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1. Introduction and purpose of this document

This Consultation Statement supports the North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan providing a comprehensive record of community planning consultation in both parishes since 2010. In 2010 the idea of large scale development in both parishes began to be strongly promoted by the Borough of King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (BCKLWN) as this formed a key aspect of their then developing LDF Core Strategy.

In July 2010 the Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk (BCKLWN), in association with Zurich Assurance Ltd, (a significant landowner in the parishes), invited representatives from both Parish Councils to a workshop to ‘Explore sustainable growth within West Winch and North Runcton’. The workshop was facilitated by the Princes Foundation and supporting consultants. In late 2011 BCKLWN adopted their Core Strategy – confirming their desire for extensive development in the parishes.

In 2012 the Parish Councils decided to develop a Neighbourhood Plan together in order to exert some influence on the proposed development. BCKLWN formally agreed the designation of the Neighbourhood Plan area in March 2013.

Therefore although commencement of the Neighbourhood Plan process was officially agreed with the planning authority in 2013, a great deal of relevant consultation had been ongoing since the planning workshops in July 2010. This has included exhibitions and meetings organised by BCKLWN as part of their ongoing LDF process, exhibitions and meetings organised by respective developers to promote their own sites and plans, and a range of exhibitions, meetings and information gathering by both Parish Councils.

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (SG) has been instrumental in bringing divergent stakeholders together identifying the ideas and concerns of particular local interest groups – including landowners, local businesses, community groups, schools, neighbouring parishes and individual residents. In September 2012 the SG appointed The Princes Foundation to assist the parishes with planning and consultation expertise - and this assistance continued until March 2013.

In 2013 the SG enlisted the support of Locality and gained funding assistance and a Planning Aid advisor –They also commissioned drainage experts to advise on sustainable urban drainage and produce a Surface Water Management Plan for the area.

Most importantly, the SG has organised a range of consultation events and processes to gain input from residents within the parishes and to ensure that interested residents have consistently had the opportunity to comment on the draft plans and policies being produced by all stakeholders. Particularly important has been explaining the relevant processes to residents ensuring that they have been clear about the different organisations involved.

The following information provides a record of community engagement, community responses and consideration of those responses that have lead to the aims, objectives and policies now incorporated in the Neighbourhood Plan.
2. Summary of key consultation events

The following pages summarise the key events and meetings held to discuss plans for development within the parishes since 2010. Information for these events has been disseminated and gathered in a variety of ways.

Both Parish Councils have websites and noticeboards and events have been advertised using these facilities along with advertising in the relevant Parish magazines, through the school and leaflet drops to every house.

West Winch PC have maintained website updates since 2010, and North Runcton PC launched their own website in 2012. These have been regularly updated with relevant information and news including reference to Borough Council meetings and the Hopkins planning application for a proposed 1,110 new houses (submitted November 2013).

Although the substantial development proposed in the parishes has been a key consideration for residents – it has been important to consider and promote all the opportunities the Neighbourhood Plan process might assist. The Steering Group has strived to ascertain what residents like and dislike about the parishes today and to identify what long-term improvements might be made through planning processes.

To ensure that all residents were given the opportunity to input into the process a questionnaire was delivered to all households in both parishes in June 2012. Additional posters and leaflets were placed at key public noticeboards and centres, and West Winch school was give leaflets so that each child could take one home. Although time consuming, a network of volunteers has been established and similar publicity has been organised for subsequent events.

Other consultation for residents and non-residents has included workshops, focus groups and interviews with representatives from stakeholder organisations. These have included telephone, letter and email exchanges and invitations to various meetings.

July 2010

The Borough Council invited representatives from both Parish Councils, Zurich Assurance Ltd, other local landowners and their consultants (including Alan Baxter and Associates, Januaries, and Maddox & Associates) and representatives from the Internal Drainage Boards, Norfolk County Council and the Norfolk Wildlife Trust, to a workshop in West Winch facilitated by the Prince’s Foundation. Approximately 40 local people attended the full day workshop.
The workshop was entitled “Exploring Sustainable Growth” – looking at the future of West Winch and North Runcton in relation to the growth of King’s Lynn. Site visits were held at strategic points around the two villages, presentations made regarding Heritage, Historic Growth, Movement, Environment/Landscape, Economy and Social. Discussion groups identified themes relating to Nature, Movement/Settlement Structure, Economy and Social and 5 areas were identified as most important by the Stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The provision of affordable housing and lower cost/shared equity housing, that is designed and integrated in harmony with all other development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Reducing the volume of through traffic from the existing A10, currently passing through and dividing West Winch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The adequacy, quality and diversity of locally provided education services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Through careful masterplanning of all new areas and re-consideration of existing developed areas, create a more 'pedestrian-friendly' village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>The design of buildings and streetscapes to follow local vernacular and be in harmony with it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**January 2011**

West Winch and North Runcton Parish Council representatives attended a ‘re-cap session’ facilitated by Princes Foundation where principle findings from the workshops the previous June were discussed. These included concerns raised by the community regarding traffic on the A10, local drainage issues and need for landowner coordination. This was further discussed at publicised Parish Council meetings.

**June 2011**

West Winch Parish Council met representatives from Zurich Assurance Ltd (ZAL), who own a large area of land West Winch including land near the centre of the village. They explained how they proposed to put in plans for housing purposes and then sell on. At this time North Runcton Parish Council became aware that a developer/builder...
(Hopkins Homes) had an option to purchase a large swathe of land adjacent the A47 in their Hardwick ward.

**October 2011**
In September 2011 BCKLWN published their draft ‘Site Specific Allocations & Policies Development Plan - Issues and Options’ document and commenced community consultation – including exhibitions in both parishes. This included diagrammatic plans of the area showing proposed boundary of ‘growth area’ and supporting text suggesting up to 6000 dwellings might eventually be possible. This was the first time many residents had seen such plans. Although the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group had still not been formed both parish councils worked together to ensure residents were consulted. The parish councils asked the Borough Council to arrange an exhibition in West Winch and we leaflet dropped all residents in both villages inviting them along. (See Appendix D invitation leaflet). Approximately 300 residents attended this event and gave valuable feedback to both the Borough Council and also representatives from the two parish councils.

**November 2011**
Both Parish Councils submit long responses to BCKLWN in relation to the draft Site Allocations Plan. The BCKLWN receive detailed representations from ZAL and Hopkins Homes indicating draft plans for development within their landholdings. The Princes Foundation advised West Winch Parish Council (WWPC) of the new opportunity to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan (NP). WWPC approach North Runcton PC (NRPC) to ask whether it would consider preparation of a joint NP.

**January 2012**
North Runcton Parish Council (NRPC) set up a working group to assess the requirements for undertaking an NP –Princes Foundation advise they will not be able to assist until later in year when new funding is available (although they have already obtained some funding to assist WWPC). Other organisations (eg CPRE / RTPI only offering advice – but not funding.

**February 2012**
West Winch Parish Council invite the Prince’s Foundation to coordinate 3 days of community planning workshops – inviting NRPC councillors, residents and other stakeholders. (Appendix E leaflet given to all households.)

Day 1. Residents attended a presentation by the Prince’s Foundation followed by open discussion where residents were asked for their aspirations and concerns about the proposed housing. Residents were encouraged to take part in exercises including showing on maps the places they liked/disliked, places of character expressing the community’s views and their aspirations for future development.
Day 2, the Prince’s Foundation consulted with representatives from both Parish Council’s, local landowners, developers, borough and county council staff, key service deliverers and key community members. Stakeholders were briefed on the planning background, major constraints, transport and highways issues and the key points arising from the public session the previous evening.
Groups focused on: Transport, Character, Community Facilities and Landscape, mapping current issues and potential future interventions.
Day 3, the Prince’s Foundation worked on summarising the outputs of the previous day and prepared for a final presentation back to the community.

During the evening of the 15th February West Winch PC held a large public meeting at the William Burt Centre attended by over a hundred local residents from both parishes where the Prince’s Foundation reported back to the community on the findings from the workshop followed by a question and answer session for residents. The workshop was written up and a booklet produced which has been extensively used as a foundation for the neighbourhood plan.

On Saturday 18th February North Runcton Parish Council hold an ‘Information Day’ at the Village Meeting Place to ensure that North Runcton Parish residents were fully informed about the development proposals and also to gather information about other concerns / preferences regarding the parish.

**March 2012**

Turley Associates on behalf of Hopkins Homes attended both Parish Council meetings presenting their plans for land adjacent the A47.

**April 2012**

April 19th – NRPC hold first NP working party meeting (with five councillors and four residents) to discuss evidence gathering. On April 30th Councillors from WWPC and NRPC met and agreed to establish a joint parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (SG) (Since April 2012 there have been more than 20 SG meetings to coordinate evidence gathering and develop the draft NP). The work of the SG and general progress on the NP has subsequently been reported at all public Parish Council meetings.

**May 2012**

Turley Associates who represented Hopkins Homes held two public exhibitions for all residents. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group members were in attendance to listen to residents views throughout the two events.

West Winch Parish Council received a letter from the Parish Church of St Mary’s West Winch with Setchey following a representative attending the Community Planning Workshop led by the Prince’s Foundation. Information about the Church was given,
along with information about the A10 and increasingly heave traffic dividing the village and isolating the church from the community it serves. Rising damp and 40 ton juggernauts were causing structural problems and the Church believed any future development in the area of the church must make provision to ensure the building fabric is not aggravated. Concerns was also expressed about the proximity of the church and hall to the A10 and additional development could result in a heavily increased traffic flow and additional surface water problems. These concerns have been addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan Transport Policies by way of requiring traffic calming measures around the centre of the village and a relief road which should take away some of the heavy goods vehicles from the church area.

**April-July 2012**
NRPC and WWPC working parties prepared ‘snapshot surveys’ of background information on both parishes (including social, economic, environmental and transport matters). SG developed a draft questionnaire for residents. A pilot questionnaire was sent out to several residents to ‘test’ the questions. Liaison with Hopkins Homes, BCKLWN and ZAL representatives.

**July 2012**
Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group travelled to view various Hopkins Home development sites with representatives from Hopkins Homes. They also spoke with residents.

**August 2012**
West Winch Landowners held a public exhibition for all residents and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group attended to listen to the views of both the landowners and residents.

**September 2012**
A questionnaire produced by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group was delivered to all households. See [Appendix F](#) for a copy of the questionnaire. 180 questionnaires were returned and analysed by the Group and the results were published on both websites. See [Appendix G](#) for a copy of the questionnaire results (finalised after analysis in Dec 2012). Residents’ comments were extremely helpful and a large number of the points they raised influenced the draft policies of the neighbourhood plan.

BCKLWN advise that they require a formal application to undertake an NP. (This submitted in October 2012 and acceptance confirmed in March 2013). Princes Foundation confirm they have funding to continue assistance until March 2013 and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Parish Councils. Hopkins and ZAL share information gathered from their own recent community consultation work.

**October 2012**
As the Steering Group started to put together the Neighbourhood Plan a number of residents worked with the Group on various aspects of the Plan. A Memorandum of Agreement is signed between the Parish Councils to work together on the NP. Meetings held with PF representatives to plan upcoming planning workshops.

**November 2012**
The Prince’s Trust and Steering Group members facilitated four separate Focus Group consultation meetings:
1. **Local Organisations/Community Groups** – Representatives from 3 churches, West Winch primary school, North Runcton Tennis Club, North Runcton Cricket Club, local Scouts and guides, an Art Club, both Parish Councils, a Borough Councillor, Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group representatives and the Prince’s Trust discussed what the Plan involved and the importance of community groups and organisations in a successful community. The main threads being:
   a) How are you doing at present
   b) What would help you succeed
   c) What effect do you expect from proposed development?

Comments raised at this meeting were fed back into the NP Steering Group meetings and used during policy making. In conclusion, many of the groups were doing well and seemed positive about the opportunities that may come from new development. Some concerns for the school if no new school was built in a timely development, various concerns about transport and access which had been addressed in the Transport policies, especially road safety on the A10 in the middle of West Winch, importance that new development was co-ordinated to benefit the majority, many aspects of the community were strong, the groups reflect civic strength and heart.

2. **Local Businesses** – Representatives from local businesses met with members of both Parish Councils, Borough Councillor, Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group representatives, local residents, Borough Council LDF Manager and the Prince’s Foundation and discussed what local business needs from and can contribute to, a successful community. The main threads were similar to the Local Organisations/Community Groups meeting. Comments raised at this meeting were also fed back into the NP Steering Group meetings and used during policy making. In conclusion, the economic climate had been tough but businesses were surviving and may benefit from new development, resignation that economic issues are out of local businesses hands, small business units or live/work units may be beneficial and certain types of employment should be located close to where people live, mixed use development, good access and movement alternatives could facilitate good work/life balance.

   A consultation meeting with representatives from BCKLWN, NCC, Environment Agency, the local IDBs, ZAL and Hopkins and consultants. Presentation by Tom Upson (drainage engineer) on behalf of PF on identified issues and constraints within the parishes, SuDS good practice from elsewhere and opportunities and constraints at the site. Input from all organisations. It was proposed that developing a surface water management plan for the entire area might be an appropriate way forward and could help shape sustainable planning in the locality. IDB engineer suggests he could undertake such a study having done something similar in Bedfordshire. Some local residents and landowners were also present.

4. **Transport And Access Technical Group.**
   A meeting with transport planning representatives for relevant organisations as above and also including Highways Agency. Presentation by Andy Cameron (transport planner) on behalf of PF. Principal issues discussed included how to design/build an acceptable ‘relief road’, how to reduce traffic on the A10 and improve junctions, crossings and the residential environment. How to plan and implement pedestrian and cycle routes. Phasing and delivery of new road infrastructure. Agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan team cannot plan roads – but that road planning is central to a successful outcome to the proposed development that BCKLWN are promoting. Agreed that relevant road planning
bodies must meet again to discuss how transport infrastructure can be planned and delivered.

**December 2012**
The PF and SG facilitate a Transport & Access Group meeting (12/12/2012) with Hopkins Homes and Norfolk County Council and put forward the views of local residents as gathered from consultation. Conclusions from the meeting were:

1. There is almost certainly no prospect of an A47 to A149 link being delivered
2. A strategy to improve the Hardwick Interchange and a decision about how and where new development gains access to the A47 are needed
3. The “big by-pass” is not financially viable.
4. A Link Road would be needed between the A10 and A47.
5. A framework and key principles for a Link Road are required
6. A significant short-term project to improve the A10 may be possible
7. What the Site Specific Allocations DPD and Neighbourhood Plan should contain in relation to transport proposals is becoming a little clearer.

**17/12/2012** The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Chairman attended a SuDS Planning Meeting with Princes Foundation, BCKLWN, and NCC. Agreed that developing a conceptual Surface Water Management Plan for the area would be beneficial – but nobody has resources to do it. NCC explained problems with taking the lead as government haven’t confirmed whether SuDS Approval Bodies (SABs) will be implemented.

A further draft of the NP was written to take into account all the issues raised by the specialist groups.

**January 2013**
Representatives from the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group met with representatives from those contracting for Primary Care to discuss health issues should large-scale housing development go ahead in the two parishes. These representatives were interim representatives as the Health Service was reorganised in April 2013.

Liaison continued between the SG, BCKLWN, and ZAL and Turley representatives.

**11/01/2013** SG representatives consulted with the Head of Middleton Primary School. Issues raised were lack of child day care, road safety and a changing population with attendant difficulty in predicting numbers

**February 2013**
A second Transport and Access Group consultation meeting was held with representatives of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and representatives from both main landowners, Norfolk County Council and the Borough Council. Discussions took place on the A10 improvements required for increased housing. This addressed residents concerns from previous consultations and completed questionnaires. Also we were able to explore how to address transport and village centre problems with policy.

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group consulted with with Henry Bellingham MP to talk about the Neighbourhood Plan and concerns regarding the number of houses
proposed by the Borough Council and the traffic problems already in existence. Also to ask for information on government funding assistance.

A SuDS meeting was held at the Borough Council offices where Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group representatives consulted with Borough Council, Environment Agency, Prince’s Foundation, Anglian Water and representatives from the 2 major land owners. This addressed residents concerns from previous consultations and completed questionnaires. Also we explored whether it was possible to address drainage issues with policy. The idea of commissioning a separate drainage study to explore the subject in more detail was discussed.

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group consulted with representatives from the Prince’s Foundation, representatives from BCKLWN and NCC and the 2 major landowners to further discuss Transport and Access issues. The meeting covered the A10 issues, and improvements to and around it and how this could be addressed in the neighbourhood plan.

March 2013
A further Transport and Access Group consultation meeting was held with representatives from the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, the Prince’s Foundation and representatives from Developers. The relief road connections with NCC and the Highways Agency was discussed and also potential short-term enhancements to the A10 with sketch plans for central West Winch being considered.

It was announced that there was no more funding for the Prince’s Foundation to assist the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group beyond March. Government yet to announce new funding strategy for NP groups. Landowners and Borough Council were still pressing ahead with the housing allocations but the Steering Group now without professional assistance.

May 2013
The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group consulted with Alan Gomm LDF manager from the Borough Council regarding the Neighbourhood Plan, as the Draft Policies were about to go out to consultation with residents.

June 2013
The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held a public exhibition in both village halls encouraging residents to comment on the Draft Policies which the Group had written for the Neighbourhood Plan.

The exhibitions were well attended and many residents took time to comment on the draft policies with many positive comments and constructive suggestions. (Appendix H exhibition posters. Appendix I invitation leaflet sent to all households in the two parishes). Residents completed a comments page with comments/likes/dislikes and these were collated into the different Policy headings. A lot of work went into analysing our resident’s comments and we amended policies as a result. Copies of the analysis are shown at Appendix J – O with details of how we have responded to residents’ comment.
August 2013
BCKLWN undertake public consultation on their Preferred Site Allocation Plan. Bidwells, representing Zurich, were also in attendance. NP steering group members were in attendance to listen to residents’ views and clarify that this was a borough council consultation.

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group liaise with BCKLWN, ZAL (Maddox Associates) and Hopkins (Turley Associates) regarding the draft NP.

The Steering Group met with representatives from Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Norfolk County Council (Green Infrastructure officer) to discuss the green infrastructure and nature conservation requirements in the Neighbourhood Plan. Environment policies further developed.


September 2013
Grant award from Community Development Foundation through Locality confirmed. Planning Aid advisor appointed to assist SG.

A meeting with the Chair and Vice Chair and David Thomas from the Internal Drainage Board to agree terms of reference for a Drainage Study which the IDB would produce. The cost to be shared between the Steering Group, BCKLWN and IDBs. The drainage study will underpin the relevant neighbourhood policies.

