

Responses to JNP Informal Consultation - JNP Policies

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
General	1	Pages 13 & 14, missing	Agreed. Due to printing error	Website Documents were correct
General	1	Pages 39 & 40 missing Strategic Gaps	Agreed. Due to printing error	Website Documents were correct
General	2	A very well laid out and professional display – thank you. Sadly Heathlands Drive is going to be affected by the noise and disruption, a bit of a bleak future.	Comments noted. Assume comment is related to the timing of construction of the proposed development which already has the benefit of planning permission. The principle of development here has been established and is therefore outside of the scope of the JNP to influence.	No change to Plan
General	3	This now becomes a community on its own. Neither part of Thetford or Croxton – is that a good idea?	The principle of development has been established through the development of the Breckland Core Strategy, the Thetford Area Action Plan and through the grant of planning	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>Like Cloverfields / Abbey Farm etc. etc. history repeating itself.</p> <p>SSSI - Forestry should not be classed as SSSI. It should be classed as managed conservation like farm land !</p> <p>Has the Stone Curlew been found in the Forestry which is not its natural habitat?</p>	<p>permission 3PL/ 2011/0805/O. A key objective of the JNP is to integrate the new development with the existing settlements. Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are designated at a national level by Natural England using defined criteria relating to species and habitats and the mechanism to amend or change these lies outside of the JNP remit.</p> <p>See link to Breckland Council’s most recent HRA for more information on Stone Curlews : here</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Query noted</p>	
General	4	Thetford Town Council would be better placed to provide the above,	This is an expression of personal opinion which seems to be at odds with previous views expressed by the respondent in	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		it is an extension of Thetford	<p>respect of local involvement and accountability.</p> <p>It is a matter of fact that the SUE falls within the parishes of Croxton, Brettenham and Kilverstone and therefore Thetford Town Council has no mandate or jurisdiction.</p> <p>Rushford is a very small but important part of Brettenham Parish which the PC wishes to preserve. The PC also wishes to integrate the SUE and its residents into the existing communities of Brettenham and Kilverstone everyone can benefit from the enlarged community and new facilities.</p>	
General	4	In conclusion, build the SUE and TEP and leave the rest of the Parish alone, as a strategic gap, as we have given up enough	Comments noted	No change to Plan
General	4	As the deadline for comments fast approaches, I feel I must put down my thoughts. I have read the draft Plan and the Character Assessments and would like to formally comment. If the Neighbourhood Plan is based on the assessments, then the	The Character Appraisals (excepting Rushford) followed a structured and consistent survey methodology based on a nationally recognised template. They were undertaken by local people. They will be refined as a consequence of comments received during the informal consultation process and also during the formal consultation in Spring 2017.	Consideration is being given to re-ordering the Character Appraisal Work by Character Area

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>assessments have to be right. As you know, I and others have helped my husband, with the one for Rushford, and am really disappointed to discover most of what we wanted has been disregarded, watered down and the remainder, randomly placed amongst Croxton, Kilverstone and Brettenham - and you made us rush it, and it was incomplete- why hasn't Rushford got its own section? I feel, quite frankly, that the PC has been unhelpful, unresponsive and failed to recognise the importance of getting it right. The Plan itself keeps harking on about the "SUE" fitting in, but there's little to fit in with - from what I understand, it is going to be a whole new town and a part of Thetford and I believe therefore, Thetford Town Council would be far better placed to take it on board and look after it all, leaving the PC to concentrate on what it's supposed too. Please just</p>	<p>Some further work may be required in terms of the Rushford appraisal to make it more easily comparable to the others.</p> <p>The respondent may have misunderstood the process and made an assumption that these are the final documents which clearly they are not – they are consultation drafts</p> <p>None of the Rushford character appraisal work was used for Croxton or Kilverstone.</p> <p>It is proposed to re-order the Character Appraisal for the formal consultation and recast it with each parish/or part parish having its own section rather than the thematic delineation that has currently been used which may help to address this specific issue.</p> <p>The remainder of comments appear to be expressions of opinion in respect of the principles of the SUE development rather than matters that fall within the remit of the JNP policies</p>	

