

**Swaffham Neighbourhood Plan (June 2018)**  
**Informal Draft Plan**

**From: Breckland District Council**  
**Breckland Council**

This is the first opportunity we have had to review the whole plan, albeit with a limited consultation timeframe, as previously we have only had the opportunity to review the plans policies. We welcome the amendments that have been made to date regarding our initial comments, particularly the policies being generally phrased in positive manner. However there is still concern about the lack of evidence with regard to some of the policies. Also where Local plan policy is supported this could be referenced in the supporting text.

Please note that there are likely to be new comments made on the policies not only because they have been amended, but also a wider professional group of officers have made comments. Also this will need to be reviewed in light of LP modification and new NPPF

<b>Page and Policy/ Paragraph No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Justification</b>	<b>Suggested Amendment</b>
<b>p2</b>	Welcome the comments about the documents being available in other formats.		
<b>p4, para 1.1</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence - Neighbourhood plans are 'made' and Local Plans are 'adopted'. Also Town Councils make comments and District Councils determine them. We would also prefer the plan to have the same time line as the Local Plan to assist with monitoring as has been developed using the spatial and strategic context contained in the emerging BLP.	Terminology and accuracy	<i>"Once the Plan is made <del>and adopted</del>, Breckland District Council and Swaffham Town Council will use it to <b>make comments on planning, where Breckland District Council will use it to-determine planning applications</b>". Amend all references to '2019-2037' to '2018-3036'.</i>
<b>p4, para 1.2</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> sentence - The regulations have been updated a number of times so there is more than one set of regulations.	Accuracy	<i>"...and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations <del>(2012 (as amended))</del>".</i>
<b>p4, para 1.3</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence - Neighbourhood plans are 'made' and Local Plans are 'adopted'.	Terminology	<i>"Once <del>adopted</del> <b>made</b>, the Plan will become..."</i>
<b>p5, para 1.9</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence - Only Breckland Council have the legal responsibility to 'make' the Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood plans are 'made' and Local Plans are 'adopted'. Also there should be 'over '50%' support for a referendum not ' <i>at least</i> '.	Accuracy and terminology	<i>Breckland District Council <del>and Swaffham Town Council</del> will <del>adopt</del> '<b>make</b>' the Neighbourhood Plan.</i>

<b>p6, Map</b>	The key is missing along with the scale. Also this shows more than the Swaffham NP area boundary, as those of the surrounding Parishes is also shown.	Clarity	Add as identified.
<b>p7, para 2.6</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence - It would be useful to clarify which Nelson family is being referred to?	Clarity	
<b>p7, para 2.9</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence – the Neighbourhood Plan only needs to “ <i>have regard to national policies</i> ”, but be “ <i>in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan...</i> ”	Accuracy	“... <del>is believed to be in conformity with</del> <b>takes account of</b> the NPPF...”
<b>p7, para 2.11</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> sentence – It would be useful to use the same term to describe the Breckland Local Plan. Also this plan does not just contain strategic polices; it also contains detailed policies.	Consistency and accuracy	“ <i>The Breckland Local <del>Development</del> Plan (2009) sets out <b>both strategic and detailed</b> planning policies for Breckland district...</i> ” “ <i>If the Plan gets <del>at least</del> <b>over 50 per Cent</b> support from...</i> ”
<b>p10-13 para 3.1-3-</b>	N.B. No reference is made to the previous rounds on informal consultation that has occurred with the District Council.		
	<b>6.1 HOUSING AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT</b>		
<b>p18, para 6.1.2/6.1.3</b>	N.B. This information may need to be amended in light of the Local Plan modifications.		
<b>p19, LP Map</b>	There is a more recent map that could be used here.	See Breckland Local Plan - Pre-submission publication.	Breckland can supply this.
<b>p20, HBE1: Location of development</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> sentence is a statement, not policy; however due to its content it is better converted into a community action project as there is insufficient evidence to currently justify this. 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence - much more evidence is needed to justify this approach as it is not currently clear where this will be located so it can't be implemented. 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence – this duplicates the more detailed TRA2 on traffic flow and is therefore not it necessary.	Evidence	Aside from moving statement to the text it would be beneficial to discuss with Breckland Council the approach being taken before the Reg.16 version is produced.
	Potential growth areas could be shown on a map (these could be displayed as arrows to avoid being confused with	Clarity	

