

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
LPR/PU/19/001/01	Planning Associate Director: Barton Willmore now Stantec on behalf of Talavera Properties	Many of the reasons that have been put forward are not sufficient to have delayed the review to this extent, and our concern is that even in changing the wording in policy INF03 to secure a full review by December 2024, if the Council is not sufficiently proactive then the amended wording will only serve to delay the inevitable of policies being considered out of date.	<p>Noted:</p> <p>The decision to undertake the Partial Update of the Local Plan as proposed is based on a number of different factors. These are explained in the papers accompanying the Consultation.</p> <p>Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012) and paragraph 33 of the current National Planning Policy Framework requires policies in local plans to be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years and should then be updated as necessary and that these reviews should be completed no later than five years from the adoption date of a plan. In the case of Breckland's Local Plan, December 2024 is 5 years from the date of adoption. If this date is not achieved then the Council is aware of the consequences that it would face under the current NPPF and Regulations.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/001/02	Planning Associate Director: Barton Willmore now Stantec on behalf of Talavera Properties	To a certain extent our client is supportive of the full review position as it allows a holistic consideration of housing and economic development. However, given the relatively weak reasons given for delaying the local plan it is our view that the policy could be strengthened further to ensure the Council maintains the progress they state they will. Further, there seems	<p>Noted:</p> <p>The Council welcomes the support for the Full Update and agrees that the approach does allow more a more holistic consideration of key housing and economic development issues alongside other issues that are of importance to the Council.</p> <p>The proposed date for submission of the Full Update of the Local Plan of December 2024 is 5 years from the adoption of the current Plan and only 2 years</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>a significant gap between the regulation consultation (November 2023) and plan submission (December 2024).</p> <p>An example of a potential strengthening and rewording of the policy may be:</p> <p>Policy INF03 sets out the Council's commitment to undertake an immediate full review of the Plan and to submit by June 2024 for Examination. The Council also commits to the following timetable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulation 18 Consultation complete by April 2023</li> <li>• Regulation 19 Consultation complete by January 2024</li> </ul> <p>Should the Council fail to meet any of the above timescales their policies relating to the supply of housing, economic development and gypsy and travellers will be deemed out of date.</p>	<p>away. This is the most realistic timeframe for the Full Update based on the work required and available resources and the current regulatory procedure. This is reflected in the Local Development Scheme</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/001/03	Planning Associate Director: Barton Willmore now Stantec on behalf of Talavera Properties	Given what appear to be unnecessary delays to the partial review we believe it is critical that there are strong and clear timescales the Council must work toward, or failure to do so triggering the same position which was original outlined in Policy INF 03.	<p>Noted:</p> <p>The Council has agreed the Local Development Scheme that includes clear milestones for the Full Update of the Local Plan. Failure to meet the December 2024 date in the proposed change to Policy INF 03 will result in aspects of the Plan being considered as a matter of planning judgment in</p>

Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)			
Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
			individual planning applications as to whether they are out of date.
LPR/PU/19/002	Planning Manager: Sport England	No comments.	Noted: NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/003	Administrator: Fisher German LLP	We would ask that you contact us if any works are in the vicinity of the Exolum pipeline.	Noted: NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/004	Principle Planner, National Infrastructure Planning: Norfolk County Council	The County Council does not have any strategic planning concerns and supports the immediate full review of the Local Plan.	Noted: NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/005/01	Saham Toney Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	<p>The text of both the proposed para. 8.22 and Policy INF 03 state the Council's commitment and planned intention to submit the full review of the Local Plan by December 2024. Notwithstanding the comments below, this is too vague a date. A specific date for submission of the full update should be stated, rather than just "December 2024".</p> <p>In support of the committed date, far more extensive evidence and a more detailed programme of work should be included in the supporting text, to give an examiner full confidence that the submission date will be met</p> <p>The only evidence made publicly available for the full review</p>	<p>Noted:</p> <p>It is not possible to give a specific date as dates for executive committee meetings have not been set for that time period. To specify a month for a period over 2 years away is considered to be reasonable and reflects the approach used in the existing wording of Policy INF 03..</p> <p>The Council is currently working on the Full Update of the Plan and has made progress in accordance with the agreed Local Development Scheme. This has been prepared in accordance with good practice and is not intended to set out every detailed workstream required for each milestone. Whilst the Council cannot be completely certain that the Review will be completed in accordance with the current Local Development Scheme it will be kept under review and if necessary changes made.</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>submission date is the Breckland Local Development Scheme (LDS), as updated and published in September 2022.</p> <p>A contingency of at least 3 months should be allowed to account for those risks, resulting in <b>an earliest submission date of the full review of 31 January 2026.</b></p> <p>Furthermore, the Council has not presented a full-back plan for the full review in the event that an examiner rejects the partial review, and thus if the partial review is rejected, further delay to the full review will inevitably follow.</p>	<p>A submission date of January 2026 would result in the existing plan being more than 5 years old and as such at greater risk of being considered out of date.