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>leave Rushford alone - put a 30mph limit from the B1066 and a width restriction on the bridge like you have been asked before, and get rid of those unsightly plastic bollards and do not put flashing signs in our village, which, as you already know, I do not want. I believe by submitting this Plan, the PC receives CIL money and I wonder just what they intend to use this money for in the future? It would be nice if you spoke to us - to me, it seems the PC will do just as they want as all they're after is the money and the power and using our name to get what you want whether I like it or not - it seems the more that is kept from us, the more you get what you want. I've been to the meetings and filled out the questionnaire and I don't get it - how can a little Parish Council think it can cope with a whole new town when it cannot encourage its own residents - it would be nice if you would speak to</p>	<p>No CIL money has been received or is anticipated</p>	

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		us.		
Preface- page 5	4	<p>One disappointing public meeting over 2 years ago</p> <p>One questionnaire 24% returned 18 months ago</p> <p>No newsletters</p> <p>No Steering Group see Rackheaths for ref.</p> <p>No Working " " Mattishalls " "</p>	<p>It's true the initial meeting attendance was disappointing but enthusiasm has now grown with 60 attending the informal consultation launch. The questionnaire return was lower than had been hoped but the PC considers represented a reasonable response and is statistically sound when using national benchmarks. The Joint PCs are the SG and the 2 chairs and vice chairs and consultant are the WG.</p> <p>The % figures quoted are not correct. This section of the plan sets out the process to date – it is not the entire process and further stages are required.</p> <p>Croxton Parish Council produces bi-monthly newsletter with updates for residents.</p> <p>Both Parish Councils have their own websites and there is also a Neighbourhood Plan website that is regularly updated.</p> <p>There is also no size fits all process for the production of JNPs and it is down to the body producing the Plan to determine the process to be followed provided it meets the statutory</p>	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
			<p>tests.</p> <p>National guidance encourages plans to be as short as reasonably practicable and there is no defined page or word limit.</p>	
Section 1- page7	4	<p>Community not involved see Locality. com for ref.</p> <p>Engagement req. to identify "anyone else"</p> <p>Document short as there is no content</p>	See comments above	No change to Plan
page 8	4	<p>Character Assessment for Rushford recognised as inadequate and fails to identify enhancements see Planning Aid for ref.</p>	<p>Character Appraisals were carried out for each parish. The Rushford Character appraisal survey work used a different template to the others and did not identify any enhancements.</p> <p>The 30 day informal consultation itself presented a further opportunity for information relating to the Character Appraisals to be provided however this was not taken up by</p>	<p>Consideration is being given to re-ordering the Character Appraisal Work by Character Area</p>

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
			<p>the local team.</p> <p>It is proposed to re-order the Character Appraisal for the formal consultation and recast it with each parish/or part parish having its own section. rather than the thematic delineation that has currently been used which may help to address this specific issue.</p>	
page 11 Fig 3-	4	<p>Is Rushford in an SSSI? the residents believe it is</p> <p>Where are pages 13 & 14</p>	<p>Fig 3 is provided by Breckland Council and shows the delineation of the nature conservation designations. The base data is provided to Breckland Council by Natural England who is the designating authority for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Therefore if parts of Rushford are not shown as falling within a SSSI then they do not fall within the SSSI and vice versa.</p> <p>See comment above in respect of missing pages</p>	<p>No change to Plan</p> <p>See above</p>
Page 15	6	If, under the Localism Act 2011, power is given to the communities	The Preferred Site options and Settlement Boundaries consultation undertaken by Breckland Council in October	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>and the community is happy with the settlement boundary, cannot the local community reject any Breckland imposed removal ?</p> <p>PD05B - Is all very well and good but the planners will simply overturn what is contained in this. They did it with the Bennett homes. I do not know if a PD05B or its equivalent was in place when planning was granted for these homes but they cross the boundaries for the proposed new rules.</p> <p>The highway aspect at the top of the hill which squeezes all traffic as it comes over the brow is something that should be addressed. Quite how you widen the road whilst providing</p>	<p>2016 includes a proposal to remove the current Settlement Boundary for Croxton. The delineation of settlement boundaries is a function of the Breckland Local Plan and not the Joint Neighbourhood Plan. The JNP will need to work within the policy framework set by the Local Plan and must be in conformity with it. The comments are best directed to Breckland Council in relation to the development of their emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>PD05B is not a term used in the JNP policies and the respondent has probably clicked on the link on page 15 which goes straight to the Breckland Local Plan consultation. The comments made here are therefore more relevant to that consultation.</p>	