October 2013
The two parish Council Chairs and Chair and Vice Chair of the Steering Group consulted with representatives from the Borough Council and the two main landowners to discuss their own Plans and the Neighbourhood Plan to attempt to avoid serious conflict between the plans.

October 2013
The Steering Group met with Rachel Hogger, Planning Aid advisor who will help complete the Neighbourhood Plan process. She talked through the help and support Planning Aid and Locality could provide the Group.
November 2013
Hopkins Homes submit outline planning application for 1100 dwellings, primary school, local centre and associated infrastructure.

December 2013
The SG attend exhibitions for residents arranged by Hopkins Homes – and encourage residents to attend with website information and leaflets. Parish Councils submit letters of objection.

January 2014
SG reps, two Borough Councillors and Rachel Hogger (Planning Aid) met with the Borough Council, Norfolk County Council representatives from Hopkins Homes to discuss their planning application in light of the draft neighbourhood plan. BCKLWN announce they intend to use ATLAS to assist them in developing site master plan. Also intend to commence strategic traffic study with NCC and Highways Agency.

February 2014
The Steering Group Chairman met with representatives of the Internal Drainage Board to discuss the Drainage Study

February 2014
The Steering Group Chair and Vice Chair, Rachel Hogger (Planning Aid) and Borough Councillor June Leamon met with the Borough Council to discuss the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Feedback received from developers and Landowners on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Turley Associates praised the Parishes in their work they have done to get the document into the form they have and considered the structure of the document to be exceptional with the vision and objectives clear and supported. Their views were noted and some amendments made to the plan, including: They did not envisage the Neighbourhood Plan having a detailed masterplan but felt this should be part of the Site Allocations document. The Neighbourhood Plan policies should have regard to national planning policy, particularly paragraph 17 of the NPPF, the villages could be separated by protected farmland/green space, concerns about contribution to the maintenance of recreation facilities, concerns over drainage solutions, density levels being set, suggestions that some aspirations should be desirable rather than justified – GP surgery, community facilities, contributions over and above CIL or S106 is not justified as a prescriptive requirement, cost of delivering road improvements and the parallel route. These comments were taken into account when Policy amendments were discussed and made.

March 2014
The Borough Council’s LDF Team submitted their response following the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Groups request for comments on compliance with the basic conditions and advice on SEA. They requested copies of plans referred to in the document. They noted issues: policy rewording required, evidence of the need for certain requirements, demonstration of the compatibility of certain requirements with the scale and nature of the development proposed in the local plan, critical review of policies and requirement s in the light of the Government’s emphases on housing deliverability and red tape reduction, contributions to sustainable development, general compliance with strategic policies of the Local Plan, special regard to listed buildings, compatibility with EU obligations, strategic environmental assessment,
habitats (appropriate) assessment. These comments were taken into account when Policy amendments were discussed and changed.

The Chair and Vice Chair of the Steering Group with our two Borough Councillors consulted with the Borough Council and landowner representatives to discuss the A10 and West Winch village centre in order to ensure that the neighbourhood plan policies reflected the desires of local residents for a safer and more accessible village centre.

The Vice Chair and Clerk of West Winch Parish Council consulted with a business owner in the village to discuss the road improvements to West Winch village centre.

SG liaise with IDBs to confirm final surface water management plan.

**April 2014**
Surface Water Management Strategy – prepared by the *Middle Level Commissioners for the East of Ouse, Polver and Nar Internal Drainage Board* on behalf of the SG is circulated to relevant stakeholders including BCKLWN, NCC and consultants for ZAL and Hopkins.

Representatives from the Steering Group, Parish Councils of Middleton, West Winch and North Runcton consulted with the Borough Council and Norfolk County Council to discuss possible improvements to the A10, Hardwick roundabout and the A47. This was linked to the study by the Highways Agency/ Norfolk County Council “A47 Hardwick Interchange King’s Lynn Brief to devise a Strategy for improving the interchange to accommodate the levels of planned growth”

**June 2014**
Rachel Hogger and Planning Aid advisors submit comments on revised NP document. Revised document submitted to BCKLWN for comment.

**October 2014**
Steering Group representatives met with the Borough Council to discuss the latest Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and to ensure the technical and legal formalities were met.

Representatives from the Steering Group, Parish Councils of Middleton, West Winch and North Runcton consulted with the Borough Council and Norfolk County Council to discuss progress with the study by the Highways Agency/ Norfolk County Council “A47 Hardwick Interchange King’s Lynn Brief to devise a Strategy for improving the interchange to accommodate the levels of planned growth”

Updated and revised NP with plans submitted to Rachel Hogger for comment. Revised document circulated to all Parish Councillors for further review and comment. Document submitted to BCKLWN to assist in preparing submission to ‘Health check’ examiner.

Throughout the period the various consultations and progress of the plans have been reported at monthly public Parish Council meetings.
November 2014.
A draft Neighbourhood Plan was finalised and circulated to key stakeholders including Borough and Parish Councillors, the BCKLWN LDF team, planning consultants for Hopkins Homes and Zurich Land and our RTPI planning aid advisor. The document (including plans, a draft consultation document and other appendices) was uploaded to the Parish Council website and residents were informed that the document was available for view. Comments were received – notably from BCKLWN, the developers and parish councillors. The documents and all supporting appendices were submitted for NPIERS for a ‘healthcheck examination’.

January 2015.
Andrew Ashcroft (Herefordshire Unitary Authority) was appointed to undertake the healthcheck examination and spent a day in the parishes on 7th January. He undertook a conducted tour of the area and in a 3 hour meeting discussed requirements for the Neighbourhood Plan with representatives from the BCKLWN LDF team and the NP team. He subsequently submitted a healthcheck report noting the complexity of this particular Neighbourhood Plan and outlining goals to assist in finalising it. He recommended that BCKLWN officers assisted in finalising some policy text and officers agreed to provide this assistance.

February 2015.
BCKLWN published their Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (the SADMP ‘pre-submission’ document) for consultation in January – with a deadline for comments by 23rd February. West Winch and North Runcton Parish Councils leafleted all residents to stress the importance of commenting on this document. On Saturday 7th Feb a public meeting was held at North Runcton Village Meeting Place to explain the key aspects of the SADMP and its relevance in relation to the Core Strategy and the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Approximately 40 residents attended. Information was also made available on the parish websites and in the parish newsletter.

Planned further consultation.
Any changes as result of the pre examination health check will be made before finalising the document for the 6 week formal consultation period.
During the 6 week consultation period the group intends to consult as per Pre Submission Consultation and Publicity Regulation 14.
## CS Appendix A: Chronological list of consultation events and functions held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event / Function</th>
<th>What happened</th>
<th>PC (parish council / councillors)</th>
<th>NP Steering Group NPSG</th>
<th>Prince's Foundation (PF)</th>
<th>Locality Residents</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Stakeholders - eg utilities, ID</th>
<th>Landowners</th>
<th>Professionals - eg BC Planners, CC Highways</th>
<th>Other information</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00/10/10</td>
<td>Workshop - exploring sustainable growth</td>
<td>workshop with PC/stake holders</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/07/11</td>
<td>(Core Strategy adopted by Borough Council)</td>
<td>Council - most people unaware what this involves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/09/11</td>
<td>Site Specific Assessments &amp; Policies Development Plan Document - Issues and Options Consultation issued by Borough Council to Parishioners</td>
<td>Document talks of South East King's Lynn - WW &amp; NR: Questions asked within document so residents can comment/reply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/09/11</td>
<td>Both WW &amp; NR Parish Councils sent out leaflet with maps and facts to residents asking for feedback re above document.</td>
<td>Contact details requested so residents can be invited to any future Development meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/11</td>
<td>Oct 11 - Public Event</td>
<td>Drop in event 3.30-8pm for residents of WW &amp; NR</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/02/12</td>
<td>Evening Event for all residents</td>
<td>Led by PF, residents given information about NPlan and asked their views</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PF = Prince's Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/02/12</td>
<td>Full day Workshop</td>
<td>Led by PF, groups worked on various issues - Transport, Community.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/02/12</td>
<td>Full day session preparing Plan</td>
<td>Led by PF with some PC present</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-5 PF working on ideas given to them from Day session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/02/12</td>
<td>Evening Event for all residents</td>
<td>Led by PF, residents updated on Workshop</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/04/12</td>
<td>Norwich Neighbourhood Plan Group Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting no 1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/04/12</td>
<td>Joint NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Meeting - Meeting no 1</td>
<td>Initial thoughts on building of new homes within parish boundaries</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Mortish, Clive Williams, Douglas Eakins, June Leamom, Michele Summers, Paul Burt, Graham Dell, Paul Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/05/12</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Group Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting no 2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/05/12</td>
<td>Turley Associates/Hopkins Homes</td>
<td>Public Exhibition for all residents</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/05/12</td>
<td>Turley Associates/Hopkins Homes</td>
<td>Public Exhibition for all residents</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/06/12</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Gp</td>
<td>Meeting no 1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/06/12</td>
<td>NR Neighbourhood Plan Group Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting no 2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/12</td>
<td>NR Neighbourhood Plan Group Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting no 3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/12</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group</td>
<td>Meeting no 2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/07/12</td>
<td>Letter to BCKLWN re Preparation of NP for WW &amp; NR</td>
<td>Formally registering intention to develop a NP for both parishes</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/07/12</td>
<td>Tour of Hopkins Homes Norfolk sites</td>
<td>MPs &amp; members went around other Hopkins sites</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/12</td>
<td>West Winch Landowners Group Public Exhibition for all residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/08/12</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/08/12</td>
<td>Community Questionnaire issued to all households for completion &amp; return</td>
<td>all households invited to complete a copy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/12</td>
<td>NR Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/09/12</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement signed re NP joint working</td>
<td>Prepared by both PCs and signed by both PC Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/09/12</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding signed</td>
<td>Prepared by PF and both PCs and signed by both PC Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/12</td>
<td>Community Questionnaire Results analysed</td>
<td>NP Steering Group analysed results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/12</td>
<td>Letter to WW residents who had shown interest - asking them for help</td>
<td>Ian Wilson and Naomi Pearce agreed to help Michele Summers with work on the NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/11/12</td>
<td>Focus Group meetings 1. Local Organisations, 2. Local Businesses</td>
<td>1 = Community Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/11/12</td>
<td>Focus Group meetings 3. Landowners/stakeholders, 4. Transport professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/12</td>
<td>Transport &amp; Access Group 1st Meeting</td>
<td>Hopkins, NCC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Health Meeting</td>
<td>Vice Chairman attended with some of NP Steering Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Giuseppe Warinner of Turkey</td>
<td>Chairman attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Clare Bunton, Head of Middleton Primary School</td>
<td>Chairman and Vice Chairman attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/01/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting No 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/13</td>
<td>Transport &amp; Access Group Update on site</td>
<td>Atkins, Alan Baxter &amp; Assoc, Urban Engineering Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/02/13</td>
<td>Briefing Meeting with Henry Bellingham, MP  6.30-7.30pm</td>
<td>Briefed Henry Bellingham, MP, about our Neighbourhood Plan to date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/02/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting No 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/02/13</td>
<td>SUDDS Planning Meeting</td>
<td>Borough Council offices</td>
<td>PF, Environment Agency, Anglian Water, Clare Coats, Graeme Warriner (Turley Associates/Hopkins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/02/13</td>
<td>Brainstorming/Rough draft for layout of Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td>Borough Council offices 10 -12 noon</td>
<td>Michele, Judy, Joe, Barry T, Clive, Douglas, June, Fran.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/02/13</td>
<td>West Winch A10 Transport &amp; Access Meeting</td>
<td>Discussion re A10 &amp; improvements to/around it</td>
<td>Rick, Michele, Judy, Andy Cameron (PF), David Taylor, Clare Coats, Phil Royston-Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting No 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rick, Michele, Judy, Barry T, Paul Burt, June, Andy Cameron (PF), David Taylor, Clare Coats, Phil Royston-Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting No 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Briefed Alan Gomm, LDF team BCouncil, about our Neighbourhood Plan to date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting No 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Gomm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/13</td>
<td>Public Consultation - NR Village Meeting Place</td>
<td>Public Exhibition for all residents to comment on Steering Group Draft Policies for N Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/06/13</td>
<td>Public Consultation - WW William Burt Centre</td>
<td>Public Exhibition for all residents to comment on Steering Group Draft Policies for N Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/06/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting No 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/13</td>
<td>until 04/10/13 BCouncil consultation on SSA - 10 week period</td>
<td>Borough Council consultation on Site Specific Allocations - 10 week consultation period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Turley Associates on behalf of Hopkins Homes &amp; Zurich Assurance re Draft Master Plan to date</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graeme Warriner of Turley Assoc, David Maddox of Zurich Assurance Ltd, Claire Coats, RM, MS, BH, JC, JL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/13</td>
<td>LDF Public Consultation re Site Specific Areas for Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Gomm, John Clements, Peter Jermy - BC, Christopher Bond of Bidwells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/08/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Alan Gomm of BCouncil for way forward re NPlan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Gomm of BC, JL &amp; PF - Chairman of Parish Councils, Chairman &amp; Vice Chairman of NP Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/08/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Norfolk Wildlife Trust &amp; NCC for Environment Policy/green infrastructure &amp; nature conservation in NPlan</td>
<td>John Hiskett (NWT), David White (NCC), RM, JL, CW, JC, PY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/09/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Alan Gomm, David Maddox &amp; Graeme Warriner</td>
<td>Cancelled at last minute due to David Maddox train delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/13</td>
<td>Overall Neighbourhood Plan updating and Draft Policy Amendments</td>
<td>NP Steering Group beginning draft reply letter to BCouncil re SSA consultation (Mtg 1)</td>
<td>SSA = Site Specific Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/09/13</td>
<td>Overall Neighbourhood Plan updating and Draft Policy Amendments</td>
<td>NP Steering Group completing draft reply letter to BCouncil re SSA consultation (Mtg 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/10/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Alan Gomm, David Maddox &amp; Graeme Warriner</td>
<td>Alan Gomm, John Clements, Graeme Warriner of Turley Associates (Hopkin Homes) &amp; David Maddox (Maddox Associates), RM, MS, JL, PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Rachel Hogger, Planning Aid - Lead Link for Locality &amp; (local RTPI Planner)</td>
<td>Rachel Hogger of Planning Aid (working in conjunction with Locality). No RTPI Planner available to be present at this mtg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/10/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee</td>
<td>Postponed until next week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/10/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee</td>
<td>Meeting no 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/11/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee</td>
<td>Postponed (Meeting no 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Alan Gomm, David Maddox &amp; Graeme Warriner</td>
<td>Alan Gomm, John Clements, Graeme Warriner of Turley Associates (Hopkin Homes) &amp; David Maddox (Maddox Associates), RM, MS, JL, PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/11/13</td>
<td>Hopkin Homes Planning Application submitted to BCKLWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/11/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To discuss overall NPlan &amp; Hopkin Homes Planning Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/13</td>
<td>Public Consultation held by Steering Group for Hopkin Homes Planning Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice Chair &amp; FL unavailable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/13</td>
<td>Public Consultation held by Steering Group for Hopkin Homes Planning Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice Chair &amp; FL unavailable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/12/13</td>
<td>Extended deadline of 20th December 2013 as requested by Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for comments on Hopkins Homes Planning Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/12/13</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee &amp; Rachel Hogger of Planning Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Link with Locality) Postponed until 8th or 9th Jan 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/13</td>
<td>Extended deadline of 20th December 2013 as requested by Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for comments on Hopkins Homes Planning Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/01/14</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee &amp; Rachel Hogger of Planning Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Link with Locality) Meeting no 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/01/14</td>
<td>Meeting with Alan Gomm, David Maddox &amp; Graeme Warriner, Rachel Hogger of Planning Aid (of Planning Aid - the Advisory Body helping us)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To discuss way forward with Hopkins Planning Application and the N Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/14</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 17 postponed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postponed until 19th February 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/02/14</td>
<td>Chairman met with Gerald Allison &amp; Alan Williamson of IDB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion about maps for Drainage Study as not covering the whole Neighbourhood Plan areas/Parishes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/02/14</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up meeting to discuss emerging Draft Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/02/14</td>
<td>Meeting with David Maddox and Urban Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To discuss A10 and West Winch village centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/14</td>
<td>Chairman, Vice Chairman, Alan Gomm, Rachel Hogger of Planning Aid &amp; Borough Councillor June Leamon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/14</td>
<td>Chairman, Vice Chairman, David Maddox, Urban Engineering (Phil Royston-Bishop) John Clements of LDF Team (BCKLWN), David Taylor, Paul Foster &amp; June Leamon (BC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/03/14</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 18</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/04/14</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Informal Meeting - Meeting no 19</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/05/14</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 20</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>Transport Briefing by Ian Parkes of NCC</td>
<td>√ √ √ Indian Parkes - NCC, Alan Gomm and Peter Jermany - LDF Team of BC, Chairman &amp; Clerk to Middleton PC; Cllr. A. Towler - NR PC; Chairman, Vice Chairman, FL, JC, PB of Steering Group; JL &amp; PF - Borough Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/06/14</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 21</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/08/14</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 22</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/09/14</td>
<td>NR &amp; WW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee Meeting no 23</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/10/14</td>
<td>Meeting with Borough Council and Rachel Hogger (conference call) to discuss our Draft Nplan</td>
<td>√ √ √ John Clements, Alan Gomm, Rachel Hogger (conference call), Chairman, Vice Chairman, JL, PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum of Agreement; Neighbourhood Development Plan

The Parish Councils for West Winch and North Runcton agree to work together, under the terms of the Localism Act 2011, to draw up a Neighbourhood Plan with the following Vision and Aims

**Vision:**
To create attractive villages with excellent facilities and quality of life where residents of all ages can live, work, play and contribute to the ongoing success of the community.

**Aims:**
To support the development of high quality, sustainable and successful new neighbourhoods whilst nurturing and enhancing the lives of existing residents in West Winch and North Runcton.
To identify the unique or distinctive physical and cultural assets of the parishes, and use these to shape the future environment and community.

**Economy:** To create an environment that fosters sustainable and rewarding jobs and supports education and skills development.
To ensure that residential expansion is supported by employment expansion and that the majority of employment opportunities are local. (within 5 miles)

**Social:** To nurture a diverse and supportive community with excellent internal communication and close links to neighbouring communities.
To ensure there are spaces, institutions and events where the whole community can regularly meet and socialise and from where new bonds and mutually beneficial initiatives can prosper.

**Environment:** To create a network of green spaces and corridors that is respected and embraced by all residents and that sustains local wildlife and a sense of rural living even within the settlements.
To sustain and safeguard agriculture in the parish in tandem with improved rural access and recreational opportunities for village residents

**Transport:** To provide an excellent network of public transport and non-vehicular transport routes that allow a genuine choice in future transport options.

