

# Brancaster Parish Draft Neighbourhood Plan

for



2015 - 2026

Covering the villages of  
Brancaster, Brancaster Staithe and  
Burnham Deepdale

Prepared by Brancaster Parish Council

2014



Borough Council of <b>King's Lynn &amp;                  West Norfolk</b>  Tel. 01553 816200 - Fax. 01553 691663	Title <b>Neighbourhood Plan Area (the whole parish)                  Proposed by Brancaster Parish Council</b>		Scale <b>1:41,046</b>
			Date <b>March 2013</b>
	Project / Details <b>Neighbourhood Planning</b>	Drawn by <b>LDF Team</b>	Drawing / Reference Number <b>NASW</b>

This Neighbourhood Plan, once finalised, approved and in place, will be used to help guide decisions on planning applications within the Parish of Brancaster.

Brancaster Parish Council has prepared this draft, developed after extensive consultation throughout the area (see appendix). It takes into account an earlier Parish Design Statement and Parish Appraisal. It was circulated for further consultation with appropriate bodies and parishioners. The Parish Council reviewed the plan in the light of comments received in response to this consultation. It was finalised and approved it for submission to the Borough Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2014.

The 'final' draft plan has been formally submitted to the Borough Council. The Borough Council will publish and advertise it, inviting comments for a period of six weeks. The plan and comments will then be considered by an independent examiner who will check its legal and compliance and conformity with national planning policies and the planning strategy for the Borough etc. and advise the Borough Council accordingly. If these tests are considered successfully met, and with any appropriate alterations made to the Plan, a referendum will be held in the Parish. If the plan receives more than 50% of the votes cast it will become part of the official development plan for the area.

Page	
2	Map of Neighbourhood Plan Area
5	General Introduction
7	Background to the Neighbourhood Plan project and rationale behind the questions
8	Method
9	Results
13	Summary
16	Draft Policies
20	Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan and the wider planning agenda
23	Conditions Statement
27	Consultation Statement
31	Project Plan
37	Appendix 1 The Questionnaire
40	Appendix 2 The Quantitative results
43	Appendix 3 The Qualitative results (reproduced verbatim)
58	Appendix 4 Responses to Consultation
64	Strategic Environmental Assessment Consultation
68	Acknowledgements

## General Introduction

The villages of Brancaster, Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale are situated on the North Norfolk coast. To the north are salt marshes and the sea; to the south is arable land. There are two churches within the villages and many 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century cottages. There is a small port that is home to the local fishing industry and a base for leisure boating. The villages contain a small supermarket and some shops and businesses.

The villages are part of the North Norfolk Coast AONB, which enjoys equal status in landscape protection terms as our National Parks. They also border the North Norfolk Heritage Coast, which has multiple national and international nature conservation designations.

A characteristic feature of this area is for the buildings to be set at right angles to the main road (which runs East-West). More recent building does not follow this pattern and we have several small 'estate type' developments and individual houses. In Brancaster Staithe there are still several examples of rows of cottages and several single dwellings gable end to the road, dating from the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. Their placing was necessary for practical use of the available space. Inhabited by fisher families, with gardens and smallholdings between the road and the marsh, the need was for a 'yard' for sheds, barns and working space. There was also a need for a track down to the marsh where a fisherman's hard was thought to exist. At that time there was a cart road running along the marsh, the length of the village, connecting Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale with Brancaster on the West and Burnham Norton on the east.

The permanent community here is relatively small with the majority of houses in the villages being 'holiday homes', either second homes or properties available for holiday lets. There is a certain amount of 'affordable' housing and an active Housing Society that works alongside Housing Associations and the Parish Council.

Brancaster includes some very significant, nationally designated heritage assets, including the site of the Roman Fort, St Mary's Church Brancaster (listed at Grade I), Staithe House Brancaster Staithe (listed at Grade II\*) and St Mary's Church Burnham Deepdale (listed at Grade II\*). There is also a conservation area designated at Brancaster.

There is more detail about the villages, amenities and facilities, services, development etc. in two excellent documents; *Brancaster, Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale Parish Design Statement* and *Brancaster, Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale Parish Appraisal*. These documents were produced through a process of consultation with residents in 2000 and their recommendations are still valid today. Several of the recommendations that have emerged from this Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire were made in the Parish Design Statement. Anybody applying for planning permission should read both these documents alongside this Neighbourhood Plan as the information within the documents is as relevant now, if not more so, than when they were produced.

The book, *Brancaster Staithe: The Story of a Norfolk Fishing Village*, written by Maurice de Soissons, gives a good background to the development of Brancaster Staithe from a working village with a self-sufficient and independent community of fisher families to the very different village you see today.

## **Background to the Neighbourhood Plan project and the rationale behind the questions**

There has been a considerable amount of recent building in the villages, including some relatively large developments, such as Powell's Yard in Brancaster. The Parish Design Statement, a document which involved a considerable amount of work and consultation and which was adopted by the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk in October 2000, recommended that new buildings should respect the context of their particular site. 77% of respondents consulted said that they thought any more new housing in the area would spoil it. There has, of necessity, been considerable new building in the area since then and, as a Key Rural Service Centre, our villages have been identified as somewhere where more houses will be built. This is something over which parishioners have little influence. However where they may be able to exert some influence is in ensuring that new houses that are built not only fit with Borough and National guidelines but also take account of local people's views, experience and knowledge of living in the area.

The King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy recognises the need to ensure that we are able to meet the housing needs of future generations so, having regard for this and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Brancaster Parish Council decided that the focus of this Neighbourhood Plan would be on the size and style of houses that will be built in the village, to try to ascertain what parishioners felt were appropriate buildings that would be functional and useful to the residents both now and in the future, and would preserve and promote the character of the villages whilst taking account of the changing face of our villages and national and regional policies.

There is an acceptance that our villages are changing; they are no longer, and will never again be, small Norfolk working villages with the entire population living and working within the area. Our villages have a reducing percentage of permanent residents, and within this population the percentage of retired people is increasing. The number of second homes has increased dramatically here, as in other places, and tourism is a big part of our economy. This change is inevitable, however the challenge seems to us to be to provide housing that can accommodate that change whilst still providing for all sectors of the community into the future.

So, the aim of this Neighbourhood Plan is to provide some guidelines, formulated and accepted by the people who live in these villages, which will influence the future growth of Brancaster, Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale. We have consulted widely with local inhabitants and have had regard for the Borough Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. We have consulted with appropriate organisations to ensure that our recommendations would have no adverse effect on habitats and the environment. Our aim is not to restrict necessary development; we want to ensure the sustainability and growth of our community and to ensure appropriate housing for those living in our villages and to support the social, environmental and ecological qualities of this special area.

## Method

- A working group within Brancaster Parish Council produced a draft questionnaire to cover the areas previously agreed by the Council.
- The questionnaire was considered at a Parish Council meeting, open to the public. Suggestions for further questions/alteration of existing questions were made and adopted.
- Parishioners were informed via the Parish Council Minutes and notifications in the Parish News that a questionnaire would be circulated. They were told that additional questionnaires would be available from identified councillors' houses and from the two village post offices.
- The questionnaire was delivered to all houses within a copy of the Parish News, and copies placed in the post offices.
- Parishioners were given two months to complete the questionnaires.
- The results were collated and two 'drop in' afternoons/evenings were held in the two village halls for villagers to call in, discuss the results and put their views forward.
- These further views were incorporated into the results and a draft document was produced which was presented to the Parish Council.
- Advice was taken regarding the need for Strategic and Habitat assessments.
- The draft document was put out for consultation (notification in the Parish News and on notices in the village). Printed copies were available for perusal at the Clerk's Office and the post offices. An electronic version was available on the Parish Website. Copies were submitted as detailed in the Consultation statement and copies were also provided to organisations that may have an interest, including the National Trust, for their comments.
- In the light of this further consultation, appropriate changes were made to reflect further comments.
- On the advice of the Borough Council a 'Health Check' was performed on the draft Plan and suggested improvements made.
- The Parish Council took a formal decision to submit the completed Plan.
- The completed Draft Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to the Borough Council for it to be formally published, comments received, subjected to an independent examination, any necessary alterations made, and then, if appropriate, be the subject of a Parish referendum (please refer to Project Plan on pages 30 – 35)



## Results

*Q1. Size of Houses. Considering the number of bedrooms in a house and realising that the village needs a spread of different sized houses to provide for a variety of needs, could you rank the following sizes in order with 1 being the size you think we need most of and 5 being the size of house we need least of*

The overall quantitative feedback shows that most people think two and three bedroom houses are sufficient and appropriate for this area. A significant number feel that one and four bedroom houses have a place. The comments show a concern that the villages do not have enough housing suitable for young people or enough family homes for permanent full time residents.

The size of houses being built is felt to be excessive and, while there may be a need for a small number of large houses, the villages have a disproportionate number of four and five or more bedroom houses. Many comments show a dissatisfaction that the large properties, a considerable number of which have been built recently, are almost all second homes and remain empty for a large proportion of the year.

The price of new houses is a worry as the permanent population here contains a high proportion of retired people and families with relatively low incomes (relative to the cost of the housing).

*Q2. Height of houses. Again we realise the value of diversity among our buildings. Could you, as before, rank the following in order, ranking 1 as the height you think should be most prevalent and 4 as the least prevalent.*

There is concern being voiced here about houses that are higher than two storeys. The quantitative results show a wish for two storey houses with a proportion of bungalows. If extra space is needed the feeling is that they should be two storey with rooms in the roof rather than three storeys.

The villages are in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and they have seen a considerable amount of 'infill' building. The comments to this question raise worries about overlooking and also about blocking the views previously enjoyed by residents and visitors.

*Q3. Thinking about materials, and again being mindful of the need for variety, please rank in order of prevalence you would like to see, the building materials for houses.*

Although, as you might expect, there is an overwhelming preference for brick and flint and chalk, traditional materials, as shown in the quantitative analysis, there are some comments that show a concern about 'modern' flint and chalk construction using traditional materials but overpowering adjacent dwellings due to size and scale. There seems to be a concern about wood predominating in a house such as one recently built in one of the villages. People feel that a

mixture of materials is appropriate with, where possible, materials sourced locally.

*Q4. Similarly with the style/materials you would like to see roofs built with.*

People seem to prefer traditional pantiles or slates, with very little support for flat roofs, partly because of the problems they cause. Eco friendly roofs had some support with some comments suggesting that they should be considered for outbuildings (garages, summerhouses etc.) where possible.

*Q5. Parking. New developments of necessity need parking for vehicles (cars, boats etc.) How many off road parking spaces do you think should be provided for each house?*

Quantitative feedback shows a wish for two or three parking spaces per house however the comments indicate a need for more; there is worry about people parking on the main road due to inadequate off road parking provision. Larger houses with more bedrooms need more parking; it is suggested that one space per bedroom is needed. There is a suggestion that within a development communal parking areas should be provided.

*Q6. Footprint of house compared with size of plot. This question is asking you to consider how much space there should be around houses, how much garden & drive you would like to see. How much of an individual plot should be covered by the house and associated buildings? Please ring the appropriate fraction.*

There is a definite indication that the house and outbuildings shouldn't take up more than a half of the plot; with a significant number of people considering that a quarter of the plot covered by buildings would be appropriate. People need a 'family sized' garden so that residents can grow vegetables and flowers and have a place for children to play. It also provides for run off and drainage of rainwater.

Concern about coverage of the plot by buildings is linked to concerns about size of houses and a preponderance of holiday homes; one comment made is that local people won't buy houses without proper gardens as they are aimed at the second home market. This does not preclude a house with a garden being used as a second home; it may then provide local employment maintaining the garden etc.

*Q7. Thinking about the ratio of affordable/shared ownership houses to 'open market' houses, what do you think should be applicable?*

The numbers show a wish for a high ratio of 'affordable/shared' ownership to 'open market'; to have one 'affordable' house provided for every three 'open market' houses. However, as the comments show, it isn't quite that straightforward. Many comments note that there is no point in providing social housing unless there is a need for it. If there isn't work in the area the permanent population will not increase unless it is by retired people (who, on the whole, tend not to need large houses).

