

Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Development Plan 2013

Report by Independent Examiner

Elizabeth Wrigley MRTPI

14 March 2014



Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Development Plan 2013

Report by Independent Examiner

Contents

	Page
Introduction	3
The Examiner's Role	4
The Consultation Process	5
Basic Conditions compliance	6
National policy	
Sustainable development	
The development plan	
European Convention on Human Rights & Other EU obligations	
Other compliance aspects	9
Qualifying body	
Plan area	
Plan period	
Excluded development	
Development and use of land	
The Neighbourhood Plan Policies	9
Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation	15
Appendix 1 Background Documents used	

Photos on front cover: core connections

Introduction

My name is Elizabeth Wrigley and my role is to consider whether the submitted Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Development Plan 2013 (which I refer to as the SNDP in this document) meets the basic conditions and has taken into account human rights, and to recommend whether the SNDP should proceed to a Referendum. My role is as set out in more detail below under the Examiner's Role. My recommendation is given on page 15 of this document.

Broadland District Council appointed me as independent examiner for the SNDP, to commence examination of the Plan at the beginning of March 2014, following the completion of the final stage of consultation, which ended on 24 February 2014. The appointment was made with the approval of the Strumpshaw Parish Council.

There are two planning authorities covering the Strumpshaw Parish: Broadland District Council, and The Broads Authority. The part within the Broads Authority is in the southern part of the Parish, with a boundary along the River Yare. Broadland District Council has an agreement with The Broads Authority to facilitate administration on their behalf of Neighbourhood Plans falling in both administrations.

The area of the SNDP is the entire Strumpshaw Parish Area, including the villages of Buckenham and Hasingham. There are no other Neighbourhood Areas covering the SNDP Area.

Strumpshaw Parish Council, the qualifying body for preparing the SNDP, submitted it to Broadland District Council in August 2013. Broadland District Council has made an initial assessment of the submitted SNDP and the supporting documents and is satisfied that these comply with the specified criteria. The Broads Authority has also assessed the SNDP.

The SNDP has to be independently examined following processes set out in the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) and the subsequent Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The Area is located on the northern edge and hill above the river Yare, which is in the Norfolk Broads, an open, tranquil, large-scale environment with wide skies and scenic landscapes, which were loved by 18th century British watercolour painters of the Norwich School. The Broads area is also characterised by diverse and abundant nature, and with lively boating and sailing recreational activity bringing rippling movement to the water, and light and reflectivity in the surroundings.

I made an unaccompanied visit on 10 March 2014.

The Examiner's Role

I am independent of the qualifying body, I do not have any interest in the land in the plan area, and I have appropriate qualifications and experience, including experience in public, private and community sectors.

As an independent Examiner, having examined the Plan, I am required to make one of the following recommendations:

1. The Plan can proceed to a Referendum
2. The Plan, with recommended modifications, can proceed to a Referendum
3. The Plan does not meet the legal requirements and cannot proceed to a Referendum

I am also required to recommend whether the Referendum Area should be different from the Plan Area, should SNDP go to Referendum.

In examining the Plan, I am required to check, under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, whether:

- the policies in the Plan relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area are in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
- the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to specify the period for which it has effect
- the Plan has been prepared for an area designated under the Localism Act 2011 and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

I am also to determine whether the Plan complies with the Basic Conditions to

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; and
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Development Plan for the area.

The Plan must also not breach, and otherwise be compatible with EU obligations and human rights requirements.

Broadland District Council will consider the Examiner's report and decide whether it is satisfied with the Examiner's recommendations. The Council will publicise its decision on whether or not the plan will be submitted to a referendum, with or without modifications.

If the Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to a referendum then 28 days notice will be given of the referendum procedure and Neighbourhood Plan details. If the referendum results in more than half those voting (i.e. greater than 50%), voting in favour of the plan, then the District Council must "make" the Neighbourhood Plan a part of its Development Plan as soon as possible. If approved by a referendum and then "made" by the local planning authority, the plan then forms part of the Development Plan.

