CONSULTATION PROCESSES INVOLVED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE SNETTISHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

**General:**

Throughout the entire process of preparing Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan [SNP], regular updates have been given by members of the Group at Full Council meetings. These are monthly, open, public meetings, and the minutes are posted on the SPC website. In addition, any meetings or further consultations have been advertised on the SPC facebook page, and in the Clerk’s notes in the TORC newsletter - the relevant sections are included below. There have also been presentations at the Village Fete, in July 2016, and at SPC’s annual Open Meetings (April 2016 and 2017). There were no specific responses in writing to any of these events or communications. However, much verbal support was demonstrated for the principle of the Plan, and questions and points raised in the early stages were incorporated into the first draft of the Plan – it should be stressed that the Plan was not drafted until the results of the Questionnaire were received – hence it was resident-driven from the outset.

In addition, from 9/11/16 the Team have had regular correspondence with BCKLWN officials, and two meetings (5th December, 2016 and 15th February, 2017) in the Village. The purpose of this was to assess the first substantive drafts of the Plan, to ensure the most suitable approach was being followed. This developed into a constructive working relationship, where ideas were proposed, discussed with BCKLWN, amended if appropriate, and incorporated into subsequent drafts. It is not proposed to publish all this correspondence which runs into dozens of emails, varying from detailed legal matters to one-line approval of suggestions. It is felt that this relationship has allowed BCKLWN to have full input into the Plan, and that SPC have been able to avoid the problem of future objections from the Borough. It should be added that this input was mainly on technical matters, wording, level of detail required and layout, rather than intervention on policies.

**History:**

Following Council agreement to the setting up of a Working Group to develop a Plan, the first stage was the designation of the Plan Area. This went out to consultation from BCKLWN from 2/5/16 to 13/6/16. There were no comments on this.

Meetings followed to consider the scope of the Plan and likely areas of concern to residents. A questionnaire was then (July 2016) published via the TORC and elsewhere – details of this, and the 102 responses, are in Appendices 2-5. There were open questions, to allow for ideas which the SNP Team had not considered to be raised. It was on the basis of this that the main priorities of the Plan were agreed, and the first drafts prepared.

---

1 Snettisham Parish Council
2 Published three times a year, and delivered to all households – print run 1550+
3 Council runs these to show its work (and that of other local groups) to the Public
4 Borough Council of King’s Lynn and West Norfolk – approval of area available on its website
Having had the first meeting with BCKLWN and with the process being far enough advanced to have something to present, two additional Open Meetings were held in the Village Memorial Hall (20th and 21st January, 2017). The draft Plan was shown for the first time – it was also available on the SPC website. All attendees, or visitors to the website, were asked to complete a comments sheet, to ascertain the level of satisfaction with the thrust of the Plan. At least 73 attended, and 31 filled in response sheets. Most comments related to matters outside the scope or power of the Plan. Of the remainder the only concerns expressed by more than one respondent were on: total numbers of new dwellings (two felt too high, two felt too low) and the proportion of affordable homes (preference for higher). There were two more detailed responses, one in writing from Pigeon – see below - and a meeting with Mr Clark, along the lines of Appendix 10.2

To produce a quantitative measure of these 31 responses, a questionnaire with no negative comments was given a nominal score of five marks; every negative comment reduced that by one mark. The overall level was over 92% in favour of the Plan and its policies.

**Pigeon Investments:**

In May, 2016, Council had been approached by Pigeon regarding a “Community-led” development in the Village. They had been appointed by the landowners of the Poppyfields site, to look at potential development, before the Plan was mooted. SPC agreed to meet them and hear their proposals. At that point, the only NP activity had been the designation of the area for the Plan – i.e. the Parish boundary. It was agreed that Pigeon, and the landowners, would be informed of the evolving process, but only at the same time as information was made available to the public generally – there was a wish to avoid any suggestion of giving commercial advantage. This has continued to date, with additional update meetings.

On this basis, Pigeon were invited to the Public Meetings in January 2017 and produced a set of detailed comments – included as Appendix 8. As can be seen, some of the wording they suggested was incorporated into the Plan, especially where it aided clarity.

It should be noted that the areas which Pigeon suggested initially for their proposals are largely congruent with the eventual areas which the SNP proposes (Poppyfields site is smaller in SNP). This was a result entirely of public responses in the Questionnaire, and the analysis of possible sites as shown in detail in the Plan itself.

**SEA/HRA:**

BCKLWN informed SPC in February 2017 that both SEA and HRAs would be required, principally due to the existence of an area allocated for housing.

---

5 See Appendix 7 of this document
6 Strategic Environmental Assessment
7 Habitat Regulations Assessment
development. The Scoping Report for the SEA was sent out to statutory bodies for consultation by the Borough, with the latest NP draft. Three responses were received (Appendix 2). Other than generic references to Plan requirements there was acceptance of the process, but no comment on the details.

The SEA proper was then produced, and conversations with the consultant led to some changes to mapping, layout etc. The SEA itself produced three recommendations on policies:

**NP08** - Could include more specific criteria pertaining to energy and water consumption, biodiversity enhancement and/or surface water drainage requirements.

**NP12** - Ensure that any planning application received for commercial development is accompanied by any relevant assessments of the impact of the proposal on noise, vibration, traffic increases, air pollution, dust, etc.

**NP15** - Could include more specific criteria pertaining to expectations about how planning proposals can enhance the landscape, visual impact, biodiversity, etc. and/or require that planning applications are accompanied by an ecological assessment and/or a landscape and visual impact assessment.

Regarding these, the Group decided to make no amendments to the Policies, since the NPPF itself required some of this, and the detail in NP08 was beyond the competence of the NP Team.

**Pre-submission consultation:**

This was formally announced in the Press (Lynn News) on 23/6/2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC NOTICE: SNETTISHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under the Localism Act, 2011, and subsequent amendments and additions to legislation, Snettisham Parish Council announces that the pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan is available for public consultation from June 25th to August 7th 2017, by which date all representations should be received. The plan is available online at <a href="http://snettishamparish.norfolkparishes.gov.uk">http://snettishamparish.norfolkparishes.gov.uk</a> or at the Parish Office, 73 Lynn Rd, Snettisham. PE31 7QA. Correspondence to the Clerk by email to <a href="mailto:snettishamparish@btconnect.com">snettishamparish@btconnect.com</a>, or the Office as above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, press releases were sent to the Eastern Daily Press, Hunstanton Town & Around, Lynn News, & Your Local Paper.

---

8 Both HRA and SEA processes were conducted on the basis of revised areas within the Plan which became those in the final version.

9 Please note that over time policy numbers may have changed – it should be clear from the context which policies in the final document are under discussion.
Additionally, this stage of the SNP development was promoted once more in the TORC newsletter (July 2017), on the Parish notice board and on facebook.

To ensure that it was more widely circulated, the following groups, organisations and individuals were contacted directly:

- Anglian Water
- BCKLWN Officers: Felix Beck, Alan Gomm - with reference on to interested departments
- BCKLWN Ward Councillors
- CPRE
- Edward Stanton
- English Heritage
- Freebridge Housing
- Internal Drainage Board (King’s Lynn)
- Ken Hill Estates
- Messrs B Cunningham & W Smith
- Norfolk Coast AONB
- Norfolk County Council – via Naomi Chamberlain
- Norfolk County Council Division Councillor
- Open Spaces Society
- Parish Councils/Meetings:
  - Fring
  - Dersingham
  - Heacham
  - Ingoldisthorpe
  - Sedgeford
  - Shernborne
- Pigeon Investment Management
- Ridgeon’s Ltd
- Sir Henry Bellingham, MP
- Snettisham Church
- Snettisham Heritage Group
- Snettisham Memorial Hall Trustees
- Snettisham Primary School
- Snettisham WI

As the Environment Agency, Historic England, and Natural England had seen the Plan at the SEA Scoping consultation they were not further consulted.
Responses to pre-submission consultation:

For clarity, these responses are available in Appendix 10 of this document.

Due to unavoidable circumstances, it took some time to collate all this information and amend/adapt the Plan in the light of these comments. Details of the changes for each set of comments are given below, and these contributed to the final Plan which was submitted to the Borough in March 2018.

1 – BCKLWN Housing Development Officer (App 10.1)

The figure of “more than 70%” was queried by the Officer. This was amended to the figure given by Mr Patterson, with a note expanding on the reports of higher figures in certain areas.

2 – Mr Clark (App 10.2)

Mr Clark had raised the issue of a retirement complex previously with the Team, though once the Plan was already significantly in place. However, there had been no other requests of a similar nature, and, given that this would have required a complete rethink of the Plan along the lines proposed by one respondent, it was felt that this should be considered in future plans, rather than the current one.

3 – Historic England – Historic Places Advisor (App 10.3)

Much of this advice was of a general “how to produce a Neighbourhood Plan” nature, which had already been followed (e.g. need for SRA/HRA) or was not necessary given the scope of the Plan. They also stated that there was no “need for Historic England to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area”. No changes resulted.

4 – Anglian Water Strategic and Spatial Planning Manager (App 10.4)

This was one of several responses which suggested a detailed study of the site as if the Neighbourhood Plan was an actual planning application. Since it has never been the intention of Council to develop the site itself, a caveat to potential developers was added (after the policies) stating that they would themselves need to ensure that any future application made the relevant investigations along these lines.

5 – Norfolk County Council (App 10.5)

2.1 – CIL is under the control of BCKLWN, which deals with most infrastructure; a reference to SPC deciding priorities on local need over time was included in the notes after the policies. The encouragement of sprinklers as suggested was added in notes to new policy 7.5.

3.2 – Since there was no proposed development in a registered flood risk zone, a specific drainage policy was not included. Commercial development at the Beach is allowed, but this would be covered by national and local plan guidance. (Local plan...
guidance is, in any case, being clarified under Environment Agency recommendations at the time of writing).

General – As in 4 above (re: Anglian Water) many of the other comments were not appropriate to the Plan, being matters for developers, and covered in the general note previously referred to. (A phone call to Minerals and Waste was made to confirm this.)

6 – Pigeon Investment Management (App 10.6)

Generally very supportive. Individual points raised:
- Map drawing (page 1) redone as not accurate.
- (Page 2) Wording of policies relating to rent/purchase and affordable etc. completely revised for clarity, incorporating some of these suggestions.
- Wording of policy relating to construction standards amended to “encourage” higher standards.
- (Page 3) Relocation of the proposed green area on Poppyfields was considered, but rejected. It was felt that the SPC preferred location gave a “break” in what was becoming a large unbroken area of housing.
- Given the problems with revising a plan after referendum, adding in a timescale of reviews seemed superfluous. That said, reference was made to Council monitoring the efficacy of the Plan with a view to any successor plan.

7 – Borough Council of King’s Lynn and West Norfolk – Officer comments (App 10.7)

A very comprehensive assessment. Much of the detail required small changes to wording for clarity – e.g. ensuring consistent use of (Local) Plan/NP/SNP etc. This was done to a very great extent. Additional comments on the Policies were added to justify their wording.

Larger issues which required complete re-wording and/or combining policies etc. were (in order as recommended):
- Windfall sites. Independent advice was taken on this. Given the large amount of windfall development which had precipitated the plan, it was felt essential to keep the strongest objection to such development. The allocation suggested was greater than the current LDF in any case. Extensive notes were added to explain and justify this, and a specific Policy incorporated.
- Removal of the timescale as a Policy.
- The note above policies was removed. (This referred to which policies applied to which areas in the Village.) Policies were re-worded to ensure that which area they referred to was clarified.
- Policies 1 and 2 (as were, dealing with location and number) were combined to give a clearer focus.
- Reference to confusion between SPC and BCKLWN boundaries was taken on board, and reference to SPC ones removed. This involved using maps more precisely.
- Though flats had not been a preferred feature from the start of the Plan, it was agreed that they may become more relevant as time progressed. To this end they were introduced and a design characteristic added.
• Explanation of the requirement for a higher percentage of affordable homes (i.e. making up for their lack in previous windfall development) was added, and tenure-related Policies combined and re-worded to include a wider range of such housing.
• Reference to second homes numbers already amended in relation to 1 above (Housing Officer comments).
• Policies were amended to remove aspiration, and be more precise. Where enforcement may be an issue, or to avoid conflict with SADMP, “encouragement” used instead.
• Considerable re-wording was done with regard to boundaries and “envelopes” to ensure clarity, while still allowing some flexibility to account for unforeseen changes during the life of the Plan – particularly in relation to commercial development.

It is accepted that it is difficult for a Parish Council without a dedicated planning department, and where the intention of the Plan is to incorporate the expressed intent of Villagers, to consider all eventualities. One important comment was added in the text of the SNP, which covered some of the BCKLWN comments: “Snettisham's Neighbourhood Plan is a considered codification of what the Villagers have expressed as being important to the future of their Village. Should there be any confusion over its interpretation in the future, it is to be hoped that those charged with making the final decision on any planning applications give due weight to the intention of the Plan, as well as the stated policies.”

8 – Rural Solutions, acting for Ken Hill Estate (App 10.8)

General support for Plan, but with preference for own land to be used.
• (page 2) The area Ken Hill propose here was looked at, but the preference was for the Poppyfields site, both in numbers of Villagers responding in the Questionnaire and on the matrix in the Plan itself (Plan Appendix 10).
• The timeframe of the Plan was quite deliberately chosen. It allows successor plans to take into account how the LDF is working, and make proposals with more independence from the LDF process.
• (page 3) The question of total numbers is dealt with extensively in the Plan, but, following other representations, the range referred to (20-40) was amended to a “maximum” of 40. That number is in addition to the LDF currently in force, and, with the windfall already allowed, this could result in over 120 homes in the 2013-2032 timeframe, far more than the likely LDF requirements.
• Reference to boundaries have been made irrelevant by the removal of any mention of new boundaries and the use of specific maps.