</p> <p>If the Partial Update of the Plan fails at examination the Council will need to consider its position. However, work on the Full Update can continue as it is not directly impacted by the outcome of the Partial update.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/005/02	Saham Toney Neighbourhood Plan Work Group	<p>Unclear if the September 2022 version has received Cabinet approval? If not the completion date</p> <p>A number of detailed comments are made on the timetable for the Full Update of the Plan as set out in the Local Development Scheme as well as on particular workstreams including the Call for sites and associated Site Assessment Methodology Report . should be amended.</p>	<p>Noted:</p> <p>The Local Development Scheme was approved by the Deputy Chief Executive and relevant Portfolio Holder in accordance with the recommendation agreed by Cabinet in September 2022.</p> <p>The comments made in respect of the Local Development Scheme relate to the Full Update of the Local Plan and associated documents that are not considered to be directly relevant to the Partial Update. These are not included in this summary of responses but the full response will be made available to the Inspector.</p>

Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)			
Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
			NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19005/03	Saham Toney Neighbourhood Plan Work Group	<p>1) Paragraph 1.1 of the Integrated Assessment of the partial review states that submission of the full update will be in 2024 (without a date). A specific date should be added to align with the drafts of paragraph 8.22 and Policy INF 03 of the partial review.</p> <p>2) In accordance with my comments to paragraph 8.22 and Policy INF 03 of the partial review, the submission date for the full review given in paragraph 1.2 should be amended to <b>31 January 2026</b>.</p> <p>3) In paragraphs 1.3 and 8.1 the completion date for the Regulation 19 consultation should be amended to 11 November 2022, to reflect the Council's announcement regarding that consultation on 28 September 2022. Given that amendment, there must also be an amendment to the date in the statement in paragraph 1.3 that "Following consultation the partial review is expected to be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in November 2022" (i.e. to a later date, allowing for processing of the Regulation 19</p>	<p>Noted:</p> <p>1) Add 'December' to paragraph 1.1 of the Integrated Assessment</p> <p>2) The Council considers that December 2024 is the correct date for the submission of the Full Update. This is in accordance with the current Local Development Scheme and is in accordance with the current policy and Regulations that require a review every 5 years.</p> <p>3) The Council still intends to submit the Partial Update for examination in November 2022 following consideration at Cabinet on November 21 2022. Whilst it is accepted that this may change in light of the responses received to the Regulation 19 consultation and is also subject to Cabinet approval.</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>representations, any necessary changes to the partial review and subsequent Cabinet / Council approval.</p> <p>4) Paragraph 3.2 notes "...an updated report, finalised in July 2022", but the document title refers to it being edited in September 2022.</p> <p>5) Paragraph 6.2 refers to submission of a full update "by 2026". That is not consistent with the proposed text of INF 03 (December 2024) but would remain valid if my comments to question 3 are accepted and INF 03 is amended to show a submission date of 31 January 2026, as I have proposed. The partial review, LDS and Integrated Assessment must be consistent on dates.</p> <p>6) Paragraph 6.5 should be amended to reflect either (a) the draft text of Policy INF 03 (December 2024) or (b) my proposed amendment to INF 03 (31 January 2026).</p>	<p>4) Amend paragraph 3.2 to include <i>(as updated in September 2022 following the first Regulation 18 consultation)</i></p> <p>5) Amend paragraph 6.2 as follows:  <i>The policy amendment would remove the requirement to submit a partial review of four policies in the adopted Local Plan by November 2022, in favour of submission of a Full Update by <b>December 2024</b>. 2026</i></p> <p>6) Paragraph 6.5 reflects the proposed text of Policy INF03</p>
LPR/PU/19005/04	Saham Toney Neighbourhood Plan Work Group	Since the Integrated Assessment forms essential evidence in support of both the partial and full reviews, the various dates it refers to must be consistent with the Plan itself	<p>Noted:</p> <p>Appropriate changes have been proposed as set out above</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
LPR/PU/19/006	Individual	Instead of building more houses we need you to spend money on sorting out our drainage, our potholes, our dentists (non-existent at the moment) more doctors.	<p>Noted: The comments made are important.</p> <p>However, they are not considered relevant to the Partial Update of the Plan as proposed</p> <p>The Council is required to find sufficient land to accommodate sufficient housing to meet its identified need in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>The need for support any new development will be considered as part of the Full Update of the Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/007/01	Individual	I would suggest firstly that you develop 'industry' in all selected areas after which you may discover the number of people/families needing 'rehousing'.	<p>Noted: The comments made are important.</p> <p>However, they are not considered relevant to the Partial Update of the Plan as proposed</p> <p>The Council is required to find sufficient land to accommodate sufficient employment land to meet identified need in a sustainable location.</p> <p>The need for support any new development will be considered as part of the Full Update of the Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
LPR/PU/19007/02	Individual	What has happened in Swaffham, is the builders have /are having the time of their lives building houses and increasing travelling Norwich, Kings Lynn, Dereham or the like to find/attend work. Breckland Authority's major aim is to increase the income from 'The Rates.'	<p>Noted: The comments made are not considered relevant to the Partial Update of the Plan as proposed.</p> <p>The Council is required to find sufficient land to accommodate sufficient housing to meet its identified need in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>The need for support any new development will be considered as part of the Full Update of the Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19007/03	Individual	To go on blindly building in the current manner we could well end	Noted: The comments made are not considered relevant to the Partial Update of the Plan as proposed.



