

Saham Toney Neighbourhood Plan
Breckland Council comments for Regulation 16 Consultation

We welcome the production of the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan and are aware of the volume of work that this has involved to produce three Pre-submission versions (Reg.14). In light of this further review of the Plan, we have not only dealt with new policy and text, but we have also aimed to take a consistent approach when key issues have not been addressed. We have also considered other issues not previously addressed, as a result of responses made in the Consultation Statement (particularly when they are incorrect) in order to help the Parish Council produce the best Neighbourhood Plan possible.

Key National Planning Policy Framework – NPPF / Neighbourhood Plan – The Plan

Page and Policy/ Paragraph No	Comment	Justification	Suggested Amendments
Whole Plan	There remains concern that there are still some issues in a few of the policies that are not considered to be consistent with either national guidance, or planning practise, which are addressed in detail below. This likely to have implications for meeting the 'Basic Conditions'.	Basic Conditions - paragraph 8(2) e of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.	See below.
Whole Plan - Phrasing	As a result of producing three Reg.14 versions of the Plan, we have been concerned about the increasing level of detail contained within the Plan, particularly regarding to the site allocation policies (Policy 2H- 2P) and the water related policies (8A-H & 9). This has resulted in a Plan that has become very complex and lacks clarity and flexibility which is not consistent with national guidance and this also risks having implications for viability.	Clarity – <i>“16 d) contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous”</i> Flexibility - 11. <i>a) plans should be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change...”</i> Viability, 67 NPPF.	See below.
General - Terminology	The used of the word 'dictate' has been incorrectly used in relation to the NP regulations in para 2.3 & 2.5, as well as Local Plan policy in para 3.6.5.	Phrasing	Replace <i>'dictate/s'</i> with <i>'states'</i> .
General - maps	Format - Although the presentation has improved, it is disappointing that they are still not consistent with one another regarding the information they contain e.g. some have a title, legend, north rose and scale, some have some of these elements and others have none,	Presentation consistency and clarity.	All the basic information to be included as advised.

	as it is detracting from the quality of the Plan. Also, in just a few the information is still too small to read and therefore difficult to use e.g. p32-33, & 138. N.B. It is noted that the scale of a map is inconsistent; some are described in text, some in a ratio, others a scale and a number have none.		
General - maps and graphics	Most would benefit by being placed in the centre of the page, so it does not look like information is missing.	Presentation consistency.	As advised.
3. THE NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA: SAHAM TONEY PARISH			
p12, para 3.0	2 nd sentence - The Consultation Statement response is not reflected in the actual changes to the Plan; it only makes reference to: <i>“initial, informal consultation”</i> and excludes specific reference to <i>“parishioners, businesses and organisations”</i> .	Clarity	Either the Plan also needs to make reference to <i>“parishioners, businesses and organisations”</i> or the Consultation Statement needs to accurately record what will be changed in the Plan.
p14, Figure 9	No of Households - it still not clear why two figures have been provided, despite the Consultation Statement stating that an <i>“Explanatory note added”</i> .	Clarity	Make the reason clear for the two sets of figures e.g. add a date for the first figure.
p15, para 3.6.1	As previously advised, the most recent list is May, not March 2020.	Accuracy - https://www.breckland.gov.uk/media/16518/Local-Development-Scheme/pdf/Local_Development_Scheme_final_June_1_2020.pdf?m=63729113894397000	As advised.
p16, para 3.6.4	As previously advised, the phrase <i>“lacks key services and facilities”</i> is negatively phrased. Also, the Basic Conditions Statement refers to a ‘few’, which is more positively expressed.	Para 16 b) <i>“...be prepared positively...”</i> NPPF.	Making reference to <i>‘limited’</i> key services and facilities would be more constructive and consistent with phrasing in the Local Plan.
p17, para 3.7.1.1	2 nd sentence - The concern regarding a ‘cap’ on numbers is not consistent with approach required by national guidance, which aims to establish a minimum amount of housing.	<i>“60. To determine the <u>minimum</u> number of homes needed...”</i> (NPPF	“Whilst <i>The policy indicates a minimum growth level of 33 dwellings in Saham Toney during the Local Plan</i>