9 – BCKLWN Housing Development Officer (App 10.9)

This was a more detailed response than in 1 above from the same department. It has already been stated that the percentage of second homes was corrected in line with those earlier comments. It was noted that the Officer agreed that Snettisham already had a proportion “significantly higher” than the Borough average. Comments from Pigeon Investments in their response imply that the second homes covenant is not an issue for them - this would suggest that viability is not an issue; hence the
policy remains. Finally, questions over affordable and other definitions and percentages raised here are mitigated by the combining of various house types and proportions in new Policy NP05.

**Health Check**

Following the receipt of the responses to the pre-submission consultation, and their incorporation into the Plan, the Group agreed to submit this latest draft for a “health check” (October 2017). This was conducted by Small Fish on behalf of Council, with the agreement of the Borough Council who would be part-funding it.

This was not a formal consultation, more to enable Council to see that what it proposed to submit would be likely to be acceptable in the later stages. Hence, it is not proposed to detail the comments made. However, it was clear that there were issues with language (the policies themselves could be worded more in what might be referred to as “planning-speak”), layout (a lack of clarity between policies and justification, requiring more separation) and classification (what was a policy and what was an aim). The conclusion was the Plan as constituted would not be likely to succeed at inspection. These comments were taken on board, and it was agreed to engage the same company to undertake revisions to the policy areas of the Plan, based on their comments, as they were, by then, familiar with it and the relevant issues\(^\text{10}\).

**Second pre-submission consultation**

In December 2017 Council was advised, by the Borough, of additional consultees not on the original list, and some who were only contacted with an earlier draft plan when the Borough performed their environmental assessments. There was a risk of this causing issues down the line, so a second publication of the documents was made running from 15/12/17 to 5/2/18 – more than the required six weeks, due to the Christmas Break.

The additional organisations consulted were\(^\text{11}\):
- Bircham Parish Council
- British Telecom*
- Community Action Norfolk
- CTIL (Vodafone and Telefonica)
- EDF Energy*
- Environment Agency
- The Equalities and Human Rights Commission*
- GCGP LEP
- Highways England
- Historic England
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Marine Management

---

\(^{10}\) Advice was taken as to the propriety of this – as there was no consideration at the time Small Fish were engaged for the health check that they might be further consulted, there was no conflict.

\(^{11}\) Asterisks denote those contacted by post – remainder by email.
Those underlined replied with either generic comments (i.e. no specific comments on the SNP) or a “no comment” response.

The only more substantive response was Marine Management, which had specific suggestions that might be incorporated into a Neighbourhood Plan; these are shown in Appendix 11. Their response TR1 was covered in the SEA where no material impact on tourism had been identified; SOC1 was covered already by a policy encouraging access to the natural environment; SOC3 was similarly covered by the SEA and the HRA regarding terrestrial impacts (no material detriment), and there were no marine implications of the Plan.

Finally, it should be noted that in order to prevent any challenges from different organisations being asked to comment on different version of the Plan, the one released for the second consultation was the same as for the original pre-submission one.
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The Future of the Village

Everyone has an opinion on where they live. How do you see the Village in five years, or in ten years, or beyond? It can be all too easy to be fatalistic about this and say that one has no chance to influence things: decisions are taken far from the Village; local views are not taken into account; money talks; the rules are always changing to allow more and more development etc. etc.

We do however have a chance to control these things locally through a Neighbourhood Plan. This does not stop change, but allows you to have an influence over what that change should be like. The plan would be a guide to all such decisions in the Village over the coming decade, and would be binding on the Borough Council which decides on planning matters.

Legally this has to be driven by the Parish Council, but in consultation at every stage with the public, eventually being put to the Village in a referendum – you may recall reading of these at Brancaster and South Wootton.

To explain why Council considers this important, please see the alternatives with and without a plan in place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With a Plan</th>
<th>Without a Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Village has control over many aspects of its future.</td>
<td>All major decisions are taken elsewhere. While local views are sought, they can be ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required infrastructure can be included from the planning stage.</td>
<td>Infrastructure improvements only come after development, if at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money from developers has to be given to the Village. How it is spent is decided here.</td>
<td>Such spending is decided at Borough and County level, and not necessarily on local priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning matters – types and mix of homes etc. are decided in advance by the Village, and future development has to fit with that.</td>
<td>Each planning application is considered in isolation rather than as part of an overall plan. Such matters are decided in King’s Lynn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a chance to develop a coherent view of the future of Snettisham, and involve everyone in this process.</td>
<td>All changes are piecemeal and there is no forward planning. Development is driven by short term considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The views of residents are paramount, and legally enforceable.</td>
<td>The future of the Village is in the hands of people who may not live here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan looks at the whole Village.</td>
<td>Areas of the Village may get left behind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have an opportunity to include other matters – parking, commercial needs, open spaces etc.</td>
<td>These matters are only considered after pressure from interested parties. Even then there may not be the power to act locally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is time pressure on this; it can take over a year to get a Plan through the whole process, and at the moment they expire in 2026, so we need to get the process started sooner rather than later. In addition the pressure on development is happening now, and we wish to avoid being too late.

We need to have a few more volunteers who are interested to be on the Plan Group – a total of around ten split roughly 50/50 between councillors and other residents. It is not a short or simple process, and would require a real commitment. However, the rewards for everyone in Snettisham could be considerable.

There will be a detailed presentation at the Open Days (see over) and an opportunity to ask questions and express an interest. In the meantime, as ever, please contact me for further info if you wish.
SNETTISHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in this questionnaire and return to the Parish Office by 22nd July, 2016. Neighbourhood Plans cannot prevent development, but are about ensuring better local control. Please bear this in mind when answering. All answers are confidential.

**Question 1 - New Dwellings**
If new dwellings are to be built, what type would you prefer?
- A single large development
- A number of small developments
- Individual plots
- In-fill only

Answer 1 for highest preference; 2 for next and 3 for next - three answers only

**Question 2 - Location**
Where should housing development take place?
List two places within the Parish boundary where you think it could:
1
2

List two places where you think it should not:
1
2

**Question 3 - Numbers**
What do you think should be the maximum number of new dwellings to be built in Snettisham in the next ten years?
- 10 to 19
- 20 to 29
- 30 to 39
- 40 to 49
- 50 to 99
- 100 plus

Answer 1 for highest preference; 2 for next and 3 for next - three answers only

**Question 4 - Property size**
What type of properties would you like to see built?
- One Bedroom
- Two Bedroom
- Three Bedroom
- Four Bedroom
- More than four Bedrooms

Answer 1 for highest preference; 2 for next and 3 for next - three answers only
**Question 5 - Property type**

What type of properties should any new housing be?

- Terraced
- Semi-detached
- Detached
- Bungalows
- Flats
- Fully Occupied - i.e. all-year round
- Second/Holiday homes
- Sheltered Accommodation
- Affordable Housing

*Answer 1 for highest preference; 2 for next and 3 for next - three answers only*

**Question 6 - Occupancy**

At whom should properties be aimed?

- Families
- Retired People
- Single People

*Answer 1 for highest preference; 2 for next and 3 for next*

**Question 7 - Affordable Housing**

Of any new dwellings, what percentage do you believe should be affordable/social housing?

- 20%
- 30%
- 40%
- 50%
- 60%

Tick one

**Question 8 - Affordable Housing**

How do you think affordable Housing should be paid for by the occupier?

- Purchased outright
- Mix of rent and purchase
- Rent only

*Answer 1 for highest preference; 2 for next and 3 for next*

**Question 9 - Infrastructure**

If development occurs, where would infrastructure improvement most be needed?

- Doctor
- Dentist
- School
- Other - eg roads.

Please specify: ____________________________

*Answer 1 for highest preference; 2 for next and 3 for next - three answers only*
**Question 9 - Housing - General:**
Please add any comments about things you would like new housing to feature. This could include: materials, environmental design, drainage (connected to mains or not), gardens etc.

---

**Question 10 - Business & Enterprise**
Do you think additional small businesses/commercial enterprises should be encouraged to set up in Snettisham?
Yes [ ] No [ ]  
*Tick one*

**Question 11 - Business & Enterprise**
What types should such businesses be?

**Question 12 - Business & Enterprise**
Where should such businesses be situated, within the Parish boundary?

---

**Question 13 - Second Homes**
Some villages have voted to prevent newly built houses becoming holiday/second homes. If this is legally allowed, would you agree with such a policy in Snettisham?
Yes [ ] No [ ]  
*Tick one*

**Question 14 - Your comments**
Please add any things important to you regarding Snettisham:

---

**About you**
Please put your home post-code

Do you live in Snettisham all year round?
Yes [ ] No [ ]  
*Tick one*

Your age

- under 20
- 20-35
- 36-50
- 51-65
- over 65

Thank you for completing this form. To be entered into the prize draw please add your phone number.
### APPENDIX 3 - Breakdown of Numerical Questionnaire Responses

#### Question 1 - New Dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Pref 1</th>
<th>Pref 2</th>
<th>Pref 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A single large development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number of small developments</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual plots</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-fill only</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 3 - Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Pref 1</th>
<th>Pref 2</th>
<th>Pref 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 plus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 4 - Property size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Pref 1</th>
<th>Pref 2</th>
<th>Pref 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Bedroom</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Bedroom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than four Bedrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 5 - Property type

As indicated elsewhere the answers to Q5 were confusing due to the question itself

Considering the preferences within each of the two areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Pref 1</th>
<th>Pref 2</th>
<th>Pref 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungalows</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Occupied - i.e. all-year round</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second/Holiday homes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Accommodation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 6 - Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Pref 1</th>
<th>Pref 2</th>
<th>Pref 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired People</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single People</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 7 - Affordable Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Pref 1</th>
<th>Pref 2</th>
<th>Pref 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 8 - Affordable Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased outright</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of rent and purchase</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent only</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 9 - Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - eg roads</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 10 - Business & Enterprise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree to encourage small business</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 13 - Second Homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For new-build no second home policy</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### About you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live in Snettisham all year round</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 20-35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 36-50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 51-65</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged over 65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4 – Questionnaire Summary – responses to open questions

**Question 2 – Location**
Where should housing development take place?
List 2 places within the Parish boundary where you think it could.

1. Not sure as new to the parish
2. Off A149
3. Cherry Tree
4. Woods on SN bypass (end). Which were burnt 2 years ago.
5. Between Station Road & Common Road
6. East of Common Road south of bypass
7. Outskirts
8. Far side of bypass
9. Some extra homes on Poppyfields
10. Past the church
11. Off Poppyfields Drive
12. Common Road West
13. Poppyfields
14. Cherry Tree Road
15. Within Present built up boundary
16. Really don't mind where in the village development takes place
17. Allotments – Saffron side (back of council houses
18. Cherry Tree Road
19. Common Road
20. Brown land
21. Poppyfields (near garden centre)
22. Park Farm
23. Opposite allotments
24. Land off bypass
25. Poppyfields extension
26. West side of bypass – to the exclusion of Common Road South
27. NOWHERE
28. On brown fields sites which are not in use
29. Poppyfields
30. Poppyfields
31. Is there a useful plan to see?
32. Beach Road
33. A149, Bypass
34. Undecided
35. Fields opp Poppyfields estate
36. Poppyfields
37. Field behind allotments – facing the houses
38. Beach Road
39. Kenhill Wood
40. Near the auction House
41. Near the garden centre at the end of Station Road
42. Undeveloped land at Poppyfields
43. Open land next to Poppyfields
44. Open land top of Beach Road
45. Land next to Kim Cairns (Beach Road)
46. Land opposite Doctors/Vets Common Road East
47. Opposite Playing Field next to British Legion Hut
48. Land left at Poppyfields by Wagga Jex
49. Near the common
50. Old Church Road
51. Beach Road/Bypass
52. Road towards Ingoldisthorpe
53. Snnettisham Hall? opp Factory Shop
54. Large field opposite Poppyfields
55. Land west of bypass
56. Opposite Poppyfields
57. West of bypass
58. Poppyfields Drive
59. Extension of Poppyfields
60. Lynn Road on entering Snnettisham
61. Past the church towards Sedgeford
62. Where they propose Silica Sand to be
63. Brownfield sites around Common Lane
64. Possible Beach Road too.
65. We have enough houses and I could not say we need any more at the moment
66. Church Road
67. Beach Road
68. NONE
69. Opposite playing/sports field – Saffron side
70. Field Poppyfields Drive
71. Only fill in
72. King’s Lynn Road
73. Next to Poppyfields Garden Centre
74. Common Road past auction Rooms
75. Site 190/550
76. Site 191/551
77. Poppyfields
78. On A149 Paper Hall Farm area
79. On A149 south of Norton Hill Roundabout
80. Paper Hall Farm, on bypass
81. Quarry, N of Roundabout
82. Opposite the Poppyfields estate
83. NOWHERE (x 2)
84. Poppyfields near play area
85. Opposite Saffron Side – near allotments
86. Poppyfields
87. Beach side bypass
88. Village already over quota for next 5 years, no new development needed.
89. None
90. Beach Road
91. End of Poppyfields
92. Next to British Legion Hall
93. Poppyfields
94. Poppyfields
95. Beach Road/Main Road corner
96. Current new build sites on Lynn Road
97. Unsure as I haven't visited the compete area
98. Empty field on Poppyfield Drive
99. Poppyfield
100. Ken Hill
101. ?
102. Sedgeford Road – opposite playing field
103. In fill
104. ?
105. Land north of Poppyfields Drive
106. Land north of Poppyfields Drive
107. Land opposite Deer Farm
108. Vacant land on Poppyfield Estate
109. Nowhere
110. Lynn Road
111. Poppyfields
112. On the western side of bypass
113. On field opposite Poppyfields that is empty bar rabbits
114. On other side of main road
115. In fill only
116. In or along the empty field by the play park adjacent to Poppyfields
117. Nowhere comes to mind but should be environmentally friendly