**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>up with houses to spare by the hundreds or/and paying extra money out to pay for the mass of empty properties or being “robbed” through tax to subsidise unemployed.</p>	<p>The Council is required to find sufficient land to accommodate sufficient housing to meet its identified need in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>The need for support any new development will be considered as part of the Full Update of the Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19007/04	Individual	<p>Should build a “North - South ByPass” to Swaffham at the earliest, urgently.</p> <p>A “North-South ByPass” is required as a matter of urgency and ban all agricultural traffic by redirecting it from the “North-South ByPass”</p>	<p>Noted:</p> <p>The comments made are important.</p> <p>However, they are not considered relevant to the Partial Update of the Plan as proposed</p> <p>The need for appropriate infrastructure to support any new development will be considered as part of the Full Update of the Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/008	Individual	<p>Should consider the effects on local services before adding to the already critical situation that we have in the area.</p> <p>There are not enough resources and services to support any more housing development in this area.</p>	<p>Noted:</p> <p>The comments made are important.</p> <p>However, they are not considered relevant to the Partial Update of the Plan as proposed</p> <p>The need for appropriate infrastructure to support any new development will be considered as part of the Full Update of the Local Plan.</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
			NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/009	Sustainable Places Advisor: Environment Agency	No comments.	Noted:  NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/010	Consultations Team: Natural England	No comments.	Noted:  NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/011	Sustainable Development Officer: Water Management Alliance	No comments.	Noted:  NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/012	Historic England	<p>Previously commented on the Regulation 18 Consultation in September 2022. As the consultation material has not significantly changed, the comments made then still stand but are repeated here for the sake of completeness.</p> <p>Pleased to see a commitment to the full review of the Plan going forward. Welcome the preparation of the Design Guide which will inform an important part of the evidence base for the Plan and Design Guide /Codes going forward.</p>	Noted  NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/013/001	Gladman	The Plan was examined in the context of a transitional arrangement	The Topic Paper sets out the evolution of the housing number for Breckland. This considers that there were

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>using an Objectively Assessed Need of 612 dwellings under the 2012 NPPF. Gladman agree that the review mechanism was a pragmatic response to this issue at the time. At the point of adoption, and hence the starting point for the ‘immediate review’ of the Local Plan the government had clarified the use of the 2014-based household projections- not the 2016 household projections. The Council could and should have proceeded with the immediate Local Plan Review on this basis</p>	<p>a number of iterations of the number that caused significant uncertainty for a review of the Local Plan as required by Policy INF 03.</p> <p>The Inspector, considering the adopted Local Plan required the Council to undertake the Partial Review using the 2016 based housing figures, notwithstanding that in October 2018, the Government had instructed local authorities to ignore the 2016 based figures when assessing their local housing need and instead use the 2014- based figures published two years earlier whilst it carried out a review of the methodology.</p> <p>This was followed, in August 2020, when, as part of the Planning for the Future White Paper, the Government consulted on a proposed new Standard Method, which had a greater focus on affordability, the results of which were to boost the national figure to 337,000 homes per annum, with most of the increases in the areas where the gap between house prices and incomes was greatest. The figure for Breckland was 1,070 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>By December 2020, the figure had again changed to 661 dwellings per annum and then to 643 in 2021 and 672 in 2022 following the application of an adjusted affordability ratio. There have been 6 different numbers published for Breckland ranging from 643 to 1,070 dwellings per annum. It is this uncertainty, combined with the other important issues set out in the Consultation that has resulted in the Council’s decision to undertake the Partial Update as proposed</p> <p><b>NO CHANGE</b></p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
LPR/PU/19/013/002	Gladman	<p>Changes to the planning system are a common theme, if not always welcomed and Gladman politely suggest that the Council should have acted sooner. Other authorities have proceeded with plan reviews during this time, and despite the period of uncertainty, are in the process of preparing plans for submission.</p> <p>Gladman do not consider that the choice to review the review policy in light of the necessary work having not being undertaken and to prioritise a full review instead, to be an appropriate strategy. If this process is accepted, this sets a worrying precedent for the robustness and credibility of review mechanisms</p>	<p>The reasons why the Council considers that it was unreasonable and unrealistic for the Council to have submitted the Partial Update covering the issues as required by Policy INF 03 are detailed in the Topic Paper.