

Yaxham Neighbourhood Plan Review (2025) - Regulation 16 Consultation

Summary of Comments

GENERAL COMMENTS

Please note: The Table presents a summary of representations. The full responses are also available

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
001 Active Travel England	Whole Plan	ATE is not a statutory consultee for Neighbourhood Plans. Guidance for groups on transport such as working cycling and wheeling is available at: Locality's Neighbourhood Planning website	No change
002 Water Management Alliance	Whole Plan	<p>No additional comments to make.</p> <p>See below previous comments from 30/04/2024.</p> <p>As Yaxham falls partially within the Internal Drainage District (IDD), the Boards Byelaws apply to any development within the Board's Area. Byelaw's to be aware of are as follows:</p> <p>Byelaw 3 – Discharge of Surface Water & Treated Foul Water into the Board's District</p> <p>Byelaw 4 – Alterations Proposed to a Watercourse</p> <p>Byelaw 10 – Works within 9m of Board Maintained Watercourses</p> <p>Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act (1991)</p>	No Change

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		<p>The reason for our recommendation is to promote sustainable development within the Board's Watershed Catchment therefore ensuring that flood risk is not increased within the Internal Drainage District (required as per paragraph 167 of the National Planning Policy Framework). For further information regarding the Board's involvement in the planning process please see our Planning and Byelaw Strategy, available online.</p>	
003 Sport England	Whole Plan	<p>Neighbourhood plan must have reference to Para 103 and 104 of the NPPF, and also reflect any strategies set out by the Local Planning Authority</p> <p>In line with section 8 of the NPPF, consideration should be given to how any new development will provide an additional demand for sports and will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities.</p> <p>Guidance for Neighbourhood Planning Bodies is available on the Sports England Website</p>	No Change
004 Breckland District Council	1.2	Agree, but clarify which version of the NPPF is being referred too.	If referring to the December 2024 version, then all paragraph numbers and references throughout the whole document should apply to the December 2024 version.
005 Breckland District Council	2.1	Update with latest information. In March 2025, Breckland District Council produced its most recent statement stating Breckland District Council no longer has a 5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS)	<p>Recommend replacement text as follows:</p> <p>In relation to the 5-year land supply the most recent statement by Breckland District Council states:- “Breckland Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land as set out below. The Council will review</p>

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
			the 5-year land supply position in March 2025.” Source: Breckland Council Statement of Five-Year Housing Land Supply (March 2025). https://democracy.breckland.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=124&MId=5155
006 Breckland District Council	Map 5	The Settlement Boundary should reflect the boundary in the Adopted Breckland Local Plan (2019).	Recommend replacement map to reflect the Settlement Boundary in the Adopted Local Plan (2019) as follows: Page 270 https://www.breckland.gov.uk/local-plan/adoption
007 Breckland District Council	7.1	It is noted that the Plan refers to the Breckland adopted Core Strategy and Development Policies Development Plan Document 2009. This was largely replaced by the 2019 Breckland Local Plan and as such this should now be referred to as the District wide spatial plan for Yaxham.	Recommend replacement text as follows: Paragraph 3.18 of The Breckland Local Plan 2019 identifies Yaxham Parish as a ‘village with boundaries’ and states that ‘In line with the Spatial Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, the level of new development permitted in settlements defined in the policy will be restricted, consistent with the rural character of these villages and reflective of the more limited service provision and infrastructure available.
008 Breckland District Council	7.5	The latest Settlement Boundary as set out in the 2019 Adopted Local Plan link. Update link and Map 5 to show correct boundary.	Recommend replacement text as follows: The settlement boundaries for settlements of Yaxham and Clint Green are referred to in these policies are as set out in Breckland’s Local Plan 2019 (see Maps 5 and 6). Brakefield Green does not have a settlement boundary.
009 Breckland District Council	7.13	Policy approach in the adopted Local Plan. The settlement hierarchy in the adopted Local Plan is informed by The Local Service Centre Topic Paper that	Recommend replacement text as follows The remainder of the parish of Yaxham, including Brakefield Green, is also covered by Policy HOU 04.