**Question 2 – Location**

List 2 places where you think development should not take place

1. In the village itself
2. Near historic buildings
3. Over past the Mill Fields
4. In centre of village
5. Places of natural beauty
6. Field on Lynn Road heading towards Dersingham
7. North of Common Road East
8. Between Snettisham and Ingoldisthorpe
9. Poppyfields adjacent to park
10. No more west of bypass (A149)
11. Centre of village
12. Outside present built up boundary
13. I really don’t mind where in the village development takes place
14. Land opposite Factory Shop
15. Poppyfields
16. Between village and Kennhill Wood
17. Near Church
18. The park opposite the Factory Shop
19. A149 Road frontage between The Bamboo Centre and Ingoldisthorpe
20. NOWHERE
21. On existing green fields
22. Not at all
23. Centre of village
24. Station Road
25. Common Road
26. Is there a useful plan to see?
27. Station Road
28. Lynn Road
29. Within village itself
30. Bircham Road
31. Undecided
32. Playing fields near church
33. Green near The Paddocks (off Shelduck Drive)
34. Field opp. Playing field – near British Legion
35. Field behind Fishers end up to roundabout
36. Playing field
37. Station Road
38. Near the church
39. Near the British Legion Hut/playing field
40. Between Snettisham and Ingoldisthorpe
41. Within the village
42. Land between Common Road West and Kennhill Woods/Common
43. Land between church and playing field
44. Station Road
45. In village centre
46. Near to roundabout on road towards Heacham
47. Common Road East or West – Goose Green areas
48. AonB
49. In front of church
50. AonB
51. In front of church
52. Cherry Tree Road (AonB)
53. Not past Park Farm
54. No more down Common Road
55. No more down Station Road
56. Centre of village
57. Poppyfields Drive
58. Snettisham Common
59. East side of village
60. Poppyfields Drive
61. Centre of village
62. NONE
63. Beach side of A149
64. Common Road West
65. Land off Poppyfields Drive
66. Poppyfields Drive
67. Council Houses Sedgeford Road
68. Manor Lane allotments
69. Site 1205
70. Site 193/553
71. Common Road West
72. Commercial Land
73. Park Farm & Snettisham House
74. Within half mile of Snettisham Church
75. Snettisham House
76. Within half mile of St. Mary’s Church
77. Existing public green areas
78. Fields, green spaces
79. Close to main roads
80. On beach side of A149 – too dangerous to cross
81. Cherry Tree Road
82. Between British Legion Hall & Bircham Road
83. Alma Road
84. Station Road
85. Village already over quota for next 5 years, no new development needed
86. All
87. Opposite Factory Shop
88. Common Road
89. Recreational Spaces
90. Any large area i.e. Opp Poppyfields
91. Land opposite bungalows on Poppyfields Drive
92. West of A149
93. Common Road East
94. Common Road West
95. ?
96. Not on arable lands
97. Poppyfields Drive
98. Poppyfields Drive
99. ?
100. Land south of Station Road/Lynn Road junction
101. North of village i.e. NE of Lynn Rd junction & NW of Cherry Tree Road
102. Land SE of Station Road/Lynn Road Junction
103. North of village – NE of Lynn Road and NW of Cherry Tree Road
104. Cherry Tree Road
105. Common Road
106. Nowhere
107. Station Road
108. Common Road
109. Not on eastern side of bypass
110. On fields between Snettisham and Ingoldisthorpe
111. On field opposite factory shop
112. Field in front of church
113. Field north side of Poppyfields Rd
114. Any open spaces which keep Snettisham the lovely place it is

**Question 9 – Housing – General**

Please add any comments about things you would like new housing to feature. This could include: materials, environmental design, drainage (connect to mains or not) gardens etc.

1. Local stone and some modern
2. Good drainage with mains connected. With gardens.
3. The developers know what buyers want. Houses should retain the character of the village, a mix of brick carrstone and tiles
4. Sandstone material to keep within the area. Environmental design to enhance area. More gardens
5. Drainage and water supply – already a problem. Property should blend in
6. Materials should be in keeping with current buildings. Gardens and green ‘open’ spaces are important
7. Drainage (connect to mains) was underlined
8. In keeping with Norfolk local design, sewerage connected to mains, small gardens, parking space for more than one vehicle
9. Carrstone only (as frontage)
10. Houses need parking spaces as there is too much on road parking in the village
11. All housing should be residential only and mainly for families and local people. On main drainage and with gardens where possible
12. I think it is important to have a garden and should be built to fit into the village
13. To match what is in the village
14. Traditional looking houses using materials fitting in with the area. With gardens and connected to the mains. No 3 storey houses
15. Gas supply, connected to mains, in keeping with traditional properties i.e. use of carrstone
16. Merge consideration for car parking within the community with central shopping
17. Think about car parking and drainage
18. Should be kept with environmental design
19. Carrstone
20. Car parking (off road)
21. Solar panels, carrstone traditional build, off road parking for three or more vehicles per property. Rubbish bin stores located at front of properties. Rain water storage tanks for gardens & toilets
22. Adequate drainage. Planning to deal with threat of floods
23. Gardens/environmental/drainage
24. Local materials where feasible; in keeping with locality. Mains connected where possible, otherwise Klargester type
25. Carrstone facings. Small gardens. Parking out of sight at back. Plant some trees to soften the brick/concrete view
26. Off road parking, buildings to be similar in style to rest of area
27. Better drainage – flooding a constant problem. Carrstone to be used in all new buildings
28. Each dwelling good plot for a garden
29. Gardens, local building materials i.e. carrstone
30. Connected to main drains. Off road parking
31. Drainage/connected to main drains. Gardens with natural permeable surfaces
32. Houses should be sympathetic to surrounding buildings and connected to all main services especially sewers
33. In keeping with surrounding properties, small gardens
34. Gardens, carrstone/flint
35. Full impact on drainage system in village taking into account the additional housing now being built or planned
36. All should in keeping with the existing
37. Mains drainage
38. Mains drainage
39. In keeping with village properties ground of outsource heating/pu panels, permeable hard surfaces, small tree and hedge planting on boundaries, open amenity areas, sewage treatment, soakaways, ample parking provision, street lighting to match new existing
40. Must be connected to al main services, well drained, some garden, must have a garage on parking area
41. Carrstone, gardens, mains drainage, wider roads, more parking areas
42. Adequate parking/garages i.e. stop putting the maximum density of houses on the smallest plot
43. Can our sewage system cope with many new housing developments in our village?
44. NONE
45. Brick and/or carrstone to fit in with village. Drainage – main if improved sufficiently. Solar panels incorporated – parking off road
46. Carrstone, connected to mains, garages, gardens – small
47. Classic Norfolk design. Drainage to mains and definitely roads good lighting and gardens
48. Good drainage to compensate for any future flooding issues gardens, traditional build and materials
49. Improved sewerage/drainage system. Building design and materials in keeping with existing traditional built houses in village e.g. carrstone
50. Eco friendly, in keeping with the environment (carrstone) good sewage system and road access
51. Eco houses, solar energy, not connected to drainage, large gardens, more open spaces, to use locally sourced materials, recycle rain water
52. In keeping with local historical style with locally sourced material e.g. carrstone & brick style. Mains drainage with infrastructure improvement to support – all mains & phone supplies underground – two stories max
53. Style in keeping with W. Norfolk i.e. carrstone & brick; mains drainage; power and phone lines buried; height of building no higher than village
55. Gardens (most new developments are concrete jungles!) Houses not so close together. Houses not right close to the main road. Parking spaces for each house. Local carrstone used.
56. Reasonable gardens. Carrstone in keeping architecture
57. Mains drainage, garden & off road parking, suitable material for area, max 2 storey if flats
58. Off road parking – (congestion is bad)
59. Alma Road & Station Road should be made one way! 1 road up/1 road down It would ease the traffic problems, use common sense
60. Built local stone, improve drainage
61. Where chosen sites may be agreed all my about answers should be considered
62. Gardens. Connected to mains. Traditional materials
63. With gardens. Sympathetic to village style. Brick/carrstone
64. Gardens/carrstone mix/mains drainage problem
65. Mainly Doctors et. And roads, when I first came here it took two years to get a dentist
66. Gardens, environmentally friendly, traditional materials, connected to mains
67. Should be sensitive to the environment but in keeping with surrounding properties. All should have gardens so as to attract wildlife
68. Gardens a priority for homes but could be shared if in a complex. Sympathetic design to fit existing buildings v. important
69. Mains sewage, street lights, chalet type houses/bungalows
70. New builds should be in keeping with local styles
71. Same as existing properties no modern architecture, more older type beams?
72. Traditional village ‘gingerbread’ stone, as eco-friendly as possible
73. Should be sympathetic to existing houses e.g. carrstone, eco-friendly design
74. Drainage is paramount
75. Use sandstone, similar to local housing. Adequate drainage is a must. All must have designated parking to prevent road parking
76. Main drains. Off road parking. Gardens
77. 1. Local stone/brick 2. Main drains 3. Gardens and all new buildings should have solar panels as standard
78. Carrstone to fit in with style of village. Ban gravelled/slabbed front gardens unless absolutely necessary
79. Small development in keeping with the rest of the village or park home sites
80. Housing should match other properties in design, style & materials. Parking & gardens must be fitted in plans
81. Swift nest-boxes Breeam standard
82. Eco design, water management systems, communal areas
83. Good quality homes to meet local needs and demand
84. Good quality homes to meet local needs and demand
85. Environmentally friendly & connected to mains
86. Should be built of materials to blend with existing building. Should have parking provision and improved drainage. Should all be no more than two stories and have gardens
87. Should be built with solar panels on, eco buildings, if an old part of the village carrstone must be used. All buildings sympathetic with the village. Should have gardens
88. Carrstone
89. The houses should be in keeping with the area e.g. carrstone, more traditional design
90. Sympathetic design & materials to compliment the area

Question 11 - Business & Enterprise
What types should such businesses be?

1. TEC
2. Only entrepreneurs risking their own money can decide
3. Shops, retail (bakers, butchers etc.)
4. Cake shop (speciality)
5. N/A
6. With Co-op + chemist + post office, shops not presently necessary
7. Any that encourages local employment
8. Hi-tech/Artisan
9. Food shops, cafes
10. All welcome
11. Anything help village local employment
12. Shops (bakery, butcher) & local crafts selling Norfolk produce
13. Restaurant, clothing, gift shop
14. Butcher!!
15. N/A
16. Light
17. Retail
18. Small business i.e. I.T, design, office, shops
19. Once Co-op opens essentials covered, maybe a butchers
20. Start-ups or smaller developing firms
21. A. shops & offices B. Light engineering + manufacturing for jobs
22. Bank/Building Society
23. Any that could make it work
24. Businesses that contribute to the community
25. Shops & offices
26. Selection of different shops
27. Businesses that employ staff
28. Ones likely to survive in this small village
29. When we get the co-op we will have all we need for our village
30. Locally sourced produce shop. Bakery/Delicatessen
31. Small/Low Personnel Requirements
32. Retail
33. Those offering maximum jobs but fit into rural location
34. Those that offer employment & are suitable for residential area
35. Vehicle maint. Light engineering. Graphic/computer design
36. Greengrocer
37. Bakery, wet fish, shoe shop, green grocer
38. We need to develop the existing ones
39. Any
40. Green Grocer, Bakery
41. NONE
42. Varied Butcher?
43. Workshops, offices
44. Offices & shops
45. None
46. Small industrial
47. Crafts, local farm produce, Bakery
48. Country clothing/Crafts/Restaurant-Wine Bar
49. Shops, garages
50. Serving the local community – village shops, groceries
51. Trades serving local area
52. Those that can create employment
53. Shops, banks, bakery, petrol garage
54. Shops (plus something unreadable)
55. Commercial Enterprise
56. Shops, offices
57. Any
58. We have most but take into account of new ideas
59. Any
60. None required
61. Greengrocer
62. Small businesses to improve local employment
63. Tourist attractions + small units to rent
64. Design Consultants/Architects/Professionals
65. Useful Co-op covers food, drink etc. Perhaps DIY
66. Tourist type shops to help draw holidaymakers – anything but more hairdressers
67. Small to medium businesses creating employment for locals
68. A mix
69. Computer based/Local produce Improved mobile communications
70. Shops i.e. food, bakery, local fruit & veg farm shop
71. We should keep garage on common road, we need it
72. The garage is already being faced out of business
73. Any – interesting shops (antiques)
74. I.T. including maintenance & repair, Bespoke Furniture, food made from local produce, 3D printing
75. To meet local demand
76. Top meet local demand
77. Craft enterprises
78. Any practical type
79. Florist, proper shops, butchers, bakers, grocery shop
80. Retail, professional
81. Shops and small business units
82. Retail – food preferably
83. Shops to make Snettisham more attractive

**Question 12 – Business & Enterprise**
Where should businesses be situated, within the Parish boundary?

1. In the digital age many will operate from home. If units are needed – N of the bypass with existing sheds
2. Away from centre, outskirts, village centre is pretty as it is
3. In heart of village
4. Off A149 & Beach Road, adjacent to Kim Cairns
5. Nr. Car Sales
6. No preference
7. Common Road & Village centre where possible
8. Common Road
9. Lynn Road where shops were originally
10. On land by the village sign
11. West side of common Road South
12. Out side P Boundary
13. N/A
14. Main village square or close to
15. Central
16. Map/plan needed
17. Centre/Market Square only
18. Beach Road, Off A149 By-Pass
19. A. In the centre. B. Outskirts
20. Centrally if possible
21. Other side of bypass towards Common Road + Park Farm
22. In the village centre
23. Shop needed opposite Poppyfields
24. Any open land
25. Yes
26. Within easy reach of the centre of the village
27. Near pubs and other shops
28. Centre of village and west of bypass
29. Centre of village; west of bypass
30. Common Road West or Office based in empty village shop? Or Poppyfields
31. As central as possible
32. Anywhere, Pref. Market area
33. On the main road through the village to encourage (something) traffic
34. Yes
35. Market
36. NONE
37. As central as possible
38. Land side of Kim Cairns Garage, Auction House
39. Centre of village
40. None
41. In centre of village, Poppyfields area
42. As close to the centre of the village as possible and/or Poppyfields
43. Commercial land
44. Using existing housing stock within the village or on A149
45. Within Snettisham Village
46. Not known
47. Close to the centre of the village
48. Central village
49. Near allotments opposite Saffronside
50. Market Square Beach side of bypass
51. Along bypass as agree many years ago
52. Anywhere preferably centre of the village
53. Not within boundary
54. Lynn Road/Market Square
55. High Street
56. Encourage businesses to use previous shops etc. within centre of village
57. Common Road West/Beach Road or east of village
58. Some on Poppyfields
59. Maybe market stalls twice weekly
60. West of A149
61. Common Road West
62. Not sure
63. Don’t know
64. Anywhere
65. Land north of Beach Road/West of the A149
66. Land North of Beach Road/West of the A149
67. In the area near The Deer Farm
68. West of Bypass
69. In the village or other side of main road
70. Yes
71. Shops in or near the village centre
72. Village centre
73. Within the high Street
APPENDIX 5 - Interpretation/Discussion of Questionnaire Responses

Not all respondents answered all questions, and not all answers were in the requested format (e.g. writing y/n rather than numbering preferences, or marking more than the requested number). It was agreed to use the highest preference responses in general, unless the figures were so close as to demand further consideration. Where any lack of clarity occurred due to this, any interpretation has been explained below.