	land allocations)		
<b>p18, para 6.1.8</b>	This section would benefit from making reference to local housing studies to support the approach being taken.	Evidence e.g. Central Norfolk Strategic Market Assessment: <a href="https://www.breckland.gov.uk/media/7410/LP-H-1-Central-Norfolk-Strategic-Housing-Market-Assessment/pdf/LP_H_1_Central_Norfolk_Strategic_Housing_Market_Assessment.pdf">https://www.breckland.gov.uk/media/7410/LP-H-1-Central-Norfolk-Strategic-Housing-Market-Assessment/pdf/LP_H_1_Central_Norfolk_Strategic_Housing_Market_Assessment.pdf</a>	Make reference to existing local studies.
<b>p21, HBE2 Mixed housing</b>	<p>End of first sentence “...<i>appropriately located to ensure enclaves do not occur.</i>” it is not clear what is meant.</p> <p>Life-time homes have an impact upon the viability of a scheme (see Policy HOU 10 in the emerging local plan under Market Housing) and is already addressed by the building Regs under M4(2)</p> <p>As previously advised, this still needs to provide evidence that one bedroom and other properties are required and needs to identify why the % of affordable should be higher</p>	<p>Clarification</p> <p>Requires a Local Housing Needs Assessment</p>	<p>The ‘appropriate’ approach needs to be clarified in the text to justify including it in the policy.</p> <p>Delete as already addressed by the building regulations.</p> <p>Include evidence to justify the mix of housing types, as well as the required amount of affordable housing and the evidence for this.</p>
<b>p22, HBE3: Well-designed developments</b>	<p>iii. Need the evidence to justify that densities drop moving out and away from the Town Centre.</p> <p>iv. Would better to refer to established patterns of development in the immediate vicinity.</p>	Evidence	Need evidence to justify this.
<b>p23, Map</b>	The maps scale is missing.	Clarity	As advised
<b>p24, Map</b>	Map would benefit from being enlarged as very difficult to read the key. Also the maps scale is missing.	Clarity	As advised
<b>p25, Map</b>	Map missing and looks like it could be too small to view easily.	Clarity	As advised
<b>p25, HBE4: Attractive town</b>	As previously advised, Points 1 & 2 have viability implications, which still have not been addressed.	Viability	As advised

<b>Centre and Conservation Area</b>	Also Point 3 - while understanding the wish for desire lines, in practise this would be difficult to implement in an already developed area – how is this expected to be implemented?	Evidence	
<b>p24, HBE5 Non-designated heritage assets</b>	Last sentence – this should this be moved to the start of the policy to make the approach this is clear from the start, but it not consistent with national guidance.	Accuracy	Amend to be consistent with national guidance.
<b>p25, para 6.1.16</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> sentence is in conflict with the 2 <sup>nd</sup> one e.g. the latter states this list is for local planning authorities to produce, but it is being included in this plan?	Accuracy	Accuracy
<b>p27, HBE6: Entrances and gateways to Swaffham-</b>	iii) Preference for native species – we would support that this should be the preference with hedgerows, but it should not apply to trees. Many of the species that are better suited to development sites are not native. There is a very limited number of natives, climate changes and disease mean that consideration needs to be given to other species of trees.		Remove (with a preference to native species) and add it to iv - Hedgerows
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> para, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence</b>	<i>“Approaches should maintain visual connections with the countryside and The Brecks”</i> The supporting text does not justify why this is important; it just says it is. However, the Brecks reference on ‘approaches’ could only be made to the south and west of the town. Also this still needs to be addressed as it is not clear where it applies e.g. a map would be useful.	See <a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5556928761561088">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5556928761561088</a> Also reference to Brecklands Fringe Landscape character assessment would be useful, which address the quality of the landscape in the local area.	Amend as advised.
<b>p27, para 6.1.19</b>	This section would benefit from justifying why “Secure by Design” is the standard being adhered to in the text rather than as a footnote.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
	<b>6.2 TRANSPORT AND ACCESS</b>		
<b>p29, para 6.2.2</b>	The source of this information is missing – how representative of the population is it e.g. does it come from NP questionnaires, if so how representative are they?	Clarity	Amend as advised.