</p> <p>If the Council had started the Partial Review as set out in Policy INF 03 then it believes that it would have been impossible to have progressed it as required by the Policy due to some or all of the issues and consequential uncertainties set out in the Topic Paper. It is noted that some 14 Local Planning Authorities have paused or delayed work on local plan preparation with some citing the uncertainty over housing numbers and planning reform. These include Dorset Council, Basildon, Dacorum, Ashfield, Arun, Sheffield, and East Hampshire.</p> <p>A partial review process is not unprecedented (North West Leicestershire) and whilst it is acknowledged that most Local Plan reviews will cover a multitude of policies, it is not unheard of for only one policy to be reviewed. Furthermore, the Planning Practice Guidance (Plan Making paragraph 069) clearly anticipates such a possibility as it states '<i>A local planning authority can review specific policies on an individual basis. Updates to the plan or certain policies within it must follow the plan-making procedure; including preparation, publication, and examination by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State</i>'.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
LPR/PU/19/013/003	Gladman	<p>To ensure the continued supply of housing and that the timescales set out in revised Policy INF 03 are upheld, Gladman consider the wording stipulating that the Local Plan will become out-of-date should be retained. This approach will hold the Council accountable should the production of the substantive review not be met. In response, Gladman consider that the current wording of Policy INF 03 should be revised to set out that, <i>“In the event that the reviewed plan is not submitted within the timescales set out above, then relevant policies of the Local Plan will be deemed to be out-of-date.”</i></p>	<p>If the Council’s five-year housing land supply falls as postulated, then para 11d) in the NPPF guides decision-makers as to the approach to be adopted. The same applies where there is a five year supply, but the exercise of planning judgment results in policies being regarded as being out-of-date. For the reasons given above, there is no need for further deeming provisions in the local plan itself.</p> <p>The addition of a ‘consequence clause’ in the Policy is not considered necessary; the decision-maker will judge what the consequences should be on the facts of each case. Further, Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012) and paragraph 33 of the current National Planning Policy Framework requires policies in local plans to be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years and should then be updated as necessary and that these reviews should be completed no later than five years from the adoption date of a plan.</p> <p>In the case of Breckland’s Local Plan, December 2024 is 5 years from the date of adoption. If this date is not achieved then the Council is aware of the consequences that it would face under the current NPPF and Regulations.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/013/004	Gladman	<p>Gladman contend that the timetable for the Full Update is not appropriate. The proposed timetable suggests a submission date of December 2024, yet the</p>	<p>The Local Development Scheme was approved by the Deputy Chief Executive and relevant Portfolio Holder in accordance with the recommendation agreed by Cabinet in September 2022.</p>

Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)			
Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>examination is not timetabled to start until March 2026, with adoption in June 2027. These timescales seem excessive and should be revised to reflect an efficient plan making process</p>	<p>The timescales for an Examination will depend on the number and complexity of any outstanding issues in respect of the Plan.</p> <p>The Local Development Scheme considers that the Full Update would be submitted in December 2024 with the examination proposed for Q2 2025 – Q3 2026 and adoption in Q4 2026</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/014/001	Savills (Pigeon)	<p>In Section 2.0 of the Draft Topic Paper the Council sets out (para. 2.2) the reason why the Local Plan Inspector identified a need to review Policy HOU 01 as being the different ways of calculating the Local Plan housing requirement – the requirement in the adopted Plan being based on an objective assessment of need in a Strategic Housing Market Assessment ('SHMA') as opposed to the 'Standard Method' for calculating Local Housing Need.</p> <p>The Inspector also referenced the Council's agreement to an immediate Partial Review in justifying his conclusions on a number of other matters, including at paras. 54 (villages with and without boundaries), 103 (site allocations), 168 (components of [housing land] supply), 176 (five</p>	<p>The Topic Paper sets out the evolution of the housing number for Breckland. This considers that there were a number of iterations of the number that caused significant uncertainty for a review of the Local Plan as required by Policy INF 03.</p> <p>The Inspector, considering the Local Plan required the Council to undertake the Partial Review using the 2016 based housing figures, notwithstanding that in October 2018, the Government had instructed local authorities to ignore the 2016 based figures when assessing their local housing need and instead use the 2014- based figures published two years earlier whilst it carried out a review of the methodology.</p> <p>This was followed, in August 2020, when, as part of the Planning for the Future White Paper, the Government consulted on a proposed new Standard Method, which had a greater focus on affordability, the results of which were to boost the national figure to 337,000 homes per annum, with most of the increases in the areas where the gap between house prices and incomes was greatest. The figure for Breckland was 1,070 dwellings per annum. By December 2020, the</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>year land supply), 183 (affordable housing and Policy HOU 07). The Topic Paper lacks coverage of these matters.