The Consultation Process

I am required to check the consultation process that has led to the production of the plan, as set out in the regulations in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Parish Council has submitted a document entitled the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement. This document describes the rounds of consultation undertaken before the final consultation period that has just closed on 24 February 2014.

I have examined the consultation background document and I am satisfied that the consultations that took place were organised and conducted satisfactorily, with information on the progress with the plan available on the parish council's web site. Specific topics were explored in additional consultations that took place on single days: 29 September 2012 for allotments, attended by 10 people, and for the Parish Community Room on 24 November 2012, attended by 50 people.

A six-week consultation on the SNDP took place from 5 July to 19 August 2013, commencing with an exhibition from 5-7 July and with a meeting at the Parish Room on the evening of 5 July 2013. Documents were made available on the parish web site, and in printed format at the Strumpshaw Post Office. The documents were available at the exhibition and via the Parish Clerk.

Representatives of the owner of the preferred site for allotments, community building and enabling housing were at the exhibition on the 5 July evening from 6 to 7.30 pm, which 29 people attended. 115 people attended the exhibition over the weekend period from 5-7 July. These are reasonable numbers on which to base the consultation outcomes.

Landowners

The Parish Clerk contacted non-resident landowners by telephone and posted CDs of the submission documents to them during this consultation. Residents who are landowners were able to respond to plan proposals through the local consultation, the advertising for which is described in the Consultation Statement, on the basis of this I conclude they can reasonably be expected to have been both aware of the consultations, and had the opportunity to participate.

Statutory Bodies

A list of statutory bodies consulted is in the Consultation Statement. These seem satisfactory, and I note that Norfolk County Minerals & Waste Department was consulted.

I am satisfied that the pre-submission consultation and publicity has met the requirements of regulation 14. The Parish Council and Steering Group have undertaken a thorough consultation process and are to be congratulated.

The District Council then placed the SNDP for comment on its consultation web portal during the period 13 January and 24 February 2014. In addition there were paper questionnaires available. A total of 17 responses were

received. I am satisfied that these representations can be assessed without the need for a public hearing. Whilst I have not made reference to all these representations in my report, I have taken them into consideration.

Basic Conditions Compliance

I have to determine whether the SNDP:

1. Has regard to national policies and advice
2. Contributes to sustainable development
3. Is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the appropriate Development Plan
4. Is not in breach and is otherwise compatible with the EU obligations and human rights requirements.

Documents brought to my attention by the District Council for my examination were those listed on their web site at:

http://www.broadland.gov.uk/housing_and_planning/5831.asp

and

<http://www.gndp.org.uk/our-work/joint-core-strategy/>

Strumpshaw Parish also falls within the administrative area of the Broads Authority so the SNDP also needs to be in general conformity with the Broads Authority's development plan.

[http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/broads/live/planning/future-planning-and-policies/local-development-framework/1\)_Core_Strategy_\(Adopted_Sept_2007\).pdf](http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/broads/live/planning/future-planning-and-policies/local-development-framework/1)_Core_Strategy_(Adopted_Sept_2007).pdf)

I have also referred to the Broadlands Landscape Character Assessment SPD September 2013 (supplementary to Policy 1 - Addressing Climate Change and Protecting Environmental Assets in the Joint Core Strategy Development Plan Document)

http://www.broadland.gov.uk/PDF/LCA_SPD_Adopted_FINAL.pdf

and the Broads Landscape Character Assessment, 2006,

http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/broads/live/planning/landscape-character-assessment/Area_14_-_Yare__Buckenham_and_Cantley_Marshes_and_Carrnew-1.pdf

National Policy

National Policy guidance is in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

According to the NPPF, a Neighbourhood Plan "must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan". Paragraph 16 states that neighbourhoods should "develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development; plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan".

The Environment Act 1995, which revised the original legislation of 1949, set out statutory purposes for National Parks in England and Wales. The Broads were designated in 1988, under The Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act, for the following purposes: the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage; the promotion of opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Broads by the public; and the protection of navigation interests.

The SNDP does not need to repeat these national policies, but to demonstrate it has taken them into account.