	N.B. Also if the Local Plan Inspector felt ‘uncertain’ about policy HOU 04, it would not have been adopted.		<i>period, it does not establish a clear cap on numbers”.</i>
5. VISION STATEMENT AND OBJECTIVES			
p25, para 5.3	b) - The Plan has not been amended in the same way the Consultation Statement has advised e.g. the latter states <i>“Satisfy the Local Plan minimum growth target and set an additional level of development via site allocation”</i> , where the former has been amended as <i>“Satisfy the Local Plan minimum growth target and provide certainty for future sustainable development, through the inclusion of site allocations”</i> (difference in bold).	Consistency	Either the Plan or Consultation Statement need to be amended, so they are consistent with one another.
p25, Footnote 2	As previously advised, this aspiration is not consistent with the approach taken in the rest of the Plan as ‘phasing’ is included in Policy 2A & all the site allocation policies.	Consistency	In view of comments on Policy 2A on this, delete 2 nd sentence.
7. THE POLICIES			
POLICY 1: SERVICES, FACILITIES & INFRASTRUCTURE			
p27, Policy 1, P1.1	As previously advised, this is should be for major developments, as otherwise the latest amendment (new T1.1 <i>“do not apply to householder schemes”</i>) risks making smaller non householder schemes unviable.	Viability.	<i>“P1.1 Where applicable all major development proposals shall demonstrate that....”.</i>
p27, T1.4	See comments re Policy 2A and ‘phasing’.	See below	Remove
p31, T1.19	See comments re Policy 2A and ‘phasing’.	See below	Remove
p33, Evidence Map 1b	Format - The presentation of the map would be improved by removing the black rectangle (left of the copyright text) as it is not clear what this represents.	Presentation	Either clarify or delete.
POLICY 2A: RESIDENTIAL HOUSING ALLOCATION			
p35, P2A.1	As previously advised, in the document mentioned in the last sentence of para T2A.4 (<i>STNP Justification of a Minimum Housing Target for the Neighbourhood Plan</i>), both the title and para 3.3a, address the issue of having a ‘minimum target’. This is also acknowledged in the Basic Conditions Statement (p42 re Policy HOU 01), (as well as addressed national guidance, but this is not reflected in the policy or text.	Consistency with evidence and <i>“60. To determine the minimum number of homes needed....”</i> (NPPF).	<i>“This Plan provides for at least 70 new homes...”.</i>

p35, P2A.1	As previously advised, serious concerns remain over the use of 'indicative delivery' and preferences to include phasing. While para 73, of the NPPF, states that "all plans should consider whether it is appropriate to set out the anticipated rate of development for specific sites", it is not considered 'appropriate' for the Para 73, NPPF to apply to the Plan. This is due to the fact that not only does phasing normally only occur in relation to strategic sites, (2/3's of the sites in this Plan are minor and 2/3's of these have been allocated for years 10-17) but it would be difficult to refuse planning permission for development on phasing grounds alone, where it is acceptable in all other planning terms. This would also cause more issues if the five-year housing supply in Breckland was to reduce over the next few years.	"...arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than in the limited circumstances..." (e.g. a substantial proposal or when not formally part of the development plan). Para 49, NPPF.	Delete all references concerning 'indicative delivery' or phasing from the policy and amend to just set out the housing allocations in the Plan, as well as the supporting text-e.g. para T1.4 T1.10; T1.19. Also remove other references to the 'phasing' element in all other policy, including: P2H.2; P2I.2; P2J.2; P2K.2; P2L.2; P2M.2; P2N.2; P2O.3; P2P.2, as well as text including: T2A.3; T2H.22; T2I.10; T2J.21; T2K.23; T2L.11; T2M.6; T2N.7; T2O.12; T2P.17.
p35, P2A.1	Also the addition of sentence starting "Actual phasing .." adds nothing constructive to the policy, as most of the sites are so small that they would not have a significant impact on infrastructure.	Accuracy	Delete
p35, T2A.1	1 st sentence - As previously advised, there is much better planning terminology, which reflects the situation more clearly.	Phrasing	"Policy 2A of the Neighbourhood Plan provides a parish specific context to broader growth requirements for allocating additional housing than that indicated in the Local Plan (see para T2D.1) "
p35, T2A.1	3rd paragraph - As previously advised, if the Plan allows for more homes under Policy 2B & 2C, this suggests that there could be more housing than the 70 units already allocated. It will be difficult to 'manage within the number allocated in this Plan', as more than this number have already been allowed for. Also see comments on Policy 2A 'minimum target' above.	'STNP Justification of a Minimum Housing Target for the Neighbourhood Plan'.	"(see Policy 2C), but otherwise the level of new residential development permitted will be managed within the number allocated in this Plan....."
p36, T2A.4 b)	As previously advised, it is not possible to 'futureproof' against any increase in housing units as it's the Local Plan that establishes the strategic housing allocation and development strategy. Future housing requirements in Breckland are yet to be determined as are	Accuracy	Delete b).

