

Response to the Examiner's Clarification Note by Swainsthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

August 2026



Examiner's Questions:

Policy SWS9:

The supporting text provides a very helpful context to the various infrastructure projects affecting the neighbourhood area. Nevertheless, to what extent does the policy bring added value beyond that provided by the relevant policies in the Greater Norwich Local Plan, other development plan policies, and the South Norfolk Landscape Susceptibility SPD?

I note the approach taken in the first and second parts of the policy. However, is the weight to be given to the impact of such proposals a matter of judgement for the determining body rather than for a neighbourhood plan policy?

Response:

A Neighbourhood Plan once made is part of the development plan for the area and therefore it is legitimate for a Neighbourhood Plan policy to provide some locally specific guidance on the weight to be given to impacts.

The Greater Norwich Local Plan does not really address large scale energy projects and certainly does not make reference to the cumulative impacts. The Adopted Development Management Policies (Policy DM4.1 Renewable Energy) is also quite dated (adopted in 2015) and also does not address cumulative impacts of multiple schemes. The Landscape Susceptibility Study is helpful in that it does address the 'cumulative' impacts but only on landscape. It does not address potential cumulative impacts on biodiversity or residential amenity.

Policy SWS10:

I saw importance of the identified facilities during the visit. The policy acknowledges that their viability may change in the Plan period or that alternative facilities may come forward.

How has the Parish Council sought to relate this policy to the approach taken in Policy DM3.16 of the South Norfolk Development Management Policies document?

Response:

Yes, it has. The first part of the policy identifies the facilities in the parish which are covered by the policy. The second part of the policy recognises the limited level of services in comparison with those covered by Policy DM3.16 – many of which would

requires some marketing to prove they were no longer viable – this is not really the case for those covered by SWS10. Policy SWS10 also implies a slightly more relaxed approach to new facilities – Policy DM3.16 requires justification for not being within the settlement boundary which would be difficult to achieve in Swainsthorpe.

Representations made at Regulation 16

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:

- Norfolk Constabulary;
- Norfolk and Suffolk Integrated Care Board; and
- Anglian Water.

South Norfolk Council proposes a series of revisions to the Plan. It would be helpful if the Parish Council commented on the suggested revisions.

Responses:

Response to Norfolk Constabulary Representation: Requests amendments to objectives, SWS1 and SWS2 relating to secure by design and developer contributions.

The purpose of Neighbourhood Plans is to provide local distinctiveness and detail which adds value to existing national and local policies. NP policies should not repeat such policy. The Neighbourhood Plan objectives were informed by local consultation on key issues held at early stage of plan preparation and reflect the community's views on the issues they consider to be important. Objective 5 makes reference to social cohesion.

Given the expected level of growth in the parish it is unlikely that there will be much derived from developer contributions or that the scale of development would require considerable adjustments to be made for it to be assimilated into what is already a very active and cohesive community. Nevertheless the representations essentially are seeking developer contributions towards police services. These are to be balanced against other competing priorities such as education, social services, fire, health etc which are best dealt with at Local Plan level where issues of infrastructure in a wider context are considered.

The addition of the suggested wording would lead to an imbalance in the Neighbourhood Plan by favouring police service over other priorities for which there is no specific local justification and therefore is not supported.

If the Examiner is minded to include some wording, then the suggested additional criterion k could be included in Policy SWS1 up to the word 'crime' but exclude references to developer funding which are not consistent with the aim of the policy.

Response to Norfolk and Suffolk Integrated Care Board Representation: Requests amendments to Policies SWS1, 3, 5, 7 and 10 in relation to health and wellbeing benefits.

Policy SWS1: Design. The standards referred to are all either largely covered by Building Regulations or Local Plan policy. However if the Examiner considers that there is a gap in this area of policy that the NP can fill then there is no objection in principle to amended wording.

Policy SWS3: Connections and Rights of Way. No objection in principle to the inclusion of the suggested wording if the Examiner is minded to include it.

Policy SWS5: Green Spaces. No objection in principle to the inclusion of the suggested wording if the Examiner is minded to include it

Policy SWS7: Flood Risk. If this issue is not covered by Building Regulations then no objection to the inclusion of suggested wording if the Examiner is minded to include it.

Policy SWS10: Community Facilities: Support for policy is noted.

Response to Anglian Water Representation: Requests amendments to policies SWS1: Design, Para 8.26.

Policy SWS1: Whilst understanding the aspiration behind the suggested 85 litre per day limit, there is no specific justification as to why this is required in Swainsthorpe (other than an NP is being produced) as opposed to another neighbouring parish. The issue may best be dealt with more strategically at either Local Plan level or through building regulations.

Para 8.26. No objection to new wording being included to cover this point.

Comments made in respect of SWS7 and para 8.53 are noted.

Representations made by South Norfolk Council : General, 6.10, 6.14, SWS1, SWS9, SWS10 and para 6.10.

No objections to modifying the Plan as requested by these representations if the Examiner is so minded.

In addition , the Group have noted some typos and other minor errors in the submitted plan which we would seek permission to amend after the examination. These are attached and are considered to be minor in nature.

draft

Swainsthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Submission version:

Typos and discussion points

Page	Section/line	Note
11	3.4 last l	'undertakes'
	3.5 l3	'tracks' ? maybe 'tracks for goods (coal, sugarbeet etc.) and a cattle pen'
13	l2	Space needed before S106
19	Fig 11.	Remove SWS11. Make policy titles agree with those in text e.g. SWS2 New <u>development</u> not housing; SWS9 remove 'major'
20	Table	As above – make sure policy titles are consistent. 'Access policy' not policies
26	(h) l3	'refers'
	(i) l1	'..where there are purpose-built...'
27	6.14	Second sentence has no verb.
	6.17 l1	Delete 'the'
29	6.21 l5	Space needed after (CIL)
38	l5	candidates
41	8.10 l4	Jubilee Gardens (singular)
	8.13 l3	Remove space before full stop.
44	Fig 19	Is it really an aerial photograph?
	8.15 l4	'5.km' is there a digit missing or is it just 5?
	8.15 l5	Remove space before full stop
	Fig 21	No blue line – remove reference from caption
48	8.23 l7	'Importance' not 'Important'
51	Para 1 l4	Comma needed after 'impacts' or (better) split sentence here.
	Para 5 l1	Comma needed after 'nature'
	Para5 last l	'maintaining'
	8.30 last l	'occurrence' better as singular
55	SWS7 para 2 last l	Stray full stop.
57	8.37 last l	Is AOD defined anywhere?
	View D last l	'offsets' should be one word.
70	Fig 35	No blue line – remove reference from caption.
79		Map shows Jubilee Garden not Millennium Green.
85	Old School House	Delete 'when Rev Long acquired it'