Sustainable development

The Parish decided to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal of the SNDP as a means of demonstrating that the principles of Sustainable Development required in the NPPF were taken into account, using separate templates appropriate for the parts of the SNDP Area in Broadland District and in The Broads Authority areas.

I have examined the report in which each policy is considered from a sustainability perspective and I am satisfied that the SNDP addresses the sustainability issues adequately.

The Development Plan

Strumpshaw Parish is within two planning authorities: Broadland District Council and The Broads Authority. The relevant development plan is therefore in two parts: The Joint Core Strategy developed by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (2011) applies in Broadland DC and the Broads Core Strategy 2007 in The Broads Authority.¹

1. Development / Local Plan for the Broads comprises:

- Broads Core Strategy DPD (adopted 2007)
- Broads Development Management Policies DPD (adopted 2011)
- Some remaining 'saved' policies of the Broads Local Plan (adopted 1997)
- A few remaining policies in the Norfolk Structure Plan and the Suffolk Structure Plan
- The Minerals and Waste Development Plans of Norfolk and Suffolk County Councils

The Broads Authority submitted their Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Document on Friday 27th September 2013, the Inspector's examination of which started in February 2014."

The Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk has been fully adopted by the three Councils, as from 10 January 2014. The JCS was originally adopted in March 2011, but following a legal challenge part of the document, relating to the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area, was remitted by the Court and redone. This process has now been completed and that element relating to the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area is also adopted. http://www.broadland.gov.uk/housing_and_planning/3615.asp

I note that there is reference in SNDP and its background documents to 'Areas of Landscape Value', a local designation identified in the adopted Broadland Local Plan 2006. In accordance with government guidance, the proposed Broadland development management DPD will be likely to replace this policy with one based on landscape character.

Broadland District Council has recently adopted The Landscape Character Assessment SPD September 2013, and the Broads Landscape Character Assessment was adopted in 2006, so impact on landscape character would be assessed using these documents.

Although, due to the passage of time, the current adopted development plan is made of slightly different documents from the ones used by the Strumpshaw Parish Council to comply with basic conditions, the policies of relevance are essentially those assessed for preparing the submitted Basic Conditions Statement.

European Convention on Human Rights (ECMR) and other European Union Obligations

Plans must comply with the Directive on Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora for Natura 2000 and European sites.² The SNDP Area contains a Ramsar site, and Strumpshaw Fen and Buckenham Marshes are in a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area. (Basic Conditions Statement pages 11-12). A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening report was undertaken to see whether a HRA was required.

The Screening Report examined sites within a 15-mile radius of the SNDP Area, and the three sites above were identified as relevant. The screening suggests that there is likely to be no significant effect from any of the SNDP policies, so a Habitats Assessment is not required. Natural England then asked for indirect effects to also be taken into consideration, in email letter 14.11.2013. In the response to the latest consultation in email letter 20.02.2014, Natural England confirms that the scale of development the SNDP proposes is unlikely to have a significant effect on designated conservation areas.

² As a 'local plan', the Neighbourhood Development Plan is required to take cognisance of the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive 2001/42/EC Office.

The Sustainability Appraisal, which also covers the Strategic Environmental Assessment requirement, and the amended Habitats Regulations Assessment screening, showing that a full HRA assessment is not required, are acceptable to the relevant authorities, and meet the EU Obligation.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan is required to take cognisance of the European Convention of Human Rights and to comply with the Human Rights Act 1998. The Basic Conditions Statement page 24 confirms the SNDP has regard to the European Convention of Human Rights and the Human Rights Act 1998.

I am therefore satisfied that the SNDP meets the basic conditions on EU obligations.

Other Compliance Aspects

Qualifying body

Strumpshaw Parish is the qualifying body.

Plan Area

The SNDP Area covers the whole of the Strumpshaw Parish including Buckenham and Hassingham. The Basic Conditions Statement submitted with the SNDP confirms there are no other Neighbourhood Plans covering the Area.

Plan Period

The SNDP covers the period from 2013 to 2026, the same period as the Joint Core Strategy prepared by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership. The Broads Authority Core Strategy covers the period 2007 to 2021.