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		<p>includes an assessment of services and facilities within each parish area within Breckland. These assessments were based on services and facilities within each parish and were undertaken with co-operation from each parish council. If any single settlement within a particular parish contained the 5 key services (School, shop/post office, community facility, employment, and public transport) then the parish was concluded as being suitable for LSC status. It is worth noting that the Inspector into the 2029 Local Plan considered Yaxham and Clint Green together in terms of services and the relative sustainability, concluding that taken together the 2 areas contain sufficient level of services to be considered as a local service centre. However, due to the distance between the 2 villages (when walking) then neither village would be sufficiently sustainable to warrant LSC status.</p> <p>The outcome of this assessment is set out in Policy HOU 02 that lists the parishes included under each of the policy HOU03, 04 and 05.</p> <p>The lists in policy HOU 02 for HOU 03, HOU 04 and HOU05 are in fact names of parishes. The only exception is that Clint Green is included with Yaxham following the examination to clarify that both settlements possess sufficient levels of sustainability to warrant designation with settlement boundaries under HOU04.</p> <p>This is important as the list under HOU 05 sets out those parishes within Breckland not covered by other policies. If the areas listed were villages then under Policy HOU 05 there should either be many more smaller villages and hamlets included in the list including for example, Brakefield Green in Yaxham parish. If settlement names and not parishes it is</p>	

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		<p>therefore unclear as to why only some are listed under the HOU05 part of Policy HOU02.</p> <p>If policies HOU 03 and HOU04 were settlement based (ie: just Yaxham and Clint Green) but not any other parts of the parish then the list set out in Policy HOU 02 of the areas covered by HOU05 should either name all those settlements without settlement boundaries or not have any list of named areas, inferring that it covers all the other settlements not named on other policies. The fact that it does include a list and that list reflects those parishes not included in higher level tiers indicates that the whole settlement hierarchy is in fact parish based.</p> <p>If the policies were settlement and not parish based then it would be unclear as to under which policy any applications for development would be considered if not listed. In considering applications under Policy HOU04 it is also important to note that commitments and development within the whole parish are counted against the 5% figure set out in the Policy and not just those within or immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary.</p> <p>This approach has consistently been supported at appeals.</p>	
010 Breckland District Council	7.17	<p>This paragraph requires updating with the latest Local Plan Timetable</p>	<p>Recommend replacement text as follows:</p> <p>In June and July 2024, the Draft Local Plan Full Update Preferred Options document was consulted on. Breckland DC has published an updated timetable to reflect the changes to housing numbers required following the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in December 2024 and the transition period during</p>

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
			<p>which plans can be made under the existing system. It is anticipated that the Regulation 19 consultation will happen in Summer 2026 and the Draft Local Plan Full Update will be submitted for Examination by December 2026.</p> <p>https://www.breckland.gov.uk/local-plan-review</p>
011 Breckland District Council	7.23	This needs updating as it is referring to out of date reports from 2015. The most recent Local Plan evidence is required.	<p>Recommend replacement text as follows</p> <p>It is noted Breckland Council is considering the future development strategy that will be required to meet the new mandatory housing requirement, including Yaxham and neighbouring towns and parishes. This will include updated evidence on key issues including transport and a water cycle study.</p>
012 Breckland District Council	9.2	<p>It is important to refer to the review of the Local Plan and the fact that future development in Yaxham may not be restricted to sites within the Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>The purpose of this policy is to prompt development to be within the existing settlement boundary. However, it is important to note that Breckland District Council is preparing a Local Plan Review. It will cover the period from 2024 to 2046. This review will include new allocations for development to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and other statutory requirements. The most recent version of the NPPF was published in December 2024. This will provide the broader context for the Local Plan and in particular the Development Strategy and allocations.</p>	<p>Recommend replacement text as follows</p> <p>Policy HOU1 – Correct spelling in first sentence ‘Yaxham’.</p> <p>Amend bullet 4 to read: "significantly more than 5%".</p>

