

Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan Review – Summary of changes to the Regulation 14 MNP2.

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
Front page	<p>Amend title page to read</p> <p>Mattishall neighbourhood Plan Review 2024-2036 Submission Version April 2024</p>	To accurately reflect the stage of the Neighbourhood Plan process
Paragraph 1.1	<p>Amend time period since adoption of MNP1</p> <p>The Mattishall Parish Neighbourhood Plan is a community-led document for guiding the future development of the Parish. The first Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan was approved by Breckland District Council on 2nd November 2017 and forms part of the development plan which guides planning decisions on new development in the parish. As the first plan is now 6 years old, it is appropriate to review and update the Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that it reflects new planning policy guidance, the adopted Breckland Local Plan and issues and opportunities expressed by the local community through more recent engagement events. Throughout this document the review of the Neighbourhood Plan is referred to as MNP2.</p>	To accurately reflect the time since the first NP was approved.
Paragraph 1.6	<p>Update paragraph 1.6</p> <p>The Local Plan sets a target for the number of dwellings to be developed in Mattishall over the planning period. The Local Plan identifies this target as being broadly equivalent to 10 per cent of the number of households at the start of the Plan period (2011) which translates into a target of 149 dwellings. This target has been met through recent developments including estate development at Dereham Road, together with development not yet built but with planning approval. Policy HOU1 and its supporting text (in Section 8 of this Plan) provides the spatial strategy for Mattishall, which aligns with the strategy in the Breckland Local Plan. It also provides a context to the housing completions and commitments at the time of the preparation of this Submission version of MNP2.</p> <p>Insert a paragraph after paragraph 1.6 to explain context provided by the Minerals and Waste Plan</p>	In response to comment from NCC (minerals and waste)

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	<p>1.7 The Minerals and Waste Local Plan provides important context to the Mattishall NP area. The document was adopted in 2017 and a review of the plan is currently at examination. See https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/policies-and-strategies/environment-and-planning-policies/minerals-and-waste-planning-policies/adopted-policy-documents The current plan includes Policy CS16 “safeguarding mineral and waste sites and mineral resources” and there are two sites in the parish that are safeguarded for sand and gravel. This applies to land at Thynnes Lane and land off Back Lane. For ease of reference, Appendix 6 includes maps of these two sites, together with a link to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</p>	
Paragraph 1.9	<p>(Previously paragraph 1.8 before insertion of new paragraph 1.7 – Minerals and Waste)</p> <p>Insert after 1st sentence</p> <p>The policies and projects in the Plan reflect the views of local people gathered through a series of consultation events, questionnaires, detailed stakeholder sessions and examination of relevant documents. The Plan has considered and where appropriate amended the draft pre-submission MNP2 to take on board the responses made during the statutory Regulation 14 consultation. The Plan references the qualitative and quantitative outputs from these activities, particularly in relation to the provision of evidence in support of the policies and projects. The NPSG is grateful to residents and organisations that have given their time to developing and agreeing ideas for the Plan</p>	To update the consultation undertaken as part of the preparation of MNP2
Figure 2	Insert end date of Regulation 14 consultation 8 th January 2024 in Box	To accurately reflect the consultation process
Paragraph 2.6	<p>Amend second sentence</p> <p>So far, there have been four clear stages in which residents of Mattishall Parish have been engaged in the review of the Neighbourhood Plan. More details will be provided in the Consultation Statement that is available alongside this submission version of MNP2 (the submission stage will take place after the pre submission (Regulation 14) stage.</p> <p>Amend Stage 4</p> <p>A further consultation with our local community and all consultees in accordance with the statutory requirements known as Regulation 14 was completed between November</p>	To accurately reflect the consultation process

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	<p>2023 and 8th January 2024. This consultation process was open and transparent. All comments received have been taken into account. Comments have been carefully analysed and assessed and can be viewed in the accompanying Consultation Statement, and the NPSG has responded constructively where amendments to MNP2 are considered appropriate.</p>	
<p>How does Box Page 25</p>	<p>Ensure Conservation Area uses capital letters in each case.</p> <p>Policy: - Refers to proposals within and affecting the setting of Conservation Area - Addition of sentence clarifying proposals that cause harm to significance of heritage asset will be refused in line with national policy. - Clarification of how proposals affecting non-designated heritage assets should be determined - Requires account to be taken of potential below ground heritage assets</p> <p>Additionally Page 25 Site 7 – page 34</p>	<p>For accuracy and consistency</p>
<p>MNP ENV2</p>	<p>Amend policy to clarify that View 4 is looking out to countryside. See also changes to Appendix 3.</p> <p>MNP ENV2: Important views and vistas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposals for new development must take account of the relationship between Mattishall village and its surrounding hinterland. 2. Development proposals should respect and must not adversely impact upon the key features (see Appendix 3 and the supporting text to this policy) of the views shown on Map 5 and listed below: <p><u>Views from the edge of the settlement looking out into the countryside:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Howes Lane, looking northeast from the junction with Old Hall Lane 2. Back Lane looking north and northeast across open countryside with Mattishall Burgh in distance 4. From public footpath in field bordered by Thynnes Lane and Welgate 7. Mill Road, opposite Ivy Dene and The Old Mill looking northeast <p><u>Views from the countryside looking into the settlement:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. New Lane towards All Saints Church 5. Mattishall Lane, west of Mattishall Burgh, looking south 	<p>To reflect intention of the policy more accurately</p>