<b>p30, TRA1: Traffic volume</b>	<p>2<sup>nd</sup> sentence – As previously advised, only development where the “<i>cumulative impacts of development are severe</i>”, could be refused (para 32, NPPF), not where it is just ‘significant’.</p> <p>Last sentence – The only new thing is the support for the delivery of an appropriate north/south relief road, but does not address how this could be supported e.g. the allocation of new housing – also see comments re HBE:1 This would be better as a Community Action policy, as it lacks evidence.</p>	Consistency with national guidance.	Amend as advised.
<b>p31, Map</b>	The maps scale is missing.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
<b>p32, TRA2: Traffic flow</b>	<p>1<sup>st</sup> sentence is a statement not policy - it would be better as a Community Action policy.</p> <p>As previously advised, the Policy does not develop the emerging Local Plan policies (e.g. TR 02) unless it identifies areas of road network improvements</p>	Clarity	Amend as advised.
<b>p33, Map</b>	The maps scale is missing, as well as the key for the Parish boundary. Also map should not include public rights of way that lie outside the Neighbourhood designated area.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
<b>p33, TRA3: Walking and cycling</b>	This approach lacks evidence. As previously advised, Repeats parts of policy TR01 e) and needs to develop what is different, but also viable.	Evidence	Replace ‘should’ with ‘must’ as not sufficient evidence for this wording.
<b>p34 TRA4: Private parking</b>	<p>The Local Plan already has parking standards and there is no evidence to justify a different approach. Therefore the current wording is too weak to make a changes to this or implement e.g. what does ‘sufficient’ mean in implementation terms</p> <p>As previously advised, this repeats some policies within the emerging Local Plan, but there are some new areas – would be better to refer to the relevant LP policy and develop what is not included e.g. on street parking &amp; electrical charging</p>	Evidence	Replace ‘must’ with ‘should’ as not sufficient evidence for this wording.

<b>p35, TRA5: Public parking</b>	As currently worded this is a statement not planning policy – they need more detail to guide this type of development Also see comments above.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
	Agree that day long parking does cause a blockage and churn is needed. Rather than provision of additional parking outside the town centre shouldn't the plan consider enforcement as a way of creating churn and designating some car parks as short term and some as long term? Where does the plan propose new parking should be outside of the town? Which sites does the plan propose and are the land owners in agreement? How will that parking be managed and monitored? Is it expected to be by the public or private sector? How will commuters and visitors access the town centre if parking is outside the town centre? Particularly if it is a distance from the town centre.	Evidence	An issue to discuss at a future meeting.
	<b>6.3 ENVIRONMENT AND LANDSCAPE</b>		
<b>p38, ENV1: Air pollution</b>	How is 'significant' defined in context of this policy? As previously advised, it would be useful to refer to LP policy COM02 & Map 7.1 – Air quality Action Plan	Clarification	Qualify what is meant.
<b>p39, ENV2: Climate change</b>	As previously advised, this repeats policies within the emerging Local Plan e.g. HOU 10 & COMM 01	Duplication	Focus on areas not already addressed by the Local Plan.
<b>p39, Map</b>	The maps scale is missing.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
<b>Page 40, ENV3 Localised flooding</b>	Repeats emerging Local Plan policies e.g. ENV 09 The last sentence is not likely to be consistent with emerging modifications to policy ENV 04 regarding how to classify SuDS.	See Local Plan Modifications to policy ENV 04 – a strategic Local Plan policy. Also comments re policy COM2	Need to amend policy to conform to modified Local Plan policy ENV 04 to meet the Basic Conditions.
	Pleased to see consideration is given to drainage and systems that can be colonised by flora and fauna. Developers often use drainage systems as an excuse not to plant trees. There are a number of SUDS systems available which can incorporate tree planting.		Where possible sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) should be used as drainage solutions using compatible tree pit designs.
<b>p41 Photographs</b>	Missing so not able to comment on.	Clarity	Amend as advised.

of views			
p42, ENV:4	This should be reworded so it is positively phrased.	Wording.	<i>“Development within the following views and vistas that is <b>well designed and sympathetic the local environment</b> is <del>overly intrusive, unsightly or not prominent</del> will <del>not</del> be supported:...”</i>
p43, ENV6	Have the landowners of the spaces that have been suggested as Local Green Spaces been consulted? BDC owns at least one of these has not been consulted on the land we own, but is proposed to be included. BDC does not agree that the land within the curtilage of the Green Britain Centre should be Local Green Space and would like this categorically removed from the plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is an employment zone and therefore incompatible with the adjacent uses being Local Green Space.</li> <li>• It is private property and is inaccessible to the public and therefore cannot be enjoyed by the public as Local Green Space.</li> <li>• It is some distance from any residential housing which would require it to be a destination for recreational use which it isn't.</li> <li>• It does not have historical significance and neither does it have recreational value and neither it is a known beauty spot.</li> <li>• The Garden Science Trust is an organisation that is highly unlikely to be able to use this land in the future because its landlord (Green Britain Foundation) has recently terminated its lease for the site.</li> </ul>	
	<b>6.4 BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT</b>		
Page 47, policies BUS 1, Green	1 <sup>st</sup> sentence reads as a statement, not as a planning policy – move to text and amend policy. .	(See wording format of policy COM1)	<i>Swaffham is keen to be seen as an environmentally friendly town with a cluster</i>