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		footpaths unless a tall retaining wall is built is beyond me. At least the vehicles will be going faster when they hit the cars coming out of the Bennetts estate.....		
Living in... page 17	4	How many people reside in Brettenham Village " " " " " Shadwell " " " " are dispersed around the Parish not in settlements 195 residents reside on Arlington, in an urban environment, outweighing the rest of the residents in the rural environment	Comments noted although it is unclear what point is being made here is and how it relates to the proposed JNP policies. However it is a statement of fact to say that Brettenham Parish is made up of several distinct areas of built settlement – Brettenham village, Rushford , Shadwell and Arlington Way. Arlington Way contains the most built up area and therefore unsurprisingly the most residents. Arlington Way is not an “urban environment” although it is a recent development with no specific shops or facilities. It is a cul de sac and does not change the overarching rural nature of Brettenham Parish	No change to Plan
Page 18	7	If this is Breckland's standard of research into local employment, enterprise and business (and grammar and spelling!) - it is not too	The information on businesses in Croxton came from several sources including Breckland Council, the Parish Council and the census. However the information on Salix is extremely	Amend wording of “Working in Croxton” to

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>impressive! V odd that they state 'there is little identifiable industry or commerce within Croxton' when the nursery is so visible. Salix is such a great success and innovative story. Not to mention Goucher and Raker fields growing 4000 tonnes of spuds!</p> <p>Salix River and Wetland's head office and main nursery is based at Croxton Park and employs up to 20 people from the surrounding area and grows over 500,000 plants each year for river erosion control installation nationwide with major contracts with the Environment Agency, Natural England and river authorities. This is complimented by a separate Wild Flower Production company. Two farming companies are also based at Croxton Park, farming in Croxton itself and surrounding villages and are the second largest employer in the village with 10 employees living locally. Vegetable production from</p>	<p>useful contextual information and the “Working in Croxton” section of the revised plan will be amended accordingly</p>	<p>include proposed text. (page 18)</p>

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		Croxton (Hall Farm and Croxton Park) supplies the main 4 supermarkets and major processors. Additional staff are taken on from the locality during the harvest seasons (May to November)		
page 18	8	The Crown Estate are a major landowner and their land is now farmed as one holding with a single tenant	Agreed. The current sentence is incomplete and requires amending.	Amend “Working in Croxton” section to include the word “tenant”
Page 18	6	<u>Working in Croxton</u> – Gerald's Farm -Thousands of tonnes of produce come from Gerald's Farm in the middle of the village. Sheep and cattle are reared there. Large numbers of workers are used in various harvests which go on throughout the year. Croxton Park Ltd produces 4k tonnes of potatoes alone and many other crops as well. Incidentally I think Salix are based on the edge of	Comments noted. Changes are proposed to this section as a result of other representations received. See above.	See above

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>Croxton Park and not in Wales.</p> <p>STANTA - Myself and two others in the village were working there until we retired. I have no doubt that others from the village will work there. Sheep have to be cared for on the 30k acres of the battle area and many crops are grown around the edges of the site. It is an important contributor to the economy of the area and not just be dismissed as MOD STANTA. The village is also an important access route to STANTA - men and vehicles have to get there somehow. They are not all dropped in by parachute. Large numbers of troops need several access routes.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Consideration will be given to amending the text to best reflect the impact of STANTA.</p>	<p>Amend text to refer to wider impacts of STANTA</p>
Working...page 18	4	<p>Tesco and Thetford Garden Centre unsurprisingly LARGE number of Estate and Farming properties</p>	<p>Agreed. Amend section to make specific reference here to the garden centre Tesco's lies outside of the JNP area.</p>	<p>Amend Plan accordingly</p>
Page 19	6	<p>Some heavy vehicles will always have to come through the village be they army vehicles or artics carting</p>	<p>The purpose of this section is to identify what it is like living in Croxton today and what the specific issues are that have</p>	<p>No change to Plan</p>