	any implications this number may have on the development strategy for the District. Although the numbers are likely to increase due to the suggested new standardised methodology the Neighbourhood Plan needs to conform to the current adopted Plan and not the emerging one.		
p36/7, T2A.4	This section does not address the issue whether all of these sites are either deliverable or developable. (See comments below on page 9 of these comments: 3. All site allocation policies (2H-2P).	Deliverability	Either clarify their status in the Plan as either deliverable or developable. If they are neither they should be removed.
POLICY 2B: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY			
p39, P2B.1 a)	Format - As previously advised, it would be clearer for the reader if this referred to a Map (e.g. an amended 7A.3 or new map), rather than a Policy to understand where this <i>'sensitivity'</i> applies. See comments on P2G.3 and Policy P7A.5.	Clarity	As advised.
POLICY 2C: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY			
p40/1, P2.C1	These criteria take a more restrictive approach than the strategic Local Plan policy HOU 04 regarding the types of developments allowed therefore, it does not meet the Basic Conditions. Criterion a) – This takes a more restrictive approach than the Breckland Council's Housing allocation policy (which deals with allocation of affordable rented housing), which only applies to targets/sites that are <i>"over and above those sites already <u>allocated</u> by the local authority"</i> . This does not apply to rural exception sites, as they are never allocated in development plans. Also, the Housing Allocation Policy is a standalone Council policy and does not form part of the 'development plan'. Therefore, the 'development plan' should not be seeking to amend the content of that standalone district-wide policy that is prepared under different legislation. Also, as Policy HOU 14 does not apply a local connection criterion, this more restrictive than the Local Plan policy requirements.	Basic Conditions - paragraph 8(2) e of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Housing Act 1988 Housing Allocation Policy - updated March 2020	Either delete a) or amend Criterion a): <i>"A small scale affordable housing on rural exception sites, for people with a Saham Toney connection, as defined by Policy 2D; in accordance with LP HOU14 where the proposed dwellings are consistent with identified needs..."</i> .

p41, P2C.2	To be consistent with the approach taken in the latter part of the policy, the same terminology should be used to accurately reflect the role of all planning policy in the area.	Consistency & Accuracy	<i>"... where it becomes evident the policies in the Development Neighbourhood Plan are failing to satisfactorily deliver the minimum housing target set in Policy HOU 04..."</i>
p41, P2C.3	The text at the end of the policy marked with an* is not a policy and should be moved to the supporting text.	Clarity	As advised.
p42, T2C.8	This new text states that <i>"Policy 2C in the Neighbourhood Plan adopts a stricter approach to housing outside the settlement boundary..."</i> than Local Plan Policy HOU 04. As this is strategic Local Plan policy, this approach does not conform with the Local Plan and therefore this fails one of the Basic Conditions.	Basic Conditions & accuracy.	If the policy is not amended (as advised above), delete 2 nd & 3 rd sentences.
p42, T2C.9	Aside from the fact that no final decision has been made regarding the consultation document referred to, this text may need further amending, depending on the outcome of the consultation. Also the new text proposes that <i>"...the additional housing delivered by this Plan ... shall not be applied as additional to any revised target set for the Neighbourhood Area should the Local Plan requirement be increased ..."</i> . It is not possible for this Plan to affect the future outcome of another development plan in this manner and this needs to be reflected in the text.	Clarity	<i>"In light of these factors, it is made clear and depending on the start date for the Review of the Local Plan and progress on the delivery of the sites included in the Neighbourhood Plan, it may be the case that the additional housing delivered by this Plan ... shall not be applied as additional to could form part of any revised target set for the Neighbourhood Area should the Local Plan requirement be ..."</i>
p42, T2C.10	Policy HOU 04 is a minimum target and can't be controlled in the way suggested. See comments on Policy 2A re ' <i>minimum target</i> '.	Ability to enforce.	Remove last sentence.
POLICY 2D: AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
p43, P2D.1	As previously advised, the Local lettings policy hierarchy needs to accurately follow the latest Breckland Housing Allocations Policy (as in para 3.4, (March 2020), which initially states <i>"a) Has lived in the district continuously for 3 years;"</i> . While the Plan has been amended, criterion a) remains far more restrictive than the	To be consistent with Housing Act 1988 (as amended) and priority for those in reasonable preference groups, also as per Breckland amended housing	Delete criteria a).