*NB: two question 9s were included by error; to avoid confusion these have been kept as originally printed.

Question 1 – If new dwellings are to be built, what type would you prefer?

There were 88 highest preference responses, 83 middle and 80 lowest. Of the highest preference responses, 51% favoured infill only, 18% individual plots, 16% a number of small developments and 15% a single large development. Thus there is a marked preference for infill only, though it is interesting to note that 15% favoured a single large development.

As there is a marked preference for infill only, this would be the Neighbourhood Plan preference. However, it should be noted that a number of respondents have expressed the view that they consider “infill” to be available land, of whatever size, between other large scale developments within the Village. We are aware that this is not the meaning within strict planning terms but it has to be taken into account. Furthermore, it may not be possible to accommodate the preferred number of homes suggested by the responses using the strict definition. It is interesting to note that 15% favoured a single large development probably on the basis that this would lead in general terms to the least disruption to the Village.

Question 2 – Where should housing development take place? List two places within the Parish boundary where you think it could.

There were 117 responses to this very important question, out of a possible total of 204, so it can be seen that not everyone expressed an opinion. As might be expected there was much variation in the responses. Nevertheless, two specific areas showed by far the largest support: land near Poppyfields (21%) and land on the west side of the Bypass (18%). All other responses were comparatively insignificant.

The most suitable area for development would appear to be the land adjacent to Poppyfields. This has good access and is near the existing Village Centre - land to the west of the A149 Bypass is separated from the main built-up area of Snettisham. Additionally, there could be access problems to the A149, and development here could have an adverse effect on the AONB. It is possible that some of the areas
could be subject to flooding problems. For the above reasons it is recommended that development should take place on land adjacent to Poppyfields – see map Appendix 10.3.

Question 2 – Where should housing development take place? List two places where you think it should not.

There were 114 responses here. On a negative question such as this, a larger variety of responses may be expected depending on the location of the resident. The areas with the highest responses were: Common Rd/Station Rd – 16%, Poppyfields 10%, in front of St Mary’s Church 9%, opposite the Factory Shop 9% and the Village Centre 8%. There were a few responses that indicated that development between Snettisham and Ingoldisthorpe would not be a good idea.

As Poppyfields was the preferred location for development above, and the fact that there was only a 10% negative response to it, there seems no reason why this area should not be put forward for necessary development. All of the other major areas listed above did not have a particularly high negative rate.

Question 3 – What do you think should be the maximum number of new dwellings to be built in Snettisham in the next ten years?

There were 81 highest preference responses, 76 middle and 73 lowest. Of the highest, 43% favoured fewer than 20 new homes with 11% favouring 20 to 29. There is a marked preference for the lower figures, with 66% overall favouring fewer than 40.

Taking into account the current LDF, which recommends 34 new dwellings in Snettisham, it would seem sensible that the Neighbourhood Plan should recommend 20-40 over the lifetime of the Plan.

Question 4 – What type of properties would you like to see built?

There were 88 highest preference responses, 86 middle and 83 lowest. Of the highest, 42% favoured three bed-roomed with 31% for two bedrooms. Only 8% preferred four or more bedrooms.

Recommend that any new developments should consist predominantly of two and three bedroomed dwellings.
Question 5 – What type of properties should any new housing be?

NB This question could have been clearer, and it was agreed to view the two issues (property type and occupation) separately.

Property type: There were 39 highest, 51 middle and 46 lowest preference responses. Of the highest, 33% preferred bungalows, 26% terraced, 21% semi-detached, 15% detached and 5% flats.

Considering the middle preference responses, as unusually these were quite high. Then 37% preferred semi-detached, 28% bungalows, 20% terraced and flats and 16% detached.

Occupancy: There were 54 highest preference responses, 38 middle and 42 lowest. Of the highest, 74% preferred full occupancy – an overwhelming majority. There was 19% support for affordable homes, with the remainder a small fraction.

Recommend that any new dwellings should consist predominantly of semi-detached houses and/or bungalows, which are fully-occupied, and not used as second/holiday homes.

Question 6 – At whom should properties be aimed?

There were 91 highest preference responses, 89 middle and 87 lowest. Of the highest, 76% preferred family homes, with 13% and 11% respectively for retired and single people. There was clearly a large majority for family housing.

Recommend that any new housing should consist mainly of family houses, which should be predominantly three-bedroomed (see responses to question 4)

Question 7 – Of any new dwellings, what percentage do you believe should be affordable/social housing?

There were 92 responses of which 45% preferred to have 20% of social/affordable housing, with 21% opting for 30%. There is a preference for 20% of social/affordable housing therefore, but it is worth noting that 66% of responses were in the 20-30% range.

Recommend that any new housing developments should contain between 20-30% of affordable/social housing.
Question 8 – How do you think affordable Housing should be paid for by the occupier?

There were 85 highest preference responses, 80 middle and 75 lowest. Of the highest, 55% favoured a mix of rent and purchase, with 27% favouring purchase outright, and 18% rental only. There is preference for a mix.

*Recommend a mix of rented and purchased affordable housing should be pursued.*

Question 9* – If development occurs, where would infrastructure improvement most be needed?

There were 92 highest preference responses, 87 middle and 81 lowest. Of the highest, 60% chose the GP option, with 21% offering their own suggestions – dentist and school were significantly lower. There is thus an overwhelming desire for improvement in the GP provision. Of the “other” category, drainage (30%), road improvements (16%), speeding/parking and traffic (16%) and open spaces/footpaths (13%) were the issues most raised.

*If further development is to take place, there is an obvious need to improve the level of GP healthcare. There are currently a dentist and a vet in the Village. Any new developments must have adequate drainage as this is, and has been for some time, a major issue. There must be adequate discussion with the responsible authorities prior to any development. A strategic drainage plan must be part of planning apps.*

Question 9* – Please add any comments about things you would like new housing to feature.

There were 90 responses, with each one expressing multiple views. There was a significant majority indicating that natural and sympathetic building materials should be used, particularly carrstone (52 responses). Drainage was a very important factor and was mentioned by 42 people. 31 responses indicated that, in new developments, the provision of gardens was important, with 21 referring to adequate parking. Another general theme was that new developments should be environmentally-friendly.

*Recommend that new developments are constructed from local materials (including carrstone) and are in keeping with the Village. Adequate mains drainage, parking and gardens should be provided. All new developments to be as “green” as is practicable.*
Question 10 – Do you think additional small businesses/commercial enterprises should be encouraged to set up in Snettisham?

Of the 97 responses, 78 were in favour of businesses being encouraged to set up in Snettisham.

*Determine the best approach to encourage such new businesses to set up in the Village. Ideally the Parish and Borough Councils should be involved in this process.*

Question 11 – What types should such businesses be?

There were 83 responses. The predominant one was in favour of more shops; financial/IT businesses were listed, along with tourist related enterprises and a garage/car repair facility. [On shops, it is worth noting that several people commented that the new Co-op would fulfil some of the need, especially if it were to have a butchery department.] There were comments that creating employment should be the over-riding consideration.

*Encourage small businesses of the above types which create employment to set up in the Village.*

Question 12 – Where should such businesses be situated, within the Parish boundary?

There were 73 responses. These fell into two main locations with similar preferences for each, namely the Centre of the Village or on land West of the Bypass.

*If new business can be encouraged to set up in the Village, then they should be encouraged to do so in the locations above. However, finding space for additional businesses with in the Village Centre may be difficult with present parking/access problems. Some commercial enterprises (probably not shops) could well be situated on land west of the Bypass, where access should not be a problem.*

Question 13 – Some villages have voted to prevent newly built houses becoming holiday/second homes. If this is legally allowed, would you agree with such a policy in Snettisham?

There were 100 responses, with a three-to-one (76%) majority in favour of a policy to prevent newly built homes becoming holiday/second homes.

*Recommend that any newly built developments should have a covenant inserted to require them to be occupied full-time, if this option is legally available.*
Question 14 – Please add any things important to you regarding Snettisham.

As may have been expected, the responses to this open-ended question generally represented a summary of the response to the previous questions. There were very few responses which added any significant new facts, but some people were against the silica sand extraction (at the time a major Village issue) and heavy traffic through the Village. There were positive comments about the usefulness of the bus service. Several comments also mentioned that footpaths needed to be kept clear.

In summary, the predominant comments were along the lines of:
- preserve Snettisham as a sustainable, stand-alone, Village, not a town, with its own character and community
- do not merge it with nearby villages/towns
- do not allow it to become a dormitory satellite to King’s Lynn
- encourage more families into the Village
- ensure that development is environmentally-friendly
- do not allow the Village to be turned into “one huge housing estate”
- all-year round occupancy should be favoured
- ensure Snettisham remains a vibrant village through all seasons.

Very many comments mentioned an aversion to additional second/holiday homes.

Information regarding respondents: “About you”

100 replied - 88% of those responding indicated that they lived in the Village. The remaining 12% gave mainly local postcodes (from Lynn to Hunstanton, including Snettisham – possibly implying second home ownership - with 2% not specifying). It is perhaps worth noting that their responses (albeit on a very small sample) were in line with the others, with the possible exception of a preference for slightly larger properties, and less concern over GP provision.

On age profile, again, 100 replied. Initial concern over an apparent bias towards older residents was slightly reduced when comparing actual demographic figures from census records – similar varying response rates can be observed in most elections/consultations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Replies %</th>
<th>Census (2011) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39% of the 1255 households were listed as pensioner ones, and census figures show an aging population. That said, it was agreed to look at ways to gather information more widely at future consultations.
APPENDIX 6 – Responses to informal Public Consultation by SPC

On January 20th and 21st 2017, the draft Plan was put to two open meetings for residents and others in the Village Memorial Hall. They were presented with copies of the Plan, and members of the Team were available throughout to answer questions and explain what had been done to date.

73 people signed the list, though it is known that more attended. These all gave PE31 7xx as their postcode – suggesting a residence in the Village. Developers and landowners were also present, some local, some from further afield.

Questionnaires were provided asking for positive and negative comments on both the Plan overall and the individual policies. 31 were returned. Most comments related to matters outside the scope or power of the Plan. Of the remainder the only concerns expressed by more than one respondent were on: total numbers of new dwellings (two felt too high, two felt too low) and the proportion of affordable homes (preference for higher). There were two detailed and lengthy responses, one from a developer.

To produce a quantitative measure to the process, a questionnaire with no negative comments was given a nominal score of five marks; every negative comment reduced that by one mark. The overall level was over 92% in favour of the Plan and its policies.

As the Team was conscious of a possible bias towards higher age ranges (mentioned elsewhere), the time of one of the meetings was specifically arranged to be convenient for parents of school children, and all parents at the Village School were written to, to inform them of this. Once again there was a heavy preponderance of replies from those over 65, and none from anyone under 36.

One wording was changed at this point for clarity – limits on second homes (Policy NP04) applied to “newly-built” dwellings rather than “new” ones.
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION

Before we can submit the Plan formally to the Borough, we have to seek the comments of residents and businesses on the draft that you have been able to see today. Once we have these, we can make any necessary adjustments before the final process begins. The Borough then have their own period for further representations on the plan, and an Inspector assesses the process. A simple majority in favour at the Referendum makes the Plan law, and it then has the same weight as other local and national planning regulations.

Please let us know what you think of this final draft of the Plan:
What do you like about the Plan?

What do you not like about the Plan?

Which policies do you agree with, and why?

Which policies do you not agree with, and why?

To help establish that we have consulted as widely as possible it is very useful to have some basic information about you. Please be assured that this is confidential – it is just to help with any statistical breakdown of the responses we have.