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>sugar beet to Bury St Edmunds. It is easy enough to stop the "rat-runners" trying to avoid the roundabout. Put up some "Access Only" signs with a weight limit attached on the feeder roads from the A134.</p> <p>Speeding through the village. It is unnerving but one must ask for the statistics. How many crashes have there been ? Has anyone been injured ? Has anyone been killed ? Are the new people in the village, who follow you from the brow of the hill and down into Harefield road with their speed guns, just furious because they failed to recognise these problems when they bought their houses ? The solution is obvious.</p> <p>Potential bus service take up from Croxton ? Probably small.</p>	<p>been identified as being of concern. The issue of traffic has been identified through the questionnaire and by the Parish Council.</p> <p>The solutions to any perceived problems will require action by Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority and they will require specific evidence before they implement any solutions.</p>	

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
Physical...page 20	4	List all of Rushford's listed buildings	It is proposed to remove reference to the Listed buildings in Croxton from this section and to incorporate it within the relevant section of the Character appraisal. It will be replaced by a general statement about the quality of the built environment and this will be replicated for the Brettenham & Kilverstone Sections. Therefore there will be no need to specifically identify Listed buildings for Rushford in this section	Remove reference to the specific Listed Buildings and move to relevant Character Appraisal section. Replace with general statement about quality of built environment
page 21	4	Character Assessments have to be right, they are a Key Aspect of all NP Policies and influence the Plan	Comments noted. The Character Appraisals will also be revised in the light of comments received during the informal consultation.	No change to Plan
Section 3- Vision page 22	4	Your vision is flawed, it will be different, it is a new town with roads, shops, pubs, cafes, street lighting, mains services, pavements, etc., it will look similar to Arlington, which is at loggerheads with the vernacular.	The vision refers to the whole of the JNP Plan area – not just the SUE. It's specific intention is to integrate the residents of the SUE into our communities, so everyone benefits from the facilities of the SUE and gels into one community with a generally rural character	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>What is wrong with contemporary, my Daughter who is 17 does not like mock architecture.</p> <p>Phase 1 is adjacent to Admirals and is quite modern and popular</p>		
Page 23	6	<p>The gateways to the villages must be safe. Feeding increasing amounts of housing estate traffic onto The Street in Croxton where traffic speed over the hill will inevitably lead to an accident.</p> <p>Speed cameras or not people will speed into the village. It is their nature. If the vicarage site is to be developed, and Bennetts obviously think that it is, there is going to have to be some imaginative thinking about how the traffic is going to be fed onto The Street; through the Bennett's estate ? Well south of the current 30mph sign? Through Douglas Close following the purchase and demolition of one of</p>	<p>The purpose of this part of the vision is to ensure that the entrances to the villages retain their rural character.</p> <p>However It should be noted that the site lies outside of the current settlement boundary for Croxton and also that the proposal from Breckland is to remove the settlement boundary in its entirety; therefore realistically the prospects of development being acceptable in this location are very low and the JNP policy will need to be recast to reflect this.</p>	<p>No change to Plan</p> <p>Policy to be recast to remove reference to development at the Vicarage</p>

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>the bungalows?</p> <p><u>Community Facilities</u> As people get older and wear out they become obsessed with their health, with golf or with both. We are all going to need increasing levels of maintenance the older we get. This is something we must accept and we must accept that if we are not too fit we will <u>not</u> be able to walk or cycle to the Primary Care Centre. Don't let it even cross your mind that your GP will come and see you in your home on a regular basis. The Primary Care Centre will have to be large, have comprehensive facilities, have excellent communications and have lots and lots of parking. If you want try and estimate scale and size think of the Academy and how many children it serves and then think of how many people need health care and image a building of the appropriate size.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Section 106 relating to 3PL/ 2011/0805/O refers to Primary care provision which is still to be determined and will be influenced by the requirements of the Primary Care trusts/CCGs and as part of a discussion between Breckland (as LPA) and the developer.</p>	