</p> <p>In Section 3.0 the Council then discusses the matter of housing need, referring to matters including 'uncertainty and delays to the publication of the housing requirement and delays to work on the revised Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMAA)' (paras. 3.3 to 3.21), 'changes to the national planning policy framework' (paras. 3.22 to 3.30), 'uncertainties due to planning reform' (paras. 3.37 to 3.47), and 'nutrient neutrality' (paras. 3.48 to 3.50) as all being reasons not to undertake the immediate Partial Review required by Policy INF 03.</p> <p>The reference to these matters should be viewed as wider context only. The discussion relating to the SHMAA and changes to the NPPF are inappropriate given, since the adoption of the Local Plan in November 2019, national policy has been consistent – the Standard Method for calculating Local Housing Need using the 2014-based household projections. Whilst other potential methods have been</p>	<p>figure had again changed to 661 dwellings per annum and then to 643 in 2021 and 672 in 2022 following the application of an adjusted affordability ratio. There have been 6 different numbers published for Breckland ranging from 643 to 1,070 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>It is this uncertainty, combined with the other important issues set out in the Consultation that has resulted in the Council's decision to undertake the Partial Update as proposed.</p> <p>This uncertainty needed to be resolved so that the other housing issues such as affordable housing and the development strategy could also be correctly planned for.</p> <p>Issues such as nutrient neutrality and changes to the NPPF and planning reform are key integral factors in determining the Council's approach and are not, as suggested, inappropriate or just part of a wider discussion.</p> <p><b>NO CHANGE</b></p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>discussed, none have been introduced, and nothing has occurred in relation to Breckland that has not applied elsewhere.</p> <p>It is notable that, whilst in March and October 2020 the Council did have an up-to-date Plan, Policy INF 03 made it clear that the Plan would no longer be up-to-date in this regard as of November 2022, unless the Council carried out the required immediate Partial Review.</p> <p>In summary, it is unclear why the review of Policy HOU 01, as required by Policy INF 03, has not been undertaken.</p>	
LPR/PU/19/014/002	Savills (Pigeon)	<p>The Council explains that it has not yet commenced the work identified by the Local Plan Inspector as being required to review Policy HOU 08. It refers to a High Court decision of December 2020, that was effectively reversed in June 2021, and explains that this timing has meant that, as of August 2022, it is “unrealistic and unfeasible” to undertake the required review. Whilst the Council discusses the matter in other regards, this is the crux of its case. It therefore should be noted that the review could have been commenced in June 2021, after the High Court judgement was reversed.</p>	<p>The adopted Local Plan does identify sites to meet the needs of Gypsies and travellers as well as a criteria based development management policy against which to consider planning applications. The Council intends to resolve any issues, including an updated evidence base as part of the Full Update of the Local Plan.</p> <p>One of the issues cited by the Council in the Partial Update Consultation Paper was the uncertainty caused by the High Court challenge ( Lisa Smith v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government) that raised questions of significant public interest concerning discrimination against Gypsies and Travellers. In particular Ground 1 that concerned whether the definition of “Gypsies and Travellers” contained in Annex 1 of the PPTS is unlawfully discriminatory.</p>



**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>In summary, it is unclear why the review of Policy HOU 08, as required by Policy INF 03, has not been undertaken</p>	<p>Although this challenge was ‘lost’ in June 2021, in October 2022, the Court of Appeal rejected the Government’s use of the planning definition of ‘Traveller’. Whilst the Court of Appeal’s decision does not automatically get rid of the PPTS definition, and the Government is likely to seek permission to appeal to the Supreme Court the ruling brings into question the definition and continues to add to the uncertainty that the Council would have faced had it undertaken the Partial Update of the Local Plan as envisaged by Policy INF 03. For example, it would leave any new evidence base that the Council had commissioned along with any allocations / policy development in the new Plan subject to challenge.</p> <p><b>UPDATE TOPIC PAPER TO REFLECT RECENT JUDGEMENT</b></p>
LPR/PU/19/014/003	Savills (Pigeon)	<p>he Draft Topic Paper explains that the Council considers that as the accessibility standards are optional “... <i>the timing of when and if this [review] is completed is a decision for the Council and can be done through a full review and should not be required to be submitted by November 2022.</i>”</p> <p>In summary, and notwithstanding the Council’s optionality, it is unclear why the review of Policy HOU 10, as required by Policy INF 03, has not been undertaken</p>	<p>The Council is aware of the changing building regulations and as such considers that it adopted the best approach in considering such standards as part of the Full Update as any earlier work may have been lengthy and abortive.</p> <p>Accessibility standards are just one of the factors set out in Policy INF 03 and the Council’s approach must be considered in the round</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