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		Policy HOU 01: The Local Plan refers to growth not being significantly more than 5%. The 5% is therefore not a limit and allows for some flexibility. This should be mirrored in Policy HOU 01 as, as worded, it is more restrictive than the Strategic Policy HOU 04 of the Local Plan.	
013 Breckland District Council	9.10	Breckland District Council has adopted a Breckland Design Guide. This should be referenced in this section of the Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>Recommend replacement text as follows</p> <p>NP4Yaxham requires those planning new development to demonstrate the highest standards of design in the context of the immediate locality within small rural settlements.</p> <p>In preparing any proposals for development, consideration should be given to the Breckland Design Guide</p> <p>https://www.breckland.gov.uk/article/19942/Local-Plan-Full-Update-2024</p>
014 Breckland District Council	10.8 and Policy ENV3	<p>Object to inclusion of Site 5 – East of St Peters Close.</p> <p>The Council notes that this site was submitted to the Call for Sites as being suitable for development with a housebuilder identified. The Council is preparing the new Local Plan based on the 2024 NPPF and new mandatory housing requirement for Breckland of 903 dwellings per annum, an increase of over 36% increase on the figure provided for in the May 2024 Regulation 18 Plan of 661 dwellings per annum. It is clear that the new mandatory annual housing requirement similar to that currently being proposed is imposed on the District will require further consideration of the development strategy and significantly greater number of new allocations for development than previously made.</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Delete Site 5 - St Peter's Close from Policy ENV3, Map 12 and 10.8</p>

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		<p>Therefore, the Council is concerned that the identification of this site as LGS at this time could be seen as an attempt to block possible future development on a site on the edge of Yaxham.</p> <p>The District Council is not suggesting that the site is or is not a suitable development site at this time but considers that it should be allowed to consider this site as part of the statutory plan making process.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council is concerned that the identification of the site as a local green space is not supported by objective evidence. It does not appear to be included in the accompanying Local Green Space evidence document but is only supported by a small assessment in Appendix A to the Plan. This appears to be an internal assessment derived from the Working Group. There appears to be a lack of detailed objectively derived evidence or of demonstrably special features. As such it does not meet the high tests for LGS designation.</p>	
015 National Highways	Whole Plan	<p>National Highways is a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p> <p>It has been noted that once adopted, the Neighbourhood Plan will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Where relevant, National Highways will be a statutory consultee on future planning applications within the area and will assess the impact on the SRN of a planning application accordingly.</p>	No Change

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		Notwithstanding the above comments, we have reviewed the document and note that the details set out within the document are unlikely to have a severe impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment .	
016 Environment Agency	Whole Plan	No further comments on this Plan.	No Change
017 NHS Norfolk & Waveney ICS	Whole Plan	<p>The ICS strategic estates team would like the neighbourhood plan to include support towards health infrastructure in the nearby area by way of Community Infrastructure Levy as and when required.</p> <p>There is currently very limited infrastructure capacity at the local GP practices to absorb the population growth expected from the allocated development sites in Yaxham and the wider surrounding area, the cumulative effect of housing in South Dereham and Mattishall on the health infrastructure could be unsustainable including that of Primary care, Community care, Mental Health care, Acute care and the Ambulance service</p>	<p>Breckland District Council support the suggested addition to the text but as Breckland District Council does not have CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy), amend the proposed text:</p> <p>‘by way of S106 contributions or any subsequent mechanisms for securing health benefits as and when required.’</p>
018 NHS Norfolk & Waveney ICS	5.14 & Objective 1	The ICS would welcome the Yaxham Parish Councils support in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of healthcare services across all health sectors for the residents in the plan area, by supporting healthcare in the neighbouring parishes, through the utilisation of local CIL (community infrastructure levy) contributions as and when improvements to healthcare capacity are required. This would help to meet key aim 5.14 objective 1	<p>Breckland District Council support the suggested addition to the text but as Breckland District Council does not have CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy), amend the proposed text:</p> <p>‘through the utilisation of S106 contributions or any subsequent mechanisms for securing health benefits as and when improvements to healthcare capacity are required.’</p>

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
019 Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Policy ENV3	<p>We particularly support Objective 9, page 30, which seeks to protect and enhance the countryside, including wildlife habitats and sites of special interest.</p> <p>S3.8 on page 14 describes a number of ecologically important sites within the Neighbourhood Plan boundary which includes 4 County Wildlife Sites (CWS), 1 of which is largely 'Ancient Woodland', an 'irreplaceable habitat.'</p> <p>We also note various Priority Habitats within the Neighbourhood Plan boundary, including deciduous woodland, lowland fen and traditional orchard.</p> <p>Although there is some wording within Policy HOU3 for all developments 'to be designed to avoid or mitigate likely significant effects to the Norfolk Valley Fens SAC...', there is no policy wording in the Plan to protect the County Wildlife Sites, Priority Habitats or the River Tud from adverse impacts from development.</p> <p>Any new development within the parish has the potential to create negative impacts on sensitive wildlife habitats, for example, from water or air pollution, direct loss of habitat, loss of species etc. It is important that these ecologically sensitive sites are protected now and for future generations.</p>	<p>Recommend the following (or similar) additional text at the end of Policy ENV3</p> <p><i>'Development proposals should retain and protect existing habitats and species including County Wildlife Sites, Priority Habitats, the River Tud and other high biodiversity habitats, and seek to enhance these where possible.'</i></p>
020 Breckland Strategic	Whole Plan	Overall – the updated plan feels quite dated, with a lot of references to events from 2015 and around the time of original adoption; it is unclear how much updating has been	