	<p>Brecklands Hosing Allocations policy by proposing that residents “resided continuously in Saham Toney Parish for the last three years”. This policy seeks to add an additional, more restrictive, layer of eligibility over and above that stated in the Council’s Housing Allocations Policy. Breckland’s Housing Allocation Policy also reflects relevant national legislation in relation to other exceptions and exceptional circumstances which will take priority over this policy, for example in respect of the Homeless and armed forces, which has not been addressed in this policy.</p> <p>This is not considered appropriate because the Breckland Council Housing Allocation policy is a standalone policy and not part of the ‘development plan’. Therefore, the ‘development plan’ should not be seeking to amend the content of that policy that is prepared under different legislation.</p>	<p>allocations policy, para 3.4</p> <p>Connection to the local area criteria, exceptions and exceptional circumstances (March 2020).</p>	
p44, T2D.2	<p>It is not possible to prioritise Saham Toney residents in the manner proposed as there are some types of applicant that are ‘exceptions’ or ‘exceptional circumstances’ to the local letting criteria.</p>	<p>Accuracy – Breckland Housing Allocations policy, para 3.4.2 & 3.4.3.</p>	<p>As advised.</p>
p44, T2D.6	<p>Breckland Council has amended the June 2019 Housing Allocation policy in March 2020 and this text requires amending to reflect the current policy approach.</p>	<p>Accuracy</p>	<p>Delete 1st three sentences.</p>
POLICY 2E: HOUSING MIX			
p46, P2E.4 b)	<p>The terminology needs still amending. Low-cost home has a specific meaning within the NPPF, but it is a type of affordable housing that is strongly discouraged in Breckland as it does not meet local need. ‘Shared ownership’ is the preferred local option and is not just for first time buyers”.</p>	<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Replace ‘<i>low cost ownership</i>’ with ‘<i>affordable home ownership</i>’ which is a broader term. “...including shared ownership, homes at a cost suitable for first time buyers and other low-income households”.</p>
p46, P2E.5	<p>The text marked * at the bottom of the policy should be moved to the supporting text as it is not policy.</p>	<p>Phrasing</p>	<p>As advised.</p>
p50, T2E.7	<p>This relates to the preference on number of bedrooms from those on the Housing Register, however it just applies to affordable rented homes and no other tenures e.g. market sales, low cost home</p>		<p>Make it clear that the figures only relate to a preference made by those on the Housing Register who are</p>

	ownership? Therefore, the way the information has been presented is misleading.		seeking an affordable rented home and does not take into account any preference by those looking for other different tenures.
POLICY 2F: COMMON CRITERIA FOR ALLOCATED SITES			
p51, P2F.2	As previously advised, it is not considered that the current approach is proportionate or viable for all sites and therefore requires amending.	Viability	<i>"P2F.2 A full proportionate ecological appraisal shall be provided..."</i>
p55-63, Policy Maps 2F.1-9	Format - It is disappointing that these maps have been enlarged, rather than adding the 'access information' onto the site map for each site, to reduce the volume of the Plan. Also, the scale is incorrect as it provides it for when the map is A3.	Presentation	As advised.
POLICY 2G: MASTERPLANNING			
p64, P2G.1	As previously advised, the approach being taken in this policy is considered too restrictive and does not offer the flexibility required by the planning system. It is still not clear why sites STNP1, STNP4, STNP7 and STNP16 appear to be excluded from being (further) masterplanned. For these sites, this policy appears to require that they should be similar to the research and layouts included in the Plan.	<i>11. a) plans should be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change..."</i> NPPF and to be consistent with Plan policy 2H, 2J, 2K & 2P.	Remove from " <i>; with the exception of proposals for allocated sites STNP1, STNP4, STNP7 and STNP16 ...</i> " until the end of the sentence and remove reference to this in the relevant policies P2H.1 b), P2J.1 b), P2K.1 b), & P2P.1 b).
p64, P2G.1	As previously advised, it would be clearer if it was the policy rather than text that identified what was considered to be ' <i>major</i> '. This should be included within the Plan and not just having the Glossary refer to another document. Therefore, as a minimum the relevant text should be amended.	Clarity	<i>"T2G.2 - Major development shall be as defined as 10 or more dwellings or sites in excess of 0.5 ha in the latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework.</i>
p64, P2G.3	It would be useful if there was a cross reference to a map (e.g. an amended Map 7A.3 or new map) that identifies ' <i>landscape sensitivity</i> ', as there is no map clarifying where this applies. See comments on Policy 2B, P2B.1 a) and Policy P7A.5.	Clarity	Include a map where this is clearly demonstrated.
p65-69, Policy Map 2G.1 & 2, & Figures 17	As previously advised, while we welcome the inclusion of these plans, it should be made clear that they are for illustrative purposes only as otherwise this approach is considered too restrictive and	<i>11. a) plans should be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change..."</i> NPPF and to	As advised.

