gap. Reasons being that there is continual residential development abutting the southern boundary, development should be placed in sustainable locations and this area is considered sustainable for development.</p> <p>Consider that Policy 1 Village Gap does not align with the requirements of Policy 13 for provision of new community facilities. Middle Field represents a significant portion of land to the size and scale of Reedham and identifying this as a village gap will only restrict the potential for community facilities or residential development.</p>	<p>The representation has been based on the previous wording In Policy 1 for Middle Field which was to protect the area as a village gap.</p> <p>However, consideration has been given to comments made by numerous stakeholders at Regulation 14 and is instead not specific on designating Middle Field as a village gap, but Policy 1 is setting criteria for the site if any development did come forward in the future.</p> <p>The policy now seeks to support keeping this area of land open due to its visual contribution to the parish, unless proposals will provide overriding community benefits such as community uses like a new community hall or school playing field which links to Policy 13.</p>

Landowner email regarding the Middle Field policy

Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Dear Claudia,</p> <p>At the meeting 31st May it was agreed that the 'Village Gap' idea was to be deleted from the document. We discussed that a 'Village Gap' was not a recognised term and that classifying it as such would rule it out as ever being a site for a new Village School, new Village Hall or Central Playing Field. We also discussed that there would need to be an element of housing to make this work ie make it viable.</p>	<p>The steering group discussed the comments put forward by the landowner. Agreed the policy would not be called a village gap and has now been changed to Middle Field.</p> <p>Wording in the policy has been amended to include the suggestions of appropriate</p>

<p>The original consultation with residents (Sept 2021) identified a strong support for a Central Playing Field. Responders did NOT express a wish that there should be no development on Middle Field. I think most planners would agree that it is the most logical and sustainable place to develop in the medium to long term. Development on Middle Field would prevent outward sprawl and provide a focal point for the village.</p> <p>As you are aware, it was a complete surprise to me to discover that Middle Field had been classified as a 'Village Gap'. I was an active member of the NP Steering Group until my wife became terminally ill. The NP was virtually complete when I left the group. It was just being tweaked here and there. It appears that after I left the group the term 'Village Gap' was invented. The owners of the Local Green Spaces (LGS) were all contacted and informed that their land had been designated as such. The Village Gap is more restrictive than LGS so I should definitely have been informed. I am a bit surprised that Collective Community Planning agreed to this.</p> <p>The owners of LGS were given a few weeks to respond. I would be grateful for a similar amount of time to respond. My comments should then be included within the Consultation Statement.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Chris Mutton</p>	<p>community uses including a new village hall, new village school or new central playing field that could come forward on the site.</p> <p><i>“An area of land between the two distinct parts of the village settlement, as defined in Figure 7, should remain open unless development proposals are for a community use. Appropriate community uses that will be supported on Middle Field include schemes such as a new village hall, new village school or new central playing field, subject to compliance with other development policies.”</i></p>
---	---

Residents

Number of responses were 13 in total via the online survey.

Housing

Section of the online survey	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Housing policies	Strong support for policies, particularly Policy 1, 2 and 6.	Welcome overall agreement and note the comments raised by residents/consultees.

Section of the online survey	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
	<p>There were 6 comments left regarding the housing policies. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall additional housing should be supported by additional infrastructure including medical, educational, and utility services. • Any development coming forward should undergo rigorous assessment to establish existing infrastructure can cope with additional demands. • The NP should reference that Reedham is within a Nutrient Neutrality Zone with regard to housing development needing to deliver efficient and effective NN mitigation • Disappointing in the design section that Barn Owl Close is an example of new development design due to the poor landscaping, hard engineering, and intrusive features. • Concern that Mill Road Site density is too high and in excess of the 10-20 range indicated for each site at point 13 of P4 under neighbourhood planning. • 30 dwellings seems unnecessary at either of the proposed sites indicated in the GNLP since 24 dwellings have been delivered on the Station Road site (Barn Owl Close). 	<p>Regarding the GNLP sites these are established in the Local Plan, outside of the NP influence, so these figures cannot be changed in the NP.</p> <p>Reference to nutrient neutrality is not needed in the NP since Reedham does not fall in the boundaries of the surface water catchment maps- Cadcorp SIS WebMap 9 - FindIT (north-norfolk.gov.uk) and nutrients-catchment-map (southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk).</p> <p>No further changes.</p>