The geographical area of the plan will cover the entirety of both parishes.
Each parish council will approve the steering group membership, consisting of current PC members and other parishioners.
Each parish council will approve each stage towards the final plan with the Neighbourhood Plan being an agenda item at each parish meeting.

The Neighbourhood Plan will seek to achieve the above vision and aims while conforming to required statutory planning guidance.

Signed for West Winch PC

Joe Sandey
Chairman West Winch PC

Signed for North Runcton PC

June Leamon
Chairman North Runcton PC
06 March 2013

Dear Mrs Leamon

Agreement to the designation of West Winch and North Runcton as a Neighbourhood Area

I refer to your letter of 15/10/2012 requesting the Borough Council to agree to the designation of the Parish of West Winch and North Runcton as a Neighbourhood Area (in accordance with Section 6 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012). The application included a map identifying the area to which the application relates, and a statement explaining why the area was considered appropriate to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area.

Following a period of public consultation between 1 November 2012 and 13 December 2012 the Borough Council received 4 responses. The request for designation taking into account the responses was considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on 5 February. Cabinet resolved that the designation of the three Neighbourhood Development Areas (including West Winch and North Runcton) as proposed be agreed. In coming to its decision, the Cabinet ensured that the area and boundaries proposed were coherent, consistent and appropriate in planning terms. Therefore under Section 61(G) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, the area designation is agreed.

Under Regulation 7(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 the decision to agree the area designation will now be publicised by the Borough Council on our website.

Yours faithfully,

On behalf of Executive Director
Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

West Winch and North Runcton
Neighbourhood Area

Name of Neighbourhood Area

West Winch and North Runcton

Parish Council(s)

West Winch and North Runcton

Date Approved

05/02/2013
By Email

Mrs June Stokes, Clerk to the Council
North Runcton Parish Council,
Windhoek, Hill Road
Fair Green
King's Lynn, Norfolk
PE32 1RW

Mrs Judy Close, Clerk to the Council
West Winch Parish Council
1 Long Lane
West Winch
King's Lynn, Norfolk
PE33 0PG

25 September 2012

Dear Michelle and Rick

Re: Supporting communities and neighbourhoods in planning 2012-13
West Winch & North Runcton - Memorandum of Understanding

Further to our recent meeting and correspondence regarding the next phase of work on West Winch & North Runcton Neighbourhood Plan, I am pleased to present a Memorandum of Understanding for the provision of support to West Winch and North Runcton Parish Councils in the period from September 2012 to the end of March 2013. The Prince’s Foundation’s involvement in the project will be entirely funded through the grant provided by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) as part of the ‘Communities and Neighbourhoods in Planning’ programme.

1. The Prince’s Foundation and Neighbourhood planning

The Prince’s Foundation has pioneered work that brings together the local community and key stakeholders, engaging them in the creation of a unified vision for an area. Developing proposals with an active, hands-on involvement of all those who will be affected by any changes on the ground secures their buy-in and ownership over the proposals and minimises the risk of coming up against future opposition / failure in a referendum.

The Prince’s Foundation has been at the forefront of the Coalition Government’s planning reforms since April 2011, supporting communities and neighbourhoods across England engaged in piloting the new features of the planning system - Neighbourhood Development Plans (referred to in this proposal as Neighbourhood Plans or NDPs) and Neighbourhood Development Orders (NDOs).

With the enacting of the Localism Act in November 2011 and secondary legislation (Neighbourhood Planning Regulations) in April 2012, the work on early Neighbourhood Plans entered a new phase. The focus of many Frontrunner communities has shifted from
early community engagement and exploration of issues and routes towards addressing them, to starting to draft Neighbourhood Plans, carrying out Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) and engaging a wider community prior to submitting draft Plans to their Local Planning Authorities.

In response to this, the Prince’s Foundation’s programme of support for the period August 2012 to March 2013 has evolved to include not only community engagement through participatory workshops, but also assistance with drafting plans and SEAs, further negotiations with local authorities or developers, further design and planning work or community engagement prior and during the statutory consultation period.

Although West Winch & North Runcton is not one of the Government’s designated frontrunner communities, we have made the case to our funder, DCLG, that our previous involvement in the area and the commitment shown to preparing a neighbourhood plan should justify West Winch & North Runcton being part of the Prince’s Foundation’s ongoing programme of support. I am pleased to report that DCLG has approved this proposal and we can continue to support you up to the end of March 2013.

2. Our understanding of the current issues and progress to date

The Prince’s Foundation has facilitated a design workshop in West Winch in February 2012 as part of the DCLG ‘Supporting communities and neighbourhoods in planning’ programme, with West Winch Parish Council as our client. It was conducted against the backdrop of:

- a substantial strategic allocation of new housing in the area in the adopted BCKLWN core strategy (July 2011) – indicatively, 1,600 units by 2026;
- a development proposal by a consortium of landowners led by Zurich Assurance Ltd, presented as a strategic masterplan for the villages; and
- a further draft proposal by Hopkins Homes for housing-led development on land to the north of the existing North Runcton village, and within North Runcton parish.

The workshop helped in developing: a greater understanding of the potential purpose of a neighbourhood plan, a set of outline issues and objectives, a draft spatial plan for further discussion and testing, and potential actions that could enable delivery of those community objectives. These were recorded in the Foundation’s workshop report.

The workshop underlined the strength of feeling about addressing traffic and movement issues, particularly regarding the A10 through West Winch and the Hardwick Roundabout. The community wishes to improve safety and environmental conditions on the A10, and to develop a transport and access plan for any new development that minimises adverse impacts to existing roads and the local environment. Although the Foundation's report set out an option for a link road between the A10 south of West Winch and the A47, further discussions and testing will be required to identify a favourable and viable option.

Large sections of the community are also very concerned about the nature and scale of future housing development. Some oppose any future development at all. Those who accept the idea that some new housing will be built (notwithstanding the numbers and timescale) are keen to see that it provides opportunities and improvements for the existing community, particularly local employment and local services. Any new development should add to local character and distinctiveness, and reflect the open, rural nature of the current settlements.
Since the workshop, the two parish councils have made a great deal of progress. They have:

- discussed the PF report at parish council meetings
- developed a draft community vision and objectives
- published that material, together with background information about neighbourhood planning, on the parish council websites
- begun to prepare baseline information on the social, economic and environmental context
- set up a dedicated steering group, with parish councillors from both villages, to lead the neighbourhood planning process
- entered into further dialogue with BCKLWN about the process, establishing that the local authority is supportive and willing to help through lending some officer time
- prepared and issued a questionnaire about the proposed Plan to all households in both parishes
- submitted the agreed boundaries for the Neighbourhood Plan to BCKLWN
- approached the Prince’s Foundation for further support

In particular, West Winch and North Runcton have resolved how to work together to help achieve common objectives. They now have a clear aspiration to prepare a single plan covering both parishes, they have agreed to work jointly on the project, and they intend to prepare a Memorandum of Agreement and project management plan to formalise working arrangements. The new steering group reports to the respective parish councils and therefore to the wider community. It is also hoped that, through the questionnaire and further consultation, other members of the community with particular skills and experience to contribute to the project may come forward to be part of the steering group.

A scoping meeting between the two parish councils, BCKLWN and The Prince’s Foundation was held on 24 September 2012 to discuss progress, future support requirements and a possible programme of assistance by The Prince’s Foundation until the end of March 2013. The immediate issue is preparing a work programme that considers and integrates:

- the outputs of the Prince’s Foundation workshop
- community aspirations discussed since then and emerging through questionnaire responses
- BCKLWN’s Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD, which the borough expects to complete and present to Cabinet by the end of 2012
- the Hopkins development proposals, which have moved on since the February workshop and are nearing a stage where an application can be expected
- the Zurich Assurance proposals, and
- the views of Norfolk County Council and others on transport and movement issues.

It is also recognised that, though there is impressive commitment from the steering group and colleagues on the two parish councils to planning positively for the future of the area, there remain significant challenges of community engagement. Gaining widespread acceptance of the principle and potential contents of a plan that provides for future housing growth and improvements to local infrastructure will require good communication and careful balancing of the views of various parts of the community.
3. What we are proposing to do

This MoU sets out the work programme agreed between West Winch Parish Council (WWPC), North Runcton Parish Council (NRPC) and the Prince’s Foundation. Our aspiration is to help you make as much progress as possible between now and the end of March 2013 – ideally to the point of submitting a Final Draft NDP to BCKLWN. Progress will depend on future decisions being made by various parties and we therefore propose to offer support in three stages, reviewing our position at the end of each and, if necessary, revising the programme of support to make best use of the time and resources remaining.

Stage 1 (Sept to Nov 12): Help you develop a project plan and immediate actions that meet regulations and your needs, and help you refine objectives and contents for your NDP

Stage 2 (Nov 12 to Feb 13): Assist you in preparing and consulting on your draft NDP

Stage 3 (Feb to Mar 13): Assist you in preparing your final draft NDP for submission to BCKLWN

More detailed list of tasks and associated timeline and outputs is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1  | Develop project plan  
   Analyse questionnaire results                                      | Oct 12   | • Project plan  
   • Refined version of vision/objectives  
   • Draft plan outline                                                     |
| 2  | Meetings with key stakeholders to include  
   • BCKLWN  
   • Norfolk County Council  
   • Hopkins Homes and Zurich Assurance and/or their representatives     | Oct – Nov 12 | • Facilitation of or contribution to meetings  
   • Meeting notes                                                        |
| 3  | Two days of workshops with parish councils and key contacts to present findings and get agreement on way forward regarding overall objectives and key design/planning issues | Nov 12   | • Contribution to focus groups with local community and businesses  
   • Facilitation of a one day technical workshop with WWPC & NRPC and key contacts  
   • Workshop notes and any drawn material produced (sketches, diagrams) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4  | SEA Screening: armed with more detail about potential NDP contents, revisit requirements for SEA in more detail with BCKLWN | Nov 12        | • Facilitation of a meeting with BCKLWN  
• Meeting notes incl agreement regarding requirement for SEA |
| 5  | Produce programme for Stage 2 and firm up outputs for sign off by WWPC & NRPC as necessary | Nov 12        | • Stage 2 programme and outputs for WWPC & NRPC to sign off                                      |

**Stage 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ongoing support with drafting and review of NDP including any supplementary material – such as transport strategy, design strategy, landscape/environment strategy</td>
<td>Nov 12- Feb 13</td>
<td>• Input into pre-consultation Draft NDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7  | Advice on communicating proposals to stakeholders and the wider public incl potential facilitation of a public session during statutory consultation period | Dec 12 – Feb 13 | • Recommendations on engagement methods  
• Facilitation of a public session (up to a day long) |
| 8  | Support with scoping and drafting of SEA if required                 | Nov 12- Feb 13 | • Input into SEA Scoping Report  
• Input into Draft SEA                                                                            |
| 9  | Help prepare Draft Consultation Statement for submission with Draft NDP | Jan - Feb 13  | • Input into draft Consultation Statement                                                         |
| 10 | Produce programme for Stage 3 and firm up outputs for sign off by WWPC & NRPC as necessary | Feb 12        | • Stage 3 programme and outputs for WWPC & NRPC to sign off                                      |

**Stage 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Review of statutory consultation responses and input into final draft NDP, Consultation Statement and SEA</td>
<td>Mar 13</td>
<td>• Input into Final Draft NDP ready for submission to District Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal reflects our best assumptions regarding the likely timescale to the end of March 2013. However, the delivery of the above work programme will depend on the
complexity of issues that may be encountered and, crucially, the willingness and capacity of key stakeholders (primarily parish, borough and county councils) to engage in and support the process in a timely fashion.

The Prince’s Foundation will work closely with the councils to prevent and/or minimise delays in the delivery of the programme. We will keep under review this work plan and will agree with WWPC and NRPC any alterations to it providing, however, that all the Foundation’s activities must end by the end of March 2013.

4. Responsibilities
To ensure that the project is successful each party will be responsible for specific tasks, as detailed below.

The Prince’s Foundation will:
- provide a Project Manager as the key point of contact
- provide further members of staff and external consultants to facilitate the meetings, carry out the support work as outlined above alongside a Project Manager
- source the necessary plans from the Local Authority or alternative sources
- assist in identifying stakeholders for the community engagement / consultations
- provide the community representative with adequate information to be able to answer queries from stakeholders or the wider community
- provide the community representative with advice and guidance relating to neighbourhood planning
- produce agreed outputs in a timely fashion (subject to the provisos mentioned in Section 3) and make it available to the Town Council
- provide access to all materials generated over the course of the commission.

West Winch and North Runcton Parish Councils will:
- provide key points of contact and day-to-day management of the project
- ensure adherence to the agreed timetable / delivery of agreed outputs
- identify and invite key stakeholders to the key meetings and engagement events
- be a key point of contact for those stakeholders who require further information
- provide a suitable venue for the meetings and engagement events outlined in the proposal above
- provide flipcharts / display boards, projector and screen if requested by Project Manager
- provide catering for meetings and engagement events if/as required by the Project Manager
- provide advice and guidance on local issues as appropriate
- advertise any public open sessions in an appropriate way to maximise attendance.

5. Monitoring progress
As outlined in Section 3 the delivery of the proposed work programme will be the subject to input of many stakeholders. To minimise disruption to the proposed programme, The Prince’s Foundation proposes a programme of monthly progress meetings with the parish councils. These may be in the form of teleconferences.

More detailed work plan will be agreed at the start of each stage of work, as issues and timelines become clearer.
The Prince’s Foundation will be providing monthly progress updates on this project to DCLG.

6. Next steps
Please sign and return this MoU to the address below.

Sebastian Knox
Programme Administrator
The Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment
London
EC2A 3SG

Signed……………………………………  ……………..……………..

On behalf of       On behalf of
West Winch Parish Council  North Runcton Parish Council
Name:
Date:

Signed……………………………………………….
On behalf of The Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment
Name:  Biljana Savic, Urban Programme Manager
Date:
Up to 6,000 new houses proposed

You may be aware of the Local Development Framework which covers the whole of the King’s Lynn and West Norfolk borough. This Framework looks at future housing needs of the borough amongst other topics.

The Borough Council has already asked land owners to suggest land which they would like to be put forward as housing land and a lot of land owners have made suggestions for our two parishes including land abutting the A10 and A47.

The Borough Council is now looking at all the suggested sites to decide which are suitable for housing over the next 10 years or so. The results of this will form a document called ‘Site Specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document’ see current draft at: http://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/pdf/06-09-11-%20Agenda%20-%20Site%20Specific%20Allocations.pdf

The Borough Council is holding a Public Event to let parishioners and the two parish councils see which land is being put forward as suitable for housing and this will form part of the formal consultation process. Representatives from both Parish Councils will be present at this event.

The Public Event will take place in:

“The Lounge” at William Burt Social Club
Watering Lane, West Winch
on
FRIDAY 14TH OCTOBER 2011

Drop in any time between 3.30 pm and 8.00 pm

Please come along and have your say about future housing development in your parish. If you would like to be involved in the decision making process please speak to a Parish Councillor at the event.

Yours faithfully

Councillors from both West Winch & Setchey and North Runcton Parish Councils.
West Winch & North Runcton Parish Councils

**Invitation to all residents**

You will remember the Public Event a few months ago which focussed on the proposed housing in the two parishes of West Winch and North Runcton.

The Borough Council is now going through all comments made in response to the Site Specific document.

In the meantime West Winch Parish Council feels it is important to meet with residents again to discuss everyone’s thoughts and concerns.

The Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment has kindly agreed to facilitate two meetings with residents and there will be 2 such meetings in February at the Village Hall, adjacent to the William Burt Social Club, Watering Lane, West Winch:

- **Monday 13th February** from 7pm until 8.30pm.  
  **Public Session open to all.** Will consist of a short presentation by the Prince’s Foundation and then discussion with everyone to understand your aspirations and concerns

The next day representatives from the Parish Council will meet with the Prince’s Foundation staff along with invited stakeholders - landowners, North Runcton Parish councillors, developers, borough and county council staff, key service deliverers and key community members to discuss what you have said is important to you and on Wednesday the Prince’s Foundation staff will produce a presentation of findings for the public event that evening.

- **Wednesday 15th February** from 7pm until 8pm.  
  **Public Session open to all.** This will consist of a presentation by the Prince’s Foundation followed by a questions and answers session.

It is very important that as many residents as possible attend the sessions on the Monday and Wednesday evenings so you can put your own point of views forward on the Monday and hear how your views are included on the Wednesday evening.
**West Winch and North Runcton Neighbourhood Plan**

**COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE**

The Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk have proposed that the parishes of West Winch and North Runcton are the location for considerable housing development, (indicatively 1600 by 2026 and potentially 6000 in future decades) *. Some landowners have already employed consultants to develop proposals, and when plans are submitted the Borough Council will review them through the normal planning process – with local residents able to comment.

However the government have introduced new legislation designed to allow residents to have more say in shaping their local communities. These *Neighbourhood Plans* will become the ‘official’ local plan, and once adopted by residents and the Borough, developers would be required to follow them. The Parish Councils of Winch and Runcton believe that working together to develop a united Neighbourhood Plan represents the best way for residents to influence future plans for the area.

To have a Neighbourhood Plan agreed we will need the support of the majority of the community. The Borough Council can then adopt the plan and will be required to take it into consideration when processing future planning applications. Some issues the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to address include:

- **Existing environment:** How to protect/enhance existing assets and remove/avoid detractors
- **New Housing:** How much, where should it go, building density, what types of housing.
- **Roads, cycle paths, bridlepaths, footpaths:** Protecting / improving the existing network and defining preferences for future routes.
- **Economy:** How can we support existing business / enterprise and help to create sustainable, worthwhile new jobs?
- **Community facilities:** How can we support/improve what we have and what will we need for a growing population? (This might include shops, schools, health facilities, recreation spaces, community buildings, public transport, clubs and societies and others)
- **Unity:** Remember that ‘them’ is usually ‘us’. We must come up with plans that are affordable and sustainable and that benefit ‘most of the people most of the time’.

In February 2012 West Winch PC asked the Prince’s Foundation to run planning workshops that helped establish some initial ideas about how the two villages might develop in future. We need to build on this work with further input from all residents. This questionnaire is an important part of that process and we intend to have additional community workshops this autumn. Details will be publicised nearer the time.