	does not offer the flexibility required by the planning system.– see comments re P2G.1 above.	be consistent with Plan policy 2H, 2J, 2K & 2P.	
p65 & Policy Maps 2G.1 & 2	Format - The presentation of this map could be improved by including a north rose, Legend, and scale.	Clarity	As advised.
SITE ALLOCATION POLICIES – GENERAL COMMENTS			
p70-106, 1 st All site allocation policies (2H-2P)	As previously advised, concern remains over the reference to phasing in all these policies - see comments above re Policy 2A re phasing.	Ability to enforce.	Delete as previously advised.
p70-106, 2 nd All site allocation policies (2H-2P)	As previously advised, the use of the words ‘ <i>up to</i> ’ (previously ‘ <i>a maximum of</i> ’) remains too prescriptive. This can be addressed by phrasing it more positively. Also see comments on Policy 2A above on ‘minimum target’.	Phrasing	“....for up to at least x new dwellings will be permitted subject to meeting the following criteria:”.
p70-106, 3 rd All site allocation policies (2H-2P) p72, T2H.8; p76, T2I.4; p80, T2J.7; p85, T2K.9; p90, T2L.3; p93, T2M.3; p95, T2N.3; p98, T2O.3; p102, T2P.3.	In the 2nd Reg.14 version of the Plan, the supporting text stated that sites STNP 1, 4, 7 (Policies G, I & J) were not “ <i>yet be considered deliverable</i> ” with no reference to whether they were developable. For all the other sites: 2, 9, 13-16 (Policies I, L, M, N, O & P); it stated that they were “ <i>considered deliverable</i> ”. In the 3rd Reg.14 version of the Plan, the text for sites STNP 1, 4, 7, regarding deliverability had been removed and no reference to whether they were developable. In this version of the Plan, reference is now all made to them being “ <i>developable/ deliverable</i> ” (with the exception of site STNP 4, which states it is now deliverable, where previously it was not deliverable). Not only do these terms (deliverable or developable) have different meanings in the NPPF, taking this approach causes a lack of clarity. This also undermines the Plan’s approach to ‘phasing’ as this is suggesting all the proposed sites could be delivered within 5 years as they are considered to be to be ‘ <i>deliverable</i> ’. N.B. Lettering for policies changed b/t 2 nd & 3 rd Reg.14.	Para 67 requires sites to be either deliverable or developable (NPPF).	Either clarify their status in the Plan as either deliverable or developable. If they are neither they should be removed. (Also see comments for p33, T2A.4 above).
POLICY 2H: SITE ALLOCATION STNP1: GRANGE FARM, CHEQUERS LANE			

p70, P2H.2	There is concern that criteria i) - j) risks pre-empting the outcome of a flood risk assessment (criteria h) by making potentially unnecessary site requirements.	Viability	Delete criteria i) - j).
POLICY 2K: SITE ALLOCATION STNP7: PAGE'S FARM			
p84, P2K.2	There is concern that criteria g) - h) risks pre-empting the outcome of a flood risk assessment (criteria h) by making potentially unnecessary site requirements.	Viability	Delete criteria g) - h).
POLICY 2O: SITE ALLOCATION STNP15: 8 RICHMOND ROAD			
p100, Map	Format - The presentation of this map could be improved by increasing the size of the scale (so it can be read), removing the green line and '19' that appear on the top left-hand side of the page, and adding a title. This would all add clarity for the reader.	Presentation and clarity.	Amend as advised.
POLICY 3A: DESIGN			
p108, P3A.3	As previously advised, it would be useful to cross refer to para T3A.11, which has a summary of the 'village character vernacular', to make clearer what the policy is seeking.	Clarity.	<i>"Local vernacular: Design proposals shall incorporate Saham Toney's character vernacular (see para T3A.19), whilst..."</i>
p114, Map	Format - While the presentation of this map has significantly improved, new information (purple and dotted blue lines) has been added, but also needs to be added to Legend, along with a title underneath, which would add clarity for the reader. Also it would be useful to have the Plan area included on it to show how these routes relate to the Plan.	Presentation and clarity.	Amend as advised.
POLICY 3B: DENSITY OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS			
p115, P3B.1	As previously advised, there remains concern that the current restrictive approach is not the most effective use of land and not in accordance with NPPF as it is possible to design at higher densities and still fit with character of area. Also, the 2 nd sentence is repeating the 1 st , but in more detail - the previous version (2 nd version) was more succinct.	NPPF, para 122 refers to making an 'efficient' use of land & there are three other criteria not mentioned in the Plan's supporting text that need to be considered e.g. different housing types & land	<i>"P3B.1 The density of new residential developments shall should maintain the prevailing character and setting of Saham Toney and. To be supported, residential development proposals must shall be guided by the data on existing densities as provided for the 19 areas listed below in Table 3B.1 below."</i>