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	<p>6. Dereham Road from east of village, looking west towards the settlement</p> <p>To clarify: 7.18 View 4 to be amended to say “View 4: From public footpath in field bordered by Thynnes Lane and Welgate. A locally valued view from the public footpath (a popular rural walking route) looking across open countryside.”</p> <p>Move paragraph 7.18 to paragraph 7.16 amending heading</p> <p>Ensure paragraph numbers for View 7 and View 4 are amended accordingly.</p>	
MNP ENV3	<p>Amend clause 3 as follows:</p> <p>Category A, B and C trees (compensation requirements)</p> <p>3.Loss of trees or hedgerows classified as being of category A or B in value (BS 5837:2012) will be resisted in line with Local Plan policy (currently ENV 06). Where loss is permitted, any Category A or B tree or hedgerow, or any Category C tree or hedgerow that has the growth potential to become Category A or B, lost as a result of development will normally be expected to be adequately compensated elsewhere within the site, taking into account the size and condition of the lost items. At least 2 trees should be planted, in suitable locations and as appropriate, up to an optimum level, to replace every tree that is removed (Not suitable for ancient woodland or veteran trees as these are irreplaceable). Replanting should comprise species that are characteristic of the area and enhance the landscape. Supplementary planting which strengthens the existing network of hedgerows will also be supported.</p> <p>Add fourth bullet point to How does Box</p> <p>Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wording updated so that it ties in with adopted Local Plan policy (that was not adopted when MNP1 was being brought forward). - Inclusion of clause on veteran trees. - Removal of final clause relating to development close to countryside as this is now dealt with in revised Policy ENV5 - Wording updated to include details of appropriate compensation measures’ 	In response to comment from Norfolk Wildlife Trust

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
<p>Paragraph 7.24 and 7.25 and Map 7 and Map 8</p>	<p>Note Paragraphs 7.24 and 7.25 are renumbered to 7.25 and 7.26 following changes to MNP ENV2</p> <p>Amend to reference to NPPF paragraph</p> <p>The NPPF enables the designation and protection of land of particular importance to local communities as Local Green Spaces ('LGS') in neighbourhood plans. Paragraph 10 of the NPPF states that the designation should only be used where the green space is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In reasonably close proximity to the community it serves • Demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example, because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife • Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. <p>Amend for clarity to support school expansion if appropriate</p> <p>The adopted Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan included one Local Green Space at the School Playing Field. It is proposed to retain this as a Local Green Space. The County Council has provided forecast pupil numbers for the school catchment area to 2033. These forecasts demonstrate that demand at the school will not exceed the capacity at the school for 210 pupils. There are no current proposals for expansion. However, should expansion of the school be necessary on the playing field, policy MNPENV4 would support the expansion of the school for a demonstrated educational need. A separate Local Green Space Assessment, available as part of this consultation, has been undertaken as part of the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. This demonstrates how certain local spaces meet the criteria in paragraph 102 of the NPPF. The spaces that meet the criteria are listed in Policy MNP ENV4 and are identified on Map 7. They are summarised below.</p> <p>Amend to be consistent with MNP2ENV2</p> <p>Site 5: Thynnes Lane</p> <p>The site is an agricultural field north of Thynnes Lane, East of Welgate, South of Cedar Rise noted for its richness in wildlife. There are distinctive views to the south – see View</p>	<p>To reflect updated NPPF and for consistency with ENV2</p>