**Remember** - we cannot represent your views if we don’t know what they are. Please take time to fill in this questionnaire fully and ensure it is submitted by one of the methods outlined at the end of this document: All information submitted will be treated confidentially and published anonymously. However you must provide your name and address as we will be required to demonstrate that this is a community led plan.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

*West Winch / North Runcton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.*

*** PLEASE RETURN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE BY FRIDAY 21ST SEPTEMBER 2012 ***

---

* For further information refer to the Parish Council websites: [www.westwinchpc.org.uk](http://www.westwinchpc.org.uk) and [www.northrunctonpc.org.uk](http://www.northrunctonpc.org.uk) or the parish newsletters.
West Winch and North Runcton Parish Councils

Your Name: _____________________________________________

Your Address:__________________________________________ Postcode_______

Please indicate the age and number of people in your household:
Pre School □  Primary School □  Under 18 □  18-25 □  25-35 □  35-50 □
50-65 □  65+ □

1. Local Facilities and Services:
1a. What LOCAL facilities / services do you use and what activities / events are you involved with now? (Consider community buildings, churches, sports pitches, play areas, paths, as well as clubs and societies within the parishes etc).


1b. What do you like about them and what, if any, improvements would you like to see?


1c. What new facilities / activities would you welcome (and support) in the parishes? (Consider also what you think will be required if new housing is built as presently proposed)


* For further information refer to the Parish Council websites: www.westwinchpc.org.uk and www.northrunctonpc.org.uk or the parish newsletters.
2. Your environment:
If new development occurs as proposed, what local features should plans seek to protect / enhance. (Write down specific examples)

2a. Historical features (Buildings / roads and lanes / other features).

2b. Specific open spaces, Trees, hedges, meadows, ponds, ditches ...

2c. Wildlife / Habitats (Animals / Birds / Plants / other). (Also please note any specific wildlife that you know to breed at or near your home – eg swifts / bats / hedgehogs etc)

3. Preferences

3a. What do you like most about where you live (and you would wish to protect / retain).

3b. What do you like least about where you live (and you would wish to see changed / enhanced).

3c. Are there any other changes you would like to see that you have not already mentioned in your answers above, but you think could help to make Winch / Runcton better places to live in future.
4. Transport
4a. Please state the approximate average number of return journeys made in a typical week by your household:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode/Distance</th>
<th>0-2 miles</th>
<th>2-5 miles</th>
<th>5-10 miles</th>
<th>Over 10 miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4b. What would encourage your household to use the car less? Tick any:

Better public transport ☐ Better cycle paths ☐ Better footpaths ☐
Others (state below) ☐ Nothing ☐

4c. Do you have any other ideas for access and transport improvements that you would use.

Thank you for your time!

If you need more space, please attach additional pages clearly stating which question is being addressed, and staple to the main document.

Collection Details:
☐ Collection: A volunteer will come to collect the form on ______________________

(Please have the form completed and if you are going to be out, leave it where it can be easily found)

☐ Email: You can scan and email the completed form to: clerk@westwinchpc.org.uk

☐ Post / Deliver: You can post or deliver the completed forms to:
   The Post Office, 216 Main Road, West Winch (a collection box will be provided inside)
   11 Common Lane, North Runcton (post in letter box)

(Please note: If you have restricted mobility and cannot deliver your form by hand – in West Winch please ring Joe Sandey 841452, or, in North Runcton, Clive Williams 840720 and we will try to arrange having them collected).

*** PLEASE RETURN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE BY FRIDAY 21ST SEPTEMBER 2012 ***
West Winch / North Runcton Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire – September 2012

Some Initial Analysis.

No of Returns: As at Saturday 29th September, 180 questionnaires had been returned. These can be broken down into areas as follow:

- N. Runcton village. (The Green, Common + Chequers Lane, New Road, Cedar Grove, Rectory Lane) **85 returns from approx 200 households – 42%**
- N. Runcton (Hardwick End – A10 – incl Mill Lane, Babingley Place, Hunters Rise, Regent Avenue, Willow Drive) **14 returns from approx 70 households - 20%**
- West Winch – (including the ‘north village’ – Back Lane, Chapel Lane etc), Coronation Avenue, the central village (Hall Lane and environs) and the south village (Setchey). **81 returns from approx 1100 households – 7%**.

Thoughts on this: The low return from Winch may have been partly due to the postal delivery and return process that was employed. However this is clearly not the only issue, as the return rate for the A10 portion of Runcton was also poor and these questionnaires were hand delivered and followed up. The return rate within Runcton village varied – where Cedar Grove had the lowest return rate. Without reading too much into these trends – we might consider the extent to which these low responding areas have a ‘sense of community’ and the extent to which residents do/don’t socialise and know their neighbours? This could in turn perhaps be linked to the physical layout / design of areas, the level of car dependence vs walking/cycling, and the amount of social interaction that is possible?? Perhaps worth considering re any new development …

Age of respondents: Of all questionnaires returned all respondents had indicated ages – but it appeared that not all forms indicated the ages of all members of the household, some only apparently indicating the age of the person who filled in the form. From the information received:

- 11 (6%) households had pre-school children
- 11 (6%) households had primary school children
- 14 (8%) households had children 11-18
- 18 (10%) households had young adults 18-25
- 16 (9%) households had adults 25-35
- 33 (18%) households had adults 35-50
- 54 (30%) households had adults 50-65
- 97 (54%) households had adults 65+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All people: % aged 0-15</th>
<th>All people: % aged 16-29</th>
<th>All people: % aged 30-44</th>
<th>All people: % aged 45-64</th>
<th>All people: % aged 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Runcton</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>26.23</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Winch</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>29.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Lynn + West Norfolk</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Late returns increased this number to 187. Some analysis figures have not been updated with the final 7 receipts.
2 This assumes 200 households in N. Runcton village, 70 in N. Runcton Hardwick and 1100 in West Winch.
3 Closer analysis showed Cedar Grove and Rectory Lane had a lower return rate of less than 30% - whilst nearly 50% responded from the rest of the village.
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It would appear that older retired people have been relatively more ‘efficient’ at returning their questionnaires – although we have a spread of age groups represented in the households that responded - and hopefully we have therefore gained information relevant to all age groups.

The number of people from each age group, purportedly covered in the survey (ie living in the households that responded), are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Pre-school</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>18-25</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>35-50</th>
<th>50-65</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Total people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighbourhood Plan:**

Of the 187 respondents, **171 (91%) answered ‘yes’**, they supported the parish councils developing a neighbourhood plan. 15 left this question blank – which may mean they had no preference or might mean they missed the question. One person (North Runcton) said ‘No’ – but they also gave no reason, no name and no address. (Of the late

**Question 2: Facilities and Services:**  
See also Appendix A.

2a. What facilities/services do you know and use?
2b. What do you like / not like about them?
2c. What new services / activities would you like?

Question 2 (a, b, c) was about what people used, what they liked, what they would change and what new facilities they would like. It was apparent that the way we framed question 2b was confusing for some people as it combined what they liked with what they would like to change. Many people didn’t say what they particularly liked as they answered that in 2a by saying what they used. Some people then used 2c to say what they would like to change as well as what they would like new. So we have analysed the answers to questions 2b and 2c together, but only counting each persons response once.

There were two main themes in the responses to “What do you like and want to keep?” **85%** of those who answered said, “**the village feel and open spaces**”. The other big theme was appreciation of the existing local clubs and social networks.

In answer to “what facilities/activities do you use/enjoy now?” there were **51 different facilities or activities mentioned**. (see spreadsheet). The most common were the commons and footpaths/ tracks – ie external ‘rural’ assets essentially being used informally ...
In answer to the questions about what they would “like improved or new” - some answers were quite detailed about village facilities and might be better addressed by the individual Parish Councils rather than through a Neighbourhood Plan. We have separated those out for the PCs to discuss. (see spreadsheet in Appendix A). However matters listed include issues such as dog fouling, and traffic related issues(speeding) – which are likely to be exacerbated by a growth in population and therefore do need to be considered by the neighbourhood plan.

The remainder fell into 25 categories - (see spreadsheet) in Appendix A - and following bar chart for the top 15.
The overall impression from these answers is that people in the villages care very much about the local environment. They value the sense of community, the open, green spaces and the ability to walk and cycle through the area.

They join in the activities on offer. They like to use the social spaces, the William Burt Centre (West Winch) and Village Meeting Place (North Runcton). However they would like these buildings to be improved in terms of general updating, modern heating systems etc.

Many of them would like to see more local facilities as the area develops with health provision being most important. Local shops might become more viable with a larger population. It is encouraging to see a preference for walking, cycling and public transport where possible and enthusiasm for outdoor activities and sport. Also good to see is requests for more community events and social activities.
Question 3: Environment:

Question 3 asked respondents to identify features they felt would be important to protect / enhance in future development within the parishes. It was intended the question might also help identify the extent to which respondents knew and understood the local environment. Part 3c particularly asked for observations of known breeding wildlife at or near the property.

3a. What historical buildings / features are worth protecting?

There were four features that received significantly more responses than others:

- West Winch and North Runcton churches (and churchyards) = 45 (ie about 25% of respondents)
- Lanes and tracks = 40+ (with specific name checks for Watering Lane and Clarks Chase in Winch and Rectory Lane, Common/Chequers Lane and Illington Lane in Runcton, and specific concerns including rat-running and increased traffic on the roads and general loss of rural character.
- ‘Village character’, an agricultural setting, open land and separation between the villages =30+
- The commons = 29

Other responses included:

Sports fields (William Burt – 6, NR cricket field – 5); WW windmill – 5 (and calls for repair); WW Church Hall / Old School and Runcton VMP – 10; Historic buildings and features in general (including walls in Runcton) – 7; Post office and school in WW; Farm buildings; Woods and hedges – 6; carrstone cottages – 3; The ‘Green’ - NR (5).

Some specific features in WW included ‘the Clappers’ (2), The ‘Manor House’ (Manor Farm?), ‘The Oucroy field’, The Pound (3), views west from Hall Lane (3), the pasture at corner of Hall Lane / Gravelhill, The ‘chapels’ (3).

3b. What specific open spaces, tree, hedges, meadows, ponds, ditches are worth protecting?

The commons again come out as the single most appreciated feature of both parishes that should be protected – with 50 references.

- Specific references to the character the commons give the villages – including 2 references to grazing cattle and 2 to mature hedges and trees. Several comments about concerns of present condition / management of NR common.
- Ponds – 25 references – especially ‘the two ponds on NR common’. 2 specific references to ponds north of NR village (on Towler land).
- Playing fields and play facilities – over 30 references – with over 20 specific for William Burt area in Winch and 6 for NR cricket field
- 15 specific references to ‘the Green’ at N. Runcton (and 1 specifically of the Beech tree thereon)
- 13 references to trees in general – and specific reference to ‘trees on common next to Commonsdie’ (Winch) and ‘trees behind houses on New Road (Runcton).
- 12 references to hedgerow and several comments about need for management and maintenance of hedges and need for hedge replacement.
- 9 references to ditches and several about concerns with drainage in the parishes.
- 8 references to permanent pasture and ‘meadows’ – and specifically pasture at Gravelhill, WW.
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• 4 specific references to woodland (and specifically Sheeps Course)
• 2 specific requests to safeguard the arable land ‘buffer’ between Winch playing fields and the A10.
• Other specific references to Puny Drain, Nar Valley Way (footpath), derelict land at Constitution Hill (Hopkins site), general field boundary trees and roadside trees and ‘habitat’. Specific requests for new public open space and new woodland.

3c. What specific wildlife / habitats are worth protecting? What breeding wildlife do you know about?
A variety of birds, animals and plants were noted:
• Over 25 references to ‘garden birds’ – which appear to include: Blackbird, Robin, Wren, Tits – Blue, Great, Coal and Long-tailed, Chaffinch, Greenfinch, Goldfinch, Dunnock, House Sparrow, Starling, Collared Dove and Thrush(es)
• Other specific references to birds included Owls (11 general references and a further 10 specific references to Barn Owl and 3 to Tawny Owl)
• More than 10 references to Woodpeckers (and 6 specifically Green Woodpecker and 3 specifically Greater Spotted Woodpecker)
• Over 20 references to Swifts – including nesting records in Winch and Runcton.
• Swallow (7), House Martin (3) (they nest around North Runcton common and its seems also in Winch).
• Other birds noted include Jays (5), Sparrowhawk (6), Kestrel (1), Pheasants (4), (Partridge (1), Magpies (1), Rooks, Crows and jackdaw (1), Heron (3), Swan (1), Ducks (presumably mallard) (5), Moorhen (3), Skylark (3), Geese (3), Gulls (1), Harriers (1). (The latter was from West Winch Common).
• The most common mammal reported was Hedgehog – with 53 separate reports from both WW and NR.
• There were 20 references to ‘deer’ – a further 5 specifically of Roe and 8 of Muntjac. One of Fallow may be erroneous.
• Other mammal reports were Fox (15), Rabbit (11), Grey Squirrel (13), Hare (4), Mole (6), Badger (7), Rat (3), Field Mouse (3), Shrew (1), Vole (1), Weasel / Stoat (1).
• Reptile reports were relatively common in both Winch and Runcton – Frog (18), Newts (9), Toad (9), Grass snake (8) and 2 of ‘lizard’ (one from Millfield Lane in Winch and one from North Runcton common. Further evidence needed – it may be confusion with common newt?)
• Insects noted included Hornet, Hornet Hawkmoth, Hummingbird hawkmoth, and more general ‘butterflies’ (4), ‘dragonflies’ (5), ‘moths’ (3), bumble bees and honey bees
• There were few specific reports of plants – but Bee orchids at Constitution Hill and off Garage Lane in Winch.
• There were few specific reports regarding habitat – although ponds, ditches, hedges etc have been extensively noted under the other questions. One reference to the moat at Manor Farm, Winch. There are several references to blackberries and hedgerow fruit.

Summary of findings from question 3:
1. It is clear that the ‘historic cores’ in both Winch and Runcton (i.e. around the churches and oldest settlement) are recognised and cherished. There is a need to safeguard and enhance them in any future development. This should include consideration of the wider ‘setting’ - trees and other assets (walls / open space etc).
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ii. The setting of the villages in farmland is well regarded but is clearly going to be problematic to retain in its entirety with the extensive proposed development. Local landscape character and the outlook for many properties will change. The challenge for the neighbourhood plan will be to retain particularly important spaces and features and ideally thread them together into multi-functional ‘landscape assets’ which are good for landscape character, amenity and recreation use, biodiversity and other uses. Retaining viable tracts of agricultural land will be important.

iii. Even with their restricted access and use – the common lands are a cherished asset in both parishes and are very important for village character and biodiversity. One particular comment said ‘don’t let our commons become urbanised like commons at Wootton’. However managing them as livestock grazing in a much larger community may become problematic in future?

iv. The rural character of a number of roads, lanes and paths is repeatedly noted, and the perceived threat to them from increased traffic volumes and associated ‘urbanising’ trends (widening/kerbs/foot pavements). Successfully maintaining a rural character for these routes and corridors could be seen as one of the principal challenges for the neighbourhood plan?

v. Many people obviously take great pleasure in local wildlife. It may not be possible to absorb the level of development proposed and keep some species in the area – especially large mammals such as Roe deer and Badger. Species that enjoy an open arable landscape (rooks / partridge / skylark) may also be problematic. However providing an appropriate scale and complexity of wildlife corridors to sustain local wildlife should be a goal of the neighbourhood plan. This should also ideally protect/ connect existing known landscape features and important wildlife habitats.

vi. New habitat creation should be designed to sustain / expand areas suitable for local indigenous species – newts, toads and grass snakes, owls and woodpeckers, bats and others.

vii. Open space planning should consider ‘wild food’ and other ‘rural’ activities people enjoy.

viii. Although the responses indicate there is a great variety of knowledge and understanding about the local environment, it is on the whole positive to see how many people do have considerable local knowledge and are very observant. (It may be worth floating the idea of starting a biodiversity recording group who can report to county. This might be of particular use to monitor changes(for better or worse) as development in the parishes proceeds).

**Question 4: Resident Preferences:**

(See also Appendix B)

4a: What do you like most about where you live?
4b: What do you like least and would like to improve?
4c: Suggest changes to make the villages better places to live?

**4a What do residents like most** ... Question 4 asked for householders preferences. Some households indicated more than one preference. Question 4a asked what they liked most about where they lived (and they would wish to protect / retain). Of the 185 households replying 50 (27%) felt that open fields,
green and open spaces, farms, countryside and farmland were what they liked most. 21 (11%) said they felt they were in the countryside yet only a short distance to town and Hardwick shops. 13 (7%) appreciated the low level of through-traffic away from the A10 and A47. 19 (10%) liked the fact they lived in a ‘traditional’ village and not a town or suburb with 40 (22%) enjoying the rural village life and feel, stating they felt relaxed and safe. 16 (9%) said the neighbourhood/community was friendly but the largest number, 63 households (34%) saying the thing they liked most about where they lived was the peace and quiet, being isolated and tranquil.

4b What do residents like least ... Question 4b asked what they liked least about where they lived and what they would wish to see changed / enhanced. 42 households (23%) disliked the A10 stating various reasons including noise, high volume of traffic, tailbacks, queues and causing congestion. 6 (3%) also stated problems with access/egress onto and from the A10 and A47. 12 (6%) cited problems on New Road, North Runcton with cars using it as a cut through between the A10 and A47 with 7 (4%) saying lorries are one of their dislikes. 10 (6%) disliked speeding motorists on village roads. 13 (7%) say the current bus service is poor with some services having been withdrawn. The A10 bus stop is too far away for elderly residents of Freebridge Haven. 7 (4%) commented on the lack of local facilities in North Runcton and general drainage problems were raised by 4 (2%) residents of West Winch and North Runcton. 10 (6%) said they disliked the thought of new housing near them, that the size of development was a worry and thought the villages would become a suburb or a town. 8 (4%) mentioned problems with a business in North Runcton but this is currently being addressed by the County Council. A vast spread of issues – but roads, traffic and transport seem to be a particular issue?

4c. What changes are required ... Question 4c asked for any other changes that had not already been mentioned in Questions 4a and 4b. Comments from those questions were also included within 4c. 28 households (15%) didn’t want the new housing at all, citing it would make the villages of North Runcton and West Winch lose their separate village identity. The replies said they wanted the villages left as they currently are and that there was nothing they disliked at the moment. 19 replies (10%) stated again that the A10 relief road / bypass had to be in place before the proposed housing commenced. A comment was made that it is only the villages of Setchey, West Winch and North Runcton that are directly on the A10 (ie that between KL and Cambridge most other villages are by-passed). A further 6 households (3%) asked for public transport to be improved. This appears to be an important issue as existing bus service problems were raised by 14 households under question 4b (and many more have suggested this under other questions).