One comment makes the point that if the open market houses were conventionally sized family houses, there might not be such a need for 'affordable/shared ownership' housing. The overall impression seems to be that housing is needed for local permanent residents, be they single people, young families or retired. If that need is for 'affordable' housing then that should be provided – either social housing or more realistically priced 'open market' housing. The need at the time can be ascertained by liaison with the local Housing Society and the Parish Council.

Discussions with respondents have shown a concern that wages don't match up with house prices (presumably because of the desirability of the area for holiday homes and holiday lets) so that even houses that are available for local people to rent are out of their reach financially. So houses available for Housing Association rents are desirable. Concern has also been expressed in discussions about 'affordable housing' being allocated to people from outside of this area rather than local people having priority.

*Q8. In our villages we have both modern and traditional design of houses. Accepting that the modern house of today is the traditional house of tomorrow, and the advisability of a variety in appearance of houses, what ratio of modern to traditional type design would you like to see?*

Unsurprisingly the numbers show a bias towards traditional design of houses, although a large number were happy with a 1:1 ratio. On the whole people want to see the traditional character of the villages retained although that doesn't necessarily mean that modern design can't look appropriate and fit in if new houses are designed to blend in. A recently built, wood clad, contemporary house attracts unfavourable comment, as do large modern houses, even though they may be built of traditional materials, whose size means they are overpowering.

One comment makes the point about extensions on the rear of houses, specifically in Brancaster Staithe, on the North side of the road looking out of place when viewed from the marsh, sea and island. New traditional-looking buildings could, and should, incorporate new ideas such as eco roofs if appropriate, and, where possible, locally sourced materials should be used.

*Q9. Thinking about the structure of developments, should styles of houses (such as modern/traditional, bungalow/house etc.) be kept together or mixed up?*

In the quantitative part of the questionnaire, more people preferred intermingled houses in order to preserve a village feel to new developments, but those making comments seemed to prefer houses grouped together. Design seems to be more important and diversity can be of benefit to the character of the villages.

*Q10. How do you think planning legislation can be used to encourage local employment?*

This picks up some of the themes that emerged from the previous questions such as the need for affordable houses for the people who live here permanently and the need for jobs. Many people highlight a need for workshops/small units to give small businesses somewhere to set up and increase work locally. Many suggest placing restrictions on the building of large properties especially those targeted at the second home market; the point is made regarding the inappropriateness of recent new developments in the villages that have houses densely packed on the site (inappropriate that is for sustainability of the community).

Some comments wonder about the possibility of ensuring that if building does take place the use of local tradesman and local materials is encouraged by prioritising planning applications that provide this sort of benefit to the community.

*Q11. What do **you** think are the most important planning issues affecting our Parish?*

Again, this picks up on the main points from the previous questions; too many large homes being built whose size and price is such that they are unlikely to ever be anything other than second homes that are rarely used; overdevelopment and too much infilling (especially if the required infrastructure doesn't develop); lack of an overall strategy to deal with ongoing building in the villages; and the price of new houses.

Comments pick up on the need to provide for the younger people who wish to stay and work here, including the need for provision not only of accommodation (in terms of more appropriate housing and 'affordable/shared ownership' housing) but of units to allow small businesses to grow here and somewhere for retail businesses.

Mention is made that smaller houses are being bought and enlarged to the point where they are, like the new builds, too big to be of use as a family home. This also applies to the size of extensions built onto existing family-sized homes.

One comment notes the recent demolition of bungalows with gardens – ideal accommodation for retired/young families – and their replacement with large houses covering most of the plot. There is a comment expressing concern about the amenities here (shop, garage, school etc.). Permanent residents, be they young, families or retired, need these amenities (especially if they have difficulty travelling) but as the permanent population reduces as a percentage of the whole it becomes unfeasible to maintain such amenities.

## Summary

The main points running through these responses are;

The need to sustain a community all the year round; the NPPF requires us to support strong vibrant communities and the Borough Core Strategy (6.5.2) says that the Council's approach to housing in rural areas will seek to sustain rural communities. Our villages contain a number of people who live here permanently. There is a vast increase in population for a small number of weeks in the year. It is said that in excess of 65% of the houses in the villages are now holiday homes or lets. The ratio of permanent residents to holiday residents is perceived to be reducing rapidly. If the permanent population, which is made up of working people, families and retired people, is to survive, a long term planning strategy has to consider provision of units for shops, workshops, small businesses etc. to provide local work. It should also address the need for appropriate housing for the people who live and work here permanently as well as for those who live here part time and our temporary visitors.

In order to do the above, and ensure that the houses built over the next few years will provide what the Government needs in terms of housing stock (houses that are used rather than stand empty) we need to look very carefully at the type of houses that are being built. The strategy has to consider the accommodation required for a full time population as well as for second homeowners and holiday lets.

Large houses do little to fill this need. They are seen as being built for the second home market and will remain empty for a large part of year. The number of these large houses is seen as swamping the 'reasonably sized' houses that would make the community more sustainable yet would still, if required, provide a functional second home. Building more appropriately sized dwellings seems to us to fit with the aim of the Borough Core Strategy, which aspires to promote adaptable, high quality development which is capable of being modified to suit people with different needs.

In order to provide the housing that is required for people who wish to live and work in the villages, as well as for second homes and holiday lets, houses should be of a modest size with two or three bedrooms, preferably one or two storeys high. They can be built of a mixture of materials providing that the design is such that it blends in with adjacent properties and maintains the character of the village.

Houses should have adequate off road parking (at least two spaces, or possibly communal parking) and the buildings should not cover more than half the area of the plot. This should apply to extensions and demolition/rebuilds - if bungalows or houses are demolished they should be replaced like for like. Houses, be they new build, redeveloped or extended, need adequate space around them to provide for parking and also for a garden. Gardens are important for family homes – to give children room to play – and also for wildlife and water management. The NPPF says in its Ministerial foreword that 'our natural

environment is essential to our wellbeing'. In these days of intensive development because of the need for housing, our gardens are places where we can, to a small extent, preserve this natural environment. It is felt that buildings should not cover more than 50% of the area of a dwelling's plot. It is possible that some of our attractive, traditional housing might not comply with this criterion; however when that housing was built there were far more communal areas available for children to play in, wildlife had more countryside to exist in, and there wasn't such a need for vehicular parking and storage; we live in an age of compromise!

None of these requirements would make houses unsuitable as second homes, but they do mean that permanent residents with average incomes may be able to own such houses, rather than the houses forever being unsuitable for permanent residency. Although there is a concern about the number of large holiday houses, second homeowners are a part of the community in the area; they are part and parcel of our villages in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Second homes provide work for local people (gardening, cleaning, maintenance etc.) and their owners play their part in village life, even though they may be here for a limited amount of time. The concern is more related to the size and type of the houses that are being built for this second home market and the limitations of this housing stock for use as accommodation for other sectors of our community. They are dwellings incapable of being modified to suit people with different accommodation needs and, as such, do nothing to promote community cohesion.

Affordable/shared ownership, housing. Accommodation is needed for people and families in order to ensure that the village has a sustainable permanent population. If these people cannot afford to live here they move elsewhere and thus the continued existence of the amenities that we do have (school, shops etc.) becomes even more precarious. Dispersal of the population, and its effect on the community, because of the unavailability of appropriate accommodation is very much a concern of the Borough, which is committed to affordable housing, and we look forward to its continued provision.

However, our respondents clearly make the point that affordable housing must be provided according to need and allocated sensitively and appropriately to support the community. The need can be ascertained by liaison with the Parish Council and the local Housing Society. These bodies will be able to inform the decision on numbers of affordable houses needed at any particular time. Affordable housing can, as identified in the Borough Core Strategy, be delivered through section 106 planning agreements and can, by liaising with the Parish Council and local Housing Society, meet the NPPF suggestion that housing density can be set to reflect local circumstance.

When the research was done for the Parish Design Statement in 1999/2000 57% of people were in favour of more jobs in the villages and 42% of respondents wanted the area to develop as a working community. Development of the area for tourism attracted very little support. Little seems to have changed in people's attitudes in that respect. It is, however, our opinion that most people are aware of the need for, and the value of, tourism, and there is little opposition to smaller

houses, many of which are rented out for the majority of the year and thus contribute to the local economy and community.

There is a widely held view that, in order for these villages to be sustainable, more support must be given to the permanent residents, without whom there would not be a 'village' in any sense of the word and thus nothing to contribute to the tourism of the area. The provision of small business premises and small-scale industrial workshops attracted much support and has been a recurrent theme throughout this report. The size, type and design of the housing built in the future must be appropriate to support the growth of the villages, to provide the economic sustainability mentioned in the NPPF.

The Borough Core Strategy talks about improving the facilities for young people so that they don't leave the area, about developing a place where skilled people want to live and work and about improving skills and raising aspirations. In addition 7.2.14 discusses the need to provide the housing necessary to support local employment opportunities and also the need to make housing accessible and inclusive. The feeling of our respondents is that the young and people on lower wages have considerable difficulty in this regard. If they have to live elsewhere and travel here to work we are perpetuating unsustainable transport patterns, but the size and price of housing in our villages is such that they have to disperse in order to find somewhere suitable and affordable to live. We need to support the building of appropriate houses if we are to retain and nurture a sustainable community – something that the Borough Core Strategy has at the heart of its planning agenda.

It is interesting to revisit some of the recommendations of the Parish Design Statement. Formulated in 2000 they are still applicable. Major recommendations included that significant open spaces in the village should not be compromised by the insertion of new building; overdevelopment affects amenities such as views, privacy and quiet; new buildings should respect the context of their particular site; when using locally occurring materials such as flint, pebble or cobble for facings, take account of the availability of craft skills; choose and combine materials with care.

It is the hope of Brancaster Parish Council that the submission of this Neighbourhood Plan, building as it does on the work done for the Parish Design Statement, can inform the further development of the housing in our villages in order to provide the building necessary to sustain and accommodate the communities living in our villages be they working families, retired people, second homeowners or tourists.

# Draft Policies

## 1. Size of houses

**The provision of smaller dwellings (those with one two or three bedrooms) will be encouraged, and no new dwelling shall exceed four bedrooms (rooms otherwise designated on plans but clearly capable of use as bedrooms will be counted as bedrooms for the purposes of this policy).**

**New dwellings should be a maximum of two storeys in height. If extra room is needed it should be obtained by putting rooms in the roof rather than an extra storey.**

**Care and consideration should be given to retaining the views within, and of, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.**

A limit on the number of bedrooms for new houses will ensure that a balance is regained in terms of size of houses, giving a spread and variety of house size. It will ensure that there are appropriate houses available to maintain and develop a sustainable community, house young people, young families, working families and retirees. It will also ensure that there are reasonably sized houses available for holiday homes and for rent.

A limit on the height of new houses will ensure that the views of the Conservation Area are not blocked for residents and tourists alike. It will also preserve the views of our heritage assets, such as St Mary's Church Brancaster and St Mary's Church Burnham Deepdale.

## 2. Design, Style and Materials used

**Any new dwelling, redevelopment or extension to a dwelling in the area should be carefully designed to blend in with adjacent properties and areas to maintain the character of the village.**

**The use of traditional materials, especially those sourced locally, and of low ecological impact materials and techniques is to be encouraged.**

An example would be 'eco' roofs used, where appropriate, for outbuildings such as garages, summerhouses and sheds.



### **3. Footprint for new and redeveloped dwellings**

**New, redeveloped and extended residential buildings should occupy no more than 50% of the plot unless the setting of a listed building, or the character and appearance of the conservation area, would be better conserved by higher plot coverage.**

This is in order to allow space for adequate parking (see policy 4) and also for a garden. We are again looking at encouraging a sustainable population by providing houses that would be suitable for families. Gardens are needed to give children room to play, room to grow vegetables etc. as well as encouraging wildlife and providing a quality environment for our village population.

