Spixworth Neighbourhood Plan Examination

Examiner’s Clarifying Questions of Broadland District Council and Spixworth Parish Council (BDC responses in red text) (Spixworth response in blue text)

Broadland District Council

1. P 26 of the plan would imply that site GNLP 0467 is in part in Spixworth Parish but the map on page 7 would suggest not. Can you confirm that although it borders the parish it is wholly within Crostwick Parish?

We can confirm that the site is wholly within Crostwick Parish.

Response and explanation
Site GNLP0467 is currently wholly in Crostwick. When consulted on as part of the emerging Local Plan it was listed as being wholly in both Crostwick and separately wholly (incorrectly) in Spixworth. Clarity was sought from the GNLP Team as to the intent of leaving the proposed site in Crostwick or moving the parish boundary to have the site in Spixworth. This clarity has not been received which leaves the uncertainty.

Historically, Spixworth residents have seen this happen and the parish boundary moved. The allocation under the current Site Allocations DPD 2016 allocated site SPL1 (as shown on Map 6 on page 25) was originally wholly in Crostwick but the parish boundary for Crostwick and Spixworth was moved to place the allocated site wholly in Spixworth. If site GNLP0467 is allocated under the emerging Local Plan it is felt likely the parish boundary will be moved again to see the site located wholly in Spixworth.

As of today, the proposed site is wholly in the parish of Crostwick, albeit, on the boundary of Spixworth.

2. Is it fair to say that the principal flood risk in Spixworth is flooding as a result of surface water run-off?

Yes, the principal flood risk in Spixworth is from surface water flooding

Response and explanation
Surface water run-off is one element of flooding that has been seen in the village and does pose the highest risk. But the village has seen flooding as a result of sewerage capacity and failure. The four pictures on page 40 and 42 are all pictures of...
the sewerage flooding caused by the pump station blockage and failure to cope with capacity.

3. Para 6.11 regarding allocation GT14 appears to suggest part of the site is not in Spixworth Parish but it appears from Plan 5 on page 24 that all of GT14 is in Spixworth. The Proposal map 1 in the Growth Triangle AAP is different to Plan 5 in the neighbourhood plan in terms of the hatched notation for GT14. Please clarify what is correct.

The proposals map in the adopted Growth Triangle Area Action Plan is correct. A small part of the allocation lies outside of the Spixworth Parish boundary. The adopted Area Action Plan can be found here: https://www.broadland.gov.uk/downloads/download/163/growth_triangle_area_action_plan

Response and explanation
Most of GT14 is located within the parish boundary of Spixworth, a small part of GT14 (the north eastern section) is located within the parish boundary of Sprowston. Please could Broadland DC reproduce Map 1 of the AAP and overlay the parish boundaries of Spixworth and Sprowston to illustrate this.

4. Is there any other Growth Triangle site allocation intentions within Spixworth Parish likely within the period of the neighbourhood plan?

At the present time there are no site allocations proposed for Spixworth in the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP). At the time of writing, site 0467, which borders Spixworth, has not been identified as being suitable for allocation i.e. it is an unreasonable alternative. Please note that the GNLP is only at the Reg.18 stage and representations from the most recent Reg.18 consultation have yet to be analysed. Therefore this position may be subject to change.

Response and explanation
No. GT14 is the only allocated site that falls within the Spixworth parish boundary of the current Growth Triangle site allocations. The allocation process under the emerging Local Plan is not finalised although there a no additional proposed sites in the Growth Triangle that are located within the Spixworth parish boundary.

Spixworth Parish Council

5. Policy 4 is ostensibly to do with biodiversity but includes in lines 3-4 a requirement for development to take opportunities for sustainable transport which is exactly the same policy message as in Policy 2 and seems not directly related to biodiversity. Is
the inclusion of this clause in Policy 4 a mistake and supposed to be removed when Policy 2 was finalised.

Response and explanation
Policy 2 is focussed on development taking the opportunity to improve the situation with public transport and sustainable transport including the integration with the existing built environment through footpaths and cycleways. Whilst similar the focus of this element of policy 4 is also different.

This part of policy 4 seeks to ensure the wildlife corridors are enhanced to enable animals to move in and around Spixworth from the countryside. As a by product this will also benefit the residents and enable them to access the open spaces around Spixworth. We have seen this work particularly well with the completion of the Broadland Northway (NDR) and the access its footpaths and cycleways now give to the countryside for the local wildlife and residents.

Neighbourhood Plan Team and Parish Council are keen to see the different elements of these policies – the promotion of sustainable transport and enhanced wildlife corridors – both taken forward and would welcome any guidance and/or clarity the Examiner can bring to either or both policies to facilitate this.

6. What is meant by the italicised section of clause 1 of Policy 10? As written the meaning and intent is not clear. Does the italicised section relate back to designing roads and parking areas to integrate into the village and the existing highway network?

Response and explanation
There is no reason for this to be ‘italicised’ and it should be changed. The policy wording is seeking to see that new estate roads are required, in their design and location, that they consider how and, if possible, connect to the village network.

This has arisen due to the concern with the site being considered for allocation in the emerging Local Plan which if brought forward is likely to see the access from the North Walsham Road and could easily isolate the possible development from the existing village. If consideration is not given to this and the proposed development is isolated then the new residents would have to use their cars to access the village facilities (such as shops, village hall, pub, etc...)

7. What is the current position with regard to the allotments south of the village hall site. They did not appear to be in use? Has the land just been set aside as part of the St Marys Court development and not yet in use?
Response and explanation
The new allotments are still in the ownership of the developer. The process of transferring to the Village Hall Trust seems to be taking an inordinate amount of time as the solicitors resolve the details of the land transfer and appropriate access requirements. There are residents ready, waiting and keen to take up their allotments. It is hoped the solicitors can complete this in the next month.

Peter Biggers – Independent Examiner March 2020
Dear Peter,

Thank you for your query.

The Broadland Parking Standards SPD has not been rescinded. Whilst the SPD is not specifically referred to within policy TS4 - parking guidelines of Broadland’s Development Management DPD, consideration is given to the SPD and also advice provided by the Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority (based on their parking standard) when considering the adequacy or appropriateness of parking provision with development. It is both the SPD and the advice provided by NCC which the BDC comment refers to.

Kind regards

Vicky

Good Afternoon Vicky

I am just looking at the design policies today and specifically policy 10 and BDC’s Reg 16 comment.

Is the Broadland Parking Standards SPD still in force even though it predates the NPPF and is that what the BDC comment is referring to when it refers to policy 10 standards being higher than apply elsewhere in the district.

Kind regards

Peter Biggers