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	4 in Policy ENV2. A well-used footpath dissects the site. The principal function of this space is as a publicly accessible (footpath only) open space and through the visual amenity it provides to walkers.	
MNP ENV 5	<p>Insert a reference to Policy ENV7 at the end of Policy ENV5</p> <p>“6. Development proposals shall set out measures that will be taken to mitigate landscape impact including an appropriate level of native tree and hedge planting, with species that are characteristic of the area, as appropriate. Development proposals found to have a harmful impact on the landscape setting of the settlement, or the character and appearance of the open countryside, will not be accepted. See also Policy ENV7”</p> <p>In How does box add bullet point to policy section:</p> <p>Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1st paragraph based on previous ENV2 (important views and vistas) policy but also linked to updated evidence (Breckland Landscape and Settlement Assessment 2022 and the Mattishall Design Guide and Code document 2023) - 2nd paragraph is brought forward from Policy ENV2 (Important views and vistas) with clause 2b) added. - Paragraphs 3 to 6 are new - Reference added to Policy ENV7 	To address feedback from Norfolk Wildlife Trust
MNP ENV 6	<p>Add clause 4 to policy:</p> <p>MNP ENV6: Tranquillity and dark skies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any new developments should not disturb the tranquillity of the plan area through obtrusive or insensitive lighting or excessive noise intrusion either by the operation of the development concerned or by associated transport impacts. 2. Development proposals that include external lighting will only be permitted if the night sky is protected from light pollution. This means the proposed external lighting: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is the minimum appropriate for its purpose (for example turned off when it is not needed). b) Is designed such that lighting is directed downwards to avoid spill up into the sky or out of the site (beam angle should be below 70 degrees). 	In response to comment from Norfolk Wildlife Trust

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	<p>c) Avoids light spillage beyond the area intended to be lit. d) Should have a colour temperature of less than 3000 kelvins.</p> <p>3. Where external lighting is required, proposals should be accompanied by information on layout and beam orientation, a schedule of light equipment proposed including luminaire type, mounting height, aiming angles and lumen unit levels.</p> <p>4. Development proposals should demonstrate compliance with best practice guidance for avoiding artificial lighting impacts on bats: (https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/). Where lighting cannot be avoided altogether in proposals then it must be designed to avoid light spill onto wildlife roosts, foraging habitat, and commuting routes for bats, birds, and other species.</p> <p>Add bullet point to How Does box</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further detail provided in both policy and supporting text with respect to development proposals that include external lighting - Add reference to best practice guidance on impact upon wildlife 	
MNP ENV7	<p>Amend policy as follows:</p> <p>MNP ENV7: Biodiversity, ecological networks and habitat connectivity.</p> <p>1. Proposals should seek to retain and enhance features of existing biodiversity value, ecological networks and habitat connectivity (see Maps 11, 12 and 13). <u>In</u> accordance with national policy provide at least a 10% increase net gain, but to ensure successful recovery of nature in Norfolk aim to achieve a 20% net gain, in biodiversity. Proposals which result in a net loss of biodiversity will not be permitted.</p> <p>2. The sites shown on Map 11 will be protected from any development.</p> <p>3. Proposed development on land outside the sites on Map 11 or within or outside the sites, identified <u>on Map 12</u>, that is likely to have a direct or indirect impact on their ecological importance (either individually or in combination with other developments), shall demonstrate in an ecological assessment that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) they would not sever or destroy the operation of a protected species, priority species or priority habitat or its ecological connectivity; or if that is not possible, 	<p>First change to reflect requirements for BNG and improve clarity of requirements.</p> <p>Second clause inserted to clarify intention with regards to CWS and SSSI.</p>

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	<p>b) they include measures to avoid harm to the protected species and priority habitat or its ecological connectivity or if that is not possible,</p> <p>c) suitable mitigation measures are proposed to reduce or minimise impact on the protected species and priority habitat, or ecological connectivity affected; or if that is not possible, and</p> <p>d) suitable measures are proposed to compensate for harmful effects.</p> <p>3. When development occurs, Opportunities should be sought to improve habitats (including the creation/restoration of ponds given Mattishall falls within the Great Crested Newts Strategic Opportunity Area) and their networks (see Maps 11, 12 and 13); This includes</p> <p>a) improving continuity along hedgerows and between trees – this should be achieved by appropriate planting in gaps to create safe corridors of movement with good continuity and cover for wildlife moving through the landscape and reducing fragmentation of habitats;</p> <p>b) Improve the naturalness of greenspaces and access to them; and</p> <p>c) Improve connectivity with and between green spaces;</p> <p>d) Incorporating green roofs and/or green walls to buildings where appropriate and possible</p> <p>4. Development proposals shall identify and assess any potential impact on a Site of Special Scientific Interest, by taking into account Natural England’s Impact Risk Zones.</p>	<p>In response from comment from Norfolk Wildlife Trust</p>
<p>Paragraph 7.46</p>	<p>Note Paragraph 7.46 is renumbered to 7.47 following changes to MNP ENV2</p> <p>Amend paragraph</p> <p>Ninety-two per cent of consultation responders on MNP1 considered protecting the environment of importance to their enjoyment of living in the Parish. When asked what the ‘biggest benefits’ that development of the village could bring, many residents (59 per cent) said one is ‘protection of the countryside and local assets’. There was support for creating new publicly accessible green spaces such as a community wood or orchard and suggestions on how to enhance the countryside included encouraging verges as wildflower areas, retaining un-used ground as important wildlife sites and planting roadside trees. Policy MNP ENV7 provides a policy context to safeguard the key features of the local environment. It provides protection for the two SSSIs, Protected Roadside Verge and the County Wildlife Site within the framework established by</p>	<p>To reflect updated NPPF and accuracy</p>