An exception might be a small fisherman's cottage, in a row of similar cottages, being redeveloped. This cottage might already have coverage of more than 50%. In this case preservation of the character and heritage of the cottages could mean that like for like redevelopment would take precedence.

### **4. Parking provision**

**New dwellings should have adequate off road parking, with a minimum of two parking spaces per house. In determining whether a higher number should be provided regard should be given to the number of bedrooms in the dwelling.**

This is essential in our villages, especially in the summer months when holiday homes are occupied and we have a large influx of visitors. Our roads are small and on road parking causes congestion and compromises safety within the villages. Several small estate developments have been built recently and in the future we would want to see consideration given to communal parking areas within the housing estates.

## **5. Replacement dwellings**

**Replacement dwellings should occupy no more than 50% of their plots, and where the replaced dwelling occupied greater than 50% of the plot the replacement dwelling should occupy a smaller proportion than its predecessor. An increase in number of dwellings above those replaced will only be acceptable where the resulting plot coverage does not exceed 50%.**

**These requirements will be relaxed where the setting of a listed building, or the character and appearance of the conservation area, would be better conserved by greater plot coverage.**

**An increase in height over the replaced building will only be acceptable where this is compatible with the appearance of adjacent buildings and the amenity of their occupiers.**

## **6. Affordable/Shared ownership homes**

**Provision of affordable housing/shared ownership should be encouraged; the Parish Council and a registered provider should be involved to help identify the scale and nature of need for such housing locally.**

We are concerned that a blanket policy of provision, which doesn't take account of the actual affordable/shared ownership housing need in the area, could be counterproductive. The Parish Council and local Housing Association should be able to suggest the scale and type of housing that is needed in the area and so should be involved in decisions regarding its provision.

## **7. Development of shops, workshops and business units**

**The development of shops, workshops and business units should be encouraged in appropriate locations, as should the development and growth of existing businesses in the villages.**

This is necessary to encourage a permanent population within the villages and to minimise the amount of travelling people need to undertake. This sort of support is essential to develop a sustainable population and to support our young people and retain them within the area.

## **8. Protection of heritage assets and views**

**The siting of new buildings shall have due regard for, and respect the setting of, designated heritage assets. Any listed buildings should be appropriately conserved to maintain the buildings, its features and setting. Developments will be expected to preserve or enhance the character, appearance and views of the Brancaster Conservation Area with regards to the built/cultural heritage.**

Views of our two churches are especially cherished; villagers have been disappointed that views of St Mary's Church Brancaster have been affected by recent developments and wouldn't want to see any further loss of this amenity.

## **9. Protection and enhancement of the natural environment**

**Development will protect, conserve and where possible enhance, the natural environment, local landscape and wildlife. New development should not adversely affect the statutory purposes of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.**

National Planning Policy Framework para 115 says that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations. We feel these last two policies will address these considerations, also bearing in mind the need to safeguard rural industries and the social needs of our local communities. Views of Scolt Head Island across the marshes are particularly valuable, as are views of the village seen from the bay across the marsh.

## **Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan and the wider planning agenda**

The three dimensions to sustainable development, as identified in the NPPF, are economic, social and environmental.

- **an economic role** – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure.
- **a social role** – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
- **an environmental role** – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

Our policies address the need to support the members of our community, be they permanent residents, second home owners or visitors, by attempting to ensure that appropriate housing is available for all sectors and that houses are built that would be able to be used for any of the sectors as the need arises. We attempt, through policies 6 and 7 to encourage the rural business economy and to encourage people to work and live in the villages. This will minimise pollution and encourage low carbon emissions by reducing travelling and thus improving the conditions in which people live and work. The NPPF specifically mentions the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work; this is also addressed in the Borough Core Strategy which wants people to have access to good quality housing, close to places of employment.

Policies 3 and 5 encourage support for our natural environment in gardens – aiding the retention, and attempting to halt the decline, of biodiversity. Small open spaces – our gardens – are as important to protect as the wide-open spaces in the National Parks. All policies contribute towards maintaining our built environment and widen the choice of high quality homes by ensuring that all houses are well designed and are of a style and size that suits all sectors and doesn't limit the provision of houses to high cost, large dwellings. This gives the required flexibility to adapt to change and provides a good standard for existing and future occupants. Policy 2 attempts to ensure that houses reflect high standards in design and architecture and that they are sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

The use of ecologically friendly materials is addressed in policy 2 and the requirement to consider the impact on the views of the AONB will preserve this visual asset for future generations of residents and tourist visitors. Without

adequate appropriate housing our community will dwindle to a size which makes it uneconomic and unsustainable to run buses, run shops, run businesses, and sustain our schools, meeting halls and local clubs. Without those facilities being available locally people will have nowhere to meet, car use will increase, thus increasing pollution, the cultural wellbeing of the community will suffer and the community will eventually become unsustainable; something which would be counter to the basic tenets of the Borough Core Strategy which aims to promote sustainable communities, sustainable patterns of development, and a strong hierarchy of successful rural settlements and supporting a range of jobs. If this is successful it will not only benefit our residents but also visitors to the area, thus creating a virtuous circle, which would be of benefit to the villages and the Borough as a whole and would encourage economic growth and inward investment.

Smaller houses, even taking into account the 50% plot requirement, will mean, in effect, that more houses can be built. This will supply more, less expensive houses for permanent residents. It will also mean that more dwellings will be available as holiday lets, thus supporting rural tourism and bringing more people to our villages all year round to enjoy the views we hope to preserve and to use the buses, shops, pubs and other visitor facilities. It will also provide work for local tradesmen, cleaners, gardeners, and letting businesses. It will benefit visitors as well as the permanent population.

The NPPF talks about a 'strong sense of place'. We feel that houses built with regard to our policies will benefit our villages, enhance the local character which is engendered by the many old traditional buildings in the villages, and attempt to recover that feeling of identity that has been lost with the proliferation of large, inappropriate, often empty dwellings. The Borough Core Strategy aims to protect the historic environment and to enrich the attraction of the Borough as a place to live, work and to visit. Our Neighbourhood plan will help address the compromises necessary to ensure a sustainable permanent community while also providing for second homes, visitors, and the retention of our traditional character vital for the well being of those who live here as well as for the interest of visitors. In preparing the plan we have been mindful of the desirability of conserving listed buildings, their features and their settings.

We feel that our Neighbourhood Plan conforms to the objectives of the NPPF. The benefits conferred on our community and visitors to the area are in agreement with the sentiments expressed within the NPPF. It will provide a sustainable way forward for the development of the villages, enhancing the region in all three areas identified in the Framework. We also feel that our Neighbourhood Plan is supportive of, and supported by, the Borough Core Strategy in its wish to foster sustainable communities with appropriate housing and is in keeping with CS06, which aims to promote sustainable communities and sustainable patterns of development, ensuring that employment and appropriate housing (including affordable housing) are provided in close proximity.

Policies 8 and 9 address protection of our traditional buildings and our countryside. If possible we would like to see the character and distinctiveness of our natural and built environment enhanced by new development proposals. Such proposals should be encouraged to contribute to the objectives and targets of any local Green Infrastructure Strategy, Landscape Character Assessments and Biodiversity Action Plans. This is a very sensitive area as regards conservation (it is, as has already been stated, part of the Norfolk Coast AONB and borders the North Norfolk Heritage Coast with its multiple conservation designations). The NPPF has strong policies on the protection of Heritage Coasts, AONB's and National Parks (paras 114-116) and on protecting wildlife and this should always be given due emphasis when development is considered in this area.

We hope that housing and other development in Brancaster will contribute towards improving local services and infrastructure. An increase in population within the villages means an increase in the need for transport, education, library services etc. There are mechanisms to do this (for example CIL, section 106 agreements and planning conditions) and it is important that these mechanisms are used to ensure that the infrastructure grows with the population.

## Conditions Statement

This statement explains how the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning regulations.

Brancaster Parish Council applied to Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2013 for the Parish to be designated a neighbourhood area (to enable a neighbourhood plan to be prepared). After the appropriate advertisement and consultation the whole of Brancaster Parish was designated a neighbourhood area by King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council on 5 June 2013. Brancaster Parish Council is a 'relevant body' for the purposes of neighbourhood planning by virtue of Section 61 G(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Neighbourhood Development Plans must meet the following basic requirements **(Paragraph 8, Schedule 4B, 1990 Act)**:

*(1) The examiner must consider the following—*

*(a) whether the draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions (see sub- paragraph (2)),*

*(b) whether the draft neighbourhood development plan complies with the provision made by or under sections 61E(2), 61J and 61L,*

*(d) whether the area for any referendum should extend beyond the neighbourhood area to which the draft neighbourhood development plan relates, and*

*(e) such other matters as may be prescribed.*

*(2) A draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions if—*

*(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood development plan,*

*(d) the making of the neighbourhood development plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development,*

*(e) the making of the neighbourhood development plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area),*

*(f) the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations, and*

*(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood development plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood development plan.*

*(6) The examiner is not to consider any matter that does not fall within subparagraph (1) (apart from considering whether the draft neighbourhood development plan is compatible with the Convention rights).*

Neighbourhood Plans must not breach, and must be compatible with, EU and human rights obligations. The National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that a sustainability appraisal should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, but the particular assessment requirements need to respond to the scale, status and scope of the plan being developed.

Brancaster Neighbourhood plan is a small scale neighbourhood plan and as such a sustainability appraisal was not considered necessary. Similarly as regards a Strategic Environmental Assessment and a Habitats assessment; Brancaster Neighbourhood plan is almost entirely concerned with the design and style of the houses to be built in our villages so will not cause any significant environmental effects, and because any development would come under the provisions of the Borough of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Local Development Framework, it was felt that that these assessments would be unnecessary. However, to ensure that this was the fact, on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2014 the draft plan was submitted to Natural England with a request that the organisation take a view as regards the necessity of a Habitat Assessment and a Strategic Environment Assessment. It was similarly submitted to English Heritage.

Natural England took the view that the Plan would not require assessment under the Habitat Regulations, as it does not propose any additional development over and above that contained within the Borough Council Local Plan. In addition the Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk has confirmed that it is of the opinion that a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required.

English Heritage suggested that because Brancaster includes some very significant, nationally designated heritage assets, including the site of the Roman Fort, St Mary's Church Brancaster (listed at Grade I), Staithe House Brancaster Staithe (listed at Grade II\*) and St Mary's Church Burnham Deepdale (listed at Grade II\*) and because there is also a conservation area designated at Brancaster, it would be helpful if the plan also included a policy specifically safeguarding the setting of heritage assets. This is now addressed in policy 8.

The replies received from English Heritage, Natural England, Borough and County Councils are included in Appendix 4.

### **Section 1. The examiner must consider the following;**

- a. *Whether the draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions (see sub paragraph (2)).*

See section 2 below.



- b. *Whether the draft neighbourhood development plan complies with the provision made by or under sections 61E(2), 61(J) and 61(L).*

This is a reference to the provisions of 38A and 38B.

38A.

Brancaster Parish Council is a 'relevant body' for the purposes of neighbourhood planning by virtue of Section 61 G(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The neighbourhood plan policies relate solely to the Brancaster Parish area.

38B

1.
    - a) Brancaster Neighbourhood plan is for the period 2014 – 2026, chosen to align with the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy.
    - b) It does not include any provision for excluded development such as national infrastructure.
    - c) It does not relate to any other neighbourhood area.
  2. There is no other neighbourhood plan in place in this area.
  4. This refers to process and consultation procedures. Brancaster Parish Council has submitted, as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, a Consultation Statement detailing the consultations that have taken place. Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan will not affect European Sites (habitats).
- d. *Whether the area for any referendum should extend beyond the neighbourhood area to which the draft neighbourhood development plan relates.*

This Neighbourhood plan is only relevant to dwellings and developments within the villages of Brancaster, Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale and it would be inappropriate to extend it outside the boundaries of the Parish of Brancaster.