Excluded development

I am satisfied that the SNDP does not cover County matters (mineral extraction and waste development), nationally significant infrastructure such as highways and railways or other matters set out in Section 61K of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

I note that as some sites for development are located in areas of potential for mineral extraction, the County was consulted on these matters, and is satisfied.

Development and use of land

I am satisfied that the SNDP covers development and land use matters.

The Neighbourhood Plan Policies

The Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Version dated October 2013, (I refer to as SNDP), begins by reference to the Parish Plan of 2011, with themes from that plan set out on page 3. The questionnaire sent to all residents in 2010 for the Parish Plan was the basis for forming initial Neighbourhood Plan topics.

The brief spatial portrait I find useful and accurate, although the second sentence in the paragraph on page 7 immediately below the photo is ambiguous: is the housing or the hill significantly adding to the landscape's value? I therefore recommend deleting the second sentence entirely.

Spatial Vision and Objectives

The value of the landscape is well captured in landscape assessments undertaken by Broadland and The Broads, and these could be referred to in the paragraph 4 on page 9 of the SNDP.

The vision is set out on page 9: to be "much the same" in 2026 as it is now. Detailed objectives follow. I consider that the policies follow from the stated objectives.

Policy 1

This policy is in conformity with the National and Local Policies. Natural England welcomes the policy.

Policy 2

This policy I also consider is in conformity. The settlement boundary to Strumpshaw is separating the village core from parts of the Parish close to adjoining villages, notably Brundall and Lingwood. Again I note that Natural England is satisfied with this policy. Norfolk Wildlife Trust suggests the inclusion of a list of wildlife sites in the policy. I do not think this is necessary, however if the Parish wishes, the existence of protected wildlife sites can be referred to in the text below the policy, in the same way as listed buildings are referred to here.

Policy 3

The policy advocates retaining the current settlement boundary to 2026. However there remains an essential conflict in this policy as currently written with the wording of policy 4. In the text below policy 3 is an explanation:

"The exception to this is a specific proposal...which can only be achieved on a site outside the development limits." I consider that the addition of this wording to the actual policy 3 itself will make the matter much clearer, so I recommend this **addition to the wording to Policy 3:**

"The exception to this policy is a specific proposal as outlined in Policy 4 below, which can only be achieved on a site outside the development boundary."

Policy 4

This policy is to provide a new combined community facility of a community room, toilets, storage space, allotments, car park and 10 enabling houses. It is essentially a site allocation policy.

I address the perceived conflict with policy 3 in my findings above. The provision of a community facility for a Parish meets the requirement to be in general conformity with the NPPF, promoting both social and healthy living objectives.

The concept has evolved since the Parish Plan of 2011, and also during the time the SNDP was drafted and early consultations were undertaken. I also note there were 6 objections to this policy in the latest consultations. Circumstances changed once it was clear the existing Parish Room is closing. Policy 9 addresses the Barn Hill site's future.

A new site is needed. I find the work undertaken to seek and evaluate sites around the settlement of Strumpshaw is clear in the submitted background document. However as the policy recommending a site is based on this work, a full understanding of the search criteria used is essential. I recommend that the SNDP should clearly refer in the text to this policy to the relevant document.

An objection is that there is no clear evidence at present of whether an open market sale of 10 houses would be sufficient for enabling the community room, car park and allotments, and particularly to ensure adequate drainage. I agree this is an important issue as the Area has sensitive water environments. The objector's concerns are that more houses on this site would be allowed if costs rose for the works. I find that the policy is clearly worded "up to 10 dwellings". If a planning application were to be submitted for more, this would conflict with the SNDP, and the Broadland Development Plan. The policy is also flexible, allowing for a growth in housing of fewer than ten dwellings, provided the required community facilities are also delivered here. The supporting text illustrates the interest expressed during the consultations on the form of enabling development here, and in particular in residential development.

I also consider the policy should relate to the number of allotments, and following conversations with the Parish Clerk, I recommend stating "up to 8 allotments" in the policy, as this reflects the current thinking whilst allowing flexibility for the plan period.