		availability; market conditions & viability; and design.	
POLICY 3C: SITE ACCESS AND ON-SITE STREETS			
p119, Evidence Map 3B.1	Format - The presentation of this map could be improved by including a Legend confirming what the information on the maps relate to.	Clarity	As advised.
POLICY 3D: PARKING			
p123, P3D.1	g) - It would be useful to refer to the relevant part of the Local Plan, as in j). N.B. The Consultation Statement states this has been amended, but no change was made.	Clarity	<i>"...and the parking standards defined in the Local Plan in Appendix 2;"</i>
POLICY 3E: DARK SKIES PRESERVATION			
p125, Map	Format - While the presentation of this map has improved, the scale is very difficult to read, the '+' & '-' need removing and a title needs adding underneath, which would all add clarity for the reader. Also it would be useful to have the Plan area included on it to show how this issue relates to the Plan.	Presentation and clarity.	Amend as advised.
POLICY 3F: CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION & MITIGATION			
p126, P3F.5	There appears to be a word missing from the sentence.	Phrasing	<i>"... will be supported providing the impact on external appearance is acceptable."</i>
p127, Photograph	The new photograph is missing a title underneath the image. Also add this information to the contents page on page 5.	Consistency	As advised.
POLICY 5: SAHAM TONEY RURAL GAP			
p134, Evidence Map 5.1	Format - The presentation of these maps would benefit by taking a consistent approach. Only one has north rose, and they take a different approach to the scale e.g. one is a ratio and the other a scale.	Consistency	As advised.
p135-6 Photographs	We welcome the improvements to the presentation of the photographs, so it is disappointing that the same approach has not been taken towards the presentation of the maps.	Presentation	As advised.

p137-9, Evidence Maps 5.2-5.4	Format - The presentation of these maps would benefit by including a scale in latter two, in the 1 st & 3 rd realigning the information in the Legend and increasing the size of the Legend in the 2 nd .	Presentation	As advised.
p140 Map 5	Format - The Map insert is not necessary and too small to read easily.	Presentation	As advised.
POLICY 7A: LANDSCAPE CHARACTER PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT			
p149, P7A.5	2 nd sentence - The use of the term ' <i>degrade</i> ' is very subjective.	Phrasing	Replace with ' <i>negative affect</i> '.
p149, P7A.5 & p150, Table P7A.1	As previously advised, the policy and table, would be aided by including a map showing where the 3 local combined (landscape and visual) sensitivity types (Moderate; Moderate-High; & High) actually are located to aid the implementation of the policy.	Clarity	As advised.
p150, Table P7A.1	This table should be swapped with table P7A.2, as the latter table provides clarity to this table in the 4 th column e.g. ' <i>combined sensitivity</i> '. The title should be underneath the table to be consistent with the rest of the Plan. Also see Comments re clarity of terminology re p225, ' <i>landscape sensitivity</i> ' and p228, ' <i>visual sensitivity</i> '. N.B. The Consultation Statement regarding comment 127* p129, P7A.3, appears to suggest these terms address the same issue, when this table and table P7A.2 are showing they have different implications.	Clarity	As advised. Also amend any other policy and text where this is referred to.
p152, Table P7A.2	This table should be swapped with table P7A.1, as this table provides clarity to the former table re the 4th column e.g. ' <i>combined sensitivity</i> '. Also see Comments re clarity of terminology re p225, ' <i>landscape sensitivity</i> ' and p228, ' <i>visual sensitivity</i> '.	Clarity	As advised. Also amend the policy and text where this is referred to.
p153, Evidence Map 7A	Format - The presentation of this map could be improved by added the north rose on the map, along with a scale and a Legend and to make the presentation of this map consistent with others in the Plan, as well as increasing its size. Also, the text on the map duplicates the text in T7A.11.	Consistency	As advised.

p154-6, Policy Maps, 7A.1-3	Format— As previously advised, the presentation of these maps would benefit by reflecting the colour on the map in the Legend, to aid all readers understanding.	A map legend is a visual explanation of the symbols and colours used on the map.	As advised.
p156, Policy Map 7A.3	Format - The map would benefit from having a explanation about the shaded grey areas (VCA1-8), as found on Map 7A.3, in visual terms rather than just written.	A map legend is a visual explanation of the symbols and colours used on the map.	As advised.
POLICY 7B: KEY VIEWS			
p158-169, Photographs and Maps	Format – While we welcome the improvement of the presentation of this information, as previously advised, it would be more consistent if the titles for the Photographs and Maps were underneath these images, rather than over, to be consistent with the approach taken with rest of the Plan.	Consistency	As advised.
p170, Policy Map 7B	Format— As previously advised, the colour used for these two difference types of key are too similar to easily read. Also, it would help if the name of the landmark features (red stars) were included on the map.	Clarity	As advised.
POLICY 7C: LOCAL GREEN SPACES			
p171, P7C.1	As currently worded, this policy would prevent any proposals where it could improve the facilities and amenities in these open spaces. As such this is not consistent with para 101 (NPPF) which indicates that the approach <i>“for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts”</i> .	NFFP, para 141, clarifies that in a Green Belt planning should <i>“positively to enhance their beneficial use....”</i> and para 145 identifies the types of development that are appropriate within a Green Belt.	Amend policy to include other exceptions to this policy, to include forms of development that improve the open spaces, i.e. landscape improvements; provide footpaths, play equipment, sport facilities, etc.
p171/2, T7C.4	As previously advised, it is not clear why reference to the Open Spaces Society is made when this is not a document the Plan needs to take account of. The majority of the characteristics are already identified in the NPPF as examples of being <i>‘Demonstrably special to the community’</i> , which the Plan needs to take account of. The criteria ‘Beauty to ‘Richness of wildlife’ should all sit under this section as examples. The exception to this is <i>‘Supported by the</i>	Clarity.	As advised.