LPR/PU/19/014/004	Savills (Pigeon)	<p>The Council is suggesting that the Local Plan, in an adopted form, does not need to consider the implications until two to three years after the works to the A47 will be complete. This is in contrast to the Inspector that considered the adopted 2019 Local Plan who considered that the impact of the dualling that was anticipated at the time would be complete by 2021.</p> <p>In summary, it is unclear why the review of Policy EC 01, has not been undertaken.</p>	<p>The Inspector considering the adopted Local Plan considered that the improvements to the A47 were imminent and as such included the need for urgent review. However, delays to the scheme at Dereham have removed the urgent need to consider the economic development policies of the Plan. The Full update of the Plan will be well advanced prior to the completion of any works, as these are yet to commence.</p> <p>The Council considers that it is more appropriate to consider this issue holistically along with other development needs in the area including for example housing growth and not in isolation. There is a clear link between economic development and housing</p> <p><b>NO CHANGE</b></p>
LPR/PU/19/015/001	South Norfolk Council	<p>South Norfolk Council was however disappointed to see reference to potential delays to Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) and to Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Councils' decision not to progress with an update to the existing SHMAA as reasons to justify Breckland's decision not to progress a review in line with Policy INF 03 of the adopted Breckland Local Plan.</p>	<p>Breckland understands that work on the joint SHMA was not pursued in light of the advanced stages of the Greater Norwich Local Plan. Work on the review of Policy INF 03 required a SHMA to be undertaken and until the decision was taken in in January 2021 it had been assumed that this would be a joint document.</p> <p><b>NO CHANGE</b></p>
LPR/PU/19/015/002	South Norfolk Council	<p>it is unclear why Breckland Council could not commission its own evidence should it have determined to progress with a review in line with the requirements of INF 03 as</p>	<p>Noted. The Council will be commissioning its own evidence base. However, the continuing uncertainty over the housing figures together with the other issues set out in the Topic Paper has made the timing of this very difficult to gauge and in any event this could not</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>adopted. South Norfolk Council would also note that the final sentence of 3.20 is not entirely correct. The 2017 SHMA did inform plan making in Greater Norwich but the GNLP relies on the standard methodology for its housing requirement.</p>	<p>have started until after January 2021 when the joint approach was abandoned.</p> <p><b>DELETE THE FINAL SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 3.20 OF THE TOPIC PATER</b></p>
LPR/PU/19/015/003	South Norfolk Council	<p>South Norfolk Council's principal concern is, however, that Breckland should continue to aim to deliver at least the local housing need identified in the most up to date evidence, in accordance with Agreement 11 of the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework (NSPF).</p>	<p>The Council is continuing to deliver housing at levels required by the adopted Local Plan and remains confident that this will continue to be the case especially in light of the progress made on the 2 sustainable urban extensions.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/015/004	South Norfolk Council	<p>On 29 July 2022 Government responded to the September 2020 consultation on raising accessibility standards in new homes. Within that response Government committed to raising accessibility standards, proposing to mandate the M4(2) standard in all new homes through revisions to the building regulations. The Council could not see reference to this within the supporting materials published by the Council but considers this a relevant development in terms of the matter referred to in INF 03.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On 12 August 2022, shortly after the publication of the Partial Review</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p><b>UPDATE THE TOPIC PAPER TO INCLUDE REFERENCE TO THESE RECENT UPDATES</b></p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		that the Secretary of State issued the Development Consent Order for the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton	
LPR/PU/19/019/005	South Norfolk Council	<p>Notwithstanding the above, as set out elsewhere South Norfolk Council does not object to a proposed amendment to Policy INF 03. However, to avoid confusion with the review referred to under paragraph 33 of the NPPF, South Norfolk Council would suggest the wording be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>The Council commits to an immediate full update of its Local Plan. The updated plan is to be submitted for examination under Regulation 19 of the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulation 2012, as amended (or equivalent replacement regulation, as appropriate) by December 2024</i></p>	<p>The Council notes that the Councils do not object to the proposed amendment to Policy INF03.</p> <p>It does not consider that the proposed wording would result in any confusion.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/016/001	Broadland District Council	Broadland District Council sympathises with Breckland District Council's predicament and agrees in-principle that a full update to the Local Plan could be an appropriate strategy to ensure that the development needs of the district are met in manner consistent with the national planning policy framework (NPPF).	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council agrees that a Full Update is the most appropriate approach to the review of the Local Plan</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