Please describe yourself:
- Snettisham Resident
- Snettisham Business Owner
- Landowner
- Developer
- None of the above

Please specify: _________________________

(tick one)

Please give your age group:
- Under 20
- 20-35
- 36-50
- 51-65
- Over 65

(tick one)

Home/business postcode: _________________________

Thank you for your comments - continue below if necessary. Please return this today, or to the Parish Office by 27th January.
APPENDIX 8 – Response from Pigeon Investments to Consultation on Draft at public meetings in January 2017
[NB the references to policies and appendices are to those at the time; action on comments summarised in Appendix 6]

CONSULTATION ON DRAFT SNETTISHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN, JANUARY 2017
RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF PIGEON INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT LTD

Thank you for consulting Pigeon Investment Management (‘Pigeon’) on the draft Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan.

Pigeon, in partnership with the landowners for land at Poppyfields Drive and land at Beach Road, very much welcome the opportunity to engage with the Neighbourhood Plan Team on the preparation of the Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan.

We consider that the draft Plan sets out a clear and coherent set of policy objectives for the village, for which the Neighbourhood Plan Team should be commended.

We generally support the draft Neighbourhood Plan and very much look forward to working collaboratively with both the Neighbourhood Plan Team and the local community to bring forward a high quality community-led scheme within the village.

The following sets out our detailed comments on some of the specific policies identified within the draft Plan and is intended to assist the Neighbourhood Plan Team in its preparation of the submission version document.

1. New residential development should take place on currently available land near to Poppyfields

We support the identification of land at Poppyfields as identified in Appendix 10.3 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for the provision of new homes. As noted within the draft Neighbourhood Plan the site is well related to existing development at Poppyfields and presents the opportunity to bring forward a high quality scheme, which has good access to existing services and facilities within the village.

We do, however, consider that the land to the east of the proposed allocation site at Poppyfields would also form a natural infill between the proposed allocation site and existing development at Poppyfields and Mallard Close (to the east) as well as proposed development off Teal Close and existing housing off Common Road (to the north). We would therefore encourage the Neighbourhood Plan Team to consider inclusion of this land (as identified on the enclosed location plan) within the Neighbourhood Plan. We consider that this land would be suitable for the provision of a small number of self-build homes to help meet the needs of people wishing to build their own home during the life of the Neighbourhood Plan (period up to 2032). Given the typical larger nature of self-build plots this additional land would represent a very modest number of homes over the Plan period, whilst making provision for the increasing number of people who have an aspiration to build their own home.

The additional revenue that would be generated by the inclusion of the self-build plots could also be used to provide a contribution to a Snettisham community fund helping to support new or existing facilities in the village and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss this concept further with the Neighbourhood Plan Team.

2. The number of new dwellings should be 20-40

We support the identification of the proposed allocation site for between 20-40 new homes. However, feel that it would be prudent to introduce a degree of flexibility into the policy wording to ensure that new homes are in keeping with the density and character of development in the surrounding area. Introducing flexibility into the policy wording would also assist in helping to ensure that affordable housing needs within the village can be adequately met during the Neighbourhood Plan period.

The following amended wording may assist the Neighbourhood Plan Team in this regard (new wording is underlined) and would help to ensure that market housing provision is commensurate with affordable housing provision.
The number of new dwellings should be approximately 20-40, subject to the scheme being in keeping with the density and character of existing development in the surrounding area and making adequate provision to meet housing needs within the village.

3. New dwellings should consist predominantly of semi-detached houses and bungalows with two or three bedrooms

Draft Policy 3 already provides some flexibility within the policy wording through the inclusion of the word predominantly. However, given the proposed Plan period (up to 2032) there is potential for housing needs within the village to evolve over this period, in particular affordable housing needs. The Neighbourhood Plan Group may therefore wish to consider the addition of the following wording (new wording is underlined) to draft policy 3 to ensure that the policy is suitably flexible to endure for the life of the Plan.

New dwellings should consist predominantly of semi-detached houses and bungalows with two or three bedrooms. An alternative dwelling mix will be supported where this meets local housing needs or is required to meet the need for affordable homes.

5. There should be between 20-30% affordable units

We generally support policy 5. However, we note that the current requirement for affordable housing provision within King’s Lynn & West Norfolk is 20% and is usually provided in the form of 70% affordable rent and 30% shared ownership (as set out under Core Strategy policy CS09). Whilst we are comfortable with providing affordable housing in accordance with local policy (and in some instances have exceeded local policy requirements for affordable homes), we consider that policy 5 should provide a flexible approach to the tenure of affordable housing if more than 20% affordable housing is provided. We would therefore encourage the Neighbourhood Plan Team to consider making provision for any increase above 20% affordable housing provision to be made up of shared equity homes and starter homes in order to ensure consistency with adopted planning policy and assist with scheme viability.

As stated in our comments in respect of policy 2, we would also suggest that consideration is given to providing flexibility in respect of the total number of homes that are permitted on the land at Poppyfields to allow for a commensurate level of market housing to be provided to meet affordable housing needs.

An amended form of wording for policy 5 is set out below in order to assist the Neighbourhood Plan Team (new wording is underlined).

There should be between 20-30% affordable units. Where affordable housing provision exceeds 20% the additional affordable homes may include shared equity homes and starter homes.

6. Affordable units should be available with a mix of rent and purchase options

As per our comments in respect of policy 5 we would suggest a minor amendment to policy 6 to include the following text (new wording is underlined):

Affordable units should be available with a mix of rent and purchase options and may include intermediate housing and starter homes.

7. Dwellings should include local materials, e.g. carrstone, and be in keeping with the rest of the village

We support this policy and would envisage local materials, including carrstone and other materials that are in keeping with the rest of the village, being included as part of a high quality scheme on land at Poppyfields.

12. Larger scale commercial development should only take place west of the A149

We support policy 12 and the identification of land west of the A149 for commercial development. The land is well related to the existing village but is an appropriate location for commercial uses given its separation from residential areas within the main part of the village (east of the A149), the presence of existing commercial uses and good access to the A149. However, we would suggest that in order to provide clarity and in order for policy 12 to be consistent with policy 1, that it would be appropriate for the land at Beach Road (as identified on the enclosed plan) to be identified on the plan at Appendix 10.4 with the following added to the text at Appendix 10.4 (new text underlined):

APPENDIX 10.4 – Current Major Commercial and Retail Site with Proposed Commercial Site

…shops, cafes etc. The solid blue area is the land west of the A149 proposed by the Plan
We would also suggest the following minor amendment to the wording of policy 12 (new wording is underlined):

*Large scale commercial development should only take place west of the A149 – see Appendix 10.4*

We trust that the above comments will assist the Neighbourhood Plan Team in finalising the draft Plan prior to its submission to the Borough Council. Thank you once again for providing us with the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan and we very much look forward to working collaboratively with both the Neighbourhood Plan Team and the local community to bring forward a high quality community-led scheme within the village.

In the meantime we would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss our comments further and will contact you shortly with a view to organising a suitable meeting time.

Yours faithfully

Rob Snowling
Principal Planner
APPENDIX 9 – Responses to SEA Scoping Report consultation: [reformatted]

Natural England:

Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan SEA and HRA requirement.

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 19th April 2017 which was received by Natural England on the same date.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Neighbourhood Plan
Guidance on the assessment of Neighbourhood Plans in light of the SEA Directive is contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance. The guidance highlights three triggers that may require the production of an SEA, for instance where:

- a neighbourhood plan allocates sites for development
- the neighbourhood area contains sensitive natural or heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals in the plan
- the neighbourhood plan may have significant environmental effects that have not already been considered and dealt with through a sustainability appraisal of the Local Plan

There are a number of designated sites in or in close proximity to the neighbourhood area for which Impact Risk Zones may be triggered depending on the location and type of development including:

- The Wash Ramsar, SPA, SSSI
- The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC
- Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog SAC
- Dersingham Bog Ramsar, SSSI
- Snettisham Carstone Quarry SSSI
- Heacham Brick Pit SSSI
- Norfolk Coast AONB

The latest Impact Risk Zone dataset is available here (Link to datasets).

Habitats Regulation Assessment
Given the proximity of the Neighbourhood Plan area to a number of Natura 2000 sites Natural England concur with the LPAs scoping that a Habitats Regulation Assessment would be appropriate. Any mitigation proposed within the Neighbourhood Plan needs to align with wider strategic mitigation within the Local Plan. In the absence of an adopted local plan, the neighbourhood plan can only proceed if adequate avoidance and mitigation measures can be secured at the neighbourhood plan level.
**Landscape**

All allocations within, or within the setting of a protected landscape should have a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment. The NPPF Paragraph 115 states that ‘Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Any development should be in line with NPPF Paragraph 116. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

**Agricultural Land**

We have not checked the agricultural land classification of the proposed neighbourhood plan area, but we advise you ensure that any allocations on best and most versatile land are justified in line with para 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Protected Species**

We are not aware of significant populations of protected species which are likely to be affected by the policies/proposals within the plan. It remains the case, however, that the responsible authority should provide information supporting this screening decision, sufficient to assess whether protected species are likely to be affected.

Notwithstanding this advice, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all potential environmental assets. As a result the responsible authority should raise environmental issues that we have not identified on local or national biodiversity action plan species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites or local landscape character, with its own ecological and/or landscape advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local landscape and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by this plan, before determining whether an SA/SEA is necessary.

Please refer to Annex 1 of this letter with regards information sources and issues to consider within the plan.

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Tamara Rowson on 02082257775. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have...
attached a feedback form and welcome any comments you might have about our service.

In addition, there was generic advice documentation regarding Neighbourhood Plans. Similar advice was the only comment received from Historic England. The Environment Agency merely re-iterated the requirements for SEA and HRA inclusion.
APPENDIX 10 – Responses to pre-submission consultation

10.1 – BCKLWN Housing Development Officer – email rec. 26/6/17 - reformatted

Good afternoon

We have received the above document and will provide full comments in due course. However, I am interested in the source of one of the statistics contained in the document. 4.1 on page 9 states that the level of holiday homes has risen above 70% in some parishes in the Borough. We are aware of claims that holiday homes and second homes make up 70-75% of dwellings in some parishes but we are not aware of any evidence to support this. Our own data from council tax and non-domestic rates suggest that the highest percentage in any parish in the borough is around 53%.

It would be appreciated if you could send me details of the source that you have used for this figure.

Kind regards

Karl Patterson
Housing Development Officer,
Borough Council of King’s Lynn & West Norfolk and Breckland Council
10.2 – Mr R E Clark – member of the public – letter rec. 31/7/17

For the attention of the Parish Clerk
Mr Simon Bowers

Dear Simon,

Neighbourhood Plan 2017

Would you please bring my following suggestion to the Parish Council for inclusion in the pre-submission draft plan.

I would like to see the land to the north of Poppy Field Drive adjacent to the existing play area developed as a community retirement village complex consisting of 1 or 2 bedroom self-contained flats with a residential care home adjacent. The land at front could be developed as a South facing community garden with off road visitor parking. The main car park would be at the rear of the complex. The site is situated on a main Bus route. The flats would be in a Hotel type environment with maybe a coffee shop / bar and a small restaurant also a residential lounge and space for hobbies.

This type of development is new to this part of the world but is very much needed and would be an asset to the village and would also bring some local employment. Many organisations are now developing this type of complex under the heading of assisted living including Saga.

Increasing numbers of retired people wish to become part of an active and supportive community and enjoy a range of social activities to which they can both contribute and draw upon that can also offer temporary or permanent care services should a time of need arise. These services enable people to live full, rewarding lives, to make new friends within their immediate community, perhaps to learn new skills and to continue to live independently for as long as possible. With purpose-built care accommodation available in the same complex, they know that they will be able to avoid the disruption of a major move in their later years and remain in the proximity of their friends. This is particularly important in the case of couples when one partner requires enhanced care and support while the other would be able to continue his/her habitual way of living.

Mr R. E. Clark former Parish Councillor.
10.3 – Historic England – Historic Places Advisor – emailed letter rec. 24/7/17

Historic England
EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

Mr Simon Rosser
Snettisham Parish Council
Parish Office
75 Lynn Road
SNETTISHAM
Norfolk
PE31 7CA

Dear Mr Rosser

Neighbourhood Plan for Snettisham

Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Neighbourhood Plan. As the Government’s advisor on the historic environment, Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Therefore we welcome the opportunity to comment on the Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan.

Your Neighbourhood Plan area encompasses the Snettisham Conservation Area and includes a number of other designated heritage assets including two Scheduled Monuments and 33 Listed Buildings, including the Church of St Mary (Grade I), Snettisham Old Hall (Grade II*), The Mill (Grade II*), and Ken Hill (Grade II). It will be important that the plan identifies these heritage assets, and that the strategy you put forward for the conservation area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets. This will assist in ensuring they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure your plan is in line with the requirements national planning policy.

The Conservation Officer at North Norfolk District Council is the best placed person to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan. They can help you to consider how the strategy might address the area’s heritage assets. At this stage we are not considering there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area.

Your local authority might also be able to provide you with general support in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan. National Planning Practice Guidance is clear that where it is relevant, Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide planning decisions and to put broader strategic heritage policies from the local authority’s local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets, including sites of archaeological interest, to guide decisions.

24 July 2017
A Neighbourhood Plan is an important opportunity for a community to develop a positive strategy for the area’s locally important heritage assets that aren’t necessarily recognised at a national level through listing or scheduling. This includes identifying any non-statutory designated buildings, sites, or places of importance to the local community, and setting out what factors make them special. This could also include consideration of any Grade II listed buildings or locally designated heritage assets at risk. This information can be used as a sound evidence base to develop a set of robust policies that protect what is special about Snettisham, and also set out the quality of the development that would be expected in your area, ensuring that, amongst other things, it responds to local character and history, reflecting Snettisham’s unique identity. It is also an opportunity to identify any potential Assets of Community Value in your neighbourhood area.

If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staff at Norfolk County Council who look after the Historic Environment Record and give advice on archaeological matters. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally important buildings, archaeological remains, and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available online via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritageway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society, local history groups, building conservation trusts, etc. in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.