"Quick wins"?
Dog fouling / dogs on commons / dogs on playing field: Name and shame on PC websites? ‘Village etiquette’ on websites and in village newsletters?
Rat running and speeding on certain roads incl Rectory Lane/New Road: Rumble strips / pinch points ?? – work with NCC
Parking outside primary school – A school travel plan? Name and shame parents? Occasional traffic warden presence?
Potholes/poor road surfaces. Also state of footpaths: Monthly report to NCC after PC meeting?
Flytipping / litter: Another local ‘etiquette’ matter? Start a reporting ‘tree’ and/or get police involved more?
Poor bus service: Probably need to work through the needs (and aspirations) within the neighbourhood planning process ...
Question 5: Transport: (See also Appendix C)

Question 5a  State your average number of journeys in a typical week.
For WW and NR out of the total 2,717 journeys recorded by residents:

- Car use accounted for 1,888 (69%)
- Walking 427 (16%)
- Bus 156 (6%)
- Bicycle 146 (5%)

... and ‘other means of transport’ 100 (4%). (‘Other means’ included a few taxi journeys, 3 by van, 5 by horse (!) and others not stipulated).
- For WW with 1,333 journeys in total, car use was 1,008 (76%), bus 81 (6%), bicycle 58 (4%), walking 170 (13%) and, Other 16 (1%).
- Similarly for NR, car use 880 (64%), bus 75 (5%), bicycle 88 (6%), walking 257 (19%) and Other 84 (6%).

There were a number of blank returns in answer to the questions.
One resident with a haulage business contributed 30 journeys per week of over 10 miles, 20 (5-10 miles) and 50 under 10 miles) – which may slightly skew results – although some other estimates seem very low. It is possible some people have misinterpreted the question.

Question 5b  What would encourage your household to use the car less? Many people ticked more than box so a percentage based on overall number of respondents is not possible.

102 respondents, said better public transport
53 said better cycle paths
49 said better footpaths
8 said others (e.g. car pool, car sharing scheme)
47 said ‘nothing’ – e.g. they liked the car, they needed the car etc ...

Question 5c  If there was better public transport, how would it most benefit you? (children going to school? Going to work? Going shopping? Leisure journeys?). Do you have any other ideas for access and transport improvements that you would use? Of 180 returned forms - 36 left 5c blank while 5 wrote ‘no’ or ‘nil’.

The bus service was mentioned most frequently as something to improve - only 8 responders writing ‘no change’. The large majority of responders desired an improved more realistic service with current service being described as impractical. 62/180 (34%) of respondents would like to use buses for leisure or shopping. A specific complaint was trolleys/prams / bikes not being permitted on buses. There were requests for a local hopper or direct bus to Queen Elizabeth Hospital from West Winch. (It was suggested that this short journey presently take 2 hours by public transport!). There was a desire for late evening buses, more school buses and expansion of the community ‘dial-a-bus’ system.
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There were specific requests for a bus service that served Common Lane/Chequers Lane (N. Runcton) and Gravelhill Lane and Chapel Lane (W. Winch) along with stop on request at the junction of the A47/New road (N. Runcton). One respondent requested half hourly bus service. Park and ride facility was suggested? Some observations were wrong (e.g. Norwich bus (X1) doesn’t stop in Middleton – but it does).

Improvements to the railway service suggested with train station and car park requested at West Winch (4ww and 1NR). A ‘Park and rail’ also requested by one West Winch resident and the former idea of a K. Lynn ‘Parkway’ was mentioned. Better train service to Ely, Cambridge – suggested (NB It was announced July 2012 that upgrading to a half/ hour KL-London service was being facilitated with line improvements now in the budget for 2014). Re-establishing a line to Norwich suggested.

Other suggestions for access and improvement suggestions included many for footpaths/cyclepaths (See 5b) – especially along Rectory Lane and Chequers Lane and connecting to KL town.

Speed limit 30mph Rectory lane instead of 40mph at present; (Various other concerns expressed about speeding and heavy vehicles through N. Runcton). Car share scheme/car service/hospital car service; Further fly over needed at Hardwick; Hatched road markings at Hardwick roundabout need to be enforced; Common lane and Chequers Lane should be accessed only with fines as penalty.

The conclusion to Question 5 (unsurprisingly) – is that people are very car orientated. Perhaps we should have asked more specifically – why do you prefer the car over other forms of transport – but we probably know the answer – not sufficient buses to make bus travel viable and not enough safe cycle routes to make cycling attractive. We might have asked about number of cars per household and whether people felt car ownership was a ‘burden’ they would like to shed? There is some suggestion that it is households with older people and or younger people (under 17) who have particularly asked for improved bus services and cycle paths – which makes sense – they can’t or might not wish to drive ...

In the neighbourhood plan maybe we need to suggest a simple neighbourhood planning goal: e.g. We will support plans and policies that will (say) triple bus, bike and foot journeys with a view to reducing the number of local private car journeys.

Bypass / Relief Road? As a general observation 43 respondents (23%) have suggested the need for a ‘bypass’ or ‘relief road’ in one or other of their answers. Some have said ‘this must happen before development’ others have said ‘may be a good idea’. Of the 43 – 35 respondents live in West Winch (30) or in the A10 section of North Runcton (5), whilst only 8 live in North Runcton village. However, it is clear that existing traffic congestion, HGV vehicles, speeding vehicles and the threat of increased traffic and congestion are a principal concern of all residents. Many specific suggestions for junction improvements (especially on the A10 at Gravelhill and Long Lane and Rectory Lane, and on the A47 at New Road), traffic calming measures and just ‘reduction of traffic’ suggest that respondents see alternatives to a bypass as viable – whilst several answers indicate specific concerns about a bypass.
APPENDICES

Appendix A – More Results from Question 2: (see below)
### We use/enjoy now

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commons, footpaths, cyclepaths, dog walking</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social spaces (WBC VMP)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports and play areas</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local shop/fuel/eating</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church activities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events/activities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guides brownies scouts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main category totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainbow and Brownies</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basketball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charity dances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>christmas concert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial a bus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fishing lakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven social club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopes charity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meadows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middleton golf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR post box</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic carpets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal British Legion Middlet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scout group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure Start playgroup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Bar b q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wives group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Details

| footpaths | 67 | 35 |
|William Burl social club | 42 | 22 |
|WWPO village store | 39 | 21 |
|commons | 24 | 13 |
|NR Church | 24 | 13 |
|WW church St Marys | 20 | 11 |
|WW play areas | 15 | 8 |
|NR Village meeting place | 14 | 7 |
|dog walk | 11 | 6 |
|Fish and Chip shop | 11 | 6 |
|Flower festival | 10 | 5 |
|NR tennis | 9 | 5 |
|NR cricket | 9 | 5 |
|buses | 7 | 4 |
|Annual church events | 6 | 3 |
|charity Bingo | 6 | 3 |
|Oriental palace | 6 | 3 |
|sports pitches | 6 | 3 |
|church meals | 5 | 3 |
|cycle paths | 5 | 3 |
|Local Fuel station | 4 | 2 |
|Art and craft days | 3 | 2 |
|Badminton Club | 3 | 2 |
|Bottle banks | 3 | 2 |
|bottle banks | 3 | 2 |
|Mobile library | 3 | 2 |
|Car boot | 2 | 1 |
|dentist | 2 | 1 |
|extra service (carols) | 2 | 1 |
|monthly family Clinic | 2 | 1 |

### Would improve or like new

| Dr surgery/health centre | 58 |
|local shop/deli/baker butch/PO/store | 32 |
larger school and nursery | 31 |
better/more cycle paths/footpaths/bridle paths | 30 |
better public transport | 26 |
A10/ bypass/traffic calming | 23 |
more playground/play space | 18 |
sports for all provision | 18 |
pub/restaurant/take away | 16 |
pharmacy | 10 |
NHS dentist | 8 |
social activity/organised sport for young people | 6 |
KL hospital more capacity | 5 |
allotments | 4 |
better drainage | 4 |
gas supply | 2 |
street lighting improve | 2 |
swimming pool | 2 |
vet | 2 |
better water pressure | 2 |
optician | 2 |
bank branch | 1 |
better broadband | 1 |
better mobile phone signal | 1 |
protection for green spaces (barriers/bunds) | 1 |
Matters that may need to be addressed by the Parish Councils outside of the neighbourhood plan.

### West Winch PC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Burt Centre and hall needs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor repaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air conditioning and dishwasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows unscrewed Main hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved heating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large car park CCTV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### West Winch Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue social village events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO ww better parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play area tiny tots area would like larger/better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10 nr Gravel Hill needs dropped kerb/crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setchey needs pedestrian crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setchey needs village sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setchey needs access to Setchey common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more horse paths eg Nar Valley way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus shelter Hall Lane needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green spaces and paths better maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less power cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy motorbikes track by railway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WW Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church clock needs repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church bells need reinstating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### North Runcton PC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village meeting place needs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating sorted out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### North Runcton Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green spaces and paths better maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue social village events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need safe footpath down Rectory Road to WW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer car service for medical appt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more dog bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour coded route board for walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village seating for elderly residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village green access for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim trail in woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrap yard restore back to farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better pedestrian access on Hardwick roundabout (crossing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle grids instead of gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want vehicle restriction Illington Lane to wooded area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like evening classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis club make affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Runcton church needs fresh flowers!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B – Results of Question 4:

### 4a What do residents like most ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Around the villages</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Village as a whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>open fields / green and open spaces / farms /</td>
<td>Facilities are walkable and/or easily accessible -</td>
<td>small village community - not crowded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countryside / farmland</td>
<td>Post Office, hairdresser, shops, buses, Social Club (WW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sky views, no light pollution, no streetlights</td>
<td>Feel we are in countryside yet short distance to</td>
<td>Feels spacious and light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and playing fields</td>
<td>town and Hardwick shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports clubs</td>
<td>Low level of through traffic and noise (NR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide grass verges and rural road verges</td>
<td>Low level traffic away from 'A' roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspoilt views</td>
<td>Minimal Social Housing</td>
<td>Rural village life and feel/character, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>river</td>
<td>Good mix of housing and gardens which are individual</td>
<td>semi rural setting relaxing and safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons for walking and with cows</td>
<td>and not &quot;boxes&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public rights of way</td>
<td>Not a housing estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>Able to sleep at night due to minimum noise</td>
<td>Friendly neighbourhood &amp; community. Feels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and hedges</td>
<td>Local Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponds</td>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Green</td>
<td>Low numbers of children / teenagers locally with low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle paths</td>
<td>level of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths and walks + paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nar Valley Way riverbank walk at Setchey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walks around village and country lanes with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjacent fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gated access to North Runcton Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4b What do residents like least ...

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>Roads / Parking</th>
<th>Lack of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A10 / A47 poor access / egress</td>
<td>6 parking outside primary school, WW</td>
<td>2 No local facilities, shop or PO (NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 volume of traffic, noise, tail backs, queues, congestion</td>
<td>Some roads need resurfacing, potholes inadequately repaired</td>
<td>1 No Park (NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47 noisy</td>
<td>Poor parking at PO / village store</td>
<td>1 Poor broadband speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorries</td>
<td>Sloping footpath</td>
<td>1 Not enough street lights WW / NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition of A10 from ordinary road into major arterial road serving rest of NW Norfolk</td>
<td>Inconsiderate parking outside properties</td>
<td>2 Lack of dropped kerbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 walking on pavements</td>
<td>Lack of footpaths connection to A10</td>
<td>1 Lack of wastebins around sports field and by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwick roundabout - volume of traffic, queues, congestion</td>
<td>Nothing to entertain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding motorists on village roads</td>
<td>Existing Housing</td>
<td>10 No local shop to buy local produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding motorists on A10</td>
<td>Housing Association / Affordable Housing - poorly planned existing</td>
<td>5 Not enough for children (NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road, NR used as cut through between A10 / A47</td>
<td>Poorly planned existing houses - new housing design locally is uninspiring &amp; high density is not inkeeping with existing</td>
<td>5 Lack of Centre to NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough speed signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorries on village roads</td>
<td>Bus Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed relief road taking WW’s problem to NR</td>
<td>Bus Service is poor and some services have been withdrawn.</td>
<td>13 Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much traffic in NR</td>
<td>A10 bus stop is too far away for Freebridge Haven elderly residents to walk to</td>
<td>1 Lack of real community - people unwilling to help one another or get involved in community matters or events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 / A47 proximity to dwellings</td>
<td>Children out late at night making noise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47 not suitable for cyclists</td>
<td>Floodlights &amp; street lights around village</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 cycle path not good</td>
<td>Light pollution on village green</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-social neighbour (WW)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of village</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgrown hedges</td>
<td>Thought of new housing near where I live, of village becoming a suburb or town and size of proposed development</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish on footpaths</td>
<td>Proposed incinerator</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree covering streetlight</td>
<td>The split village (no centre) (WW))</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unused telephone box</td>
<td>First impression of village via Chequers Lane to</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Description</td>
<td>Related Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgrown pathways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untidy and poorly kept properties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient local jobs &amp; opportunities across KL, high level of unemployment &amp; poor prospects for school leavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber /rubble recycling centre - inappropriate in village, rubbish/spoil heaps, farmland being used for commercial purposes, lost attractive buildings and risk to old trees, inappropriate business in village setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasteground between Esso Garage &amp; property full of rubbish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog waste</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR School catchment is Middleton even though could walk to West Winch school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural buildings obscure view from NR churchyard towards Middleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor drainage in general</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor recent Commons Management (NR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish and visitors not having regard to wildlife and village way of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4c. What changes are required ...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport and Traffic Comments</th>
<th>Related Comments</th>
<th>Industry / Employment / Business Comments</th>
<th>Related Comments</th>
<th>Services / Utilities Comments</th>
<th>Related Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A10 relief road / bypass must be in place before the proposed housing commenced. This would make West Winch a better place to live. Only Setchey, West Winch and North Runcton are directly on the A10. The other villages have been bypassed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Making WW into a major industrial area (farming etc) would be disastrous to current residents. Too much expansion is not necessary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gas supply to village (NR)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 T weight restriction required on A10 through West Winch when relief road/bypass in place and keep lorries out of village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR - no commercial development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cable TV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No need for increase in employment premises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improve mains water pressure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief Road needs embankment to stop noise pollution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Make adequate access to existing premises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improve drainage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-route A47 and A10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strict control of expansion of caravan site and removal or strict planning control of recycling plant in NR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Better broadband speed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less traffic on A10 - road cannot presently cope</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove overhead wires from roadside</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road / A47 (NR) need safer and better maintained junction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bus Service Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer A10 and A47 junctions, especially for right turns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bus stop on A47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve crossing for pedestrians and cyclists on A10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct bus service to Queen Elizabeth Hospital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don't want one anonymous conurbation / mini town thus losing separate village identity. Leave the villages as they are. We like it as it is and don't want more people or cars. Nothing I dislike</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 should have a speed camera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not enough public transport from Rectory Lane to King’s Lynn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Winch Jubilee celebrations borough villagers together - annual event? More community led events, boot sales / fetes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Gravel Hill Lane junction (roundabout?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improve public transport</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Would like our own police - to control youths after dark</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route of proposed link road could affect existing peace and quiet and needs to be as far away as possible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of our county councillors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy traffic stops emergency services and must put lives at risk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recreation / Leisure / Countryside Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>NR needs more young people with children and enthusiasm. Average age of residents may be too high</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local link transport or P&amp;R adjacent A10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sure the Commons could be improved to increase wildlife like Roydon Common</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>More public parking in village (NR)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow traffic down at Post Office / Shop (A10 WW). Traffic lights are good but not the answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Countryside could become overcrowded with too many houses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use car park for dropping off school children in West Winch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village traffic dangerous for children and animals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Close the Common gates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Continued high quality, low density, housing with every property having it's own green</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming measures needed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Although Commons are grazing commons and not public they need to be managed for biodiversity and amenity values as well. Historic asset and need respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not estates / social housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce village speed limits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local Pub</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No land in NR for changes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less through traffic and lower speed limit in Rectory Lane and New Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Way marked walks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old burnt out engineering works at Setch are eyesore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve road surfaces and drainage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organise activities - tai chi, dancing, lectures, film nights, community choir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce amount of new housing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle paths from NR to town and high schools needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trees around new development. Make it separate from existing village. Maintain green areas to aid separation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Need the 2 parish councils to have the same agenda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve footpaths. Rectory Lane is dangerous and stops before NR village. Need footpath on Chequers Lane allowing residents to adopt more healthy lifestyle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Council to clear up after cutting verges and play areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cancel the incinerator</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road (NR) could take further traffic away from village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Need rubbish bins around William Burt Centre and Play areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>By-laws to restrict number of cats per property</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve cycle and walking routes - more public footpaths between villages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don't change the farmland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce light pollution by floodlit properties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safe footpath to KL town centre (NR)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leave some green spaces for children to safely play</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Main drawback to West Winch is it's accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorries for proposed incinerator would make A10 busier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bridleway network around villages is bad and could be opened up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PC should not support the housing as infrastructure cannot support it</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You shouldn't have to be a William Burt Social Club member to participate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It is all too late</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dog Waste bins / reduce dog mess</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain local ponds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better pavements for wheelchairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket Club should be open to public for social purposes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep village character</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better local facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Winch is a lovely village with clubs and organisations to suit all age groups - main</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawback is accessibility</td>
<td>'You can't improve perfection'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C – More Data from Question 5: (See Below)
### Results for Q. 5a

#### Average Number of Journeys Per Week for West Winch & North Runcton Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transport - CAR</th>
<th>Transport - BUS</th>
<th>Transport - BICYCLE</th>
<th>Transport - WALKING</th>
<th>Transport - OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL JOURNEYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families with children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Journeys</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRIPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**
- a) One journey per week by taxi.
- b) One of the residents noted 3 van journeys per week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transport - CAR</th>
<th>Transport - BUS</th>
<th>Transport - BICYCLE</th>
<th>Transport - WALKING</th>
<th>Transport - OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL JOURNEYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families with children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Journeys</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRIPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**
- c) NOTED ON INPUT - impossible number of journeys - check questionnaire.
- d) Includes 5 journeys via car and train per week.
- e) 2 trips by taxi.
- f) 5 rides per week.

#### Totals for West Winch & North Runcton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transport - CAR</th>
<th>Transport - BUS</th>
<th>Transport - BICYCLE</th>
<th>Transport - WALKING</th>
<th>Transport - OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL JOURNEYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families with children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Journeys</strong></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRIPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**check**
- 246
- 403
- 22
- 7

### Totals of Average Weekly Car Journeys for North Runcton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE JOURNEY LENGTH IN MILES</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF JOURNEYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Results of Q. 5b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. entered by</th>
<th>WW / NR</th>
<th>5b</th>
<th>better pub transport</th>
<th>better cycle path</th>
<th>better foot paths</th>
<th>others state</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>TOTAL RESIDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Winch</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Runcton</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Runcton and West Winch
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Invitation to all residents

Public Drop-In Session open to all

All residents from the two parishes, including Setchey are warmly invited to come along to either of the 2 identical exhibitions on progress made on the Neighbourhood Plan for the villages.