LPR/PU/19/016/002	Broadland District Council	It appears clear from the timeline set out in Table 1 that a decision was taken to undertake a partial review of the Breckland Local Plan well in advance of the Natural England's (NE) recent guidance on Nutrient Neutrality (NN). Whilst there may be other reasons that justify a pause in the examination of the GNLP, in Broadland District Council's view there also remains a compelling case for a pragmatic approach to be taken in respect of the adoption of the GNLP irrespective of the NN issue.	<p>Noted. The Council considers that the NN issue could have caused delays to the Partial Review of the Local Plan at examination as it would have been required to have been submitted for examination by November 2022 and that currently the required mitigation measures are not in place that could have raised issues on any allocations that there may have been within the affected catchment. The Council considers that the Full Update of the Plan gives the Council time to have identified appropriate mitigation and this can be factored into the Full Update as it emerges.</p> <p><b>NO CHANGE</b></p>
LPR/PU/19/016/003	Broadland District Council	Broadland District Council was however disappointed to see reference to potential delays to Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) and to Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Councils' decision not to progress with an update to the existing SHMAA as reasons to justify Breckland's decision not to progress a review in line with Policy INF 03 of the adopted Breckland Local Plan.	<p>Breckland understands that work on the joint SHMA was not pursued in light of the advanced stages of the Greater Norwich Local Plan. Work on the review of Policy INF 03 required a SHMA to be undertaken and until the decision was taken in in January 2021 it had been assumed that this would be a joint document.</p> <p><b>NO CHANGE</b></p>
LPR/PU/19/016/004	Broadland District Council	On 29 July 2022 Government responded to the September 2020 consultation on raising accessibility standards in new homes. Within that response Government committed to raising accessibility standards, proposing to mandate the M4(2)	<p>Noted</p> <p><b>UPDATE THE TOPIC PAPER TO INCLUDE REFERENCE TO THESE RECENT UPDATES</b></p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>standard in all new homes through revisions to the building regulations. The Council could not see reference to this within the supporting materials published by the Council but considers this a relevant development in terms of the matter referred to in INF 03.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On 12 August 2022, shortly after the publication of the Partial Review that the Secretary of State issued the Development Consent Order for the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton</li> </ul>	
LPR/PU/19/017/001	Armstrong Rigg	<p>Continue to recommend that the Council take a step back and proceed with a partial review of the Local Plan that complies with Policy INF 03 rather than try to circumvent the requirements of this policy.</p> <p>If the Council does choose to proceed to examination with the currently proposed Local Plan Partial Update it is recommend that, at the very least, the policy is amended to reflect the previous wording with respect to the consequences of not complying with the policy. In this event we recommend the following amendment:</p>	<p>A submission date of January 2026 would result in the existing plan being more than 5 years old and as such at greater risk of being considered out of date.</p> <p>If the Partial Update of the Plan fails at examination the Council will need to consider its position. However, work on the Full Update can continue as it is not directly impacted by the outcome of the Partial update.</p> <p><b>NO CHANGE</b></p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>“The Council will undertake an immediate full review of the Plan. The full Review of the Plan is planned to be submitted for examination by December 2024. <b>In the event that the review is not submitted for examination by this time, then the Council’s policies that relate to the supply of housing, economic development and gypsy and travellers will be deemed to be out-of-date</b></p>	
LPR/PU/19/017/002	Armstrong Rigg	<p>In summary, our client remains of the view that the Local Plan Partial Update is not positively prepared, not justified and not consistent with national policy, such that it fails the test of soundness set by NPPF paragraph 35. In addition, the Council has presented no evidence on whether they have engaged with neighbouring areas to ascertain if they have any unmet need. Our client therefore considers that the Partial Update fails to comply with the duty to cooperate.</p>	<p>The Council is part of the Countywide Strategic Planning Group where cross boundary issues are discussed and resolutions agreed.</p> <p>The Council has never been asked by nor has it asked any neighbouring local authorities to accommodate any unmet housing need.</p> <p>Breckland has an adopted local Plan and plans of several neighbouring authorities are at an advanced stage and so this is not an issue at this time.</p> <p>The Council is actively engagement with discussions and the agreement of a Statement of Common Ground with Neighbouring authorities on this matter.</p> <p><b>NO CHANGE</b></p>
LPR/PU/19/018/001	Rosconn Strategic Land	<p>The Local Plan Inspector’s rationale for introducing Policy INF 03 was due to the release of the 2016 household projections in the late</p>	<p>The Local Plan is based on locally objectively assessed needs and not on the 2014 based household projections. The unforeseen fluctuations and uncertainty over these figures, as set out in the Topic</p>