	<i>Parish Council</i> '. This is an unnecessarily as this is it not a NPPF requirement, and if the Pariah Council don't support the sites why include them in the Plan?		
p173, Policy Map 7C.1	Format - As previously advised, the Map insert is not necessary and is difficult to easily read. Also, the Local Green Spaces would have been better presented if located in the centre of the map and were on a larger scale, so their boundaries were clearer.	Clarity	Remove.
p174, Policy Map 7C.2	Format - While we welcome the inclusion of the Photo's in boxes, so they are consistent with those on p135/6, the presentation of them could be improved by centralising them.	Presentation	As advised.
POLICY 7D: BIODIVERSITY AND HABITATS			
p179-186, Policy Maps 7D.1a-7D.4b	The font size on the Legends remain varied. N.B. These maps worked much better when each type of map faced one another.	Presentation consistency.	As advised.
POLICY 7F: TREES AND HEDGES			
p189, P7F.1	As previously advised, while sympathetic to this approach, this can only apply where they are ' <i>irreplaceable</i> ' such as ' <i>ancient woodland</i> ' and ' <i>ancient or veteran trees</i> '.	Para 175 c), NPPF.	As advised.
WATER MANAGEMENT POLICIES – GENERAL COMMENTS			
p191/2, 8A-9	As previously advised, there is concern that a number of these policies are not a land use planning matters but are implementation (Building Control) ones. Also, there is a risk that such technical information can quickly change and risks them becoming out of date. The policies need to be significantly reduced to cover the main planning issues e.g. Surface water, Sustainable drainage including SuDS and Sewerage by separating out the ' <i>what</i> ' from the ' <i>how</i> '; keeping the former in the policy and the latter into another guide or appendix.	Succinct, para 15, NPPF.	As advised.
POLICY 8A: SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT GENERAL PROVISIONS			

p191, P8A	There is concern that as phrased (except in P8A.2) it would include residential extensions and other minor developments, which could have viability implications.	Phrasing	Revise to apply only to major developments.
p191, P8A.3	NPPF only requires FRA for sites less than 1 ha in flood zone 1, if the site could be affected by sources of flooding other than rivers and the sea, for example surface water drains. An area in “low risk of surface water flooding” would appear to have no reason to provide a FRA. This therefore seems onerous and beyond national requirements.	Viability	Amend to confirm to national guidance.
p192, P8A.5	We are aware that the LLFA Team are only consulted on major development and that the approach in the Plan does not conform with their protocol or statutory guidance.	Regulatory	Amend to only apply to major development.
p192, P8A.6	As previously advised, it is Breckland Council’s responsibility to determine planning applications, and therefore to determine what information is required for each individual application.	Requirements for Information.	<i>“...discharged into the public sewerage network prior to being decided, upon request from the Local Planning Authority when considered necessary”.</i>
p192, P8A.8	Such information is more appropriately located within the supporting text, especially as it can date very quickly.	Phrasing	As advised.
P195, T8A.19	<i>The Plan states that “It should be noted that the Breckland Strategic Flood Risk Assessment does not include Saham Toney”. As part of the evidence base for the adopted Local Plan, and underpinning the site specific allocations and Policy ENV09 (flood risk and surface water drainage), the Council commissioned a District wide Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Update (covering Saham Toney as appropriate) and Flood Risk – Sequential Test Report. In finding the Plan sound, these were considered by the Local Plan Inspector as an appropriate evidence base.</i>	Accuracy	Delete
p198-200, Figures 25-26	Format - The presentation of these photos, could be improved if they were centralised.	Presentation	As advised.
POLICY 8B: SURFACE WATER RUNOFF (DISCHARGE) RATE & VOLUME			