We note that the Neighbourhood Plan proposes to allocate land for development, both to the north of Popple Lane and to the west of the A149. It is not apparent that the Forum has undertaken the process of determining whether or not Strategic Environmental Assessment is required for the Plan to comply with EU obligations. In order to establish whether or not any site allocations/policies in the final plan might have significant effects on the historic environment, it is necessary for your Forum to consult us (together with the Environment Agency and Natural England) on the matter so that we might assist you in coming to a view. We will then formally advise on the likelihood of the Plan having significant environmental effects upon the historic environment such that Strategic Environmental Assessment is required. The consultation should take the form of a Screening Opinion. More information on this can be found in our HE Advice Note 8 - Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment: [https://historicengland.org.uk/documents/historic-environment-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/]

Further information and guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans has been produced by Historic England. This signposts a number of other documents which your community might find useful in helping to identify what is special about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. This can be found at:
The following general guidance may also be useful to your forum in preparing your neighbourhood plan, or considering how best to develop a strategy for the conservation and management of heritage assets in your area:

HE Advice Note 1 - conservation area designation, appraisal and management:

HE Advice Note 2 - making changes to heritage assets:

HP Advice Note 3 - site allocations in local plans:

HE Advice Note 7 - local listing: https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/locally-heritage-listing-advice-note-7/

Finally, we would like to stress that this advice is based on the information provided by Snettisham Parish Council in your email of 21 June 2017. To avoid any doubt, this does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed neighbourhood plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.

If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Edward James
Historic Places Advisor, East of England
Edward.James@historicengland.org.uk

cc. Pam Lynn, Conservation Officer, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council
10.4 – Anglian Water Strategic and Spatial Planning Manager – email 3/8/17 - reformatted

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan. The following comments are submitted on behalf of Anglian Water. I would be grateful if you could confirm that you have received this response.

**Policy NP01**

It is noted that the proposed site is to be allocated for residential development for 20 to 40 dwellings.

We have no objection to the principle of development on this site. However it is important to note that improvements to the existing water supply network and potentially the foul sewerage network are expected to be required to enable the development of this allocation site.

Therefore it would be helpful to include reference to water and wastewater infrastructure requirements for this site as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Should you have any queries relating to this response please let me know.

Regards,

**Stewart Patience**  
Strategic and Spatial Planning Manager  
Anglian Water Services Limited

10.5 – Norfolk County Council – email 4/8/17 - reformatted

Norfolk County Council Comments on the:  
Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan (Reg 14)  
August 2017

1. **Preface**

   The officer-level comments below are made on a without prejudice basis and the County Council reserves the right to make further comments on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

   The County Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and recognises the considerable amount of work and effort which has been put into developing the Plan to date.

2. **Infrastructure Delivery**

   The neighbourhood plan will need to consider the following;

   Housing and other development will be expected to contribute towards improving local services and infrastructure (such as transport, education; library provision, fire hydrant provision, open space etc.) through either the payment of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL); planning obligations (via an s106 agreement / s278 agreement); or use of a planning condition/s.
Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service advocates the installation of sprinklers in all new developments. Sprinklers have a proven track record to protect property and lives. It would therefore be helpful if the emerging Neighbourhood Plan could refer to the installation of Sprinklers in new development. The neighbourhood plan should therefore contain policies referencing the delivery of the above infrastructure and services.

2.2. Should you have any queries with the above comments please call Naomi Chamberlain (Trainee Planner) on 01603 638422 or email naomi.chamberlain@norfolk.gov.uk.

3. Lead Local Flood Authority
The County Council considers that a flooding policy should be included in the Plan, the following policy is advised;

INTENTION
The Plan seeks to contribute towards strategic multi-agency efforts to reduce the risk of flooding from all sources in the Plan area. It seeks to promote a range of assessment and mitigation measures that will ensure that any future development (or redevelopment) will have a neutral or positive impact on flooding.

POLICY: FLOODING/DRAINAGE

3.3. The Plan requires that any future development (or redevelopment) proposals show there is no increased risk of flooding from an existing flood source and mitigation measures are implemented to address surface water arising within the development site.

Any new development or significant alteration to an existing building within the Plan area should be accompanied by an appropriate assessment which gives adequate and appropriate consideration to all sources of flooding and proposed surface water drainage. Any application made to a local planning authority will be required to demonstrate that it would:
Not increase the flood risk to the site or wider area from fluvial, surface water, groundwater, sewers or artificial sources.
Have a neutral or positive impact on surface water drainage.

Proposals must demonstrate engagement with relevant agencies and seek to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures manage flood risk and to reduce surface water run-off to the development and wider area such as:
Inclusion of appropriate measures to address any identified risk of flooding (in the following order or priority: assess, avoid, manage and mitigate flood risk).
Where appropriate undertake sequential and /or exception tests.
Locate only compatible development in areas at risk of flooding, considering the proposed vulnerability of land use.
Inclusion of appropriate allowances for climate change
Inclusion of Sustainable Drainage proposals (SuDS) with an appropriate discharge location.
Priority use of source control SuDS such as permeable surfaces, rainwater harvesting and storage or green roofs and walls. Other SuDS components which convey or store surface water can also be considered.
To mitigate against the creation of additional impermeable surfaces, attenuation of greenfield (or for redevelopment sites as close to greenfield as possible) surface water runoff rates and runoff volumes within the development site boundary.
Provide clear maintenance and management proposals of structures within the development, including SuDS elements, riparian ownership of ordinary watercourses or culverts, and their associated funding mechanisms.

3.4 More information can be found on the LLFA website -
3.5. Should you have any queries with the above comments please email Helen Underwood (Senior Flood Risk Officer) at llfa@norfolk.gov.uk.

4. **Transport**
   4.1. When considering off-road parking standards (policy NP10) the neighbourhood plan must adhere to Norfolk County Council parking standards available here - https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-planning/planning-applications/design-of-developments/highway-advice-for-developers#Parking.

   4.2. Should you have any queries with the above comments please call Ian Parkes (Senior Infrastructure and Economic Growth Planner) on 01603 223288 or email ian.parkes@norfolk.gov.uk.

5. **Minerals and Waste**
   5.1. Norfolk County Council, in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority for Norfolk, wishes to highlight that Mineral Safeguarding Areas underlie the areas proposed for development in the draft Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan (land near to Poppyfields in Policy NP01 (page 8) and land at the junction of the A149 and Beach Road in Policy NP12, page 11).

   5.2. The NPPF includes a requirement for policies to be included in local plans in order that areas of known mineral resources (designated as Mineral Safeguarding Areas) are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development. In Norfolk this is implemented through adopted Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 – Safeguarding.

   5.3. Proposals for development on Mineral Safeguarding Areas will need to meet the requirements of Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16; for mineral investigation, assessment and potentially a level of prior extraction if an economically viable resource is proved.

   5.4. Therefore, the Mineral Planning Authority recommends a modification to Policies NP01 and NP12 and the supporting text, so that prospective developers of these sites are aware of the potential for them to have to address mineral safeguarding within any application, as follows:

   **Policy NP01**
   The site is underlain by a defined Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. Any future development on this site will need to address the requirements of Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 – ‘safeguarding’ in relation to mineral resources.

   **Policy NP12**
   The site is underlain by a defined Mineral Safeguarding Area for silica sand. Any future development on this site will need to address the requirements of Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 – ‘safeguarding’ in relation to mineral resources.

   Norfolk County Council, as the statutory authority for Mineral Planning in Norfolk wishes to be kept informed as the Plan is progressed.

   5.6. Should you have any queries with the above comments please call Caroline Jeffery (Principal Planner) on 01603 222193 or email caroline.jeffery@norfolk.gov.uk.
04 August 2017

Snuttisham Neighbourhood Plan Team
73 Lynne Road
Snuttisham
Norfolk
PE31 7QA

SENT VIA EMAIL TO SNETTISHPARISH@BTCONNECT.COM

Dear Sirs

CONSULTATION ON DRAFT SNETTISHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2017 RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF PIGEON INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT LTD

Thank you for consulting Pigeon Investment Management Ltd (‘Pigeon’) on the draft Snuttisham Neighbourhood Plan.

Pigeon, in partnership with the landowners for the land at Poppyfields Drive and land at Beach Road, very much welcome the continued opportunity to engage with the Neighbourhood Plan Team on the preparation of the Snuttisham Neighbourhood Plan.

We consider that the draft Neighbourhood Plan sets out a clear and coherent set of policy objectives for the village, for which the Neighbourhood Plan Team should be commended.

We generally support the draft Neighbourhood Plan and very much look forward to working collaboratively with both the Neighbourhood Plan team and local community to bring forward a high-quality community-led scheme within the village.

The following sets out our detailed comments on some of the specific policies identified within the draft Plan and is intended to assist the Neighbourhood Plan team in its preparation of the submission version document.

NP01 - New residential development should take place on currently available land near to Poppyfields

We support the identification of land at Poppyfields for the provision of new homes. As noted within the draft Neighbourhood Plan the site is well related to existing development at Poppyfields and presents the opportunity to bring forward a high-quality scheme, which has good access to existing services and facilities within the village.

We wish to take this opportunity to draw your attention to an administrative error that has arisen in plotting the boundary of the proposed allocation. The northern boundary line does not follow the current field boundary and it is suggested the site boundary be amended to reflect the field boundary. Please see Appendix A for the suggested revision.
NP06 – Affordable units should be available with a mix of rent and purchase options.

We are supportive of the objective of this policy to provide a variety of affordable housing types, but suggest this range be expanded to include Starter Homes. Starter Homes have been promoted by the Government to help young (below 40 years) first-time buyers purchase a home at a minimum 20% discount off the market price, and including Starter Homes along with Shared Ownership/Shared Equity in the mix of the affordable houses will encourage young families to move to and remain in the village.

An amended form of wording for policy NP06 is set out below in order to assist the Neighbourhood Plan Team (new wording is underlined)

Affordable units should be available with a mix of Affordable Rent, Shared Equity/Shared Ownership, Starter Homes and purchase options.

NP05 – There should be between 20 – 30% affordable units. Where affordable housing provision exceeds 20% the additional affordable homes may include shared equity homes and Starter Homes.

We are generally supportive of this policy. However, as referenced in the response to policy NP06, we suggest Shared Equity and Starter Homes be included as part of the total affordable housing mix in order to attract and retain young families in the village.

An amended form of wording for policy NP05 is set out below in order to assist the Neighbourhood Plan Team (new wording is underlined)

There should be between 20 – 30% affordable units. Affordable housing provision may include a mix of Affordable Rent, Shared Equity/Shared Ownership, Starter Homes and purchase options.

NP07 – Dwellings should include local materials, e.g. carrstone, and be in keeping with the rest of the village

We support this policy and would envisage local materials, including carrstone and other materials that are in keeping with the rest of the village, being included as part of a high-quality scheme on land at Poppyfields.

NP08 – Dwellings should be constructed to the best practicable environmental standards

Current Building Regulation standards equate to Code for Sustainable Homes Level4, which requires high standards to be met for energy, potable water consumption, waste, materials, surface water run-off, pollution, health and well-being, management and ecology. Failing construction standards to the ’best practicable environmental standards’ has the potential to substantially influence the ’affordability’ of the affordable units for Registered Providers and it is recommended the policy be adjusted accordingly.
An amended form of wording for policy NP12 is set out below in order to assist the Neighbourhood Plan Team (new wording is underlined)

**Dwellings should look to exceed construction standards which exceed Building Regulation standards**

NP12 – Large scale commercial development should only take place west of the A149.
NP12.1 – The preferred site is at the junction of the A149 and Beach Road.
NP12.2 – No further access points directly onto the A149 should be allowed as a result.

We support policy NP12 and the identification of land west of the A149 for commercial development. The land is well related to the existing village but is an appropriate location for commercial uses given its separation from residential areas within the main part of the village (east of the A149), the presence of existing commercial uses and good access to the A149.

**NP14 – The six-acre standard for open space should guide long-term planning decisions in Snettisham.**
**NP14a – Two areas should formally be designated ‘Green Space’**

We support the ambitions of the draft Neighbourhood Plan to achieve the six-acre standard of open space in the village, but feel this is not best achieved through designating ‘Poppyfields East’ as open space. This land parcel has low levels of ‘natural surveillance’, with no properties offering direct views onto this land (houses in Mallard Close and Goosander Close and those accessed off the private roads leading from Common Road only have rear gardens backing onto this land). **‘Secured by Design’ (official police security initiative) guidance encourages high levels of natural surveillance overlooking communal areas, such as public open space, in order to discourage anti-social behaviour and minimise the opportunity for crime to be committed.**

We suggest the Neighbourhood Plan be amended so that the open space is re-positioned to the west of the site, adjacent to the existing play area. This arrangement would ensure appropriate levels of natural surveillance are provided in addition to creating a single large, and more usable amenity area for the village to enjoy. Please see Appendix B for the suggested revision.

**NP17 – This Plan should remain in force until the end of 2032**

We support the fifteen-year lifetime of the Plan, but suggest the Plan is reviewed at 5-year intervals (after 5 years and again after 10 years) in order to allow the Neighbourhood Plan Team an opportunity to assess whether the Plan is achieving its objectives and make any amendments.

It is suggested the following wording (new wording underlined) set out below is added to the supporting text to Policy NP17.

17.3 The Plan can be reviewed after 5 years and/or 10 years.
Comments on Pre-Submission Draft Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan

by Officers of the Borough Council of King’s Lynn & West Norfolk

07/08/17

It is clear that an enormous amount of work, thought and care has gone into producing the plan, and the Neighbourhood Plan team should be commended for their efforts.

Taken as a whole, though, it is sometimes difficult to see

- what the community’s priorities are,
- that the plan reflects the Borough strategic policies and positively supports them,
- that sufficient focus has been given to the realities of what might be viable and deliverable, and
- how the plan might be an effective tool in practice for decision makers and others.