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
Housing Team		undertaken on large parts of the plan, with several whole chapters showing negligible changes on the tracked version. In addition, the plan refers to 5yr land supply as being current as of 2023, it is now 2025 and this is not current. It is for others to decide how much of an issue this is in regard to basic conditions, but it feels as though the plan would benefit from a quick update where matters have significantly changed in the meantime. It also does not refer to the latest adopted Housing Allocations Policy 2024 (updated Jan 2025).	
021 Breckland Strategic Housing Team	Policy HOU1	HOU1 – whilst the amendments seem minor, they appear to have the effect of requiring any development to meet all of the requirements, rather than any of them as in the previous plan. This would appear to have the effect of making development in the village considerably more difficult; if this is not the intention then it should be explicitly stated how many of these criteria must be met. We would suggest that you reinstate the ‘either’ and ‘or’ or include a note to say “they will not generally be permitted unless it meets one or more of the following criteria:”	<p>Proposed rewording of Policy HOU1</p> <p>In principle, new residential development will be permitted on suitable sites within the settlement boundary (see Map 5 – Yaxham and Map 6 – Clint Green).</p> <p>Proposals for new residential development outside the settlement boundary will generally be permitted where :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is in accordance with the other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan or falls within the categories of development which the NPPF identifies as appropriate for the countryside; Or: • It is a rural exception site for affordable homes; or for market housing It is of an appropriate scale and design to the settlement and does not increase the size of the settlement by significantly more than 5% of its existing dwellings; and It can be clearly shown that the benefits clearly outweigh the adverse impacts, especially those impacts on the strategic gaps, the rural landscape and the open countryside.

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
			Development within or outside the settlement boundary will not be permitted where it has a significant adverse impact, whether direct or indirect, on the Badley Moor SSSI or the Nar Valley Fens SAC.
022 Breckland Strategic Housing Team	Policy HOU7	<p>HOU7 – strong objection. Affordable housing, unless specifically developed as an exception site, is a provision for the district in line with Breckland Policy HOU07 (particularly pt4), and must be for a Neighbourhood Plan Policy to be in conformity with the adopted Local Plan it must allow allocations in line with the adopted Allocations Policy.</p> <p>Having consulted with the Housing Manager, it is clear that this policy would not follow the allocations policy. This would lead to a significant disadvantage for others in the district, and result in Breckland being placed at risk not meeting statutory obligations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) homeless people under the Housing Act 1996 b) people in reasonable preference bands under the Code of Guidance for Allocations. <p>Both of these are groups whom the council is required to prioritise.</p> <p>It should be noticed that where this policy has been agreed in other neighbourhood plans, local prioritisation only applies on sites proposed in the neighbourhood plan over and</p>	<p>Suggested this policy is reverted to the previous version, or removed from the plan.</p> <p>HOUSING POLICY HOU7 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING Provision of affordable housing/shared ownership will be encouraged where this is commensurate with the scale and nature of need for such housing locally.</p>

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		<p>above those required to meet the Strategic Housing Need as set out on the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>It is noted that no additional sites are proposed within this Plan, therefore this provision cannot be applied here.</p> <p>We would be happy to work with the Parish Council on seeking to develop an exception site in Yaxham, where lettings can have these restrictions under Breckland Policy HOU14.</p> <p>However, on the grounds above, we must sustain our objection and ask that this policy is reverted to the previous version, or removed from the plan.</p> <p>We also suggest you could propose new suitable sites within this Plan; these would then be over and above requirements, and the proposed Policy could be applied to these sites (and these sites only).</p>	
023 Breckland Strategic Housing Team	Para 9.9	Fully support the suggested Housing mix and “provision of smaller affordable dwellings with one or two bedrooms” Almost half of households on our current housing register need 1-bed accommodation.	
024 National Gas	Whole Plan	<p>Proposed sites crossed or in close proximity to National Gas Transmission assets:</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission’s assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure.</p>	No Change