Saturday 8th June 2013 from 1pm until 4pm
at
The Village Meeting Place in North Runcton

Sunday 9th June 2013 from 1pm until 4pm
at
The William Burt Centre Village Hall in West Winch

You will be able to see the results of the Community Questionnaire completed last year and see what the Steering Group has been putting together in order to produce a Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

You will also see a list of meetings held with village groups, highways, drainage boards and other interested parties, all organised by the Steering Group, as well as some of the Draft wording for Policies to go in the Plan and some indicative maps showing some of the proposals.

We need you to tell the Steering Group what you think.

Teas and coffees will be available to all attendees and all we ask is that you discuss your initial thoughts with members of the Steering Group and complete a feedback form.

If you have any queries about the event please email the Steering Group Secretary franxhome7@btinternet.com or telephone one of your parish councillors in either village.
The Borough Council has designated the parishes of West Winch and North Runcton as an area for future housing development.

Up to 1600 houses to be built by 2026. After 2026 there could be further development in the area and to the south. Landowners are willing to sell land and there are developers who are drawing up plans to build houses.

We want local people to have a big say in what happens.

Under the Localism Act Parish Councils can draw up a Neighbourhood Development Plan. This is a formal legal process. West Winch and North Runcton have joined up to form a Neighbourhood Development Plan steering group. There are parish councillors and other local people on the group.

The Neighbourhood Plan steering group is

- seeking the ideas of local people
- taking advice from professionals
- drafting new local planning policies
- drawing up a Neighbourhood Development Plan for the area.

Then

- the plan has to be inspected and passed by a planning inspector.
- there is a further consultation period
- there will be a referendum for all the people who live in the area covered by the plan.

If more than 50% of the people who vote, approve the plan, it has to be adopted by King’s Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council. It will become part of the Local Development Framework.

So developers will have to show they are following the local policies in the plan in order to get planning permission.

From the development will come other money to be spent on improving our neighbourhoods.

It is important for local people to have as much say and influence as possible about the future of their area. Many people in West Winch and North Runcton have taken part in workshops and answered the village questionnaires to give their ideas.

The consultation today is a further chance for local people to see how the plan is shaping up and to say if the group is getting it right.

So read on and let us know..............
What is all this about?

The Borough Council has designated the parishes of **West Winch** and **North Runcton** as an area for future housing development. The intention is to build up to 1600 houses by 2026. Thereafter it has been suggested that up to 6000 could be built. These proposals are outlined in the adopted Core Strategy (2011).

Under the Localism Act (2011) Parish Councils can now draw up a **Neighbourhood Development Plan**. This is a formal legal process that will result in a plan that has to be followed in this planning cycle (ie up to 2026). **West Winch and North Runcton Parish Councils feel that a Neighbourhood Plan will be the best way for residents to have their say in these proposals. Both Parish Councils have signed an agreement to work together and have formed a **Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group.**

The Neighbourhood Plan steering group is comprised of parish councillors and other local people who have expressed an interest in helping. We are:

- Liaising with and assessing the requirements of the local authorities and central government
- Speaking with developers and others who have an interest in building the proposed houses and other infrastructure
- Seeking the opinions and ideas of local residents
- Taking advice from other professionals
- Drawing up a **Neighbourhood Development Plan** for the area.
- Drafting planning policies that will complement national and district policy but will also be particular to the neighbourhood plan area (see below).

It is essential that we arrive at a plan that all residents can accept. Even if we have some reservations - we need to agree a plan. Disadvantages might be balanced by new benefits – perhaps community facilities, new footpaths and public open spaces, safer road crossings or community initiatives …

This exhibition shows you our first draft ideas for plans and policies. **Please think carefully about what we have proposed, ask questions, and please give us your feedback – positive or negative.** Please try to be specific with your comments – noting particular policies or areas as required.

Thank you for your help!
Legislation sets out a clear process that we have to follow in order to create the Neighbourhood Plan. We need to work alongside the Borough (BCKLWN) – who are preparing their Local Plan for the entire district. We are proposing the following programme:

**Note**

- the plan has to be inspected and approved by a planning inspector.
- there will then be a community referendum for all residents in the two parishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates:</th>
<th>Neighbourhood planning stages</th>
<th>BCKLWN planning stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Draft plans and policies – Community Consultation. <strong>We are here</strong></td>
<td>10 week consultation on preferred site allocations plan (SAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2013</td>
<td>Further refine plans and policies</td>
<td>BCKLWN undertake further statutory 6 wk consultation on NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2013</td>
<td>Agree draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) with BCKLWN and submit to them</td>
<td>BCKLWN to publish preferred SAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Review BCKLWN comments and finalise the NP for further 2 wk final local consultation period</td>
<td>BCKLWN send out the final NP for further 6 wk consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>Final revisions. Submit NP for examination by independent planning inspector</td>
<td>Independent Inspector to review BCKLWN SAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2014</td>
<td>Attend to any comments on the NP from planning inspector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2014</td>
<td>Local referendum (parish residents) to endorse NP. If 50% of respondents support the plan it is agreed.</td>
<td>BCKLWN adopt agreed plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the plan is adopted by BCKLWN it becomes the local plan for this area for the duration of the planning cycle (to 2026).

**The community consultation process during the neighbourhood planning process is essential** – and the inspector will wish to see evidence that residents have been involved throughout. So far since the beginning of 2012 we have:

- Gathered information about environmental, economic, social and transport issues within the two parishes.
- Held community workshops and information days in both West Winch and North Runcton
- Held focus groups and technical workshops to consult particular stakeholders
- Undertaken a community questionnaire and circulated the information gathered
- Provided information and updates on NP progress through the parish websites, newsletters and monthly meetings

**Is there anything else we should do?** Do you need copies of information? Do you wish to be sent email updates? If so please leave your comments / details today before you leave.
What is proposed?

1600 new homes by 2026 would require other facilities. New roads would be required, a new primary school and new public open space. We need to agree an appropriate housing density (dwellings per hectare – dph).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-15 dph</td>
<td>Detached or semi-detached houses with large gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-25 dph</td>
<td>Typical estate housing as already found in parts of West Winch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-80 dph</td>
<td>Three storey apartments and townhouses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is likely that a range of densities will be required / desirable. Not all people want large gardens. Denser development can ‘buy’ more open space and make public transport and local shops more viable. However, West Winch and North Runcton have a rural setting and denser urban development will need careful design if it is to ‘fit’.

One of the challenges will be to ‘join’ old and new development.

Our Vision

*To create attractive villages with excellent facilities and quality of life where residents of all ages can live, work, play and contribute to the ongoing success of the community.*

**Aims:** (What we hope to achieve)

*To support the development of high quality, sustainable and successful new neighbourhoods whilst nurturing and enhancing the lives of existing residents in West Winch and North Runcton.*

*To protect the unique and distinctive physical and cultural assets of the parishes, and use these to shape the future environment and community.*

**Some Important Considerations**

West Winch and North Runcton Parish Councils are committed to work together on planning the future settlements – but feel the villages need to keep their separate identities. We also feel strongly that agricultural land should be protected wherever possible and that ‘buffers’ of ‘open countryside’ should be retained around the settlements.

Although the common land in West Winch and North Runcton is a much loved asset for residents – and greatly enhances the character of the villages – it is not available for general access. In general both villages are already deficient in public open space. We feel it is essential this is addressed in future planning.
Feedback gathered from the questionnaire confirmed many common resident views:

Transport, Roads and Traffic
1. One of the main concerns of residents is existing roads and traffic – especially in relation to the A10, Hardwick roundabout and A47. The majority of people think that more development is bound to exacerbate problems. HGV traffic is a particular concern.
2. Other traffic and access related concerns included, rat-runs and speeding, dangerous junctions, and lack of safe cyclepaths and footpaths in some sections. Public transport is generally unsatisfactory. All these issues make people car dependent – which in turn makes traffic levels worse.

Landscape and Environment
3. Residents appreciate the rural aspects of the parishes – the common land, mature trees and hedges, views of open farmland. They appreciate the older parts of the villages and particularly heritage buildings and existing community facilities – the meeting halls, sports pitches etc. People especially like seeing local wildlife – deer, badgers, hedgehogs, owls, woodpeckers, frogs, newts …
4. However residents think foot/cyclepaths are often inadequate, that both parishes are short of open space and that there are already adverse impacts on the environment. There is great concern about new development replacing the rural character and the impact of many new residents on the existing environment. There are concerns about impacts to drainage and potential for flooding.

Community and Social
5. Both parishes have an ageing population (30-35% over 65 and retired - above local and national averages). Access to good services (especially medical and social) is therefore considered very important. Many residents appreciate the existing social facilities and events - but would like more.
6. West Winch primary school is popular – but the scale of development proposed would require a new school. People appreciate local convenience shops and might like more.

Economic
7. Although there are relatively small ‘employment areas’ in W. Winch and N. Runcton, and many people are retired, most economically active people work locally. Many residents feel that better public transport and cycle paths might reduce local car journeys and traffic related to work.
8. Although agriculture employs few people these days – many people feel that retaining farmland and farms is essential for a sustainable economy – as well as for the character of the area.
9. Retaining local character may also be advantageous for local ‘tourism’. 
Policies on the Environment

We think environment related policy will be essential in planning new development that ‘fits’ with the existing settlements as well as for improving (or not worsening) existing environmental concerns and problems.

With the development proposed there will be massive changes to the area and loss of green-field land. Our policies and proposals try to ensure:

1. Existing landscape and environmental assets are retained and protected where possible (e.g. woodland, ponds, field trees and other heritage items).
2. New landscape features (woodland, meadows, hedges, paths and corridors) are an integral part of the new plans and that they compensate any losses.

3. That there is provision for a sustainable drainage system – based on the existing topography and drainage pattern. (Please note that we intend to develop a framework drainage design for the entire area in conjunction with the drainage board).

4. That a network of sustainable wildlife corridors are created that provide refuge, habitat and safe movement corridors for our wildlife – as well as providing paths and passive recreation areas for human residents.

5. That development includes a sustainable network of public open space, including active recreation facilities that will ensure that both new and old settlement has appropriate provision.

6. That development impacts during construction are carefully managed and that impacts from new development (e.g. noise / night lighting e.t.c) are mitigated.

7. That new development has distinctive character – preferably utilising local building materials and styles. That the design of new development helps ‘build community’ and create ‘civic pride’.

8. That new development considers the likely impacts of climate change – and can cope with such change. That new development facilitates environment-conscious lifestyles in future …

9. Notwithstanding that some agricultural land will be lost – our suggested plan tries to limit the amount of agricultural land that will be affected, sustain a spatial separation between the villages and sustain a rural character where possible. (See sketch masterplan)

Please also take time to read the draft Environment Policies in full
The Neighbourhood Plan will aim to ensure that new development will be built to the highest standards to ensure attractive, sustainable and long lasting places to live, work and play.

On matters of settlement planning and building design, new development will already have to comply with existing national and local planning policy – as well as current building regulations. However the Neighbourhood Plan can help define where development goes, the density of development, styles, materials and details over and above national guidelines.

**Some principle policies we are proposing include:**

1. All housing will be located within 400m of a local centre (ie within easy walking distance).
2. There will be a hierarchy of public open space – with small play areas (for children up to 6 yrs old) within 100m of all houses and neighbourhood play areas (for children up to 14) within 1200m.
3. We will set building densities for different areas of the development.
4. We will encourage the use of an acceptable palette of materials to set a distinctive design character for different areas of the development.
5. We will set requirements for external storage provision – the size of garages, and storage for bins, bicycles and the like.
6. We will set requirements for street design and parking provision and encourage pedestrian priority areas.
7. We will set requirements for garden size and layout and suggest ways in which the ratio of built development vs gardens and open space can be maintained over time.
8. We will propose that affordable housing is spread throughout the development – avoiding large enclaves and ensuring a mixed and balanced community.
9. We will endorse high quality sustainable design – with renewable energy, sustainable urban drainage, low carbon building materials (and building techniques) and energy efficient buildings.

Please also take time to read the draft Development Policies in full.
Policies on the Local Economy

Many residents have asked – where are all these new people going to work? The need for new housing is partly because we are all living longer, and partly because more people live alone. But we feel strongly that there will be a need for new local employment and that this must be supported by the Neighbourhood Plan.

We also want to ensure that existing viable businesses benefit from the proposed growth in the parishes. We feel that local employment and easy access to it can help to minimise local traffic. We want to support opportunities for homeworking and small business. We think that farming is an important aspect of our local community, and that food production should be a part of a sustainable economy.

Some key considerations for local economic policy will include:

1. Supporting local education, life-long learning, skills development and access to existing and new education facilities and initiatives.
2. Ensuring that existing sustainable and appropriate business has the provisions and support to thrive and grow.
3. Provision for new employment related development within plans. That this provision will not have adverse impacts on the local environment or community.
4. That, whilst accepting some agricultural land will be lost, plans ensure the protection of viable tracts of agricultural land and farm businesses.
5. Provision of viable local centres that can support convenience stores and other public amenities – especially those that can support homeworking and small enterprise.
6. Excellent footpath and cyclepath access to existing and new employment areas – including Hardwick and other areas within King’s Lynn.
7. Ensuring that new development can benefit local designers, builders and suppliers.
8. Supporting technical innovation that can support local business and enterprise – for example, fast broadband provision.

Please also take time to read the draft Local Economy Policies in full.
Most respondents to the 2012 questionnaire were positive about existing facilities – the William Burt Centre, the village meeting place in N. Runcton, football, cricket and tennis facilities. West Winch primary school is popular and the village also has a convenience store, post office, other shops and a dentist.

However many residents have suggested they would like improvements to existing facilities, that some important facilities such as a GP surgery are missing, and that they have concerns about many new residents moving in and ‘swamping’ existing facilities (e.g. the primary school, dentist and even local footpaths).

We have an ageing population. We have lost some village services and there are concerns about the on-going sustainability of remaining facilities. We need to ‘steady the ship’ and ensure that existing residents can benefit from the new development proposed.

Our Neighbourhood Plan policies will try to ensure that future residents enjoy a vibrant neighbourhood with a balanced diverse community and all the amenities required to have a happy and fulfilling lifestyle.

Some key aspirations will include:

1. A new primary school – delivered early in the development of 1600 new houses by 2026 – so that the existing primary school is not swamped with new residents.
2. A new GP surgery – so that there is ready and easy access to GP support – especially important for our ageing community.
3. Provision of at least one new community centre / hall that can serve the new and existing communities and complement existing facilities.
4. Improvements to existing community buildings to make them energy efficient, comfortable and flexible for a range of community use.
5. An excellent network of public open spaces and recreation facilities. These and all community facilities must in turn be connected by an excellent network of paths to minimise car use (see also policies for Environment and Development).

6. Support and promotion of the arts, life-long learning and healthy lifestyles. Community initiatives to acknowledge and celebrate local history and heritage – including our natural heritage.

7. Ensuring excellent, equitable, public transport provision and access planning to ensure that all members of the local community can utilise local facilities – and also easily access facilities in King's Lynn, Norwich, Cambridge - or further afield.

Please take time to read the draft policies for Society, Community and Culture.
Policies on Transport

Seeking to improve traffic and environment conditions along the A10 whilst also trying to ensure new development does not make conditions worse are primary aims of the Neighbourhood Plan. But clearly this is not straightforward.

We feel a new road running parallel to the A10 – and perhaps 500-750m east of it (see plans) seems inevitable. This will not be a ‘by-pass’ as such – and there will still be a lot of traffic on the A10. However, in order to ‘spread out’ traffic on different roads and make the new development ‘permeable’ for traffic we have concluded that this ‘relief road’ is essential. We have consulted a range of traffic experts.

We also think it is essential this road is operable at an early stage of the development – otherwise we will get more traffic with no improvements to the A10.

Principle transport policy areas are therefore:

1. Get the ‘relief road’ built – minimising impacts to existing settlement and landscape and incorporating good design to minimise noise, light and air pollution. The road will also need well designed and frequent vehicle/pedestrian/cycle crossings and a maximum speed limit of 30 or 40mph.

2. Improve the A10 corridor – potentially with improved junctions, more crossings, and urban design to denote ‘village centres’. This is likely to involve some areas of redevelopment along the road in time.

3. Ensure that development supports the provision of sustainable public transport that can greatly reduce the need for local private car journeys.

4. Ensure that development includes an excellent network of cyclepaths and footpaths so that the development is ‘walkable’ or ‘cyclable’ and that use of cars for local journeys is less favourable. Such links must especially connect community facilities and neighbouring communities – King’s Lynn, and Middleton being key.

5. Development design will ideally make cars ‘secondary’ to pedestrians with careful design.

6. The Neighbourhood Plan will try to support the BCKLWN Core Strategy objectives of reducing local HGV traffic.

Please also take time to read the draft Transport Policies in full.
Sketch Masterplan – Brief Explanation

This **DRAFT** plan was developed in conjunction with the Princes Foundation and assumes that the development proposed by BCKLWN over coming decades is inevitable. We have followed sound planning principles – building up from the natural landform and drainage pattern, considering existing assets that we would like to retain – such as woodland, meadows, tracks and paths. Other important constraints have included the existing high pressure gas pipeline corridors and minimising adverse impacts of existing and proposed roads.

We have considered how we might safeguard good farmland and the setting of the two villages, create ‘walkable’ centres and provide sufficient open space and landscapes that can benefit wildlife. This process has helped us to ‘shape’ the proposed development.

| Approximate area of built development = 105 Ha |
| Largely residential – but we would require new community facilities and some employment sector development |

| Approximate area of ‘green infrastructure’ = 53 Ha |
| Approximately 22 Ha of new woodland and related habitats; 22.5 Ha of new ‘multifunctional’ corridors including spaces for sustainable urban drainage; over 8 Ha of new playing field |

| The ‘relief road’ = approximately 2.65 km long |
| We would envisage a corridor 40-50 metres wide (allowing for a 10m carriageway, drainage, Dual-use paths and landscape mitigation works). |

| Over 10km of new dual use cyclepaths – including connections to King’s Lynn, towards Middleton and to the old rail track to Bawsey and Leziate Lakes. |

Note that 105 Ha of development land with an average residential density of 30 units per hectare would only be able to accommodate 3150 dwellings. In fact with employment sector development and community facilities the available area for housing will be even less.