Map 5 on page 26 shows the hatched area allocated and is sufficient to accommodate all elements of the proposal. If any further land was needed this would need to be justified through the consideration of a planning application.

An objection remains on the evidence of need and use of the community room. I find that the brief for the community room and size of car park, drainage needs and other issues is not yet sufficiently worked out. The illustrative concept plan in the submission SNDP Map 6 in Appendix 2 illustrates, I think, 19-20 car spaces, 6 allotments and a particular housing mix of 3, 4 and 5 bed detached houses. However no rationale for this is given, so I suggest **map 6 on page 27 is only referred to as "illustrative" and is used for discussion purposes**. The text should clarify more work is required to specify the size of facility needed and the site drainage solutions, in order to proceed to the planning application.

I therefore recommend the following changes:

- i) **Delete reference in the policy to map 6, but retain reference to the site allocation in map 5.** If the Parish wishes it can include map 6 as “Illustrative” in the concept plan.
- ii) **Include the wording “up to 8 allotments” in the policy**
- iii) Refer in the text to the Trustees’ documentation confirming that they will close their existing Parish Room on Barn Hill, so the baseline option before the community when it votes is clear: the current Parish community room will not be available.
- iv) In the paragraph headed Potential sites I recommend referring to the document containing site search selection criteria.
- v) The relevant SNDP policies would apply here together with other policies in the development plan for Broadland, the Broads Authority, and the NPPF as part of the consideration of a planning application. If felt useful, a reference to this fact could be made in the supporting text.
- vi) In the paragraph headed Proposed site I recommend deleting the entire paragraph starting “In order to deliver...” and, if the Parish wished to, placing this paragraph in the concept statement document in Appendix 2.

Policy 4 would be worded:

“Policy 4: An area of land is identified for a new community room, up to 8 allotments and an enabling residential development of up to 10 dwellings, located to the west of Mill Lane, as shown in Map 5 in Appendix 1.”

Other points I have examined have not created a need to change the text.

I have addressed the clash between policy 3 and policy 4, by suggesting policy 3 is explicit that the community facilities would be on an exception site.

One objection is to access on to Mill Lane. At present it is not clear what level of traffic movements the site would generate. However this would be addressed through a planning application, in which safe suitable access provision will need to be demonstrated.

Drainage and water quality are raised as issues in this site location in several responses. I have considered the response from Natural England to the latest consultation, on 20 February 2014, that “poor water quality is one of the largest threats to the natural environment in Strumpshaw Parish”. They recommend that the site Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) address biodiversity, landscape and amenity as well as drainage.

The concept plan and design here will need to be worked up in a planning application to ensure adequate space is available for using sustainable drainage mechanisms such as swales and ponds. However, I do not suggest a change in the policy 4 wording to include SUDS as other policies at the District level exist to cover this.

The agricultural land classification of the site is not stated, it should be added to the description, and specified as one of the search criteria.

The site is described as in an 'Area of Landscape Value', a local designation identified in the adopted Broadland Local Plan 2006. However in accordance with government guidance the Broadland Development Management DPD will be likely to replace this policy with one based on landscape character, so the text could also refer to the landscape character of the area.

One objection suggests the Community Facility is just for users living in the Strumpshaw settlement. It is clear that the SNDP is for the whole Parish, including the small villages of Buckenham and Haddingham, so the Parish Community Facilities, i.e. allotments and room, should therefore logically also be for the whole Parish.

I have considered whether the enabling development would be subject to a section 106 agreement, and whether this should be set out clearly in the policy or supporting text. However the word "enabling" should make this requirement clear: the planning application could not be implemented until the agreement was signed.

Policy 5

There were no objections to this policy in the latest consultation. I note that guidance on the parish's vernacular design is proposed as a separate exercise to the Neighbourhood Plan. The policy conforms with the NPPF, and in particular to para 58 on good design quality for development.

Policy 6

Two key green features within the settlement boundary are identified, both are privately owned. I have considered whether the owners were properly given the opportunity to participate in the consultations, and I am satisfied.