Natural Environment

Section of the online survey	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
<p>Natural Environment Policies</p>	<p>Policy 7 to Policy 11 overall had agreement or strong agreement from the online respondents.</p> <p>There was one strong disagreement on Policy 8 (LGS) and this links to the objection of a landowner not wishing for their private garden at Quay Terrace being designated. A few comments left about this LGS included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the area was privately owned • people already fail to respect this area as private property • there is a covenant in existence to prevent inappropriate development already • the title for this LGS should be changed if this stays in to state the area is 'private'. • Figure 14 should be amended to show Quay Terrace extending to the slipway. <p>One comment noted that page 45 needs to be amended with the correct listing of green spaces reading 1 to 4 not 5 to 8. Another comment on green spaces is the loss of these to any size of development will be detrimental to the area.</p> <p>For the biodiversity policy it was suggested that the reinstatement of farmland invertebrate strips would significantly help biodiversity whilst providing local amenity.</p> <p>For the dark skies policy, it was considered that controlling new development is essential but retrofitting external lights can be a problem for households and businesses since</p>	<p>Welcome the overall agreement with the policies.</p> <p>LGS3- Quay Terrace Group has been discussed and the decision is to leave this as it is.</p> <p>LGS3 boundary in the relevant figure amended to go right up to the slipway.</p> <p>Also, its title now has reference to it being a green private area.</p> <p>Updated LGS numbers.</p> <p>No further change.</p>

	<p>older fittings are replaced by LEDS which can have inappropriate power. So how might this be controlled?</p> <p>One comment for surface water management stated this will only worsen existing problems and damage the environment which is what one felt has happened as the Barn Owl Close development.</p>	
--	--	--

Community facilities

Section of the online survey	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Community facilities section	Policy 12 to Policy 14 overall had agreement or strong agreement from the online respondents.	Welcome the overall agreement with the policies.

Transport and accessibility

Section of the online survey	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Transport and accessibility section	<p>Policy 15 overall had agreement or strong agreement from the online respondents.</p> <p>Comments raised the issue of school parking and the hazard this creates for both the children and residents. It is encouraged that the village should be promoting walk to school initiatives to reduce driving. Also, it is raised that whilst parking is a problem where could alternative space be provided to address this concern.</p>	<p>Welcome the overall agreement with Policy 15.</p> <p>Note in the online survey Q8 was labelled as Policy 14 when in fact it was Policy 15- Parking Provision within Reedham.</p> <p>Acknowledge the comments raised for the concern of school parking and the need to promote better initiatives for encouraging walking to school where possible.</p> <p>The PC are working along the lines of discussing with the school and appropriate</p>

Section of the online survey	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
		stakeholders' ways to encourage children to walk to school to create a behavioural change amongst children and parents.

Historic Environment

Section of the online survey	Stakeholder comments to the Regulation 14 consultation	NDP Response
Historic environment section	<p>Policy 16 overall had agreement or strong agreement from the online respondents.</p> <p>One comment raised that for No 6. Gospel Hall - if this has now been sold with plans to convert to a house, is it too late to include in the Plan?</p>	<p>Welcome the overall agreement with Policy 16.</p> <p>Regarding the question raised by a respondent. It is not considered too late to include Gospel Hall in the NP since if plans are being put in place currently or in the future to convert the building then they must have regard to the policies intentions.</p>

Appendix A: Stakeholder Email

REEDHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Chairman: Tony Noon
Clerk to Reedham Parish Council: Mrs Claudia Dickson
31 Mill Lane, Acle, Norfolk NR13 3BJ
reedhampc@outlook.com
07769 972902

2nd March 2023

Dear Stakeholder

Reedham Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Regulation 14 Consultation

Reedham Parish Council, as the qualifying body, are now consulting on their Pre-Submission Draft of the neighbourhood plan for Reedham. This consultation is in line with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012) and will run for a period of 8 weeks from 6th March 2023 to 28th April 2023.

The consultation offers a final opportunity for you to influence the Neighbourhood Plan before it is submitted to Broadland District Council and the Broads Authority.

There will be 2 consultation events where members of the Neighbourhood Plan group will be available to discuss the plan and answer any questions:

Saturday 18th March 2023, 10am-12pm, at Reedham Vikings Social Club, The Hills

Thursday 20th April 2023, 7pm to 9pm, at the Village Hall, Pottles Lane

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

An online survey can be completed by following this link - [Reedham Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation \(smartsurvey.co.uk\)](https://reedhampc.norfolkparishes.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan/).

All comments received by 29th April 2023 will be considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 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.

Comments can also be sent to Mrs Claudia Dickson via email reedhampc@outlook.com or post them to 31 Mill Lane, Acle, NR13 3BJ.

Appendix B: Consultation Poster

REEDHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Tell us what you think

A consultation will run from Saturday 6th March until Friday 28th April 2023

Details of the plan can be found on the Parish Council website (reedhampc.norfolkparishes.gov.uk) a link on the website will take you to a survey form which you can complete online.

For those that cannot complete the survey online paper copies of the plan and survey forms are available at the Doctors Surgery, Village Hall, Post Office, Café The Ship or by request to the Parish Clerk (reedhampc@outlook.com) or Telephone No. 07769 972902

Consultation events will also be held at the following locations

Reedham Vikings Social Club - Saturday 18th March 10am until 12noon

Reedham Village Hall - Thursday 20th April 2023 7pm until 9pm