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p><u>Transport and Highways Safety</u> Cycling to Gt Hockham might be fine on a summer's day but is it a priority on a cold day in February? Could the money be better spent ?</p>	<p>In recent years cycling has become a popular recreational activity particularly with families. Increasing opportunities for safe cycling has a number of health and well-being benefits as well as introducing people to their surrounding countryside. It is recognised that it may be seasonal however any form of modal shift will only be achieved through positive action making opportunities available.</p>	
page 23	4	<p>I have little idea of what the existing environment is like in the SUE as it is on private land. The Character Assessments must identify what is important to the residents, for me, especially along the Little Ouse valley.</p> <p>Facilities are already included in the SUE as you know. There are no pedestrian or cycle links to or from Rushford or public transport</p>	<p>The area to be developed as the SUE is currently undeveloped agricultural land. The remainder of this representation appears to be a statement in relation to the Character Appraisal.</p> <p>The SUE already has the benefit of planning permission in outline and therefore the principles of development are excluded for the remit of the JNP although it will allow the community to benefit from it and for the JNP to influence the construction where appropriate</p>	No change to Plan
page 24	4	<p>Kingsfleet must be a £1,000,000,000 project</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SUE will provide the facilities needed by the 3 Parishes</p>	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
			and 2 PCs The costs involved in the development are more likely to be in millions rather than billions.	
Section 4- Draft Policies page 25	4	Character Assessments underpin and inform most policies and are fundamental to the NP they must be right	Agreed. The Character Assessments are important which is why 5 separate local teams were established to determine the local character.	No change to Plan
JNP1- page 27 page 28	4	<p>Arlington does not conform to the vernacular and nearly half of Rushford and Brettenham are new. Good design is what's needed, not pseudo detailing</p> <p>Rushford has been evolving for the last 40 years to its present state</p> <p>How unwelcoming your comments for the new residents in Croxton</p> <p>To afford a house nowadays most couples have to work, and will go through various stages in life</p>	<p>Comments are made in respect to existing development already built and occupied and therefore outside of the scope of this plan to influence that development. However, good design is important. The policies in the JNP are aimed at producing good design and good design is that which reflects its position in the locality and respects the size, scale, massing, materials and rhythm of its surroundings – this can be achieved through subtle details.</p> <p>The concerns indicated in this section came directly from residents views through the questionnaire and refer to their concerns over future developments</p> <p>The remainder of this representation is a statement of “personal” opinion</p>	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>of land so that should the vicarage be demolished they will have access to that land.</p> <p>No doubt they will argue that as planning has already been given for access onto The Street a couple of dozen more cars will not make much more of a difference.</p> <p>They will not be there of course to assist the Paramedics.</p> <p>The question of drainage in "The Street" has to be addressed ambitiously with overcapacity to cope with future village development.</p> <p><u>Commuter /Dormitory situation</u></p> <p>The village has to increase the number of young and middle-aged people. They have no work here so by definition will have to commute to and from where there is work. They and their children will enliven and reinvigorate a community which</p>	<p>See response to comments above in relation the Vicarage.</p> <p>This has been identified as an issue by the community and requires addressing although this will need to be through negotiation with the statutory undertakers and not just through the JNP process</p> <p>Comments noted. It is not clear how the respondent expects the village to attract more middle aged or younger residents without an increase in appropriate residential provision.</p>	

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>unless things change will end up at "Croxtan Stay Active" each week before making an appointment with Mark Skinner. Encourage and embrace them.</p> <p>The Vicarage is poorly positioned on its plot and not a particularly attractive building. That plot and the land to the south and east of it would make an ideal block of land for further housing for prospective commuters if villagers were prepared to agree to an incremental urbanisation towards Thetford. I personally believe that it would encroach on the strategic gap and be the thin end of the wedge.</p>	<p>Comments noted although this statement appears to be contrary to previous comment on the Vicarage made by the same respondent.</p> <p>The JNP policies and character appraisal identify the Vicarage as a building of some merit albeit in poor repair and seek to secure its retention</p>	
Page 29 Policy JNP2 - Density	6	<p><u>Vision</u> Where on earth did anyone get the idea that Croxtan had a "tranquil character"; hooting of the trains, F15 Fighter jets, 81mm mortars - often just</p>	<p>Whilst it is appreciated that "tranquillity " is a subjective term it is a term identified by the Parish Council as being an appropriate description of Croxtan.</p>	No Change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>before first light - single rotor and twin rotor Chinook and Osprey helicopters up until midnight.</p> <p><u>Housing Density</u> Any attempt to introduce housing on the "John Prescott" density such as has been done in Stanford Road where the old ordnance field depot stood on Croxton Road should be fiercely resisted even if an attempt to justify it on the grounds of affordable housing was put forward. The attempt to do this on the "Cotters" site where two houses were applied for and then the application was suddenly changed to four is an example of too high a density. High density housing can lead to neighbourly friction and whether we like it or not each house will have a couple of cars if not more. They then park on the road and/or on the pavement - e.g. the slip road onto the Bennett estate in Croxton -</p>	<p>The aim of this density policy is in fact the reverse of the national prescriptive minimum density policy that was advocated by the previous Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing.</p> <p>During the evolution of this policy, which initially looked at a minimum or maximum density it became clear that this would be difficult to define and also to justify and that it would fail to recognise differences in historical density patterns. This plan has sought to use a character led approach and therefore the policy wording has been phrased in such a way to allow for variation in density provided they are appropriate to the locality.</p> <p>However it should also be recognised that the indicative details contained in the permission granted under 3PL/</p>	