The objection - as I understand it this is not made by an owner - was that it was not possible to implement this policy. If the owners consent to the policy, I see no problem with it. The NPPF enables communities to identify green areas of particular importance to them for special protection in neighbourhood plans (NPPF paras 76 and 77). **The relevant map is map 5, and the text to this policy needs to state this for clarity.**

Policy 7

Policy 7 relates to traffic safety, it received no objections in the recent consultations, and it reinforces other policies by the District and County Council. Para 32 of the NPPF requires safe and suitable access to development.

Policy 8

The Broads Authority, as the relevant planning authority, considers the Neighbourhood Plan compliant with its own policies. The Broads Authority consultation response in an email of 27 January 2014 however also suggests

that in Policy 8 a notion of size is specified for “small scale” employment uses.

As any development involving additional floorspace would require planning permission, I consider the SNDP can be combined with other policy in the Broads, including nuisance and traffic impacts, to work out if the scale sought is appropriate and sustainable. There are industrial and commercial opportunities elsewhere in the County for when enterprises outgrow their premises. The NPPF is clear in its support for the sustainable growth and expansion of rural enterprise, (NPPF Para 28), and I find that policy 8 in the SNDP is compliant.

Policy 9

This policy relates to the reuse or redevelopment of the Parish Room on Barn Hill to an appropriate new use. It is acceptably worded, and there were no objections in the latest consultation.

Policy 10

The church requires a kitchen and toilet facility for visitors, which is the subject of policy 10. I have looked at the repeated objection by English Heritage to this policy wording, as set out in their letter on 21st January 2014. There could, they suggest, be other locations in the churchyard that could provide a solution more sympathetic to the setting of this grade 1 listed building and English Heritage also recommends looking again “inside the envelope of the existing building”.

English Heritage draws attention to the NPPF. I have to determine if the SNDP is compliant with national policy, and in this case the balance between community need and cultural heritage has to lean strongly towards conserving and enhancing the appearance and setting of a Grade 1 listed church in an area close to the tourist attractions of the Broads, so that the enjoyment of its setting and natural beauty are enhanced for future generations to enjoy.

I would expect there to be a comprehensive analysis, with full designs to demonstrate that what is to be built will lead to the enhancement of the church and its setting, before a policy could be made that the location is “attached to the south side” of a grade 1 listed building. I recommend the following wording be used in the SNDP:

“Policy 10: A small facility including toilets and kitchen will be sought for St Peter’s Church visitors, in a way that will offer least harm to the significance of the existing grade 1 listed church and its setting.”

The text below the policy can suggest a preference for a search location, and the need for an appropriate design, to follow the third sentence, if the Parish desires.

General comments

I have addressed above the latest consultation comments on specific policies. There are in addition three general comments.

1. Natural England confirms that they are satisfied that the SNDP is unlikely to have a significant effect on designated conservation sites.
2. A concern is raised: “where is the provision for affordable housing?” The SNDP refers to affordable housing in the text in several places: it was a thread from the Parish Plan onwards, and several references are made in the SNDP (pages 3,10, 12, 14 and 15) but the affordable homes aspiration does not get expressed in any planning policy. However Broadland District Council’s planning policies will apply to any new housing sites in the Settlement. The Council operates a system of local allocation of affordable housing. I therefore think the aspiration is expressed, and the existing Development Plan will be sufficient.
3. The third general comment is from Norfolk County Council and confirms it has no objections to the SNDP, welcoming the changes made in response to earlier comments.

Implementation & Monitoring

The text here reflects the role planning applications will play in delivering the SNDP policies. The last sentence of the second paragraph I suggest should say “any Community Infrastructure Levy allocated to the Parish from any development will be used by the Parish Council for infrastructure related to the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Development Plan.”

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

I find that the SNDP has been prepared in accordance with the statutory requirements and processes set out in the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) and the subsequent Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan does not deal with County matters (mineral extraction and waste development), nationally significant infrastructure such as highways and railways or other matters set out in Section 61K of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Development Plan does not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area and there are no other Neighbourhood Development Plans in place within the Neighbourhood Area.