- e. *Such other matters as may be prescribed.*

There are none.

**Section 2. A draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions if;**

- a. *Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued*

*by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood development plan.*

The plan is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular gives effect to its policies on localism, local distinctiveness, heritage and conservation. As such it is appropriate to make it.

- d. The making of the neighbourhood development plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.*

This plan aligns with the NPPF and the Borough Core Strategy in promoting sustainable development, attempting to ensure that necessary future development enhances rather than detracts from the quality of life of the residents of Brancaster in the future, maintains its valuable environment and promotes appropriate economic development.

- e. The making of the neighbourhood development plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority.*

This plan is in accordance with the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Core Strategy and conforms to it in terms of strategy.

- f. The making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.*

Brancaster Parish Council has taken advice and, since it will have no significant environmental effects and will not affect any European Sites, a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not considered necessary.

- g. Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood development plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood development plan.*

There are no prescribed conditions.

This draft Neighbourhood Plan has been developed to support the social, environmental and ecological qualities of this area; it is not an attempt to stop development but to ensure that the development that takes place contributes to the future growth of our area in a sustainable manner.

We have considered the European Convention of Human Rights and there is nothing in this draft Plan that would conflict with any of its tenets.

It is considered that the Brancaster Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan meets the conditions set out in Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the 1990 Act.

## **Consultation Statement**

Brancaster Parish Draft Neighbourhood Plan was developed through wide consultation with local people. A range of relevant organisations, as well as local people, were consulted on an initial draft of the plan, which was revised to take account of the responses to form this Draft Plan.

### **Parishioners and local businesses**

1. Initial Questionnaire. As detailed earlier in the explanation of method, questionnaires were produced and delivered to every household in the area with the Parish News. People were made aware of the process through updates in the Parish News. Extra questionnaires were available from the two post offices in the villages. 135 questionnaires were returned. We didn't ask for names on the questionnaires in order to encourage people to reply. However we did give people an opportunity to give us their email addresses (for updates) and so we are aware of some of the people who returned questionnaires. It was gratifying to see that these were from a range of people: permanent residents, holiday home owners and owners of property to let. We also had replies from landowners and employers in the area as well as owners of local businesses.
2. The results were collated and made available to the parishioners on the website and again at the post offices but primarily at two local 'open day' events. These were held on Friday September 20<sup>th</sup> 2013 at Brancaster village hall and Thursday September 26<sup>th</sup> 2013 at Brancaster Staithe village hall. These were open from 2pm to 7pm in order to give people the opportunity to attend after work if that suited them better. For these open days the results were printed out on large, flip chart sheets and also on laminated A4 sheets. People were encouraged to write down their comments and there were also Parish Council representatives present at all times to discuss the results with the attending public. These events were advertised in the Parish News (as was the availability of the results and comments on the website etc.). Attendance at the events was disappointing with no more than a dozen people attending each event. These were mainly permanent residents within the villages together with a few second-home owners. Further discussion with villagers led us to the conclusion that people felt little need to discuss it further and were happy for it to go forward: this might explain the poor attendance. Several people emailed comments regarding the results, including our Borough Councillor and a local landowner, business owner and employer. All comments from the meeting and emails etc. were taken into account in writing up the document.

3. The document was written up and, when completed and accepted by the Parish Council, it was made available for further consultation for two calendar months from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014 to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2014. This was important as it now contained the draft policies distilled from the questionnaire results. Parishioners were again made aware that the document was ready for consultation through the advertisements in the Parish News, on the Parish Notice Boards and on the Parish Website. The document itself was put onto the Parish website, emailed to all those people who had registered an interest previously, and was also available in hard copy for viewing at the two post offices, the Parish Clerk's Office and one of the Parish Councillor's houses. Further comments were invited. Again, comments received were incorporated into the document.

Throughout this process regular updates on progress were given at Parish Council meetings.

### **Consultation Bodies**

The following Consultation Bodies were considered. Several were thought to be not applicable – reasons are given for this below.

- (a) *The Mayor of London*  
Brancaster is not a London Borough and so this is not applicable.
- (b) *Local Planning Authority, county council or parish council any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority*  
The Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk is being consulted, as is Norfolk County Council.  
Copies of the plan have been sent to adjacent Parishes.
- (c) *The Coal Authority*  
Not applicable in this area.
- (d) *The Homes and Communities Agency*  
This was not considered to be applicable in this case.
- (e) *Natural England*  
Although this Neighbourhood Plan will not have an impact upon protected species and area environmental designations it was felt relevant to consult with Natural England in view of the designations on the surrounding area. A copy of the plan has also been submitted to the National Trust for comments. Comments were also invited (and received) from the *Norfolk Coast Partnership*.
- (f) *The Environment Agency*

Again, although this Neighbourhood Plan will not have an impact on drainage, rivers, water quality, flood risk etc. it was felt that consultation with the Environment Agency would be advisable.

- (g) *English Heritage*  
It was considered relevant to consult with English Heritage, especially with regard to policy 8.
- (h) *Network Rail*  
Infrastructure Limited. As there are no railways in the area this was not considered applicable.
- (i) *The Highways Agency*  
There are no designated 'Trunk Roads' in the area so this is not applicable.
- (j) *The Marine Management Organisation*  
This Neighbourhood Plan does not impinge on the offshore and fringe of coast interests of the Marine Management Organisation and so was not considered applicable.
- (k) *Electronic Communications considerations*  
This Neighbourhood Plan does not contain any policy that impinges upon telecoms infrastructure or its future development.
- (l) *PCT, Electricity, Gas, sewerage undertaker, water undertaker*  
None of these will be affected by any proposal in the Neighbourhood Plan and so none were considered applicable.
- (m) *Voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area*  
There are none locally that are applicable.
- (n) *Bodies that represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area*  
There are none locally that are applicable
- (o) *Bodies that represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area*  
There are none locally that are applicable
- (p) *Bodies that represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area*  
There are no representative bodies of this type locally, however local businesses were consulted by the same process as parishioners.
- (q) *Bodies that represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area*  
There are none locally that are applicable.

In conclusion, it was felt appropriate to consult with the following bodies;

Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council  
Norfolk County Council

Adjoining Parish Councils  
Natural England  
Environment Agency  
English Heritage  
The Norfolk Coast Partnership  
National Trust

Copies of the plan were submitted to these organisations before 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014 and the organisations were asked to respond by 31<sup>st</sup> May 2014.

### **Issues and Concerns arising from the Consultation**

The main issues and concerns arising from the pre-submission consultation have been addressed within this draft plan as follows;

Despite there being significant interest in the draft Plan by parishioners, and several requests for emailed copies, no further suggestions have been received from that quarter. We consider that to be a vindication of the way the plan has been put together; wide consultation by means of a questionnaire and open meetings has meant that parishioners/local businesses feel that the draft Plan is a fair representation of the aspirations of the Community.

Consultee Organisations; The responses from the organisations we consulted with have been included in full later in the document (Appendix 4). The document was revised in the light of these comments. They have been taken account of in the policies (notably policies 8 and 9) and, where appropriate, within the text of the Plan.

## Project Plan

This project was initiated in early 2013 with the application for designation of the area being made in March 2013. The draft plan was produced as has already been described and it was submitted for a 'health check'. The report arising from this was received on 6<sup>th</sup> August 2014 with a recommendation that a project plan be included in the documentation for the further stages of the process. The following project plan covers the work due to take place from 1<sup>st</sup> November 2014 on to implementation.

Estimated date	Estimated timescale	Parish Council actions	Borough Council actions
01/11/2014	1 month		<p><b><u>UNDERTAKES A 'STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT' (SEA) SCREENING.</u></b></p> <p>This is to check whether (as expected) a full assessment is not required.</p> <p>The Borough Council will undertake the necessary consultation, etc. and advise the Parish Council accordingly.</p>
01/12/2014	2 weeks	<p><b><u>FORMALLY AGREE THE PLAN IT WANTS TO SUBMIT</u></b> (and also accompanying documentation).</p> <p>It must send —</p> <p>(1) a <b>map</b> or statement which identifies the area to which the proposed neighbourhood development plan relates;</p> <p>(2) a <b>consultation statement</b> (a document which—</p> <p>(a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;</p> <p>(b) explains how they were consulted;</p> <p>(c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted)</p> <p>(d) describes how these issues and concerns have</p>	

Estimated date	Estimated timescale	Parish Council actions	Borough Council actions
		<p>been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.)</p> <p>(3)the <b>proposed neighbourhood development plan</b>; and</p> <p>(4)a <b>statement explaining how the proposed neighbourhood development plan meets the statutory 'basic conditions'</b>.</p>	
15/12/2014		<p><b><u>SUBMISSION OF DRAFT PLAN TO BOROUGH COUNCIL</u></b>  Note that once the plan is submitted to the Borough Council it is largely out of the Parish Council's hands.</p>	
15/12/2014	2 weeks.		<p><b><u>CHECK ON VALIDITY OF SUBMITTED PLAN</u></b>  Decide whether all the required documents have been submitted and that procedural legal requirements have been met.</p>
01/01/2015	3 months		<p><b><u>PUBLISHES THE PLAN PROPOSAL FOR COMMENT</u></b>  Publishes proposed plan on its website, etc., inviting comments within 6 weeks.</p>
	(During publication period above)		<p><b><u>CONSULT PARISH COUNCIL ON CHOICE OF EXAMINER</u></b>  Identify suitable candidates Examiner must be suitably qualified and experienced, and with no conflicts of interest.</p>
	(During publication period above)	<p><b><u>AGREE CHOICE OF EXAMINER WITH BOROUGH COUNCIL</u></b>  Examiner cannot be appointed without the Parish Council's agreement. The Borough Council will probably identify two or three potential examiners.</p>	
	(During publication period above)		<p><b><u>APPOINTMENT OF EXAMINER</u></b>  Borough Council appoints and pays for the examiner.</p>
01/04/2015	2 months		<p><b><u>EXAMINATION</u></b>  LPA sends examiner plan and other</p>



Estimated date	Estimated timescale	Parish Council actions	Borough Council actions
			<p>submission documents, and copies of all representations received in the preceding consultation.</p> <p>Examiner reads all the documents and comments, and visits the area (usually alone). May hold a hearing if she/he considers it necessary.</p> <p>The examiner sends a report to LPA (and copied to PC) advising the LPA whether he/she considers the plan meets the 'basic requirements', and recommends whether it should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Proceed to referendum, and if so whether the referendum should extend beyond the plan area (usually because it affects other areas).</li> <li>(b) Proceed to referendum only after changes have been made, recommending appropriate modifications</li> <li>(c) Should not proceed to referendum.</li> </ul>
01/06/2015	2 months		<p><b><u>DECISION WHETHER PLAN SHOULD PROCEED TO REFERENDUM</u></b></p> <p>Borough Council has to consider each of examiner's recommendations and make its own decisions whether the basic conditions and legal requirements have been met, or modifications should be made to make it do so, and hence whether it proceeds to referendum, and also whether the referendum area should extend beyond the plan area.</p>
01/08/2015	1 month		<p><b><u>CONSULTATION ON ANY DECISIONS CONTRARY TO RECOMMENDATIONS</u></b></p> <p>If the LPA is minded to make any decisions differing from those recommended by examiner, it must first consult.</p>
01/09/2015	2 weeks	<p><b><u>RECEIVES DECISION WHETHER PLAN will PROCEED TO REFERENDUM</u></b></p> <p>Will also learn whether LPA will make any changes to the Plan before the referendum.</p>	<p><b><u>PUBLICATION OF DECISIONS</u></b></p> <p>The Borough Council must publish its decisions (and notify the Parish Council) as to whether the Plan may proceed to referendum, and if so whether it will first be modified to meet requirements.</p>