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>stages of the examination whereas the Local Plan based its housing requirement on the 2014 household projections.</p> <p>Unlike the nationwide picture, the result of using the 2016 household projections in Breckland was a substantive upward adjustment to 770 dwellings per annum (dpa) whereas the adopted Local Plan's housing requirement is 612 dpa. In the current national planning policy context this is now largely a moot point because the Standard Method for calculating Local Housing Need (LHN) still uses the 2014 household projections as the starting point for the demographic baseline. On its face, therefore, an important part of the rationale for Policy INF 03 may appear to have fallen away.</p>	<p>Paper, that have occurred since 2019 and the adoption of the Plan made the Partial Review as proposed by the Inspector an unrealistic and unreasonable proposition.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
LPR/PU/19/018/002	Rosconn Strategic Land	<p>Given the adopted Local Plan's reliance on large-scale strategic allocations, the erosion of its flexibility to respond to changing circumstances as a result of increases in the baseline housing need figure cannot be a desirable outcome and will likely lead to a five year housing land supply and/or housing delivery deficit at some point in the current plan period and prior to a new local plan being adopted. As the Council points out,</p>	<p>Progress continues on the 2 large sustainable developments in the District as set out in paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 of the Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Housing Land Supply Report (2022) also shows that in addition to the 2 large sites, there are a wide range of other sites (both minor and major) that are successfully contributing to the delivery of housing across Breckland.</p> <p>It is committed to a timely Full Update of the Plan as well as the commissioning of new evidence that will take of account of the latest numbers to establish a</p>



**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		this scenario will still trigger corrective action in the form of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, but in a plan-led system such corrective action should be the exception and not the rule.	housing need figure for the District and if appropriate make deliverable allocations in the new Plan  NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/018/003	Rosconn Strategic Land	Without a Plan review that delivers additional sites for development, the Council's five year housing land supply will become a hostage to fluctuations in the LHN upon the five year anniversary of the adopted Local Plan. Even a slight further increase in the LHN will significantly erode or completely absorb the adopted Local Plan	The Council has an up to date Local Plan.  It does not know nor does it wish to speculate what any future housing numbers will be for the District. It is committed to a timely Full Update of the Plan as well as the commissioning of new evidence that will take account of the latest numbers to establish a housing need figure for the District and if appropriate make deliverable allocations in the new Plan  NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/018/004	Rosconn Strategic Land	The lack of a timely and substantive review of development requirements and, accordingly, additional site allocations when combined with the elevated baseline housing need suggested by the Standard Method, means that the flexibility and contingency which had been built into the housing land supply of the District within the adopted Local Plan is effectively cancelled out, which cannot be a desirable or sound outcome	The issue of housing numbers is only one reason what the Council does not consider that the Partial Update of the Plan could have been delivered as envisaged by Policy INF 03.  The current plan still has built in flexibility to provide for the latest figure of 672 dpa and the Council is committed to a Full Update of the Plan in a timely manner so that any erosion of this can be dealt with in the new Plan.  NO CHANGE
LPR/PU/19/018/005		The Council's assumptions about the timing and rate of delivery of	The Council can demonstrate a 5 year Housing Land supply.

**Partial Update Consultation Responses: (Second Consultation September 30 – November 11 2022)**

Ref. No.	Organisation / Individual Representation	Comments	Council Response
		<p>housing sites should be tested in detail to ascertain whether further sites are needed to make up any shortfalls within the current plan period.</p> <p>The importance of a robust future supply is especially relevant as we would note that the Council's latest five year housing land supply assessment dated August 2022 identifies that there has been a substantial accumulated shortfall of some 651 units since the base date of the adopted plan. In the past eleven years of reported completions, the Council has only exceeded its annual requirement in three monitoring years against the comparatively lower local plan figure of 612 dpa.</p>	<p>It is important to note that over the first 5 years of the plan period there was a cumulative shortfall of 886 dwellings (2011 – 2016). However since 2016 there has been an over supply of 235 dwellings when assessed against the 612 dpa local plan requirement. It is therefore evident that the remaining 651 shortfall is a consequence of the early years of the Plan and that since 2016 the Council has been positively planning for deliverable housing across the District.</p> <p>Progress continues on the 2 large sustainable developments in the District as set out in paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 of the Topic Paper.</p> <p>It is committed to a timely Full Update of the Plan, timetabled to be submitted by the end of 2024, that will consider future trajectory for the delivery of new housing across the District</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>