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		obstructing service vehicles such as rubbish lorries and ambulances.	2011/0805/O will have set some overall density for the SUE.	
JNP2- page 29	4	The Arlington Estate is not integrated, it is all but gated, is a cul-de-sac and does not share the same concerns as the rest of the Parish Integration will be between the SUE and Thetford, we have nothing to share in Rushford	Comments noted. This appears to be a statement of personal opinion.	No change to Plan
JNP3- page 30 page 31	4	The Character Assessments must identify, we have much to protect in Rushford. Enhancements must be discussed fully with residents Ditto	Character Appraisals were carried out by local people, for each parish. The Rushford Character appraisal survey work used a different template to the others and did not readily identify any specific enhancements. Therefore it was difficult for residents to comment upon that aspect during this informal consultation which is disappointing. However the JNP policies and the Character Appraisals will	Consideration is being given to re-ordering the Character Appraisal Work by Character Area

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
			<p>undergo further amendments and there will be further opportunities to comment on the wording during the next formal stage of consultation in Spring 2017.</p> <p>It is proposed to re-order the Character Appraisal for the formal consultation and recast it with each parish/or part parish having its own section rather than the thematic delineation that has currently been used which may help to address this specific issue.</p>	
JNP4 page 32	4	<p>Character Assessments vital for Rushford</p> <p>SUE stands for sustainable urban extension it is an extension of Thetford</p>	<p>See comments above in relation to Character Appraisal for Rushford.</p> <p>The remainder of this response is a statement of personal opinion, fact or matters that are not within the remit of this JNP</p>	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		<p>There is no affordable housing on Arlington Engagement should start now, Pidgeon could have more on its web-site</p>		
Page 32 - JNP 4	6	<p>Mixed integrated housing might be an ideal but when are the brown rice and sandals social engineers going to realise that someone who has a crippling mortgage on a five bedroom house does not want to have a row of one bedroom flatlets on the opposite side of the road. Clustering similar housing and social groups together with graduated integration with other groupings rather than planting an apple tree in the middle of a Leylandii hedge works. It is not PC to express these views but they arise from contacts with stressed patients who were at their wits end because of difficulties with incompatible neighbours. Integration and cohesion can occur but it cannot occur abruptly where</p>	<p>Comments noted however the personal characteristics and behaviours of potential future occupiers of the SUE is not a matter for the JNP</p>	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		differences, for whatever reason, are divisively large. It has to be very sensitively done.		
page 33	4	The SUE is urban sprawl, no communities are lost, Kilverstone Estate are owners of the land being developed, and concrete jungle is applicable to inner city developments	Comments noted	No change to Plan
JNP5 page 34	4	The Character Assessments are inadequate to underpin and justify this Policy and your statements	The Character Appraisals (excepting Rushford) followed a structured and consistent survey methodology based on a nationally recognised template . They were undertaken by local people. They will be refined as a consequence of comments received during the informal consultation process and also during the formal consultation in Spring 2017.	Further refinement of Character Appraisal will be undertaken
Page35	8	The village is already part of the cycle link between Croxton and Thetford under the TAAP (route 30 plus part of route 13)	Agreed. Although there may be opportunities to enhance this route	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
Page 35 - JNP 6.	6	<p>Let's be sensible about it and have paths and cycle ways which are commensurate with the needs in the community and which the community can afford. I am of average fitness for my age but I probably walk for no more than an hour and a half if I wander off into the forest. "Proposals that include measures to enable improved levels of walking and cycling by residents etc " but will the majority of retired residents who do not already walk and cycle, perhaps because that have a bit of arthritis, asthma or whatever come out in their droves to hit a two hour target because the planning gauleiter says it is good for them?</p> <p>Back to the "rat-run" - solar powered mph displays and "Access Only" signs. If you can't stand the residual essential traffic that remains - Move</p>	<p>Comments noted. See earlier comments in the vision section in relation to cycling which addressed this point. It should be noted that increasing the opportunities for walking and cycling is a key objective of national planning policy guidance.</p> <p>Comments appear to be a statement of personal opinion.</p>	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