Estimated date	Estimated timescale	Parish Council actions	Borough Council actions
		If the decision is that the Plan cannot proceed to referendum, the process stops. It can only be re-started by the Parish Council submitting a new plan.	
15/09/2015	1 month		<b><u>MAKES ANY CHANGES it considers necessary to the neighbourhood plan</u></b> to satisfy the legal requirements Note such changes are solely the Borough Council's responsibility and decision, but in practice if it decided changes were needed it would probably consult the Parish Council about them.
15/10/2015	1 month		<b><u>REFERENDUM HELD</u></b> The Borough Council organises and pays for this. (The date of the referendum may be timed to coincide with an election or by-election to save costs.)  Those who can vote in the referendum are those on the electoral register with an address in the referendum area and entitled to vote in Borough Council elections. The usual polling stations in the area would probably be used.
	(included in above time)	<b><u>PARISH COUNCIL RECEIVES NOTIFICATION OF REFERENDUM RESULT.</u></b>  Note if the plan fails referendum (see to right), the process stops and can only be restarted by Parish Council submitting a new plan.	<b><u>REFERENDUM RESULT</u></b> If more than 50% of those voting in the referendum support the Plan, the Borough Council must proceed to bring it into force. If 50% or less support it, the plan fails.
15/11/2015	1 month		<b><u>BOROUGH COUNCIL BRINGS PLAN INTO FORCE</u></b> The LPA makes formal decision to 'make' the plan as soon as reasonably practicable after the referendum.  From the date it comes into effect the Plan remains in force until the end date specified in the Plan, unless it is previously superseded by a new neighbourhood plan.
15/12/2015	2 weeks	<b><u>PARISH COUNCIL NOTIFIED</u></b>	<b><u>PLAN PUBLISHED</u></b>

Estimated date	Estimated timescale	Parish Council actions	Borough Council actions
		<p><b><u>WHEN PLAN IS IN FORCE.</u></b></p> <p>Also receives a copy of the Plan (which may differ from the draft Plan submitted).</p>	<p>LPA must publish the plan on its website.</p> <p>A copy of the Plan (which may now differ from that submitted) is sent to the Parish Council, and potentially other bodies specified in regulations.</p>
<p>01/01/2016</p> <p>Until 2026 (unless previously replaced)</p>			<p><b><u>IMPLEMENTATION</u></b></p> <p>Once 'made', the Plan forms part of the development plan for the area, along with the local plan (prepared by the LPA) and minerals and waste plans (prepared by the County Council).</p> <p>Decisions on planning applications and appeals (by the LPA, planning inspectors, or the Secretary of State) must start by consideration of the development plan (which includes the neighbourhood plan). Decisions should, by law, be made in accordance with the development plan, unless 'material considerations' indicate otherwise. Material considerations can include any relevant planning matter, but will typically include national planning policies, and matters not included or anticipated in plans.</p> <p>Note that almost all planning application/appeal decisions will involve some balancing of the development plan against other material planning considerations, or of different development plan policies which pull in different directions. Therefore while development plans are a strong guide to decisions, they are not regulations and cannot be expected to be mechanically applied.</p> <p>Where there is any conflict between a neighbourhood plan and the local plan (Borough's adopted plans), the most recent one prevails.</p>
		<p><b><u>MAY PROPOSE A NEW PLAN</u></b></p> <p>The Parish Council may at any time an existing neighbourhood plan is in force propose it is</p>	

Estimated date	Estimated timescale	Parish Council actions	Borough Council actions
		<p>replaced by a new one. (This could be wholly new, or partly new and partly the same as previous plan). The procedure is the same as for the original plan. The old plan will be superseded if and when the new neighbourhood plan is brought into force.</p>	



5. Parking. New developments of necessity need parking for vehicles (cars, boats etc.) How many off road parking spaces do you think should be provided for each house? —

Comments: .....

PTO

6. Footprint of house compared with size of plot. This question is asking you to consider how much space there should be around houses, how much garden & drive you would like to see. How much of an individual plot should be covered by the house and associated buildings? Please ring the appropriate fraction:

Less than 1/4                      1/4                      1/2                      3/4                      More than 3/4

Comments: .....

7. Thinking about the ratio of affordable/shared ownership houses to 'open market' houses, what do you think should be applicable?

AF/S : OM            1:1            1:2            1:3            1:4            1:5            1:6            other (please specify)

Comments: .....

8. In our villages we have both modern and traditional design of houses. Accepting that the modern house of today is the traditional house of tomorrow, and the advisability of a variety in appearance of houses, what ratio of modern to traditional type design would you like to see?

Modern            4:1            3:1            2:1            1:1            1:2            1:3            1:4            Traditional

Comments: .....

9. Thinking about the structure of developments, should styles of houses (such as modern/traditional, bungalow/house etc.) be kept together or mixed up? Please ring the appropriate answer.

Grouped together                      intermingled

Comments: .....

10. How do you think planning legislation can be used to encourage local employment?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

11. What do **you** think are the most important planning issues affecting our Parish?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Please return it to the box in one of the post offices, or to Cyril Southerland, Richard Seppings or the Parish Clerk before **30<sup>th</sup> July 2013**. You will have a chance to talk about this further with us at one of our open days at the village halls. Keep an eye on the Parish News for further information.



We will consult on the final document before you get the opportunity to vote on its acceptance; it would be great if we could send it to you by email so if you could give us your email address it would be very useful.

Email (optional): .....


June 2013

## Appendix 2 – The Quantitative results

135 questionnaires were received and points allocated to ratings as appropriate. Although the majority of respondents were, as might be expected, permanent residents, a significant number (21%) were holiday home owners.




Chalet bungalows were mentioned by two people and rated 1 by one of them.  
 3+ storeys rated least priority by two people.  
 3+ including basement rated 3 by one person.  
 One person mentioned 3 bed bungalows.



Four people rated flint/brick mixture 1 or 2.  
 One person mentioned a mix of carstone/chalk/flint.  
 One person rated carstone 3.  
 One person mentioned rendering with wood.  
 One person rated steel and glass 3.  
 Two people mentioned rendering.




## Roof Materials




Five people mentioned flat/standard/normal/plain tiles and rated them 2 or 3.  
One person rated concrete tiles as 2.  
One person rated a mixture as 3.

## Parking spaces per house




Six people said 1 space per bedroom even though this wasn't a choice on the questionnaire.  
One person said 0.75 spaces per bedroom.  
Several people said 2 spaces as a minimum.

## Footprint




## Affordable/Shared ownership:Open Market




Several people noted the need to ascertain the demand for affordable housing.

## Modern:Traditional



Two people said as traditional as possible.

## Arrangement



## Appendix 3 - The Qualitative results (reproduced verbatim)

### Comments.

#### Question 1. Size of Houses.

- Currently too many big expensive houses. Need ordinary family homes.
- 4 bedroom houses rarely needed. 5 bedroom house not needed at all.
- Smaller houses would encourage first time buyers.
- One bedroom places needed for single elderly. 4 beds for shared rent needed for young.
- The largest houses in the village seem to be mainly second homes and very underused.
- Affordable housing required.
- Houses are needed for village families, either young/?2 children (3 bed houses) or older couples (2 bedrooms).
- No more houses needed – many/most sit unoccupied for most of the year. New houses should be only for people to live in full time.
- Less expensive houses for people who work here would be a good idea.
- I don't think we need any more houses unless they are for permanent residency.
- There should be a good mix of 1 – 3 bed houses.
- Need for smaller properties so local families can be provided for.
- A mix of houses for full time users.
- It seems the larger properties that are built remain empty while a smaller property seems to be occupied fully in most cases, and are affordable to be lived in and employed in the area.
- This is a high cost housing area and affordable housing is essential for young people and those, including the retired, having smaller incomes.
- The young have to be considered.
- A humble not fixed up cottage.
- No need for more houses – some need for accommodation for lower paid.
- It should not be necessary for more than a few 4 or 5 bedroom houses to be built.
- The bedrooms must be of a reasonable size.
- The bedrooms must be of a correct size.

#### Question 2. Height of Houses.

- Mixture.
- Not really a single storey (bungalow) village.
- Two storeys with rooms in roof are preferable to full three storey.
- Houses should not be built that block existing houses' views.
- More terraces and houses 'beyond' as on North side of road would be good.
- A mix is best, avoids uniform appearance and provides interest, provided surrounding gardens are allowed for.

- 3 storey houses not really wanted.
- None higher than three.
- Very large properties and absent owners can be a problem.
- No houses with three or more storeys are appropriate.
- Too high spoils people's view of the area.
- For rebuilds storeys remain the same.
- Overlooking is becoming a problem.

#### Question 3. Building materials for houses.

- Variety good but in keeping.
- I would like to see a mixture. Too much 'modern' flint and chalk is overpowering. Some wood, some brick, mixed in would enhance the look of the village.
- I would expect contemporary architects will use more glass given the composition of glass and improved insulation materials.
- A mix is best, avoids uniform appearance and provides interest.
- It doesn't matter; they just need to be well designed.
- A mixture of materials. So long as wood does not predominate I am happy to see it used.
- A mixture would be acceptable.
- Modern design using local/trad materials.
- Wood can be unsuitable; see new house in Brancaster Staithe.
- Depending where it is.
- A good mixture.
- The traditional materials maintain the character of the villages.
- All mentioned would be suitable.
- Local materials essential.
- It is best to use materials in sympathy with the area.
- Any materials used must be compatible with those used for other nearby houses.
- Norfolk villages have their own charming style.
- Local materials.
- Again a good mix of brick/flint etc – not wood.

#### Question 4. Roofing Materials.

- A good mixture.
- Flat roofs are not good to look at and do not wear well.
- Flat roofs leak.
- Dormers are great new but heavy. Victorian-style dormers are a disaster.
- A mixture of roof styles within a single development.
- I would like to see some eco-friendly roofs where appropriate e.g. On a garage, summerhouse etc.
- Flat, grass etc. for garages.
- Traditional emphasised.
- Norfolk villages have their own style.

- Flat roofs, grass, other materials are unsuitable and are unlikely to be cost efficient in the longer term.
- No preference – whatever suits house/surroundings.
- No non-conforming materials.
- Unsure about grass as I haven't seen this.

Question 5. Number of off road parking spaces per house.

- Already holiday homes block up the road.
- Unfortunately upon reviewing our ratings above, we can see that most current developments comprise the worst of our ratings.
- At least 2 spaces per household.
- Single garage, plus space per bedroom in house.
- Fed up with e.g. Saxon Close having all cars parked on main road.
- 2 minimum, 3 preferred.
- 2 minimum, 3 maximum.
- In this area many people have boats, work vans etc. and with the threat of losing the Coasthopper, it is difficult to see how working families (often at least two people having to travel to work) could manage without a minimum of three spaces per house.
- Stop the half space syndrome.
- 1 and 2 beds need 2 spaces and so on upwards.
- As most people seem to use their garages for purposes other than putting cars in I have ignored them in arriving at proposed spaces.
- 2 – but problematic; people have visitors. I would rather see communal parking and space left for gardens.
- Adequate space provided on either side of entrances off the main road for safety purposes.
- 2 spaces but more if the house has more than 2 bedrooms.
- At least one space for each bedroom.
- At least 2 but it depends on the likely number of occupants. I would say number of bedrooms = number of car spaces needed.
- Parking in the village is already inadequate, so the problems should not be made worse.
- 2 for a 3 bedroom house.
- 4 plus boat.
- 2 maximum. Is parking needed for boats?
- 2 as a maximum.
- Minimum of 1.
- 2 cars – 3 for bigger houses.
- No less than 2.
- Two to each house depending on size of house.
- 2 but not always possible with terraced rows.
- 2 at the very least. Parking on the street is an increasing problem.
- One car per adult required.
- Any fewer than 2 and people park on the road.
- 2 plus one boat.