**We have concluded that more than 3000 dwellings in both parishes will be unsustainable in that it would lead to settlement coalescence and total loss of rural character and village scale.** We presently propose that this is the view we will put forward to BCKLWN and the independent planning inspector.

We welcome your comments on this and the other draft documents.

*North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group*  
*June 2013.*
Community consultation held on 8th and 9th June 2013

Feedback regarding Draft Map and Draft Policies

Community Consultation events were held in both villages on the above dates. A total of 105 people attended the events over the 6 hours. A display of draft policies and draft maps were available, along with a sit down area with copies of the results of the previous questionnaire and a full set of Draft policies. Residents were invited to complete a feedback form asking them what they agreed with and what the group had missed. They were also asked how they would prefer to read their copy of the FINAL Neighbourhood Plan and also give their contact details.

Maps and General Feedback

Basically happy with what has been said.

The whole thing seems to have been well thought out but villages should be kept as villages.

Plan is well thought out and presented. I share the comments and concerns.

Having read through the plans and documents I commend the Parish Council [Steering Group] for the presentation of facts and information given in the documents.

I find it difficult to come to any quick decision on the plans that already mention the roads, school, transport, playing field, surgery which have already been covered.

Well done [Steering Group] and thank you for the opportunity to peruse the plans.

Looks well planned out, but time will tell.

The Draft Policies are very good BUT the order in which things are done is crucial [refers to new road – see Transport]

The neighbourhood plans appear to be well thought out and it is pleasing to see the two villages respect each others’ space (North Runcton / West Winch and Setchey).

Very detailed Maps are most useful.

I find your proposed development plan for West Winch and North Runcton horrendous. It will no longer be a village community. What you are proposing for 2026 and beyond will swamp the existing village as we know it. The fact that you are proposing to almost double the size of the village proves no thought or consideration to local residents. My wife and I have lived here for nearly 50 years, why should we be forced out of our homes because of greed. My main concern is for the meadows adjacent to Hall Lane [land south of Silvertree Way and Elm Tree Grove and west of where Hall Lane and Gravelhill Lane meet] it is a natural habitat for a large number of wildlife including newts, bats, water voles, 7-spined sticklebacks, grass snakes, moor hens, barn owls and many more. The above mentioned area should be protected as an area of SSI. The area is below sea level with no drainage. If
development is carried out it will put my property at a serious risk of flooding. Letter to follow to express my many concerns.

Agree with the plan.

Not a lot.

This should be called West Winch Neighbourhood Plan as there is not building in North Runcton [village]. Even thought the drainage scheme indicates that North Runcton area has the best drainage.

Agree with all work and draft plans so far, particularly in respect of consultation.

The Draft Neighbour Plan – I agree with the proposed draft plan – I have no particular comments to make in objection. The plan seems to be a sensible proposal in the circumstances.

Overall the draft proposals seem good (as good as they can be). The additional road parallel to the A10 appears essential

Overall a good proposal in my view – thank you and congratulations to all those involved in preparing it.

No real suggestions it all seems quite reasonable – people must have somewhere to live – environmental aspects seem to have been covered.

I notice the bridle path is wrong at Hardwick Narrows Lane. It is at the moment going through my house and land. Also it does through Mr Symington’s houses so I think it should be put in the right line as I study land enclosures and byways and highways, I do know what I am saying is right. I feel the plan is very rough and given the opinion that it is not that exact which I think is wrong. My pleasure time is archives and map study so I try to be precise. I love my history. I am compiling a book so to me it is very important that I get it right.

I personally feel that this neighbourhood draft plan has been put together with great care, thought, sympathy and understanding of what the residents of West Winch and North Runcton want and desire in a situation where most of them would prefer things to stay as they are and keep their village identity. A majority vote would oppose this development as we know, so if we have to have something that is not desired let’s hope that the Borough Council and developers adopt the policies which have been so meticulously thought out into their plans.

While I appreciate the hard work that has gone into this, shouldn’t the Neighbourhood plan be fighting against the development rather than, as it appears, agreeing to it taking place?

I agree with all points noted.

We must maintain the West Winch / North Runcton “Divide”.

VERBAL COMMENT AT EVENT - Concerned about some of the detail of the plan [map].
VERBAL COMMENT AT EVENT - Bit grumpy that hasn’t been ‘consulted’ – but I explained there wasn’t much that could have been said previously – and this was consultation. Generally he didn’t seem unhappy with the proposals – notwithstanding he will be greatly affected. He (understandably) doesn’t like the ‘not knowing’ what is happening – esp the road.

VERBAL COMMENT AT EVENT - Also grumpy about lack of ‘consultation’. Did articulate concerns about many new near neighbours and impact on farming.

Finally, the draft copy of the NH Plan did not include any maps. This makes it difficult to understand what the plans area.

I hope the next draft will include suggestions of proposed new amenities; plans of green space, WW centre, relief road design a route, schools, cycle routes etc. However I do feel that the NH Plan committee are doing an excellent and unenviable job in difficult circumstances. I salute, thank and congratulate you all for a job well done.

---

**Draft Transport Policies**

We need a bypass now!

We feel that with the expansion of the current villages, the character of these villages will be lost and bring more disruption with local transport which is very poor at present times and not ‘value for money’, extra traffic and rat runs for motorists, lack of parking facilities for homes although [the draft policies] state 2 per household – see Downham Market’s new estate!

The A10 is already busy and bisects the ‘communities’.

Better footpaths and more frequent buses would help.

Relief road may help if it ever gets funded? Certainly needed!

TRA01, 02, 05, 08, 09 – Strongly agree.

Consideration of a railway platform at West Winch and car parking. This would be beneficial to the increase of residents and communities.
I would suggest a roundabout on the A10 at the junction with the new road close to Gravelhill Lane. There is sufficient room to place it away from existing houses. This will allow easier exit onto the A10 from Gravelhill Lane.

Traffic calming measures should be placed on the existing A10 through the area by the church.

The new road should replace the A10 as the Primary Through Route.

A maze of roads should be avoided at all costs.

The Draft does not state what measures to be put in place on the A10 corridor. UNLESS substantial traffic calming is put in place the increased traffic flow will continue along the A10 corridor e.g. (road narrowing, traffic humps, chicanes). The road to the east should be substantial enough and away from proposed developments to keep main flow of traffic away from proposed extended village. New road could begin at Gravelhill Road area and sweep widely eastward. Presumably with a roundabout or traffic lights. This would make exit and entrance to West Winch [Gravelhill Road] easier.

The Draft Policies are very good BUT the order in which things are done is crucial. The new road must be done early on or much more congestion will arise or the [new] road might be subject to repeated delays.

Noting the high proportion of elderly residents it is clear that private cars will be much used and even with more cycle tracks.

Relief Road must be built as a priority.

TRA01 – Agree. New “parallel route” to have before build starts.

TRA05 – Design and build village centre in tandem with “parallel route” to establish reason for traffic flow variations i.e. old A10 will go through the centre of new enlarged West Winch and the preferred route for HGV’s will be on the “parallel road” to the A47. Current options at Hardwick to then take the overpass if travelling on the A47/A17.

I do not think that you have missed it, but if you now say that you are prepared to accept a relief road (as indicated) rather than to push for a bypass (which starts at Oakwood Roundabout and ends at Constitution Hill) will lead to us here having a bypass [not?] worth calling one. The road is necessary particularly if the incinerator is built.

Would there be any pressure put on big Lorries to use the relief road, if not, they will not.

NO MAJOR BYPASS THEN NO DEVELOPMENT.

TRA01 Parallel Route – Is there to be a guarantee that the new parallel route will be finalised prior to the housing development as representative from Zurich Insurance previously stated that if Norfolk County Council will not provide funding then Zurich will not pay for it.

TRA01 – 12 – Agree strongly. Must have a parallel route in place early on in development. No access onto A10 until new route is in place and operating. Limit old A10 to less than 7.5 tonnes.

Need better public transport to and from QEH.
The questionnaire results show that residents are concerned about the A10 traffic. This must be dealt with before any housing on new sites takes place.

The development will only be successful with the construction of the Relief Road. The old A10 will need to be restructured in use, ban lorries except those needing access. The new Relief Road should be the new A10.

Upgrade the A10 to a trunk road so that Highways [Highways Agency] are responsible for the new Relief Road.

New road MUST be deliverable in its entire length.

New road should be “new A10”

Important that no variation to proposed public transport, walkways and cyclepaths take place.

Interesting to see whether cycle spaces, bin storage areas etc ever materialise!

No new road – no new houses.

New road priority

We strongly agree that the A10 needs a bypass.

Full agreement with TRA01 through to TRA12.

In addition to this [The fact that you are proposing 35 dwellings per hectare which is nearly town dwelling density, shows that you have no regard for our community as a village and want to turn us into a suburb. This is the major point that has been missed. THIS IS A BADLY THOUGHT OUT PLAN WHICH WE NO NOT NEED. As an alternative to this the expansion plans to build 3,600 more dwellings should be dropped. We cannot cope with the 25,000 people this will bring!] the proposed conurbation will have a major trunk road running through it. This is already overloaded and the proposed 30 mph minor road between West Winch and North Runcton will not help the A10 situation. What is needed is a major dual carriageway around the whole area.

The A10 at the moment will need definitely to be re-routed as it won’t take any more traffic. Concerns 1st phase will be built Hardwick roundabout end and A10 will struggle with excess traffic.

Cycle routes good idea.

I agreement with proposed roundabout taking traffic from A10 away from village Setchey side.

Don’t want rat run roads.

A bypass is definitely needed to cope with the extra volume of traffic using the A10 if plans go ahead.

Agree with the plan. I feel and believe that there should be a bypass.

Agree with network for cycling and walking routes.
TRA01 currently Rectory Lane, Checkers Lane and New Road are used as rat runs. During peak times and summer holidays by satnavs avoiding A10, A47 and Hardwick Jams. How will you control volume of traffic through quiet village? What about electronic speed display sign that also has inbuilt licence plate reader and gives plate number and speed. Ask Three Rivers Council in Hertfordshire. Also prevention of HGVs using rat runs. How will "Distributor Road" intersect Rectory Lane etc. Once this road is built it will then become the favoured rat run. Proper crossing points, roundabouts will be needed.

Footpaths would be necessary. All the distributor road will do is move West Winch’s traffic problems to North Runcton. Same argument applies to TRA12, TRA04 and TRA03. This distributor road will become a de facto bypass for West Winch. Then any proposed bypass plan will disappear.

Traffic problems

It is essential that the proposed relief road is built FIRST.

First priority – Relief Road or bypass. The A10 is NOT suitable for more traffic.

Better public transport would be advantageous. WARNING – more people does not automatically mean more users.

As this is a draft plan it is obvious that West Winch needs a new road which we are informed has to come to the east of West Winch – which is likely to cross some of our land. This new road would be coming closer to North Runcton who will be having no new development but bringing the noise etc closer to the village. A definite plan of the proposed new road needs to be produced and a meeting held with the landowners to get their input.

To me the development must have an adverse effect on traffic in the area and therefore no development should take place unless relief roads are built before any building begins. It would still lead to heavy congestion on the Hardwick roundabout and roads leading in.

Relief Road for A10

Cycle ways / walkways – need for regular upkeep, clearance of same – probable requirement for emergency service outstation / cycle patrols.

Bus / minibus services – Post Office seems to combine this in some rural areas. Local stores – Tesco / Sainsbury’s.

Need much more frequent bus service – and more shelters. Certainly a bus service to QEH.

I have no difficulty in housing being built if the roads could cope with the traffic. Already these facilities are taxed to their limit.

I would like to have a cycle lane alongside the A47.

Already people use our road [Common Lane, North Runcton] as rat runs. I walk my dog along Rectory Lane (which is really small for two cars let alone a person walking their dog as well) They don’t slow down. There will be an accident before long.

TRA01 – TRA04 There is a real danger the parallel route will become another ‘rat run’ to avoid the Hardwick roundabout. How can the risk of this be minimised? (30mph throughout?)
TRA10 – strongly support this – strengthen? Need a safe cycle route parallel to the A47 from New Road to the Hardwick roundabout – extend to meet existing path in Middleton.

If the new roundabout onto the A47 is implemented then restrict the need of traffic either side will be essential.

The additional road parallel to the A10 appears essential and if pedestrians and cycle provision is effective then this could be positive.

I agree a relief road is key to all, businesses and homes. Therefore the first stage of the Transport Policy should be resolved, and as bold as necessary.

Happy with Transport Policy. Existing A10 road is a concern. Too busy, can’t travel in summer.

Traffic: - House building is not the problem. Traffic will greatly increase the A47/A134/A10. A10 are the roads used by all through traffic going north - east - and the coast. Access from minor roads to these main roads will be difficult.

Re TRA08 – it is all very well have a ‘bus stop’ close by but it’s no good if the bus doesn’t stop there or if there is only 1 bus a day Monday to Friday. Public Transport has to be improved in North Runcton.

Broadly agree with the thrust of the transport policy, although I feel that walking and cycling should be equal first preference, due to the increased practicality of cycling for covering the five miles to town and carrying shopping and small cargo.

TRA01 should include a commitment to include the recommendations of LTD15-00 during any work so as to preserve current non-car routes to town (an omission during the recent Hadwick Road works that severed our primary link to town). I will comment further on this, TRA10 and others after seeing the Proposals Map.

TRA02 should refer to the DfT Manual for Streets. The “way that minimises conflict” should explicitly exclude segregation because that both increases maintenance costs and hinders dynamic allocation of space to reflect actual use. We should also specify a maximum distance between crossings, less than the current 2 mile gap on A10 Lynn Road.

TRA04 and TRA05 seem slightly in conflict – if both routes have 30mph sections, how are we expressing a preference for traffic to use one over the other?

TRA07 should include non-car users in the road design considerations and refer to the Manual for Streets to help express our expectations of the design.

TRA08 maybe shouldn’t specify bus shelters to be quite as common, as these seem to be a significant maintenance and insurance liability. Maybe a few at key timing stops.

TRA09 seems inadequate, as by the time 50 dwellings area occupied, car-centric habits may have formed. A bus service should serve the edge of each application area before any occupation, with extension into it once 50 are occupied.

TRA10 should seek that street name signs be visible from footway entrances and not only roads.
TRA11 should require an adequate proportion of part-sheltered cycle parking at destinations where visitors are likely to remain for hours.

Bus Shelters – within the build must be enclosed to give residents shelter – regular service thus getting away from ears – ease congestion.

An extremely important factor is the very poor access to the A10 due to the volume of traffic. It can already take up to 10 minutes to safely get onto the A10 going south. The extra volume of traffic from the proposed development will probably treble this time.

VERBAL COMMENT AT EVENT - Interested in checking where new road would be. Relieved to see it is past Setch now – so thinks it will not affect him. But said the future of retail business on Garage Lane he thought was dependent on good road frontage (him – the Beer store etc). Also noted that Kier are proposing to move in next few years. Carters might expand. Various other businesses down there. He would be happy to act as go-between for wider business chat.

Norfolk stands still regards new roads. This is a disgrace. Business brings work and jobs come from this. People will wish to take up the new housing as work is the main factory why people come to live in an area - not to be on welfare.

We need better public transport especially to the Hospital. The buses running along the A10 and taking the bypass route to the hospital rather than via the Town Centre. This means not having to change buses at the bus station.

I dispute the fact that you claim that the majority of A10 traffic travels at speeds in excess of 40mph throughout the speed restricted area. As a WW resident, I usually find that the speed limits are obeyed caused by the traffic turning into Rectory Lane, Chapel Lane, into the Post Office, Gravelhill Lane and Garage Lane at Setchey.

I believe that the NH Plan Steering Group should also address the need to improve cycle routes to/from Lynn, installation of cattle grids in NR Common access roads and widening of Rectory Lane and Chequers Lanes especially to accommodate PSV’s.
Draft Local Economy Policies

We do not believe that we would use local facilities i.e. shops if provided as two substantial supermarkets at the end of the A10/A47 within short distance.

LE01 – agree Brownfield sites should take preference to Greenfield.

LE02 – agree new residents must have employment opportunities.

LE03 – Local services must remain and be expanded and be walkable.

Centre of the village should be around the church with shops, medical centre and chemist. Bigger school, clubs for younger children as most children get bored and don't know what to do.

LE10 and LE11 same as above [Footpaths would be necessary. All the distributor road will do is move West Winch’s traffic problems to North Runcton. Same argument applies to TRA12, TRA04 and TRA03. This distributor road will become a de facto bypass for West Winch. Then any proposed bypass plan will disappear.]

LE01 – with the excess of Brownfield sites in Lynn, why is prime agricultural land being developed?

Where are the jobs. Disagree with policies on Local Economy – not realistic.

Where would these people who live in these proposed houses work? Is this going to increase unemployment and increase of crime?

I am 44 [years old] and there are no good jobs here. There are too many eastern Europeans and more housing would encourage more people (if many people can afford to buy a house these days) I couldn’t if I had to buy again. I only can earn £850 a month if I am lucky. This is a real problem for young people.

I agree with LE01 and LE02 – I am also fed up with picking up the rubbish that people throw out of their cars – a small thing but more people more rubbish. I like to keep my village clean and tidy.

LE01 – strongly support. Existing agricultural land must be protected.

With regard to having local services within 5 mins walking distance of a development – I do not think that this would be economically viable – small shops struggle to survive and here they would each have a small catchment area.

Background: I note that reference is made to NR Common and its facilities, but no mention is made of the WW Common and its facilities. I also note that no representation has been made to the WW Service Station, The Winch Restaurant and the Oriental Palace.

Little accreditation has been given to the many businesses that thrive in the Setchey industrial complex which employ a considerable number of people and also those businesses that straggle the A10 towards Setchey. The road infrastructure in the Setchey industrial complex is in desperate need of improvement as indeed is the access/egress to the A10.
The future availability of high speed internet seems to escape the attention of this area. This too needs to be urgently addressed.

Draft Housing/New Development Policies

We feel that with the expansion of the current villages, the character of these villages will be lost.

I consider the construction of 6000 houses taking up to approximately 1500 acres of land on the A10 corridor is aiming too high. It is important that all the infrastructure is in place prior to construction. There is no mention of the number of affordable properties or private properties catered for and I have doubts that there will be co-existence and integration between the two sections.

North Runcton village is not getting enough housing.

Density of housing to be in-keeping with existing.

HOU20 – strongly agree.

I just hope there is no alley way between houses joining into different parts of estates as these can be what is called “ran run” for would-be burglars or yobs.

New housing areas should avoid “Alleyway” footpaths. If there is a future rise in crime they could become “bolt holes” for offenders.

