

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE RYBURGH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

INDEPENDENT EXAMINER:

Christopher Collison BA(Hons) MBA MRTPI MIED MCMi IHBC

To North Norfolk District Council and Ryburgh Parish Council
By email to Chris Brown Project Support Officer NNDC and Patsy Adams Parish
Clerk Ryburgh Parish Council
Copy to Mike Rundle Secretary Neighbourhood Plan Working Group and Iain
Withington Planning Policy Team Leader (Acting Policy Manager) NNDC

Dated 16 July 2020

Dear All

Ryburgh Neighbourhood Development Plan Independent Examination – Examiner letter seeking clarification of matters

Further to my initial letter of 25 June 2020 I am writing to seek clarification of the following matters:

Policy 1

1. A representation states “*the roads named do not extend beyond the village confines/built environment*”. The supporting text and justification in the Neighbourhood Plan, and in the photographs in Evidence Document 4, have a focus on the public highway that is the high street of Great Ryburgh “*in the village*”. I have noted some digital maps indicate Bridge Road extends from Station Road Great Ryburgh in an easterly direction as far as the A1067, and Fakenham Road extends from Station Road Great Ryburgh in a westerly direction as far as the B1146. As a point of clarification could you please confirm whether it is intended the policy should relate to this entire length of road, or whether it is intended it should relate to the parts of the named roads that are within or immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary identified in Annex 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy 2

2. Paragraph 4.2.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan states “*It is accepted that Policy 2 cannot apply to that part of the dismantled railway passing through the Industrial Site where it is impracticable due to existing buildings.*” This is not consistent with Policy 2 and not consistent with the map at Annex 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please clarify whether it is intended Policy 2 should relate to the dismantled railway “both north and south of the Crisp Malting site, but not including that site (identified on the Map in Annex 4)”. In your response could you please explain the relationship between Policy 2 and strategic policy CT7 in respect of this issue.

3. Policy 2 includes the term “*fully incorporate green infrastructure principles*”. Please clarify where in the Neighbourhood Plan these principles are defined?

Policy 3

4. Please direct me to the existing evidence that supports the limit of up to 5 dwellings.
5. Given the settlement boundary is clearly defined, could you please explain the purpose and meaning of criterion 3.
6. Please confirm the District Council has not provided a housing target at neighbourhood area level, and the Parish Council have not requested an indicative housing requirement figure.
7. Please confirm the abbreviation HRA refers to Habitats Regulations Assessment.
8. Please explain how the final two sentences of Policy 3 relate to the policy title. Please also explain how these sentences serve a clear purpose by providing an additional level of detail or distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policies.

Policy 7, Policy 8 and Policy 10

9. Please direct me to the existing evidence that supports the **precise** boundaries of the habitat area identified on the Map in Annex 6.
10. Please direct me to the existing evidence that supports the **precise** boundaries of the open land area identified on the Map in Annex 7.
11. Please advise me where the variation between the “North of Great Ryburgh small field landscape” area identified on page 108 of Evidence Document 2, and the area in that vicinity identified on the Map in Annex 7 is explained.
12. Could you please confirm the key to the Map on page 108 of Evidence Document 2 incorrectly switches the colour coding of the Lt Ryburgh and North of Great Ryburgh small field landscape areas.

I request any response to these requests for clarification is agreed as a joint response of the Parish and District Councils wherever possible. This request for clarification and any response should be published on the District Council website.

In order to maintain the momentum of the Independent Examination I would be grateful if any reply could be sent to me by 12.00 Noon on Monday 27 July 2020.

As the Independent Examination progresses, I may seek clarification with respect to other matters. For the avoidance of doubt recommendations of modification of the

Neighbourhood Plan that may be contained in my report of Independent Examination will not be limited to those matters in respect of which I have requested clarification.

I should be grateful if the District Council and the Parish Council could acknowledge receipt of this email.

Best regards

Chris Collison
Independent Examiner
Planning and Management Ltd
collisonchris@aol.com