The Sustainability Appraisal, which also covers the Strategic Environmental Assessment requirement, and the amended Habitats Regulations Assessment screening, I find to meet the EU Obligation.

The policies and plans in the SNDP would contribute to achieving sustainable development. They have regard to national policy and to guidance, and generally conform to the strategic policies of the development plan for the Broads Authority and Broadland District Council.

I therefore recommend that **the SNDP, with recommended modifications,**

can proceed to a Referendum.

I make some detailed recommendations to the text in this report. For convenience, the changes to Policy wording I recommend are repeated here.

- I recommend this **addition to the wording to Policy 3:**
“The exception to this policy is a specific proposal as outlined in Policy 4 below, which can only be achieved on a site outside the development boundary.”
- I recommend the wording of these policies is changed as set out below:
“Policy 4: An area of land is identified for a new community room, up to 8 allotments and an enabling residential development of up to 10 dwellings, located to the west of Mill Lane, as shown in Map 5 in Appendix 1.”

“Policy 10: A small facility including toilets and kitchen will be sought for St Peter’s Church visitors, in a way that will offer least harm to the significance of the existing grade 1 listed church and its setting.”

I am also required to recommend whether the Referendum Area should be different from the Plan Area, should it go to Referendum. I recommend that **the Area should not change.**

Elizabeth Wrigley 14 March 2014

v2

Ends

Appendix 1 Background Documents

The documents used for the examination

-  strumpshaw neighbourhood plan [PDF, 2270 Kb]
-  strumpshaw NP supporting documents [PDF, 293 Kb]
-  strumpshaw NP consultation statement [PDF, 230 Kb]
-  strumpshaw NP consultation statement supporting documents [PDF, 13608 Kb]
-  basic conditions statement [PDF, 411 Kb]
-  strumpshaw NP sustainability appraisal report [PDF, 1163 Kb]
-  strumpshaw NP SA supporting documents part 1 [PDF, 590 Kb]
-  strumpshaw NP SA supporting documents part 2 [PDF, 528 Kb]
-  strumpshaw neighbourhood plan hra screening [PDF, 120 Kb]
-  strumpshaw NP consultation response form [PDF, 368 Kb]

Notes used as additional information in preparing the report: various sources on the web

1. Exception sites, outside the development red line “Only developed as an exception to normal planning policy”.... Norfolk RCC *Affordable Housing Guide* pages 7-8.
2. Local connection is defined as “currently lives in the Parish, needs to give or receive support from a close relative in the Parish or from villages surrounding the Parish”. *Rural Homes That People Can Afford* http://www.broadland.gov.uk/04_leaflet_2012r.pdf
3. *Rural Living Broadland* includes a report from Strumpshaw Parish in which it is clear that there was a housing issue: “lack of housing for the elderly to downsize to and for young people to stay in the village” was quoted. Interestingly the need for allotments was reported to be “a surprise given that most houses have big enough gardens. “
4. Strumpshaw Fen and Buckenham Marshes (north of the river Yare) are on the Yare Valley Cycle Route (Norwich-Reedham-Norwich).
5. A number of trains on the Norwich to Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft (Wherry Lines) services call at Buckenham station by request at the weekend. Four trains each way call on Sundays and Public Holidays, one on Saturdays.

6. Strumpshaw Fen nature reserve is 500 m down Low Road on the right. To reach Buckenham Marshes, continue past Strumpshaw Fen, turn right at the road junction and continue until Buckenham train station, adjacent to the marsh.
7. The Broads Authority has prepared a Site Specific Policies Local Plan to provide planning policies for individual sites and areas. The document will sit alongside the already adopted Broads Core Strategy DPD and Development Management Policies DPD as part of the Broads Local Plan. The Site Specific Policies Local Plan and accompanying documents have been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for independent examination.
8. According to the NPPF, a neighbourhood plan "must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan. Para 16 states that neighbourhoods should “develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development; plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan”.

• 38 Guildford Grove, London SE10 8JT • 020 8694 6226 • liz@coreconnections.uk.com • www.coreconnections.uk.com



Registered company number 5199702 38, Guildford Grove, London SE10 8JT