Would prefer to keep developments to low/medium density.

HOU19 – Plan and build drainage network BEFORE builds starts.

North Runcton hardly impacted by new house build!!!

HOU01 – 22 Excellent ideas and structuring.

Who will buy the houses and where will they work?

HOU 01 – 22 - Agree strongly. Housing must be in-keeping with existing – density and build/type. No 3 storey building. More housing in North Runcton. Agricultural land should be considered there.

Need to ensure all development is only two storey not three storey or higher. Local developments of three storey are out of place.

Housing density must not be too high.

The development of similar properties and NOT apartment blocks would also be of an advantage to local area.
We feel there is a need for some smaller affordable housing for young families and better housing and facilities for the elderly.

I find your proposed development plan for West Winch and North Runcton horrendous. It will no longer be a village community. What you are proposing for 2026 and beyond will swamp the existing village as we know it. The fact that you are proposing to almost double the size of the village proves no thought or consideration to local residents. My wife and I have lived here for nearly 50 years, why should we be forced out of our homes because of greed.

The entire proposed development plan will turn West Winch and North Runcton into a suburb of King’s Lynn. It will no longer be a village community. The proposed number of dwellings for 2026 and beyond will swamp the village as you are aware with your statement on needing a new school as the existing school will be swamped (your words!).

We do not need 25,000 future offspring, more residents in these villages.

The fact that you are proposing 35 dwellings per hectare which is nearly town dwelling density, shows that you have no regard for our community as a village and want to turn us into a suburb. This is the major point that has been missed. THIS IS A BADLY THOUGHT OUT PLAN WHICH WE NO NOT NEED.

As an alternative to this the expansion plans to build 3,600 more dwellings should be dropped. We cannot cope with the 25,000 people this will bring!

Need adequate parking for cars, adequate drive ways. I know from my own experience as a District Nurse parking is a large problem.

A mixture of housing not all small houses/housing association. Executive housing in-keening with West Winch.

HOU5 – the new developments should be screened from the village / road by large trees to reduce noise.

HOUS11 – the new developments despite offering to use vernacular materials and styles will look generic, as seen by other Hopkins sites – this is a token gesture.

Too many people

This should be called West Winch Neighbourhood Plan as there is not building in North Runcton [village]. Even thought the drainage scheme indicates that North Runcton area has the best drainage.

West Winch will become an extension of King’s Lynn as there will be next to no break between them.

As plan is now, West Winch is taking ALL development. North Runcton appears to have woods, farmland etc protected.

A new development will probably happen – but needs to cover both villages.

As this is a draft plan it is obvious that West Winch needs a new road which we are informed has to come to the east of West Winch – which is likely to cross some of our land. This new road would be coming closer to North Runcton who will be having no new development but bringing the noise etc closer to the village. A definite plan of the proposed new road needs to be produced and a meeting held with the landowners to get their input.
HOU17 and HOU18 – private outside space minimum 10m² / adequate space for waste and recycling bins outside. If a household has a black / green / brown / grey bin (as most do!) this will need approximately 5 m²!

I have no difficulty in housing being built if the roads could cope with the traffic. Already these facilities are taxed to their limit.

King’s Lynn cannot support all these houses.

I feel too many houses are being built and the wildlife and nature is being destroyed. Don’t build the houses on top of each other. New estates are too hemmed in. No gardens. I would hate to have no choice than to buy a new build which if I’d been 24 instead of 44 – would have had to do. I love where I live and how it is now. I wanted to live in town I would be in town. I need space, I love nature. I’m sorry but this breaks my heart and the whole development will spoil this piece of King’s Lynn.

Two concerns are in relation to density of house:
1) 55 dwellings per hectare seems pretty high – probably preferable to be less.
2) But at the same time even with that density only 3000 houses will be possible I believe – significantly short of the 6000 target ultimately – likely consequences?

Developers are people without much afore thought. They ask us to help when really it is too late. They seem to think they are right but I don’t think so.

I have grave concerns over the number of new homes that are being proposed as they greatly exceed the number of homes currently in West Winch and North Runcton put together.

With regard to the type of housing/density – could it be included in the plan that once a developer gets planning permission that they are not allowed to make significant changes to the plans i.e. get permission for large expensive houses and then at a later date get the plans altered to high density housing or social housing.

I generally agree with policy HOU01, 02 and 03.

I don’t quite understand HOU04 and perhaps where it suggests 400m it should be a little bit more generous, after all we are trying to encourage people to walk and bike.

In respect of HOU05, there are several dog walkers in West Winch and it may be difficult for you to make people walk dogs where you want them to. What must be encouraged is that dog walkers should look after their dogs and ensure any faeces they drop are picked up and put in the bins provided. I suggest that developers on estates are encouraged to provide dog bins. However, these positions will need to be agreed with the neighbourhood committee.

I agree with HOU06 and 07 and note you are awaiting further details from the planners regards density.

I agree with HOU08 and that new development should meet Secured by Design standards.

I am pleased HOU09 restricts development to two-storeys in height.
In respect of HOU10 housing types/live work, this is a bit of a grey area. These days a lot of people work from their own home and are usually professional people. What we must be concerned about is people setting up businesses which are not conducive to housing estates. We do not want plastering contractors or builders or other types of industry being created from these areas. If there are to be specific areas for live work, where people live about the shops, then fine. But once again the use of those shops needs to be restricted. No doubt the planners can give more advice regards this point. I would have thought live work proposals or the like, should be in a specific area.

I agree with HOU11 exterior design.

HOU12 regarding provision of covered bicycle storage units appears to me to be dictatorial and unnecessary. Most people will have a small shed where they store their bicycles. If each plot has have an open cycle store and these have got to be sized on the number of bedrooms plus 1, what is going to look like? Also are people really going to want to park their bikes on show for someone to come along and possibly steal?

In respect of HOU13, Norfolk County Council Highways already have standards for parking in Norfolk and this policy should consider their requirements as ultimately they will be consulted upon the proposed design. Advice should be taken from Highways.

Similarly HOU14 cars/design and size of garages, Highways do have minimum standards which I believe are internal dimensions of 7 x 3m. I believe 7 x 3m is too large and your proposals of 6.5 x 3m would be more acceptable. However, are they prepared to agree with your reduced dimensions?

HOU15 provision of ventilation and daylight is usually covered by the National Building Regulations. Privacy is usually governed by the planners who ensure there is limited overlooking from one property to the next and they have reasonable privacy. However, upon housing estates there will be a level of compromise to be reached which the planners will consider as part of their consultation.

HOU16 I do not think you should be dictating the floor ceiling height of rooms or the sizes of bedrooms. The National Building Regulations do not have a minimum floor to ceiling height and this greatly assists design when endeavouring to provide dwellings that are similar to cottages which naturally have low ceiling heights. Standard house types will have a usual floor to floor height of 2.6m, leaving ceiling heights between 2.3 and 2.4m. I suggest the floor to ceiling height together with sizes of rooms are omitted. Whilst I believe built in general internal storage spaces are required, again I do not think you should dictate their sizes. However, you need to ensure you emphasise adequate provision is provided.

In respect of policy HOU17, there is no heading for this, could you please explain what this is about?

Policy HOU19 link to drainage, certain areas of West Winch are of a clay subsoil which has virtually no permeability. Therefore it may be dangerous to suggest the use of permeable surfaces as where it tries to drain through it cannot and would need crated soakaways beneath which are adequately sized to suit the permeability of the soil. However, given the permeability is almost solid, these crated soakaways will become massive and not viable. It would make more sense for any new developments to have both foul and surface water sewers with the latter being taken to a river or natural stream. This should be encouraged upon estate developments.
In respect of Policies HOU21 and 22, again these are very dictatorial and for either individuals or house builders to meet these standards, could scupper any development. I recommend you only ask developers to meet National Building Regulation standards which no doubt will increase in standard as time moves on.

VERBAL COMMENT AT EVENT - She is very interested in selling that land and welcomed ideas to make it more suitable for development.

All dwellings to be built with an integral garage to minimise on-street parking.

Housing to be constricted on the wide a venue principle.

Housing to be finished in a standard colour or pattern – not like the last development in WW which resembles “Toy Town”.

If the current housing plan goes ahead, it seems that WW will take the brunt of the majority of new housing. It appears very little development is planned for “old” North Runcton thus enabling it to retain its rural aspect and character. However, the same will not apply to WW.

I personally would prefer the new proposed housing to be located alongside of the A47 commencing from the Hardwick roundabout towards Constitution hill and beyond. This would in effect be an entirely new community. This “new” village would not impinge on the rural aspects of either WW or NR. This plan would also relieve the need for an A10 relief road as all vehicular access would be to the A47. However, I suspect that this or similar proposals will not ever be considered as this would require compulsory purchase of land and would inevitably require more work by BCKLWN. Instead it is far easier to allocate new housing developments on land made readily available by greedy institutions, tired farmers and others wanting to make a “quick buck”; all at the expense of destroying our rural villages and their communities. Cynical beliefs? I think not. To me it makes better sense to build a miniature Milton Keynes than destroy the villages of West Winch and North Runcton.
Draft Environment and Drainage Policies

As much of the existing hedges and wooded areas must be kept.

I would be concerned about environmental impact, notably flood risk / drainage provision.

Make sure drainage is sufficient not like the floods that have happened in Eller Drive and Southfield Drive [West Winch].

As long as any new development has lots of green open space then it should be acceptable.

It has to be important that with any new development the infrastructure can cope with the increased demand put upon it.

Essential that Common Land (West Winch and North Runcton) remains in place.

EN6 – Plan and build drainage network BEFORE builds start.

EN1 – start the new village of Hardwick Green for initial development to continue concept of spread out rural living and ensure full housing infrastructure established in early years.

Existing open areas must be protected and expanded by way of footpaths and cycleways.

My main concern is for the meadows adjacent to Hall Lane [land south of Silvertree Way and Elm Tree Grove and west of where Hall Lane and Gravelhill Lane meet] it is a natural habitat for a large number of wildlife including news, bats, water voles, 7-spined sticklebacks, grass snakes, moor hens, barn owls and many more. The above mentioned area should be protected as an area of SSI. The area is below sea level with no drainage. If development is carried out it will put my property at a serious risk of flooding. Letter to follow to express my many concerns.

Have you established criteria for an archaeological survey? Field walkers and metal detectorists will provide evidence.

EN1 & EN4 – More details needed how will “off site” contributions help bid diversity once it is lost in village. How will future monitoring protect already lost habitats.

Environmental loss

This should be called West Winch Neighbourhood Plan as there is not building in North Runcton [village]. Even though the drainage scheme indicates that North Runcton area has the best drainage.

As plan is now, West Winch is taking ALL development. North Runcton appears to have woods, farmland etc protected.

Wildlife corridors – deer / badgers etc.
Need attractively landscaped park with amenities for all ages including disabled – maybe sensory garden area, ponds etc. Ideally situated on land south of Silvertree Way / pasture area Gravelhill Lane [West Winch] – this land is often waterlogged / flooded in winter but is popular for dog walkers. Fishing in existing ponds etc. Could have fitness trail / outdoor gym (such as at Necton). This land is already used by a lot of people for dog walking etc. and should not be developed.

I have no difficulty in housing being built if the roads could cope with the traffic and the surface water facilities could cope with rain water. Already these facilities are taxed to their limit.

The land south of Silvertree Way [West Winch] is always flooded in the winter and is not suitable to build on, but a wooded area would be good and the trees would use some of the water. The decisions that are made now will dramatically affect the future generations and it is very important that we get it right.

I am also fed up with picking up the rubbish that people throw out of their cars – a small thing but more people more rubbish. I like to keep my village clean and tidy.

I feel too many houses are being built and the wildlife and nature is being destroyed. I love where I live and how it is now. I need space, I love nature. I’m sorry but this breaks my heart and the whole development will spoil this piece of King’s Lynn.

All I can say that I am pleased I am 44 and I know what it is to be alone with the sound of skylarks above my head something that will be gone in the future – thanks to greed – again! Think of the natural world for once.

The proposals to ensure that West Winch and North Runcton remain separate and that green areas and ‘buffers’ are retained are good.

Environmental aspects seem to have been covered.

I am particularly concerned that any development will dwarf North Runcton and spoil what is a lovely quiet leafy village. There is a danger that North Runcton will lose its identity and all but disappear and merge into King’s Lynn. If development is to take place it is imperative that there is ‘a buffer zone’ of countryside round North Runcton.

The green fields and woodland should be protected. Rights of way must be protected – they are already heavily used by dog walkers and horse riders. More homes will mean more dogs being walked – more dog bins needed.

I couldn’t see any reference to the provision of allotments in the plan – I understood that these had been included.

I am writing to you to express my concerns for proposed future planning for development, i.e. housing on pasture land adjacent to Hall Lane, West Winch. I strongly oppose any further housing in this area and I have several issues I wish to bring to your notice.

- One of my main concerns is that the above mentioned area is in a very low lying position with a very high water table. The soil consists of a very heavy clay with non-existing drainage and there is only one small field drainage ditch which is overgrown with brambles, trees etc. and comes to a dead end i.e. the water goes nowhere therefore overflows into the field. This field drain is a continuation of a field drain which runs alongside my property and under Hall Lane to it.

- Some years ago, the roads to Pine Tree Chase, Oak Avenue and Poplar Avenue were regularly being flooded as the road drains could not cope with the amount of rainfall during periods of heavy rain and overflowed into gardens. To alleviate this,
the drains were then piped into the field drain running alongside my property with no thought given to where it would end up.
- In 2002, I arranged for part of this ditch to be cleared. This was an absolute necessity due to very poor planning when the Bovis Homes site was built, e.g. ditches and pits were filled in without any pipes being installed. This resulted in my entire property being flooded with up to 15 inches of water on several occasions.
- After I had the ditch cleared out, the Highways Department diverted all the surface water from Southfields Drive into it, with no thought or consideration given to the problems caused to myself. During periods of heavy rain, the road drains along Gravelhill Lane and the southern end of Hall Lane cannot take the water flow, it bubbles up from the drain gratings and flows in a torrent through the gate opposite my property, into the field causing huge ponds of water, adding to the water level in the field ditch. This results in the water in the ditch alongside my property not being able to go anywhere hence it floods into my garden.
- The field in question is virtually a flood plain and to consider building on it is absolute madness.
- This must not be allowed to happen again. I have letters and photographic evidence to support my claims. Having personally worked for several years for the Internal Drainage Board in this area, I have a wide knowledge of the inadequate drainage.
- Another concern for me and many others, is that because of the nature of this low lying site, it has become a natural habitat for many species of wildlife, including grass snakes, frogs, toads, newts, sticklebacks, water voles, foxes, rabbits etc. This area also supports a wide variety of birds including barn owls. The pasture is surrounded by very mature trees and hedges which have not been touched for nearly 100 years.
- I feel very strongly that this area should continue to be protected for future generations. I intend to contact the Norfolk Wildlife Trust for their help and advice.
- A further important issue is the sewer system which is already up to maximum capacity. The system has caused lots of problems in the past, specifically flooding with untreated sewage to several low lying properties, including my own.
- [paragraph about access to the A10 put under transport]
- My closing statement would be, and on behalf of all the local residents, the tragic loss of very old pasture land including the lovely views with the resident herd of cattle. Far too much pasture land has been lost in the past.

-Before any decisions are made, my points must be very carefully considered.
Draft Society, Community and Culture Policies

We agree with a new doctors for the number of proposed new houses to be built.

We agree with refurbishment/updating of existing facilities and of broadband.

Would certainly want GP Surgery and more shops. Oh for a decent newsagent near the Dentist in West Winch! [Leete Way].

SCC3 – not sure about new community centre.

SCC4 – strongly agree – definitely a new health centre.

More facilities.

What have we missed – there is no reference to how the local hospital (QE) will be able to cope with increased housing residents.

SCC policies – agree

Need better public transport to and from QEH.

New hospital would be needed to cover the needs of this amount of extra population.

New school would also need to be provided for this population as well.

Without these facilities being put into place [hospital and school] first it is no good considering the development of housing.

New facilities must be deliverable (e.g. Doctors Surgery, Sports and community facilities)

SCC4 - Ageing population will require sheltered housing and a further old peoples’ home / nursing home.

SCC4 – hospital QE is too small to accommodate so many new residents. Local ambulance cover needs increasing.

A medical centre is also a much needed asset!

We feel there is a need for some smaller affordable housing for young families and better housing and facilities for the elderly.

What about the hospital coping with this amount of people?

GP Surgery needs to be built early on.

Provision of school, amenities for play etc.

Doctors surgery and chemist.

Sports areas / clubs for youths – trouble comes from being “bored”.

What about support for local clubs – water sports at Leziate etc. Look beyond boundaries of development.
There is no specific provision for more places of worship or other community facilities.

I have no difficulty in housing being built if the roads could cope with the traffic and the hospital could cope with the amount of patients. Already these facilities are taxed to their limit.

SCC1 – agree with a new primary school – what about secondary school places?

SCC2 new medical centre is essential.

New facilities required with these new houses

Hospital: - Hospital facilities are already under great pressure. How will it cope with the great increase in population?

Schools/Facilities: These won’t be provided by builders for a long time after the houses have been built, if at all, unless it is in the builders’ contracts.

SCC7 within the community building to support “Parish Office” and/or meeting room to support the residents

School We require another Faith School in West Winch / South Lynn. Currently the King’s Lynn Catholic School) St Martha’s) is full and catholic children are being turned away. The new housing will bring more immigrants and along with the indigenous population a Catholic school is needed. The new immigrants are from Catholic countries. They are asking for their children to be baptised at Our Lady’s Catholic Church, London Road. Many of these people are practising Christians and wish to live and work here.

Hospital – more specialisation is required at the clinics. This saves the long journeys to either Cambridge or Norwich for treatment. People, especially the elderly find the travelling a problem when in pain. The Hospital needs to adapt to a larger population that will need care in the future.

Page 1, para 1. There are no cycle paths/lanes at present into the town centre. Are these anomalies covered in the NH Plan? The current cycle paths from WW to Lynn Southgates are disjointed and not conducive to safe cycling. Will they be improved as part of the NH Plan?

Page 1 para 2. There is no mention of the WW Bowls Club in the Draft NH Plan. The Bowls Club serves both villages and is an integral part of the sporting scene especially for the senior members of this community.

One hears that the developers are consigned to build a new primary school if development exceeds 100 dwellings. Does the NH Plan address the possible need of a new high school being built to accommodate the increased population? It is also noteworthy that St Martha’s RC school is currently oversubscribed. Currently this school cannot take additional pupils from Catholic families.

Page 2 SSC3 Suggestion that a Parish Council office and associated facilities are built to accommodate the increased growth in the community.