**Reedham Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Examiner’s Clarification Note**

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt, matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

***Initial Comments***

The Plan provides a clear and concise vision for the neighbourhood area.

The presentation of the Plan is good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. The Plan includes various high-quality maps and photographs.

The Plan addresses a series of issues which are very distinctive to the neighbourhood area. It is commendably supported by a series of detailed Assessments which inform the relevant policies in the Plan.

***Points for Clarification***

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now able to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of the examination report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan:

*Policy 1*

This policy addresses two separate issues. The first is to retain the separation between the two parts of the village (paragraph 41). The second is a supportive approach towards development on Middle Field that will bring overriding benefits for the community (including development uses such as a new village hall, new school and playing field) (paragraph 42).

In my view there is clear tension between these two matters. It would be helpful if the Parish Council explained its thinking on this policy.

In addition, please can the Parish Council advise about any emerging or costed proposals for a new village hall, new school and playing field.

*Policies 2 and 3*

It would be helpful if the Parish Council responded to the District Council’s comments on these policies.

Has the implication of the policies on commercial viability been tested?

*Policy 4*

This is an excellent policy. It sets out a very good local response to Section 12 of the NPPF.

Is the policy intended to be applied proportionately?

*Policy 5*

Is the policy necessary now that it has been decided not to proceed with the site (GNLP3003) following the Inspector’s report on the Local Plan?

*Policy 6*

It would be helpful if the Parish Council responded to the District Council’s comments on this policy.

*Policy 7*

I am minded to recommend modify to the policy based on the factual comments made by the District Council. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

*Policy 9*

In the round this is an excellent policy. It is properly underpinned by Views Assessment.

*Policy 12*

This is a distinctive policy which applies existing Local Plan policies to community facilities in the parish.

*Policy 13*

The first part of the second section of the policy reads as a statement of fact rather than as a land use policy. Please can the Parish Council explain its thinking on the matter? Does it relate to the contents of paragraph 121 of the Plan?

*Policy 14*

In the first part of the policy what is meant by ‘certain types of commercial use’?

It would be helpful if the Parish Council responded to the District Council’s comments on this policy.

*Policy 15*

Whilst the policy has two distinct headings, they both make reference to the School. Should the first part simply apply more generally throughout the parish?

*Policy 16*

There appears to be a conflict between the title of the policy (non-designated heritage assets) and the policy itself (all heritage assets including the identified on-designated heritage assets).

I note that the supporting text makes no reference to designated heritage assets. In addition, I have concluded that the policy brings no added value to designated heritage assets beyond the content of national and local planning policies.

Am I correct to conclude that the policy should apply solely to non-designated heritage assets?

***Representations***

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

It would be helpful if the Parish Council responded to the following representations:

* the Broads Authority;
* Savills;
* Norfolk Constabulary;
* Norfolk Wildlife Trust;
* Norfolk County Council; and
* the two comments from property owners about the proposed Quay Terrace Local Green Space (LGS3).

Broadland District Council proposes a series of revisions to certain policies in the Plan. It would be helpful if the Parish Council commented on the suggested revisions (beyond the matters already raised in this note on a policy-by-policy basis).

***Protocol for responses***

I would be grateful for responses to the questions raised by 29 January 2024. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I would be happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled, please could it come to me directly from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.
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