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		<p>National Gas Transmission has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>National Gas Transmission provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/network-route-maps 	
025 Historic England	Whole Plan	No specific comments to make at this stage	No change
026 Natural England	Whole Plan	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft Neighbourhood Plan.	No change
027 LLFA	Policy ENV3 & ENV4 and Whole Plan	The LLFA welcomes that the Yaxham “NP4Yaxham” 2016 - 2036 Adopted May 2017, Updated July 2024 – Examination Version (Regulation 16) and its proposed policies make references to flooding from various sources such as surface water and fluvial flooding and to the implications of climate change on development and flood risk. It is however noted that no references are made within the document to other sources such as groundwater flooding, with no groundwater mapping provided. Policies ENV3: Green Infrastructure and ENV4: Surface Water Management Plans within the Regulation 16 document, are of most relevance to matters for consideration by the LLFA.	

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		<p>As was the case when reviewed at the Regulation 14 stage, whilst the LLFA note that some changes have been proposed to the Neighbourhood Plan for Yaxham and its policies, given the period of time which has elapsed since the adoption of the Yaxham Neighbourhood Plan in 2017, the LLFA advise that policies relating to matters for consideration by the LLFA would benefit from being reviewed and updated where applicable, particularly due to an increasing risk of surface water flooding resulting from climate change and updated guidance.</p> <p>Furthermore, as previously advised at Regulation 14 stage, whilst the retention of Policy ENV4 relating to surface water management plans which recognises the need for developers to provide effective surface water design and management, along with ensuring development does not cause flood related problems elsewhere within the Parish of Yaxham, is welcomed by the LLFA, it is still considered that this policy / supporting text would benefit from enhancement / updating and referencing the inclusion and benefits of SuDS within developments such as permeable surfacing, rain gardens, rainwater harvesting and attenuation ponds.</p> <p>Furthermore whilst the LLFA also note and welcome the inclusion of fluvial and surface water flood risk mapping in the document, this would also benefit from being updated with mapping provided for all sources of flood risk including groundwater, along with signposting within the document to further guidance documents available relating to surface water drainage and SuDS such as the latest version of 'Norfolk County Council LLFA Statutory Consultee for Planning: Guidance Document'.</p>	

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
		The LLFA welcome references are retained to the Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Document complimenting Strategic Policies included within the Breckland Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	
028 LLFA	Flooding Records	<p>The LLFA are not aware of AW DG5 records within the Parish of Yaxham, however, this will need to be confirmed with/by Anglian Water.</p> <p>According to LLFA datasets (extending from 2011 to present day) we have 1 no. record of internal flooding and 4 no. records of external/anecdotal flooding in the Parish of Yaxham. The LLFA highlight the importance of considering surface water, groundwater and flooding from ordinary watercourses within the Neighbourhood Plan in the best interest of further development in the area. We note that all external flood events are deemed anecdotal and have not been subject to an investigation by the LLFA.</p> <p>According to Environment Agency datasets, there are significant areas of localised surface water flooding (ponding) and surface water flowpaths present within the Parish of Yaxham.</p>	
029 LLFA	LGSs	The LLFA have no comments to make on the proposed LGSs.	No Change

Reference	Clause	Comment	Suggestion
030 Highways	LGSs	<p>Comments from the Highway Authority have not been incorporated into the Regulation 16 Neighbourhood Plan document. Previous comments relating to the local green space designations were <i>'Sites 1, 3, and 4 interface with roads, which include dedicated highway land, while Site 2 is entirely a highway. The policy should allow land use for highway functions without restrictions.'</i></p> <p>The Highway Authority objects to the designation of sites 1, 3, and 4 which is designated across part of the highway. The Highway Authority also objects to the designation of site 2 which is entirely highway.</p> <p>The objection of local green space site 1, 2, 3, and 4 is due to the sites proposed to be designated on highway land as this landforms part of the public highway. Any designation as local green space may limit the ability for NCC to fulfil its statutory duties with regard to highway improvements, management and maintenance.</p> <p>Therefore, site 1, 2, 3 and 4 must be removed as LGS designations</p>	