credentials			<del>of green</del> <b>Businesses development that has an environmental focus. The following such Businesses will be particularly encouraged:</b>
<b>Page 47/8, policies BUS 1 and BUS 2</b>	The reference to a green cluster is noted, but it is not clear what is being proposed; an opportunity to attract specialist companies e.g. working in the clean tech or just friendly companies.	To strengthen Swaffham's local economy.	Clarify the approach being taken in the text, especially the linkages to economic development.
<b>p48, BUS2: New Businesses</b>	Still need to see the evidence for why this list (which is identical to the Mattishall NP) is appropriate to Swaffham? Have the range of business types and sizes in the policy come as a result of economic analysis of the grow needs of the town?	Evidence	Provide evidence for the type of facilities to be supported.
<b>p48, BUS3, Small shops in new development areas</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> sentence reads as a statement, not as a planning policy – it needs to development what criteria need to be considered to allow this form of development.	Clarity	As advised
<b>p51, BUS 6 Telecommunications</b>	Still repeats policy INF01 and provides less guidance	Duplication	If retained, it needs to be more detailed than the Local Plan policy or state in the supporting text that the Local Plan policy is supported.
	<b>6.5 COMMUNITY AND SERVICES</b>		
<b>p55, COM1: Sports and leisure facilities</b>	Needs to provide some evidence to guide what is considered 'reasonable'.	Evidence	Include evidence in supporting text.
<b>p56, COMM2: Informal meeting places, play spaces and parks</b>	2nd sentence - SuDS reference too prescriptive could exclude land unnecessarily and conflict with emerging LP modified policy ENV04.	See Local Plan Modifications to policy ENV 04 – a strategic Local Plan policy. Also comments re policy ENV3	Need to amend policy to conform to modified Local Plan policy ENV 04 to meet the Basic Conditions.
<b>COM3: Community buildings</b>	As previously advised, a developer can only be asked to pay for funding towards community buildings where there is an evidenced need or it will fail the planning obligation tests (para 122 of CIL regs). 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph duplicates COMM 04	There is a limit to the amount to fund it due to the pooling restrictions: <a href="http://www.localgovernmentlawyer.co.uk/index.php?option=com">http://www.localgovernmentlawyer.co.uk/index.php?option=com</a>	Provide the evidence required and amend 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph by either providing more detail or support Local Plan policy in supporting text.



		<a href="#">_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=26090%3Athe-pooling-restriction-and-infrastructure-shortfalls&amp;catid=63%3Aplanning-articles&amp;Itemid=31</a>	
<b>p61, Monitoring the use of the Neighbourhood Plan</b>	It is not a statutory responsibility or 'role' of Swaffham Town Council to monitor the Neighbourhood Plan, it is a Breckland Council one. However, this does not mean the Town Council could not voluntarily work with Breckland Council on this process.t	Clarification	<i>"It will be the <b>voluntary</b> role of the Town Council to promote and <b>assist Breckland Council with</b> monitoring the use of the Neighbourhood Plan for all planning applications".</i>
<b>p64, Map</b>	Map would benefit from being enlarged.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
<b>P65 Character Area description</b>	Missing so not able to comment on.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
<b>p70, Map</b>	Map would benefit from being enlarged.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
<b>p71, Map</b>	Photograph would benefit from being enlarged.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
<b>p72, Map</b>	The scale is missing from the map.	Clarity	Amend as advised.
<b>p73/74 Table</b>	Remove reference to No 6 re site at Garden Science Trust, Green Britain Centre.	See comment re policy ENV6	Delete information regarding site No 6.
<b>Omission</b>	It would be beneficial to include a glossary within the plan.	Clarification	Breckland Council can assist with this.