- Consider neighbour liaison so that unused holiday home could be used by neighbours.
- The village is too congested with parked cars etc.
- 2, not 1.5 as no such thing as half a car.
- Essential to create off road parking.
- 0.75 per bedroom rounded up.
- Depending on size of plot of course but of necessity at least two for cars if nothing else.
- Commercial vehicles should not be parked in areas allocated for private off road parking.
- Two or three – family and visitors to each home.
- Don't forget local tradesmen need a place to park their vans.
- Parking should be within property boundaries.
- The Ship refurbishment has changed London Street – drunk, loud, parking everywhere.
- Depends on size of house. 1 space per adult.
- 2+ with garage.
- Planning permission for extensions should not be given if it results in cars parked on the road.

#### Question 6. Footprint of house compared with size of plot.

- Modern lifestyle doesn't allow for garden.
- Cars and garages should be hidden from road if possible.
- $\frac{1}{4}$  may be too ambitious,  $\frac{1}{2}$  OK.
- If families are to live in houses they need gardens.
- $\frac{1}{2}$  for smaller properties but a bit more generous space for larger houses with more occupants and more vehicles.
- $\frac{1}{4}$  seems very small,  $\frac{1}{2}$  seems not enough space.
- Various, depends what people want.
- It depends on where it is in the village. It doesn't matter providing it is well designed. There are up to 100% coverage in Burnham Market and beautiful.
- Houses without proper gardens are unlikely to be bought by local people (if they can afford them) and are aimed at, and bought by, 2<sup>nd</sup> home owners who are seldom here.
- Depends on size of plot, larger house needs more parking.
- Depends on type of property.
- I think there should be AT LEAST  $\frac{3}{4}$  plot garden. Then people have room to grow veg., children can play and there is drainage into the ground for rainwater, flowers for bees and insects etc. and natural places for wildlife.
- $\frac{1}{4}$  plot covered; this does not seem to be current practice.
- Various houses need various sizes.
- A house should have a garden the same size as the house and a drive.
- Houses for young families need more space.
- Where there is space there should be a garage.
- The village is being spoilt by infilling and overcrowding.
- Not crammed estates.

- We would not like to see crammed estates (e.g. Powell's Yard).
- Some recent developments look crammed in.
- Large gardens in second homes have to be cared for.
- ½ could be increased to allow for off road parking.
- Space to off road park and land to grow vegetables and flowers for insects and wildlife to continue to flourish and a place to relax.
- Depends on use of house – residential larger garden, holiday use less garden but more parking (off road).
- Very much depends on property and who would be in it.
- Houses are too different to answer.
- Depends on resident and needs i.e. lone person or family.
- Enough to enable sufficient off street parking.

Question 7. Ratio of affordable houses/Shared ownership to 'open market' housing.

- To be decided on NEED of the community at the time, not a fixed ratio.
- No regulations should be set.
- This is a difficult, possibly irrelevant question. There should be enough affordable housing to fulfil the need for it. We have little work here in the village, and too many houses already. The future of this village depends on retired people living here permanently, together with consideration to increase work (working from home etc.). I'm not convinced that there is need for ANY houses. Without the work there is no need for the houses.
- We seem to have enough affordable at the moment.
- More affordable homes needed.
- If large quantity of homes ratio should be higher.
- The ratio could well change as development takes place.
- (1 affordable:2 'market') could be commercially viable if developers were not so greedy.
- What is the demand for affordable? That must be met.
- Applications for small developments should be considered in the light of other recent applications so that overall the 1:3 ratio should be achieved.
- Considering the present development of more expensive owner occupied houses having developed in the village I think more affordable/rented accommodation is needed.
- To keep the village it needs houses for people who want to live there. It does not need more holiday (usually empty) houses.
- Only affordable/shared ownership are needed.
- I do not know how great has been the demand for AF. If great it should be 1:2.
- Important to ascertain how many affordable homes are required.
- Allowing for infill where appropriate.
- Does it not rely on the demand for AF/s, which is dictated by those who want to work/live in the area, which is dictated by jobs available? How are we going to get more employers in the area?
- It would be OK if open market houses were family houses instead of huge properties miles out of locals' price ranges.

- I would like families to remain.
- Not in a position to judge but suspect we have too few affordable houses.
- Essential for affordable housing.
- Houses for local residents are most important.
- Do not know the demand for affordable houses. It depends upon that.
- Bias towards homes for younger and permanent residents.
- Such a measure should increase the amount of housing available to young people.
- Brancaster has become a posh, snobby, empty place!
- The affordable/shared ownership housing also needs to be appealing to local families e.g. if it is 3 beds it should have a garden.
- 1:10000

Question 8. Modern:Traditional design of houses.

- Traditional. It is not a modern village.
- Encouragement should be given to eco building in traditional styles.
- No strong opinion.
- Brancaster is an attractive old village, houses built mainly of stone (local).
- The quality of modern designs has not been high. C.f. wooden house in Brancaster Staithe opposite Snellings.
- Houses like the new one opposite Snellings should not be entertained.
- Copies of older houses are rarely successful. A new/modern design is usually far more pleasing – and often exciting, and can successfully use traditional materials.
- Attention should be paid to blending the houses so that the smaller older properties are not dwarfed by large modern developments (as in Thornham where a new house is so much larger that the surrounding properties).
- Many poor modern designs.
- But they (modern houses) must be above average in design.
- Provided the ‘modern house’ is well designed.
- I am not averse to contemporary design and would welcome some in the village. You will always be up against design being in the eye of the beholder.
- General view is that more modern houses are changing the character of the village.
- We are a traditional village. It is nice to see well designed modern houses but they should be the exception rather than the rule because it is important, in my view, to retain the character of the village. However, big modern houses, built in traditional materials, trying to look like cottages, look silly. There are also some massive modern square extensions that have, in my view, ruined the view from the North, e.g. next to the White Horse in the Staithe.
- The outside of the house should be in keeping with the village but modern inside.
- Modern houses can look appropriate if they have characteristics reflecting some thought to ‘blend’ into the existing character of the village.



- I do not accept that a modern house of today is the traditional house of tomorrow. Currently wood facias are popular and are not including flint or brick at all. Mostly glass and chrome ... appalling.
- Problem comes when decent houses are knocked down and huge unsuitable houses put in their places.
- Whatever the ratio, the extremes of house design should be avoided to ensure no clashes of style, incongruities.
- A good mix of both.
- Do not want to see the character of the village change dramatically.
- The authorities should look at design quality.
- Design is the important thing.
- Traditional build can also involve eco methods of construction.
- Whatever the design it is important to use local material, and in keeping with surrounding properties.
- Maintain the character of Brancaster as much as possible, modern is modern and thus cannot become traditional.
- Don't like wood cladding.
- It depends on style.
- The characters of the villages should remain dominant.
- Good modern is better than out of proportion 'pretend' traditional. Important to use local sympathetic materials.

Question 9. Should styles be intermingled or grouped together?

- Intermingled gives a richer mix.
- Grouped together, but there are unlikely to be more than 10 on any site.
- It would depend on location within village and space around houses.
- But the character of the main road through the village should be preserved.
- Grouped together; Branodunum a good example.
- Intermingled; a village is a mixture, not a series of estates.
- Intermingled is usually very unsatisfactory.
- Grouped together; please not modern unless using wood or stone.
- Grouped is ideal but practically means they most contrive to be intermingled.
- At the moment properties seem to be intermingled and it seems to work.
- Design is the important matter.
- Design is the most important thing.
- The diversity of buildings is one of the most attractive features of the villages.

Question 10. How can planning legislation encourage local employment?

- Train young people in the service industries. Well qualified gardeners, painters, carpenters, fencers are constantly needed.
- More affordable houses needed for people who live here.
- Speed up the process to encourage building and construction.
- Set aside land to enable the building of light industrial units/office space.

- New developments must include a shop and be within reach of a surgery, petrol/diesel station, Church.
- It can't.
- Helping home-based enterprises to develop.
- It can't. Leave it to the market.
- Give planning permission to small industries.
- Ensure provision is made for small start-up businesses and other established small business.
- Commercial space integrated within space e.g. Artist studio, shop.
- By insisting that any new buildings have to be permanently occupied for at least 2 years. These people would then use local amenities all year round.
- Permitting some limited house/flat construction will help local employment.
- Have any employment potential planning applications been submitted and due to current legislation been refused?
- Small-scale businesses should be encouraged. Siting them in this parish might be more difficult, but a site for sale in Docking would be ideal.
- By creating some form of retail space or light industry/offices.
- To allow a small amount of small starter units for local business.
- Allowing more business use of land not allowing change of use business to holiday home.
- Allow sites within our villages be able to be used as workshops/light industrial use. Barn conversions would be suitable. It should not be necessary for people to have to travel to work in Docking/Fakenham etc.
- Affordable housing plus shared ownership housing encourages people to move into villages.
- 'Infilling' should be encouraged rather than new small estates on green field sites on the edges of villages.
- I know this will be unpopular but the villages of Brancaster and Brancaster Staithe need to own their own windmill on the Common or nearby.
- You could specify local materials be used where possible and give a tax incentive say a small VAT rebate for people using them.
- Allow businesses to develop. Allow houses to be used for commercial purposes.
- At a national level, legislation to rein in the 'free market' where house prices are concerned. Locally, more social housing, possibly funded by higher council tax on 2<sup>nd</sup> homes.
- Possible workshop and office space may help.
- Limit use of builders to those located within a set radius of village.
- Restrict building of large expensive properties.
- Firstly to build traditional types of building which will give better opportunities for local and specialised tradesmen. Secondly to include better access to the information highway and connections to superfast broadband (for home businesses).
- I do not consider the planning legislation is against local employment, it should be strongly promoted by the community and the Parish Council.

- It should not be, it is pointless.
- Small shop/workshop provision may help provide local employment and support the village community. No more over large second homes. Restrict houses to a type that can be lived in permanently, even if they may be sold as second homes they could revert to permanent residency in the future.
- Impossible to legislate. It's a free market choice now and should continue to be so. If local employment is as good as it can be, then it will be used anyway.
- Only build when there is a proven need for local people i.e. cut down 'on spec' development for second homes. Note; when local affordable houses have come on the market, both for sale or rent, the take-up by local people has been very slow.
- More 2 bedroom houses and less 4+ bedroom houses.
- We despair! Recent developments have mainly involved imported labour or companies and have been for the benefit of transient, rather than local able bodied working folk. Bring back the days when a local person could build a property for themselves, utilising local labour, on their land without it being considered an extension of the village envelope – the nationwide 'need' for considerable additional housing makes it clear that such envelopes must be extended. Brancaster is a prime example.
- Reduction of costs for those living and working within the community, possible a percentage reduction on all services and council tax.
- Give planning permission for a business (such as a shop or food outlet) to be built. Then it could employ local people.
- Encourage commercial development e.g. of redundant buildings.
- Small units could be developed on sites within the village, for people to start up their own businesses and employ others.
- Tasteful and appropriate development generates jobs.
- Would it be possible to impose a requirement for local trades to be considered/used first in preference to those from further afield.
- By encouraging a mix of development. Not just big profit holiday housing but affordable retirement housing schemes and the use of section 106 agreements to generate employment opportunities via planning gain e.g. the funding of a small shop.
- By putting covenants on properties that ensure they are re-sold to local people or permanent residents to prevent the properties becoming holiday/second homes.
- Many young adults are forced to live with their parents because of a lack of affordable housing, and the mortgage deposit is so large.
- Stop charging VAT on modernising old buildings and put it no new build.
- People need affordable housing to be able to work in the area.
- Not allow too many very large houses. This takes them off the market permanently for local people.
- No permission for holiday homes – too many already.
- Various sorts of building work – shops.
- The development of small businesses linked with residential accommodation.

