

Tasburgh Neighbourhood Development Plan

Examiner's Clarification Note

Comments from Tasburgh Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group in blue italics.

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 excellent. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. The Plan makes extensive use of various high-quality maps and photographs.

The Plan addresses a series of issues which are very distinctive to the neighbourhood area.

The relationship between the Vision, the objectives and the policies are very clear and are helpfully captured in Figure 12.

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 TAS1

In general terms this is an excellent policy. Nevertheless, is the reference to the identified Local Green Spaces in the opening element of the policy necessary? *This is for clarification purposes, so that the 'Natural assets' are differentiated from the designated Local Green Spaces – for the reader, so that they do not think there are sites missing. The sentence could be removed, or TAS2 could be put before TAS1.*

Is there any specific reason why the section on Loss of natural assets does not include the potential for off-site mitigation/compensation? *No objection to amending the wording of 'loss of natural asset' section.*

Policy TAS2

This is an excellent policy which is underpinned by the details in Appendix C.

Policy TAS3

This is another excellent policy. In this case, it is underpinned by the details in the supporting text.

Policy TAS4

This policy takes a positive approach to climate change.

Is it intended to be applied in a proportionate way? *Yes*

Is the reference to 'Large development' intended to be that used in the development management system? *Yes, 10 dwellings or more.*

Policy TAS6

The relationship between the policy and the Design Guidelines and Codes is a very positive local response to Section 12 of the NPPF.

Is the policy intended to be applied in a proportionate way? *Yes*

Does the Parish Council have any comments on South Norfolk Council's representation that the Transition Area boundary should be amended so that the proposed allocation site is incorporated within the 'Upper Tasburgh' character area and so that the boundary follows the road and existing residential development, without extending into the open fields?

The 'Historic Core and Transition' area is to reflect the character of both Upper and Lower Tasburgh, including the heritage of the adjacent area. The TAS1 allocated site is situated opposite an area of transition of character. If TAS1 is designed with transition in mind, there will be a blend from Upper to Lower Tasburgh. No objection to using the rationale from the Design Code within the Neighbourhood Plan itself – wording of page 28 (2.3.3) of the Design Guidance and Codes document.

The 'Transition Area' should be called 'Historic Core and Transition' area. This covers the issue of the a sensitive archaeological and heritage site.

The Neighbourhood Plan is not resisting the allocated site, but is looking to promote a development that genuinely reflects the character of the area and delivers a well-designed development.

Policy TAS7

This policy takes a positive approach towards the location of new housing and complements the Design Guidelines and Codes.

Given the overall structure of the policy and its environmental safeguards is any purpose served by the two uses of 'only' in the policy? *We have a concern about how the policy may be interpreted without the word 'only', with a risk that an application is determined based on one policy and not considering other policies.*

Policy TAS8

The policy helpfully sets out the challenges of the local housing market. Nevertheless, has its potential implication on the commercial viability of residential development sites been assessed? *Commercial viability has not been assessed as the Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate land.*

Please can the Parish Council explain the intention of the final sentence of the final section of the policy? As submitted the 'greater number' is neither defined nor does it have a baseline. *Suggest removing 'A greater number of'.*

Policy TAS9

In principle the refinement of a policy in an adopted or emerging Local Plan in a neighbourhood plan is entirely appropriate. However, is there evidence to justify the delivery of more open space than needed to meet the additional demands arising from development? *Delivery of open space at the front of the development is to for amenity and aesthetic value (reference to Objective 2, 'complement the character of Tasburgh'). Para 7.16 and 7.17 covers the justification for both comments. Criteria (b) is to serve the development and community. Criteria (e) is for landscape and aesthetic value.*

As submitted the sixth criterion conflicts with Policy VC TAS1 of the emerging South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan. South Norfolk Council advises the requirement for vehicular access from both Church Road and Henry Preston Road was determined by consultation with Norfolk County Council Highways to make the access acceptable. In this context please can the Parish Council advise about the way in which it has addressed this matter? *The justification for this is based on local knowledge and representation as stated in paragraph 7.17. Criteria (f) – this is strongly felt by the community on the grounds of further traffic congestion and pedestrian safety next to the primary school.*

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:

- Norfolk Constabulary;
- Norfolk Wildlife Trust;
- Anglian Water; and
- Norfolk County Council.

South Norfolk 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.

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 South Norfolk Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Tasburgh Neighbourhood Development Plan

4 January 2024