The Borough Council officers support the Parish Councils involvement in shaping development in the area and in achieving quality development which enhances the area for the benefit of existing and new residents and others. It will continue to offer advice and assistance to refine the neighbourhood plan to achieve these aims, and to progress the plan through the formal processes towards adoption.

Since the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) will be relevant for planning applications in Snettisham, an internal consultation with our colleagues from Development Control took place, and their responses regarding the practicability and understanding of the proposed policies, on grounds of their experience with other neighbourhood plans, has been implemented within this pre-submission consultation response.

The Borough Council’s officers more detailed comments are set out below. In general we do not want to object to the Neighbourhood Plan Draft, but want to make clear, that certain adaption and finalisation of the plan draft seem necessary to pass the independent examination and progress to referendum. We would welcome further dialogue on how these can be addressed.

Abbreviations:
CS Core Strategy
LP Local Plan
NP Neighbourhood Plan
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework
PC Parish Council
SADMP Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Document
The Basic Conditions which neighbourhood plans must meet:

- Supports sustainable development;
- Generally conforms with local plan strategic policies
- Regard to National Planning Policy Framework
- Compliant with EU requirements
- Not likely to affect European designated nature conservation sites

General Comments

1. In general, a NP will be the first document considered in the decision making process for planning applications in the neighbourhood plan area, therefore it is important that the plan provides a clear framework of policies. Therefore, it is important, that policies of the NP are clear (e.g. for allocation or for the whole NP area)

2. Attention should be given to existing policies in the Core Strategy, the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, and how the NP will work with these. Some of the topics in the NP are already covered in some way by these, and they will continue to operate alongside the Neighbourhood Plan. The neighbourhood plan does not, therefore, need to invent a whole planning framework, but identify what should (and could) be particular and special in the neighbourhood plan area.

3. Many of the same or similar comments to those below have previously been made by the Borough Council officers at earlier stages of the plan preparation. These are likely to be made again within an independent health-check, if undertaken, or formally, for consideration by the Examiner, when the plan is submitted if these are not addressed previously. Some of the key issues raised in these earlier comments remain to be addressed. Unless these are addressed before submission, there is a risk that the Neighbourhood Plan will be found not to meet the Basic Conditions, or have to have substantial deletions and modifications made to it.

4. An overview map including the residential allocation, the proposed commercial development site and the Green Space designations should be included.
**Individual Comments**

Note those relating to the Borough Council’s officers greatest concerns are highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title / Policy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Suggested Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>The PC should be aware that in the case of a “five year housing land supply” issue, certain conditions have to be met to have a NP which is not considered “out of date”. The “at least 34 dwellings” is the number for the allocation in Snettisham; it does not mean that development cannot happen at other sites, e.g. infill within the development boundary. The term “windfall sites” is used to refer to those sites which become available for development unexpectedly and are therefore not included as allocated land in a planning authority’s development plan. Due to the nature of windfall development, this can add housing numbers to the ones planned from allocations. (See also comment at NP01 below). The Parish Council and the Borough Council do have a common interest to locate development appropriately. Since this document is available to the public and will form part of the development plan certain parts of the current wording do not fully represent the practicalities such as the situation pertaining to a “five year land supply” situation. It could be reworded to make more explicit the practicalities, i.e. national policies may come into play, but this is beyond the influence of the Borough or Parish. The need for a “local plan”. The NP is not a “local plan”.</td>
<td>Consider rewording of this section. Consider to add a definition of windfall sites (e.g. in footnote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use coherent wording.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Section 4     | Maybe include the general considerations about the timeframe of the plan (currently Policy NP17) here. | Make reference to Policy NP17 in Section 4. |

<p>| Note above Policies | Can be overlooked quite easily, in particular if you look at one policy without reading the whole policy section. In general a policy should be “clear and unambiguous.” | Consider either making this note more visible or make specific reference to it in the policies to avoid ambiguity. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title / Policy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Suggested Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP01</td>
<td>The Note above the Policies explains that all Policies except NP01 refer to the whole Plan Area; therefore the proposed allocation does not include a minimum figure of houses. Although, as pointed out previously the average density based on the Settlement Hierarchy suggests 59 dwellings may be possible for this site. In this regard even if the whole number of houses given in NP02 is developed at Poppyfields, the density might be too low in terms of viability / affordable housing provision, etc. There seems to be no policy addressing potential windfall sites. As written the Section 6 – Note there is a confusion about this.</td>
<td>Add a proposed Housing Number for this site -&gt; e.g. as in the SADMP “Land amounting to ... hectares, as shown on the Map, is allocated for residential development of at least ... dwellings. Clarify role of residential “windfall sites”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider effects of Policy NP02 and NP03 (if 20-40 are the maximum number for the whole site, the density might be too low to be viable, additionally if you want a Provision of 30% affordable housing it might add additional problems in terms of viability -&gt; allow flexibility which allows e.g. a slightly higher number of dwellings to be able to provide the high number of affordable houses)</td>
<td>Adjustment in regard to Policy NP02 and NP03.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP02</td>
<td>The Note states that this number applies for the whole area, though if one reads it it sounds as if it applies for your allocation (you even refer to the number of 34 dwellings at the SADMP allocation) Variety of 20-40 is very broad (potential 100% increase to minimum number). The PC should remember that development can also happen at other places (e.g. windfall sites) within the NP area -&gt; development boundary and SADMP allocation. The simple 20-40 unit figure could lead to an unreasonable expectation that there is an upper limit that can be enforced. Justification as to why this number is suitable for the Plan Period seems to be missing. What happens if a certain proposal includes 41 houses and is considered acceptable and sustainable? An ultimate number of housing might be too restrictive, it is not only new residents which need new houses, also changes in the household size (average household size is lower than in the past) due to personal reasons of the inhabitants leads to higher demand. Conflict with Policy NP01 and existing Policy SADMP: G83.1 (at least 34 houses)</td>
<td>Consider a rewording and reshaping of this policy. Clarify the role of “windfall sites”. If it should apply for the whole area, A target of residents instead might be more appropriate than a number of houses. Clarify timescales and applicability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title / Policy</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Suggested Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP03</td>
<td>What about dwellings with multiple occupation? E.g. affordable housing might be easier to provide as flats. Flats may also be suitable for family occupation, and particularly smaller dwellings might be more sustainable if they are constructed as flats instead of individual houses. Flats may also offer benefits in regard to accommodate elderly or disabled residents.</td>
<td>Consider if a mix of houses/offset might be more beneficial?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification - What evidence exists that there is no need for flats in Snettisham?</td>
<td>To consider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP04</td>
<td>Consider comments from Housing Department; what is the evidence for 70% second homes figure?</td>
<td>Include specific evidence regarding second homes in Snettisham, and direct impacts caused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP05</td>
<td>Conflicting existing with Policy (Core Strategy) C509: Current affordable housing standards in C509 require 20%. The aspiration to have a greater % is understood, but where is the specific evidence. There may be implications for scheme viability. It would be helpful to discuss this issue with the Borough Council Strategic Housing section. Threshold for affordable housing provision?</td>
<td>Does the same threshold as in C509 apply?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing evidence/justification for affordable housing up to 30%?</td>
<td>Explain why the Borough wide policies are not sufficient. Justify why Snettisham needs a variation to give up to 30%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider comments from Housing Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP06</td>
<td>Repetition of an existing Policy C3 (C509): &quot;Tenure mix - 70:30 Rented to owned ownership&quot;</td>
<td>Consider removal if it is simply repeating existing policy. If present policy is not sufficient, explain why and what is more sufficient (evidence needed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider comments from Housing Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP07</td>
<td>There could be a conflict with NP03. Environmental standards for houses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial repetition of existing Policy SADPP DM15: &quot;The scale, height, massing, materials and layout of a development should respond sensitively and sympathetically to the local setting and pattern of adjacent streets including spaces between buildings through high quality design and use of materials&quot;</td>
<td>Is there more specific design guidance that could or should be included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title / Policy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Suggested Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP08</td>
<td>This is more an aspiration than a policy. With this vague phrasing what proof would they need to provide in their application that they can implement certain environmental standards? They may well seek to show that higher standards would not be viable/practicable. There is a difficulty that no specific standards are referenced.</td>
<td>The policy could be altered to request that developers are &quot;...encouraged...&quot; to meet best practicable standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP09</td>
<td>This is a very broad wording for the policy. Should there be particular sizes specified, or types of spaces? Is any type of &quot;garden&quot; appropriate? How to consider if flats are developed?</td>
<td>Make the policy &quot;clear and unambiguous&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP 10</td>
<td><strong>What is off-road parking appropriate to the size of the dwelling?</strong></td>
<td>Make the policy &quot;clear and unambiguous&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This policy refers to a topic already dealt with in existing policy SADMP DM 17. <em>Residential dwellings</em> New dwellings (including flats and maisonettes) will be required to include car parking to the following minimum standards: a. One bedroomed unit — 1 space per dwelling; b. Two or three bedroomed unit — 2 spaces per dwelling; c. Four or more bedroomed unit — 3 spaces per dwelling.</td>
<td>If existing policy or standards are sufficient, consider whether policy is relevant, or make reference to the Borough Council policy in text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP 11</td>
<td><strong>Policy conflicts with NP01, NP02, NP03 due to wording &quot;only small scale retail and other business development should be allowed&quot; -&gt; is no residential (infill) development allowed?</strong></td>
<td>Make the policy &quot;clear and unambiguous&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of small scale retail is missing.</td>
<td>Add the necessary definition of small scale retail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conflicts with Development Boundaries of the Local Plan - Development Boundaries already exist. The &quot;Village Envelope&quot; is shown as an Internal designation&quot; (note 4) It does not seek to replace these boundaries. It is not clear as to the purpose/status of the lines in the NPP.</strong></td>
<td>Consider use of the development boundaries instead to remove possible conflicts of different sorts of lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP 12</td>
<td><strong>Clarification of NP 12.1 where does &quot;west of the A149&quot; refer to? -&gt; as shown on the map</strong></td>
<td>Consider a rewording to make it clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Clarification of NP 12.2 &quot;no further access onto the A149&quot; -&gt; access from where?</strong></td>
<td>Clarify allocation at NP12.1 on plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title / Policy</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Suggested Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP13</td>
<td>Clarification needed. Which kind of development should be prohibited? What are small-scale concerns related to tourism or wildlife? Why should policies SADMP/CS be superseded?</td>
<td>Make the policy “clear and unambiguous”, and additionally define the site on the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan Development: Boundaries, Allocations and NP allocations are relevant for planning applications. This Policy also refers to the informal designation of the “Village Envelope” therefore it leads to confusion. Informal designation and development boundaries are not the same.</td>
<td>Consider a use of the development boundaries instead, to remove possible conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confusing repetition and adoption of existing policies.</td>
<td>Make the policy “clear and unambiguous”, if existing policies are sufficient consider deletion of policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP14</td>
<td>Definition of “six acre standard” – is it the Fields in Trust guideline?</td>
<td>Clarification needed, which “six acre standard” and what does it mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition of existing Policy if the Fields in Trust guideline is meant – see Policy SADMP DM 16 – Provision of Recreational Open Space for Residential Developments</td>
<td>If existing policies are sufficient consider a removal or add specific clarification in a Snettisham context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP16</td>
<td>In general this topic is a highway issue, and NCC Highways is involved within the development process.</td>
<td>Consider a rewording. Making it clear that the PC supports prioritisation of traffic movements via current junctions with the Bypass, if acceptable by Highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One thing the PC should consider is that low densities are contradicting strategies such as walkable towns or car avoidance for short journeys, first of all due to low densities the walking distances get longer and also public transport provision is less likely as well as provision of other services (e.g. local shops need a certain numbers of residents to be viable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP17</td>
<td>This is not a land-use Policy. It is a general characteristic of the plan itself, and does not need to be in the Policy section.</td>
<td>Should be moved from the Policy Section to the general part of the plan – Section 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should you have any queries relating to the above, please contact:

Felix Beck
Planning Policy
Borough Council of King’s Lynn & West Norfolk
01553 616816 / felix.beck@west-norfolk.gov.uk
August 7th 2017

Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan Team
Via email: snettisham@gmail.com

Dear Sir / Madam,

CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON SNETTISHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2017-2032

Introduction

Rural Solutions is working with The Ken Hill Estate and has been asked to submit a consultation response on behalf of the Estate in relation to the consultation draft Neighbourhood Plan.

As the Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan Team will be aware, large areas of land within the Parish are within the ownership of The Ken Hill Estate. As a major landowner the Ken Hill Estate takes a positive and proactive approach to ecological conservation on its land holding. The Estate has one of the largest Higher Level Stewardship schemes in Norfolk and is in discussion with Natural England about how to intensify this.

The Neighbourhood Plan notes the lack of objection in the village to the installation of a local solar farm that demonstrates that villages are supportive of "green" development. The solar farm was developed on Ken Hill Estate land. Whilst the Estate has developed a solar farm within the Parish it should be noted that the Estate also purchased some land adjacent to the Parish in recent years which had received consent for a large wind turbine development. This purchase was made in order to ensure that this visually intrusive renewable energy development, which would have impacted upon the environs of Snettisham as well as the Estate, did not go ahead.

We note at page 2 of the draft plan that the first indications of an ancient village of settlement in the parish were discovered on Ken Hill Estate land in 1946.

The Ken Hill Estate notes that the draft Neighbourhood Plan has been the subject of extensive input and consultation and supports in principle the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan for Snettisham.

The Estate is pro-actively reviewing together with Rural Solutions its landholding and potential opportunities for development over the short-long term. Having reviewed the draft plan, in conjunction with the adopted plans of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk
Borough Council, Rural Solutions wishes to offer the following comments on individual policies or sections of the plan.