- The release of building land.
- Small industrial units with no change of use covenant.
- To encourage small industrial units for small businesses.
- Main employers are tourism and fishing. Planning should be sympathetic to supporting employers in these fields.
- Provide more affordable housing.
- Ensure provision of small business units for enterprises that will flourish in the local environment.
- More full time jobs mean full time residents essential to maintaining local influence.
- Use housing associations/shared equity.
- Encourage clusters of small industrial units.
- Build lock up units for small business.
- Provision of 'start up' business premises.
- Modern start up units for small (micro) businesses.
- Encourage locally traditional houses e.g. flint which use the skills of local people.
- Probably best achieved by limiting space for car parking as discouraging use of cars would energise local shops. Branodunum got this right back in the '80s by one car garages but off road parking has blossomed since then.
- With affordable housing. Green belt should not be encroached on. Solar panels should not be visible from the road.
- I believe that there should be no more housing built unless skilled work is available which would enable people to earn enough to afford a decent home.
- Traditional houses require traditional skills. Local builders skills and knowledge encouraged.
- More affordable housing to keep locals around and keep schools and services used. Maybe some retail units?
- Lower cost/affordable housing must rate high on the list of priorities but it is essential that these properties do include a garden and drive and are maintained to a high standard.
- It is vital to support local craftsmen. It is important that planners take notice of the community and act accordingly.
- Any multi property development must include on its site or elsewhere a ratio of affordable houses. Push for better broadband so people can work from home; speeds have deteriorated over the last year!
- When planning granted list of local craftsmen sent to homeowner.
- Obviously be granting permission for developments but then you are defeating the object of maintaining traditional character. Therefore permission should be mainly limited to traditional developments.
- As I've said, more parking at houses to allow families to travel to work.

Question 11. What are the most important planning issues affecting our Parish?

- There are too many private houses being built that will end up as second homes for people who are not local and therefore they will not stay in the

village long enough to contribute to it. Therefore more 'affordable' housing for locals need to be built.

- Local residents' views and wishes being ignored.
- Too much tree felling and infilling is taking place. The Parish is rapidly becoming a weekend/holiday period dormitory. The recent redevelopment of 'Powells Yard' is of no benefit to the village or its Parishioners whatsoever. Local residents should be allowed to develop their land/plots, if possible, to the benefit or usage of themselves.
- Main road.
- Only build when there is a proven need for local people; you have to ask the question – how many more houses are required for local people. Development for second homes should be cut down although a new development, e.g. Powells Yard, will employ local gardeners, cleaners etc.
- Seemingly no overall vision for;
  - The second home rebuild/renovation programme on an ever-increasing scale.
  - New developments on smaller plots.
  - Selling off pockets of agricultural land for new builds (or affordable housing).
- The village has too many houses and they are FAR too big. Houses should be built that can be holiday homes, family homes or retired homes. Very large houses with no gardens, built specifically as second homes, can never revert to be houses for normal families. House size MUST be limited.
- Too many new, large houses being built for second home absentee owners. Overload of holiday homes being built by/for absentee landlords.
- The erection of large expensive dwellings for absentee owners, which local people can not afford to purchase.
- Lack of an overall 10/20/30 year plan as to where in the villages should be building sites. No point in having a plot by plot permission. The rest unbuilt land should be frozen for 30 years as farmland.
- Too many new developments considering we already have lots of rarely used holiday homes. New houses not catering for locals – too big/expensive. Need real houses for real people!
- You will never satisfy all the people all the time. The underlying foundation should be to create a planning agenda that maintains the requirements of a wholesome living community.
- Overdevelopment of expensive and larger properties restricting the number of reasonably price alternatives.
- Rural workshop provision.
- With weekend or holiday homes much more thought should be given to parking both vehicles and trailers and boats.
- Keep playing fields/parks/recreation areas.
- We have noted some 'horrific' wooden houses (near harbour entrance) which seriously affect the character of the village – one wonders how planning permission was ever granted.

- We do not need more houses, as they do not help the housing shortage as they are all sold as second homes. Also a large number unsold at the moment.
- Second homes.
- Traffic speed on Whiteways Road approaching the T-junction with the A149. Also persistent flooding on the A149 in front of Leftleys. These are both NCC matters.
- Build more small houses as they are needed by permanent residents and are not good for holiday letting.
- That Brancaster Staithe retains its character of a working port and that no caravan parks are allowed. New housing should help the local community and be built for their benefit.
- Too many large expensive houses encouraging second home buyers.
- The granting of seemingly unrestricted numbers of houses way out of reach of villagers financially.
- Affordable housing available to encourage permanent residency as compared to holiday home owners in our village.
- Affordable homes for younger people who are permanent residents. Need for more affordable retirement houses for housing association tenants to free up council houses with 3 bedrooms but only occupied by one person.
- More say for Parish on planning control.
- Main issue not about planning but transport and employment.
- Overdevelopment e.g. new houses by The Ship and Powells Yard.
- Over development.
- More affordable/social housing needs building, no more second homes that sit empty for most of the year.
- NIMBY/2<sup>nd</sup> home domination.
- Providing enough housing and jobs for residents and blending together the full and part time residents. Part time residents often feel excluded from village activities.
- If you have the money it seems you can build what you like.
- Considered growth of good quality housing should be permitted to help local employment and investment in the Parish.
- Not allowing any further building developments that result in more holiday homes making the villages ghost towns for half the year.
- Affordable housing for local residents otherwise the local area will die as schools will close, shops will be uneconomic to run, facilities will decline – ghost villages in winter – no sustainable employment.
- No more holiday homes. The proportion of houses for living in and holiday homes needs to reflect the need for affordable/shared ownership.
- To provide sufficient housing for local families/people who want to live in the village, not just own houses to rent out for a few weeks a year.
- The major issue is the balance between local owner-occupiers and holiday homes. Recent developments in Powells Yard, Manor Farm, Saxon Fields and Common Lane, when completed and sold will affect the balance. The resulting percentage will indicate what influence or planning action should be taken.

- Stop small bungalows being dismantled to allow large holiday homes to be built on the plot.
- Overcrowded infills and overlooking balconies and dormers.
- Slums were done away with because of too close proximity of houses, there needs to be a restriction on 'too-close' building.
- It is wrong the villagers have no say - we have to live next to it.
- Not enough affordable (i.e. around £80-100,000).
- That it doesn't become a wealthy retirees ghetto.
- Don't extend the village envelope.
- Brancaster is over developed. There should be some limit on how many more holiday houses are built.
- To build houses that 'fit in' with the environment. Use local materials and avoid the 'seaside brick bungalow' at all costs. Landscaping around new houses is very important.
- Lack of broadband – not strictly planning. +20mph speed limit.
- Sensible sized and priced homes for local families to live and work and raise children here – keeping schools etc. alive in the villages.
- Appropriate style/design and compatibility with the area.
- Too much infilling on small plots. Over development of a plot.
- The disappearance of retail units. Having backed and failed with the support of the village shop, given the continuing expansion of houses, at what stage is it worth another go to try and establish a small cluster of retail units (more likely to succeed than just one)? Affordable housing.
- Homes should not be squeezed into every little space available, car parking and traffic general will be the problem.
- Lack of amenities for those who are unable to, or prefer not to, travel to find these i.e. shops, garage, traditional pub etc. Also, and most importantly, the continuation of a reliable and regular bus service.
- Councillors in Lynn agreeing rebuilding of sufficient decent sized houses for huge second homes. Continuing to be aware of affordable housing needs.
- If you buy a bungalow you must replace (if a rebuild) with another bungalow. If this is a second home, you cannot increase footprint and number of bedrooms and storeys.
- We are fortunate that there is now a high proportion of affordable houses in this village, but recent developments in Powells Yard/Manor Farm etc will only go to people from outside the village – I would oppose more unaffordable housing.
- Preserve the character of the villages. Keep cars from parking on the roads overnight.
- The rate of development far exceeds the present infrastructure namely roads and drains in particular. Infilling without road frontage should be restricted to smaller 2/3 bedroom houses.
- Overdevelopment, and building on farmland.
- Getting more jobs into the area.
- Lack of off road parking throughout the village.
- Extensive recent building - Powells Yard, barn conversions (main road) - creating many holiday homes.

- Recent large building estate. Over large houses,
- Provision of off road car parking and restriction on parking on the side of the main road in the summer months.
- Allow village to grow for full time residents.
- Affordable housing for local people or those who work in the area.
- Ensuring that those with money and influence do not dictate planning policy and planning decisions.
- Too much growth in holiday homes.
- Overbuilding. BPC must stop increasing number of houses being built of they will change character of village irreparably.
- We don't get enough say, and it is overridden most times when we are listened to.
- Small retail start-up shops administered by Parish Council with Covenant regarding no change of use.
- Making sure the infrastructure can cope with new development.
- To retain the character of the villages at the same time allowing new developments of affordable housing to encourage local people to remain, particularly young people.
- Guarding against too much 'urbanisation' and keeping as much of the 'wild ' and country feel as possible.
- Not enough affordable houses for local youngsters.
- Need for affordable homes to benefit the local community, and amenities.
- Large holiday homes that are left empty for most of the year are never going to be affordable for locals in the future or beneficial to the village for most of the year.
- As an area of outstanding natural beauty it is most important to protect the visual character of the Parish in every way. Any lowering of standards, such as washing being permitted to be hung out close to the main road (as seems to be currently allowed) should be unacceptable.
- Parish Council does not have much choice.
- Too many houses are owned by second home owners.
- Too many empty, large houses bought by the rich and only used 3 or 4 times a year.
- Buildings that are passed that clearly should not, such as the 'boatshed' which is clearly a separate dwelling at the bottom of Black Horse cottage.
- Speed of some cars, lack of a cross walk and congestion near the sailing club and Leftleys.
- Planning consent is being given to too many very large houses which don't fit in with existing buildings and are much too big to be affordable to local families.
- As far as I can see no notice is taken of P.C. views.
- An uneven development balance, too many big profit holiday homes and not enough housing for young families or less affluent retirees. We must find a way to ensure the continued viability of at least one small shop.
- Empty houses, too many urban insensitive bossy new owners who are loud and rude and have no interest in community or landscape or birds or dunes – dog fouling too.



- The need for sufficient housing for local people who may well be earning below average wages.
- To avoid the errors of the 60's and 70's when too many inappropriate properties were built. Tasteful development is the desire.
- People get dissatisfied about not being heard. Planning seems to be in progress before we have a chance to object, and no matter what the media say, things just go ahead.
- Density. Look at Powells Yard in Brancaster and the two houses in Deepdale on the corner.
- Density.
- Overdevelopment on infill sites. Lack of highways planning.

## **Appendix 4 - Responses to Consultation.**

### **English Heritage response to Consultation**

English Heritage is supportive of parishes wishing to prepare Neighbourhood Plans; our interest is primarily concerned with the historic built environment and our comments will therefore focus on those aspects of the plan.

Brancaster includes some very significant, nationally designated heritage assets, including the scheduled site of the Roman Fort, St Mary's Brancaster (listed at Grade I) Staithe House, Brancaster Staithe (listed at Grade II\*) and St Mary's Burnham Deepdale (listed at Grade II\*). There is also a conservation area designated at Brancaster. We are therefore concerned that there is no mention to the historic environment in the plan.

The plan is succinct and contains a series of 7 policies, and while we have no objection to these policies a situation could arise where, say, the provision of new affordable homes or development of commercial units might adversely impact on the setting of heritage assets. It would therefore be helpful if the plan also included a policy specifically safeguarding the setting of heritage assets. Alternatively, the existing policies might be expanded to make appropriate reference to the historic environment.

Such a policy might read: *'The siting of new houses, including affordable homes, together with the development of shops, workshops and business units, shall have due regard for, and respect the setting of, designated heritage assets. Development will also be expected to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Brancaster Conservation Area.'*

24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582 700 Facsimile 01223 582 701 [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk)

*English Heritage is subject to the Freedom of Information Act. All information held by the organisation will be accessible in response to a Freedom of Information request, unless one of the exemptions in the Act applies.*

#### **EAST OF ENGLAND REGION**

English Heritage has prepared guidance on the setting of heritage assets and a pdf version of this guidance is attached.

It should also be noted that any development within the Scheduled area will require Scheduled Monument Consent and early discussions with English Heritage on any such proposals are strongly recommended.