		! If you don't like the traffic going to Tesco - Starve !	See above.	
JNP6 page 35	4	I would like more information on footpaths and cycle networks I do not like the term "rat run" for people going about their daily business Rushford had the bridge when I bought my house A11 dualling has made a difference to traffic flows, could you please release the survey data What about links for Rushford	The existing cycle routes can be found on the Sustrans website here . Comments are a statement of personal opinion or preference Not sure what traffic data is referred to – Highways England or localised village survey? No specific new cycle routes have been suggested. Perhaps a more specific route could be suggested through the formal consultation in Spring 2017	No change to Plan
JNP7 page 36	4	Where are the existing facilities CIL - zero rated?	Existing facilities are identified in the introductory chapters of this plan. They are however limited as the plan indicates. See comment on page 5 reference CIL question.	No change to Plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
Policy JNP 7 Page 36	9	Phase 1 - Medical provision not seen !	The SUE currently only has outline permission with several matters “reserved” for determination by future applications. No construction can be started on site until this happens	No Change to Plan
Page 37 - JNP7	6	<p>This page has its priorities wrong. If you don't maintain your car and put petrol in it you are not going to go any where. Maintenance and petrol are your priorities.</p> <p>If you are unwell either physically or mentally you are in a similar position. Health comes first. No "ifs" no "buts", health comes first.</p> <p>It justifies its own bullet point at the top of the page not in a bracketed afterthought along with a "Place of Worship" in one of the two proposed community centres or just above a "Strategic Open Space"</p> <p>Unless Health is prioritised as first in the list you may as well forget the whole of this JNP.</p>	The bullet points follow the same order as the Section 106 which is the mechanism for delivering new facilities. Health facilities are featured in the first bullet point. This could be amended to put a more explicit reference to health facilities first.	Amend list to put health facilities as the first bullet point.

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
Pages 39 and 40	4	Where are pages 39 and 40??	Refer to first comment on list	Action as first comment on list
JNP13 page 45	4	Character Assessments, as previously stated, inadequate to underpin and justify this Policy, Rushford residents had no opportunity to contribute to it	<p>The respondent appears to have misunderstood the longer term process.</p> <p>The Character Appraisals were undertaken by local people. The Rushford Appraisal used a slightly different format to the others but does contain personal input from a number of residents. Clearly purely from a management perspective not everyone in the village can undertake the survey work as it would become unwieldy however the purpose of the informal consultation on the Character Appraisal was specifically to enable local people to comment upon it and contribute to it.</p> <p>Rushford residents had the same opportunity as the remainder of the residents in the JNP area to partake/comment on the character appraisal work during the informal consultation period. .</p> <p>There will be further opportunities during the formal stages in Spring 2017.</p>	No change to plan

Responses to Informal Consultation on Joint Neighbourhood Plan – October –November 2016

Page Number/Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
JNP14 page 47	4	Rushford, again, had no opportunity to influence this policy	See comments above in relation to process. The purpose of the informal consultation is to enable input from local people.	No Change to Plan
Section 5 page 48	4	Input and involvement from Community has been suppressed Who exactly will be involved What exactly is to be changed Where is the implementation plan Who will provide leadership How can you monitor, you have no Clerk or Planning Dept.	Comments are an expression of personal opinion. The Implementation Plan will be produced once there is greater certainty around what the specific policies in the plan will say and how they will be monitored. This is an iterative process. Breckland Council will also be responsible for monitoring the plan and have specifically responded to confirm that	No Change to Plan