Page Six – General Text:
The Neighbourhood Plan states that:

The Parish Council should work in conjunction with BCKWN to encourage new businesses to set up in Snettisham, particularly where these provide employment within the Village. There is a considerable amount of farming in the Parish, and diversification should be encouraged.

The Estate supports these statements. The Estate rents out commercial premises at Home Farm to the east of the Snettisham bypass and considers that demand exists for further commercial premises in the village, to the benefit of local employment.

The Estate as a farming landowner supports the encouragement for diversification.

The plan goes on to state that:

Due to the extensive flood risk zones – see Appendix 11.2 - additional development in the area of the village near the beach was not considered.

The Estate agrees that flood risk zones may mitigate residential or major commercial development in this area, however this location does provide opportunities for appropriate tourism development which enhances the area.

Policy NP01 - New residential development should take place on currently available land near to Peppysfields.

The policy proposes allocation of site for new housing in the village. Paragraph 1.7 of the policy justification states that:

1.7 This land was identified as the only substantial space where development could occur without significant detrimental effects in the immediate environs of the main Village. See Appendix 10.

The Estate does not object per se to this residential allocation however it would commend paragraph 1.7 and considers a preferable site exists within its land ownership.

The Estate owns a number of places of land on the edge of the village. This includes Site 14 (land off Common Road, Cherry Tree Road, A149) as shown at Appendix 10.
The site is bounded on three sides by highways and includes existing buildings, including converted buildings successfully let as offices. The site is large enough to accommodate residential development; extension of existing commercial uses; extensive areas of public open space (which policy NP14 indicates are necessary in the Parish) and ecological corridors; and, improved access across the land to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty beyond.

The site is large enough to accommodate both future development over the Neighbourhood Plan period and beyond. Therefore part of the site could be developed during the period covered by the current draft Neighbourhood Plan with land left over delivering additional development over the decades beyond.

It is noted from Appendix 5 that a number of villagers supported development upon this site adjacent to the bypass.

Appendix 10 of the document includes a ‘Comparison of available sites for development’. The assessment of this land adjacent to the bypass gives rise to three areas where a ‘severe adverse effect or infrastructure issues’ are considered to arise, as noted below:

‘Farmstead’ – The land’s location on village-edge between three roads, and away from larger tracts of land mitigates its value as farmland. Access to the site by farm vehicles may be an issue for local residents that impacts on amenity.

‘Corridor/Separation’ – It is considered that as the site is within the bypass it does not play any significant role in separating Snettisham from the countryside. As part of the development of the land there is the potential for extensive public open space which provide public access for existing residents of Snettisham.

‘Access’ – It is considered that the site holds good potential for vehicular access. The site has not been discounted by the County Council’s Highways Team when assessing sites being considered by the Borough Council.

For the above reasons it is considered that the land off the bypass provides a better option for residential development, over the plan period and decades beyond than the site proposed by the draft plan.

NP02 - The number of new dwellings should be 20-40 / NP17 - This Plan should remain in force until the end of 2032.

Rural Solutions considers that the Neighbourhood Plan should have the same timeframe as the Borough Council’s Local Plan i.e. to 2026 not 2032. There are numerous benefits in terms of both the provision of development and the provision of infrastructure for the plan period to be aligned with the Borough Council’s.
It is not considered that the plan justifies a plan period which extends beyond 2026, which would mean that the Neighbourhood Plan and Borough Plan would be 'out of step'.

The justification for policy NP02 states that:

2.1 The LDF figure for the period ending 2026 was 34 – the proposed figure is in keeping with that general level.

On the basis that the Borough Council's Plan covers the period up until 2026 and proposes 34 dwellings, the proposal for 20-40 homes over the period to 2032 could reflect an under-provision of housing. If the extended time period (to 2032) for the Neighbourhood Plan is maintained then at least 40 houses should be delivered by the plan.

NP07 - Dwellings should include local materials, e.g. carstones, and be in keeping with the rest of the Village / NP08 - Dwellings should be constructed to the best practicable environmental standards.

The Estate supports the aims of these policies to deliver high quality development in Snettisham.

NP11 - Within the Village Envelope only small scale retail and other business development should be allowed.

We note the ‘village envelope’ shown at p.11 together with the footnote which states that:

4 When there is reference to the “Village Envelope”, this is an informal designation, as shown in the Map above. It consists of the area within the main built up part of the Village, bounded by the AONB to the North, the by-pass to the west, and the River Ingold to the South.

We have reviewed this informal designation, shown at Fig. 1 below, in the context of the adopted development boundary from the Borough Council’s plan, as shown at Fig.2.

The informal village envelope, which based on the policy impacts only on small scale retail and other businesses, differs significantly to the adopted development boundary. We are unclear having reviewed the plan of the reason for this difference. It is not considered that a rationale has been presented for a different boundary to be in place for small scale retail and other business development, to the development boundary adopted by the Borough Council which would continue to apply to other forms of development.
Fig. 1 above: ‘In informal’ designation proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan differs from adopted development boundary from Borough Council’s Plan (Fig 2. Below).
We hope that these comments may be considered useful in the preparation of the Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan.

With kind regards

Yours sincerely

JAMES ELLIS
Associate Director
james.ellis@ruralsolutions.co.uk
0756 226 1999
Good afternoon

Please see the below comments from the Strategic Housing team.

**Policy NP04**
As per my previous email, we believe there is a factual error in this policy – according to Council Tax and Non-Domestic Rates data, the highest rate of 2nd homes/holiday lets in a single parish within the borough is around 53%, rather than 70% as stated. However this does not invalidate the overall message and we acknowledge that the proportion of 2nd homes in many of the villages in the north of the borough is very high. It is clear that this has had a significant impact on house prices in certain areas, making it increasingly difficult for local young people to find suitable accommodation in those areas. However, thought should be given to the potential unintended consequences of this policy. For example, if the policy results in uncertainty in relation to sales and land prices and this results in less development coming forward, then the policy will not aid the sustainability of local services as intended. It would be worthwhile looking into how the similar policy introduced in St Ives has worked and what impact it has had

For your information, according to Council Tax data, there are currently 224 2nd homes in Snettisham parish which equates to 14% of the overall stock. Whilst not at the same level as some other parishes in the borough, this is still significantly above average for the borough.

**Policy NP05**
Whilst we invariably welcome the provision of affordable housing, this policy would require viability testing to demonstrate that any provision over the district wide 20% is viable and would not restrict development. Using the current wording, it is likely that developers would seek to provide the borough-wide policy compliant 20%. It should be noted that Starter Homes do not currently meet the NPPF definition of Affordable Housing.

**Policy NP06**
This is already required by borough wide policy, CS09, which requires 70% of affordable housing contributions to be affordable rented and 30% to be shared ownership or other forms of intermediate housing such as shared equity

Please let us know if you have any queries regarding the above.

Kind regards

Karl Patterson
Housing Development Officer,
Borough Council of King’s Lynn & West Norfolk and Breckland Council
APPENDIX 11 – Response to second pre-submission consultation

Marine Management Organisation – email rec. 25/1/18 – general response on neighbourhood plans, plus these specific comments - reformatted

Policy Recommendations

Please see below suggested policies from the East Marine Plan to be considered when developing your policy. These suggested policies included below have been identified based on the activities and categories within the document entitled above. They are provided only as recommendation and we would suggest your own interpretation of the East marine plan is completed:

- **TR1**: Proposals for development should demonstrate in order of preference, that during construction and operation:
  a. they will not adversely impact tourism and recreation activities
  b. how, if there are adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities, they will minimise them
  c. how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated
  d. the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.

- **SOC1**: Proposals that provide health and social wellbeing benefits including through maintaining, or enhancing, access to the coast and marine area should be supported.

- **SOC3**: Proposals that may affect the terrestrial and marine character of an area should demonstrate, in order of preference:
  a. that they will not adversely impact the terrestrial and marine character of an area
  b. how, if there are adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area, they will minimise them
  c. how, where these adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area cannot be minimised they will be mitigated against
  d. the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts
## APPENDIX 12 – Summary of all responses from public and organisations, and relevant changes if made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response from</th>
<th>Area referred to</th>
<th>Suggestions or comment</th>
<th>Effect on plan (or n/a with reason)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public - 102</strong></td>
<td>Whole of Plan</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Ideas from this formed the first draft of Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pigeon Investments</strong></td>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>Inclusion of land to east of site</td>
<td>N/A – wish to keep a buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of dwellings</td>
<td>Flexibility in total</td>
<td>Number made flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New dwellings</td>
<td>Evolution in needs</td>
<td>Phrase incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>Extension of definition</td>
<td>Categories combined incl. shared equity etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger commercial</td>
<td>Proposed area</td>
<td>Various revisions, concluding with “preferred” rather than “allocated” area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public – 31</strong></td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>General comments re infrastructure, agreement with most points; some wanted higher numbers, some lower;</td>
<td>Included, with Pigeon comments, in some rewording; other responses were on issues outside the powers of a neighbourhood plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural England</strong></td>
<td>SEA/HRA</td>
<td>Acceptance of process but no specifics</td>
<td>HRA and SEA produced and incorporated into SNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic England</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCKLWN Housing</strong></td>
<td>Second homes</td>
<td>Query on number</td>
<td>Number corrected; reference in footnote to original figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roger Clark</strong></td>
<td>Retirement complex</td>
<td>Allocated area should be residential village complex with facilities on-site</td>
<td>N/A – Plan had never been conceived in this light and no other such suggestions received. Major developments planned locally – Hunstanton – and no specific need identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic England</strong></td>
<td>Water/Drainage</td>
<td>No specifics</td>
<td>N/A – this for developers at planning stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sprinklers</td>
<td>Add reference to such requirements</td>
<td>Added, but removed as policies developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flooding risks</td>
<td>Could be included</td>
<td>N/A – allocation not within flood zones. Flooding etc. would be considered at planning application stage, under current local/national guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Adherence to NCC guidelines</td>
<td>Policy reworded to reflect NCC and NPPF guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation Statement: Page 68 of 70*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minerals and Waste</th>
<th>Addition of specific policies</th>
<th>N/A – these would be covered at planning application stage in co-ordination with NCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon</td>
<td>Error noted in boundary</td>
<td>Map redrawn at finer scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Affordable homes definition wider</td>
<td>Included in revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing mix</td>
<td>Wording risks viability, and unclear</td>
<td>“Encourage” included in wording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing standard</td>
<td>Change area of allocation; include open area</td>
<td>N/A – desire to prevent solid development without some break in housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td>Addition of review dates</td>
<td>N/A – once agreed at referendum reviews very difficult. Reference to SPC monitoring efficacy of the Plan and suggestions for consideration by future plans were included however</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Consistency of wording; justification for policies</td>
<td>Changes made, and more detail and references provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five year/Windfall</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>Comments added and policy included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Length of Plan</td>
<td>Removed from policies and added to general text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Note above policies not clear method</td>
<td>Wording of all policies states applicability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Viability</td>
<td>Possible maximum extended slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident rather than unit measurement</td>
<td>N/A – impossible to enumerate residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats</td>
<td>Addition of greater options for dwelling types</td>
<td>Reference to changing needs during lifetime of Plan added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second homes</td>
<td>Number questioned</td>
<td>Already amended to correct BCKLWN figure as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>Reasoning for greater need than Local Plan</td>
<td>Historical deficit given more detail in justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing standards</td>
<td>Environmental standards conflict; repetition</td>
<td>Environmental reference moved from policy to community aim; reference to adjacent dwellings as model made to include wider village given lack of vernacular in immediate area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>Vagueness</td>
<td>Specific amount of garden specified, including for flats etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Lack of clarity and conflict with SADMP</td>
<td>Numbers added and reworded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail etc.</td>
<td>Definition of small-scale lacking</td>
<td>Specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Several comments recur in different policy areas; amendments only referred to once
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Not clear and conflicting with BCKLWN definitions</td>
<td>References clarified and maps for specific policies included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Uncertainty over allocation for commerce and whether included in HRA/SEA</td>
<td>Allocated area made preferred area – assessments to be made by developers on planning application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Clarity needed as to what is/is not allowed</td>
<td>Policies completely reworded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td>Definitions and repetition</td>
<td>Made an aim not a policy; clarified that green space should be considered holistically over time, not just on individual sites as developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>Involvement of NCC Highways</td>
<td>Included in policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Effects on sustainability</td>
<td>Clarity added to show that the allocation is within current built up area and does not reduce sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Lack of proposals map</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Solutions (Ken Hill Estates)</td>
<td>Allocation site</td>
<td>Prefers use of Ken Hill land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Consider synchronising Plan with LDF</td>
<td>N/A – Plan timeframe selected to cross LDF ones to allow effects to be considered; also very difficult to co-ordinate development of new SNP with evolving LDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Greater provision</td>
<td>Numbers increased, and made more flexible, in line with comments elsewhere above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Inconsistency with BCKLWN boundaries</td>
<td>Maps for each policy, as above, removing confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCKLWN Housing</td>
<td>Second homes</td>
<td>Already amended as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrect figure</td>
<td>Wider definition of affordable, incl. starter homes; consultation with likely developer confirms not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 17 to Feb 18 Second Pre-submission consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A – SEA did not require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Greater provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Inconsistency with BCKLWN boundaries</td>
<td>Maps for each policy, as above, removing confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCKLWN Housing</td>
<td>Second homes</td>
<td>Already amended as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrect figure</td>
<td>Wider definition of affordable, incl. starter homes; consultation with likely developer confirms not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Management</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>N/A – policy already addressing access to the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health benefits etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Effects on terrestrial and marine environment</td>
<td>N/A – terrestrial effects covered in policies already; no marine considerations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>