Yours sincerely

**David Grech.** Historic Places Adviser

## Natural England response to requests for view on assessment

21<sup>st</sup> February 2014

Dear Mr Seppings

Planning Consultation: Brancaster Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan – Habitats Regulations Assessment

Thank you for your inquiry regarding the need for Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) for the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan which was received by Natural England on 14 January 2014

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

From the information that you sent to us regarding the Brancaster Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan we understand that the Plan deals only with the design and style of houses and does not propose any development allocations. We note that the latest stage of the Kings Lynn & West Norfolk Site Allocations Development Plan Document is proposing small scale development within your parish and that this will be progressed through this document rather than the Neighbourhood Plan. We also acknowledge that the Council's Core Strategy has been adopted (2011) which has an accompanying HRA report. This HRA concludes that any potential adverse effects on the integrity of European Sites have been adequately avoided or mitigated for.

I can therefore confirm that the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan would not require assessment under the Habitat Regulations provided that it does not propose any additional development over and above that contained within the Local Plan.

We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Roslyn Deeming on 0300 060 1524. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to [consultations@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk).

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

Yours sincerely

Roslyn Deeming

Land Use Adviser

## Natural England response to Consultation

7<sup>th</sup> April 2014

Dear Mr Seppings

Brancaster Parish Draft Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for consulting Natural England on the above in your email of 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2014.

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

The Plan area incorporates parts of North Norfolk Coast Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a component SSSI of the North Norfolk Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site. However, as we mentioned in our response dated 21<sup>st</sup> February 2014 (ref: 109715), Habitats Regulations Assessment is not required since the Plan deals only with the design and style of houses and does not propose any additional development over and above that proposed through the Local Plan; this has been addressed through a separate Habitats Regulations Assessment. Whilst it is unlikely that plan policies will have an adverse effect on the natural environment we believe that draft Policy 8 should be expanded to require that new development will protect, and where possible enhance, the natural environment.

The Plan area also incorporates part of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Whilst the Plan generally seeks to protect and enhance the interest features of this nationally designated landscape we believe that draft Policy 8 should be expanded to include requirements which will ensure that new development will not affect the purposes of the protected landscape. You are advised to consult the Norfolk Coast Partnership for its views and advice on this matter.

Proposals may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. The Plan should encourage proposals to contribute to the objectives and targets of the local Green Infrastructure Strategy, Landscape Character Assessment and Biodiversity Action Plan wherever possible.

I hope these comments are helpful. For clarification of any points in this letter, please contact Janet Nuttall on 0300 060 1239.

## **Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk response to Consultation**

Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk

14<sup>th</sup> April 2014

The LDF Task Group, on behalf of the Borough Council,

- (i) commends Brancaster Parish Council for its endeavours in preparing a draft neighbourhood plan;
- (ii) has no objection to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan
- (iii) recommends that the Parish Council
  - a. reviews the recently published National Planning Practice Guidance in relation to neighbourhood plans before it finalises its plan for submission; and
  - b. makes it explicit in the submission plan that it has given special regard to
    - i. the desirability of conserving listed buildings, their setting and features,
    - ii. the character and appearance of the Brancaster Conservation Area, and
    - iii. the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- (iv) confirms that the Borough Council is of the opinion that a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required; and
- (v) confirms the Borough Council will continue to advise and assist the Parish Council in progressing its neighbourhood plan.

## Norfolk County Council response to Consultation

### Norfolk County Council Response to Brancaster Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan

Reg 14 consultation

April 2014

1.  
*Preface*
- 1.1. The officer-level comments below are made on a without prejudice basis and the County Council reserves the right to make further comments on the emerging Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan (BNP).
2. **General**
- 2.1. The County Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the BNP. The County Council suggests the PC might want to consider adding some broad sustainability aims/objectives.
3.  
*Infrastructure Delivery*
- 3.1. The PC may want to consider including a policy on infrastructure delivery indicating that:

Housing and other development will be expected to contribute towards improving local services and infrastructure (such as transport, education; library and fire hydrant provision) through either the payment of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and/or planning obligations (via a s106 agreement / planning condition).

The emerging plan should make it clear that new or improved infrastructure will be funded/delivered through CIL and/or S106 agreements.
- 3.2. Should you have any queries with the above comments please call or email Stephen Faulkner on 01603 222752 / [stephen.faulkner@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.faulkner@norfolk.gov.uk).
4.  
*Settlement Limits*
- 4.1. *PC may consider clarifying the extent of the parish the plan covers by including a map.*
- 4.2. Should you have any queries with the above comments please call or email Stephen Faulkner on 01603 222752 / [stephen.faulkner@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.faulkner@norfolk.gov.uk).
5.  
*Minerals and Waste Comments*
- 5.1. The Mineral Planning Authority has no specific comments to make regarding the draft Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan. It is noted that the NP does not

propose making allocations, and proposed allocations contained in the current draft of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Detailed sites plan have been subject to comments made by the MPA where it is considered appropriate.

- 5.2. Officer contact: Richard Drake  
(Acting Principal Planning and Policy officer: Minerals and Waste Policy)  
Telephone: 01603 222349  
Email: [richard.drake@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:richard.drake@norfolk.gov.uk)

### **Additional Comments from Norfolk Coast Partnership**

It might be worth mentioning in the general introduction that the villages are in the Norfolk Coast AONB, which has equal status in landscape protection terms to our national parks, and that they border the North Norfolk Heritage Coast which has multiple national and international nature conservation designations – in order to emphasise the sensitivity of their setting, which I'd see as supporting your aims, although I fully agree that villages need to remain living, working communities within this context.

It might also be worth mentioning somewhere that NPPF still has strong policies on the protection of Heritage Coasts, AONBs and national parks (paras 114-116) and on protecting wildlife – the 'sustainable development' and economic growth aspects often tend to be quoted without this balance.

On policy 8, the statutory purpose of AONB designation is 'conservation and enhancement of natural beauty'. This covers built / cultural heritage as well as landscape and wildlife but is quite confusing in itself, so I suggest the policy might say "*...and will conserve, and where possible enhance, local landscape and wildlife.*" (since the built environment bit is already dealt with in the first part of the policy).

## Strategic Environmental Assessment

In order for a formal decision to be taken as to whether a full Strategic Environmental Assessment is required Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency must be consulted on this specific question. The Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk agreed to undertake this consultation. The notice below was sent to Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency.

### Consultation on SEA Screening: Brancaster Draft Neighbourhood Plan

#### (Regulation 9 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004)

I am writing to consult you on the Environmental Assessment Screening of the above neighbourhood plan, which is being prepared by Brancaster parish Council.

The Borough Council is of the opinion, subject to the results of this consultation, that a full environmental assessment is not required because the plan determines the use of only a small area at a local level, as provided by Regulation 5 (6), and, having regard to Schedule 1, is of the provisional opinion that is unlikely to have environmental effects.

I would be grateful for your advice on the matter. Please provide any response you may have within 28 days of this consultation – i.e. by Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2014.

I attach a copy of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. (Note that you were previously consulted on this plan, but did not make any comment on the question of SEA screening.)

Should you have any queries on the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

#### John Clements

BA(Hons), BTP, MSc, MRTPI  
Principal Planner (Policy)

#### Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk

Tel (direct line): 01553 616240

Email: [john.clements@west-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:john.clements@west-norfolk.gov.uk)



The complete online planning and building resource



## Responses to Borough Council's SEA Consultation

### English Heritage

Dear Mr Clements

Thank you for email dated 28 October consulting English Heritage on the SEA Screening Opinion for the above plan.

For the purposes of this consultation, English Heritage will confine its advice to the question, "Is it likely to have a significant effect on the environment?" in respect of our area of concern, cultural heritage. Our comments are based on the information supplied in your email, including the June 2014 version of the draft Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan. It is for the Council to make the final decision in terms of whether SEA is required.

Your email indicates that the Council considers that the Neighbourhood Plan will not have significant environmental effects within the plan area, which presumably includes effects on cultural heritage. It would appear that the Neighbourhood Plan focuses on shaping how development comes forward and will respond to allocations in the Local Plan rather than allocating land itself. On the basis of the information supplied, and in the context of the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment Regulations [Annex II of 'SEA' Directive], English Heritage concurs with the Council that the preparation of an SEA is not required.

The views of other statutory consultation bodies should be taken into account before the overall decision on the need for an SEA is made. I would be pleased if you can send a copy of the determination as required by Regulation 11 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

We should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by you with your email dated 28 October as well as the June 2014 version of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. To avoid any doubt, this does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on later stages of the SA/SEA process and, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise in the Neighbourhood Plan where we consider that, despite the absence of SA/SEA, these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

We hope that the above comments are of assistance.

Yours sincerely

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge | Principal Historic Environment Planning Adviser

Direct Line: 01223 582775

Mobile: 07826 532954

Email: [tom.gilbert-wooldridge@english-heritage.org.uk](mailto:tom.gilbert-wooldridge@english-heritage.org.uk)

English Heritage | East of England Office

24 Brooklands Avenue | Cambridge | CB2 8BU

[www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk)

## Environment Agency

Dear John Clements

Thank you for your email.

Due to resource pressures we are no longer able to provide you with bespoke advice on screening opinions. If there is a specific issue which you require our expert advice on before issuing the screening opinion then please contact us with details and we will endeavor to assist you. We remain a statutory consultee for scoping opinions so please continue to submit these for our review and comment.

Attached is a copy of our planning application guidance which provides general information on the type of detail we expect to be submitted as part of planning applications as well as more information about our charged for planning advise service.

Please could all future consultation emails be sent to our team email inbox - [planning\\_liaison.anglian\\_central@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:planning_liaison.anglian_central@environment-agency.gov.uk)

Regards,

### Emily Crook

Sustainable Places Senior Planning Advisor  
(Cambridgeshire and Bedfordshire Area)

✉ Environment Agency, Bromholme Lane, Brampton, Huntingdon, Cambs. PE28 4NE

☎ Internal: 750 3924 ☎ External: 01480 483924

💻 [emily.crook@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:emily.crook@environment-agency.gov.uk)



#### **NEW: charging for planning advice**

We now charge developers for some of our planning advice. Please get in touch with us if you have any questions.

## **The Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk agreed on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014 that an SEA is not required for this draft Neighbourhood Plan**

I can confirm the Borough has today agreed that SEA is not required.

The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

Having had regard to Schedule 1 of the Regulations, and consulted the relevant statutory bodies, the Borough Council considers that an SEA of the Draft Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan is not required as that plan is unlikely to have significant environmental effects because it constitutes a minor modification of the provisions of the King's Lynn & West Norfolk Core Strategy (adopted 2011).

Regards,

John

### **John Clements**

BA(Hons), BTP, MSc, MRTPI  
Principal Planner (Policy)

### **Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk**

Tel (direct line): 01553 616240

Email: [john.clements@west-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:john.clements@west-norfolk.gov.uk)



## Acknowledgements

- The Borough of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Planning Department, specifically Mr John Clements for his help and encouragement.
- We owe thanks and appreciation to the authors of the two documents; *Brancaster, Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale Parish Design Statement* and *Brancaster, Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale Parish Appraisal*. We have, with permission, used information from these documents and the work done by the team in 1999/2000 has been valuable in informing our thinking regarding the Neighbourhood Plan project.
- Maurice de Soissons who helped with the background information and allowed the use of quotes from his book *Brancaster Staithe: The Story of a Norfolk Fishing Village*.
- Josephine Luddington for her help with arranging distribution of the questionnaires with the *Parish News* – and her team of compilers.
- Liz Chaney for her invaluable assistance and advice regarding language, layout etc.
- The local sub postmaster and sub postmistress for their help and for allowing us to distribute and collect questionnaires at their post offices.
- Jim Herculson for advice regarding the functions of the Housing Society.
- Those who helped with the questionnaires and the drop in days in the village halls.
- All those parishioners who took the time to fill in questionnaires and visit our drop in days.

For copies of this plan contact the Parish Clerk Janet Lake;

[ljaneve@aol.com](mailto:ljaneve@aol.com)

For queries regarding the plan contact Richard Seppings;

[Richard@seppings.net](mailto:Richard@seppings.net)