p201, P8B	The policy requirements are overly onerous to require all development proposals to provide such information and therefore lacks flexibility. It also seems unnecessary as it appears to repeat SuDs guidance and other technical documents. NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance do not mandate the use of the SuDs Manual as it will not be possible in every situation to meet its requirements.	Viability	Delete or amend to only apply to major development.
p201, P8B.3	There is significant concern that the online version of the Plan and the paper copy of the Plan contain different policy. The online version states: “...it shall be shown that the flood risk has been managed in accordance with the most up to date 47 Surface water run-off mitigation measures shall ...”. However, in the printed version the policy reads “...it shall be shown that the flood risk has been managed in accordance with the most up to date version of BS8533:2011 “Assessing and managing flood risk in development – code of practise” . P8B.3 Surface water run-off mitigation measures shall ...”. (the text in bold indicates the different text in each document). Also we are seeking confirmation from the Parish Council that other errors has not occurred elsewhere in the Plan.	Clarity	Amend online version: “...it shall be shown that the flood risk has been managed in accordance with the most up to date 47 version of BS8533:2011 “Assessing and managing flood risk in development – code of practise” . P8B.3 Surface water run-off mitigation measures shall ...”.
POLICY 8C: INFILTRATION TESTING			
p203, P8C	The policy requirements are overly onerous to require all development proposals to provide such information and are all non-planning matters for the LLFA to consider.	It is not proportionate and reasonable for small scale proposals to provide such degree of information.	Delete or amend to only apply to major development.
POLICY 8G: RESISTANCE & RESILIENCE OF SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS			
p210, P8G	The policy requirements are overly onerous to require all development proposals to provide such information and therefore lacks flexibility.	Viability	Delete or amend to only apply to major development.
POLICY 8H: DESIGN OF SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS			

p210, P8H.1	The policy requirements are overly onerous as the specific SUDS and drainage details, calculations and data is often not available during applications and is secured via condition.	The policy requirements to provide all necessary SuDS design data and calculations is overly onerous and goes against government guidance and advice to be proportionate and reasonable.	Amend to add "... or sufficient details is provided to enable the LLFA to satisfactorily conclude the proposed SuDS are acceptable in principle ".
POLICY 9: FOUL SEWERAGE PROVISION			
p215, P9.1	The policy requirements are overly onerous on small scale developments which still require permission.	There are various reasons why mains connection is not feasible, supply of evidence maybe overly onerous for small scale developments.	Amend to read "... unless it is produced demonstrated that it is not feasible to do so ".
p215, P9.2	Applicants may not be able to provide evidence that capacity is available within the sewerage network as this is dependent on Anglian Water's evidence and monitoring.	Policy requirements may not be achievable.	Amend to "... pumping stations, or either that capacity can be made available in time to serve the development, or an acceptable alternative provision has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority, and in consultation with the statutory foul drainage provider. "
p215, P9.6	The text marked * at the bottom of the policy should be moved to the supporting text as it is not policy.	Phrasing	As advised.
MONITORING			
p217, Table	Policy 2A target - as previously advised, remove monitoring indicator ' <i>Delivery broadly in line with the planned trajectory</i> '.	Ability to enforce.	As advised.
p219, Table	Policy 3A target - relation to ' <i>Pattern and Design of New Housing</i> ,' as previously advised, it is not clear by what criteria or how this is to be measured.	Clarity	Provide details on how the monitoring will be undertaken.
p219, Table	Policy 3A target ' <i>Use of Local Vernacular</i> ', as previously advised, is the indicator how local vernacular is used or how a development responds to the local vernacular? The target is ' <i>How well the design</i>	Clarity	Provide details on what is being measured and how.

	<i>relates to the Parish Design Guide</i> , but it is unclear how this is measured.		
GLOSSARY			
p222/223, Tables (was p198/99)	As previously advised, it would be more useful for the reader if all the terms that were used in the Plan were found in the Plan.	Clarity	As advised.
p225, 'landscape sensitivity'	This explanation does not address what is meant by ' <i>landscape character</i> ' and there is no other explanation in the Glossary for it.	The Consultation Statement re response 127* p129, P7A.3, appears to suggest this term and the one below cover the same issue.	Clarify as advised.
p225, 'Making of the Plan'	The Neighbourhood Plan becomes part of the ' <i>development plan</i> ' for the area, not the Local Plan, which is also part of the ' <i>development plan</i> ' for the area.	Accuracy	<i>"The formal, legal acceptance of the Neighbourhood Plan as part of the Local Development Plan by Breckland Council"</i> .
p228, 'visual sensitivity'	This explanation does not address what is meant by ' <i>visual character</i> ' and there is no other explanation in the Glossary for it.	The Consultation Statement re response 127* p129, P7A.3, appears to suggest this term and the one below cover the same issue.	Clarify as advised.
Omission	It would be really beneficial if there was an acknowledgement in the Plan, that to meet the requirements of the 2010 Equalities Act, that the Parish Council has the responsibility to make it available in other formats, if requested.	This is a Parish document that other Breckland Neighbourhood Plans have addressed.	As advised.