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	<p>paragraph 185 of the NPPF. The first part of the policy also sets out a general presumption that other elements of biodiversity and ecological importance should be maintained and enhanced including the ecological connectivity between them or protected species, or other priority species.</p>	
Paragraph 7.51	<p>Note Paragraph 7.51 is renumbered to 7.52 following changes to MNP ENV2</p> <p>Amend the text currently in paragraph 7.51 as follows: Policy MNP ENV9: Flood risk and drainage</p> <p>7.52 There are a number of localities within the Parish where localised surface and fluvial water flooding occurs and, in some locations, this can frequently be during periods of modest rainfall. In the face of climate change, the risk of surface water flooding is likely to increase. The sewerage system is also locally subject to overflowing and backflow. During MNP1 consultation, the need for new developments to avoid flood plains and surface water flood zones was noted by a number of residents.</p> <p>7.53 Breckland’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) published in 2017 provides an assessment of the different sources of flood risk (flooding from rivers, surface water, groundwater, sewers, reservoirs, canals and other artificial sources). The work shows that Mattishall is at risk of flooding from rivers (fluvial flooding) and surface water, as well as being susceptible to groundwater flooding. Map 15 focuses on fluvial flooding and is an extract taken from the Breckland SFRA 2017. As can be seen this shows areas at risk of fluvial flooding in both Mattishall and Hockering. The risk in Mattishall is limited to the northern parts of the parish (away from the settlement itself) and relates to the two main tributaries of the River Tud which flow through Mattishall (Jacob’s Island Drain and The Moat Stream).</p> <p>7.54 The SFRA 2017 explains that there is a high risk of surface water flooding surrounding the three ordinary watercourses; Jacob’s Island Drain, Moat Stream and Occupation Road Drain. There are also two other pathways of surface water that adjoin Jacob’s Island Drain and Moat Stream from the east. Map 16 shows the areas in the parish at risk of surface water flooding.</p> <p>7.55 In terms of groundwater flood risk, Figure 7 in the SFRA is a strategic scale map showing groundwater flood areas on a 1km square grid. According to this map, many areas of the parish, including settled areas in the village are susceptible to groundwater emergence.</p>	In response to comment from NCC (LLFA)

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	<p>7.56 Mapping data showing the long term risk from fluvial flooding and surface water flooding is also made available by the Environment Agency here: https://check-long-term-flood-risk.service.gov.uk/map</p> <p>7.57 It is essential that flood risk is fully considered as part of any development scheme. An important part of this is the sustainable management of surface water. The widely preferred approach (by Norfolk County Council in its capacity as the Lead Local Flood Authority) to managing surface water is through the incorporation of sustainable drainage systems (also referred to as SuDS). The key principle of SuDS is to replicate, as closely as possible, the natural drainage from a site before development and to use shallow surface structures to mimic the pre-development scenario and manage water close to where it falls. SuDs can be designed to slow water down before it enters streams, river and other watercourses, they provide areas to store water in natural contours and can be used to allow water to soak (infiltrate) into the ground, evaporate from surface water or be transpired from vegetation. To be classed as SuDS, the system should take into incorporate four ‘pillars of SuDs’ design. This means taking into account water quantity (flooding), water quality (pollution), amenity and biodiversity.</p> <p>7.58. The NPPF requires that all major developments should incorporate SuDs unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate.</p> <p>7.59 Policy ENV9 (below) will apply alongside adopted Local Plan policy (currently Policy ENV 09 ‘Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage). This applies a strategic, district-wide approach to managing flood risk. The Local Plan sets out what will be required from developments with respect to location of development, incorporation of the surface water drainage mitigation measures, required run-off and attenuation rates, potential impact of infiltration on groundwater, as well as the adoption and maintenance of drainage systems.</p> <p>7.60 Applicants are signposted to the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) – Statutory Consultee for Planning – Guidance Document last updated in October 2022 (version 6.1), available here at www.norfolk.gov.uk The document sets out in which circumstances the LLFA will need to be consulted as part of the development process. In addition it includes four useful standing advice notes: Part B of the document includes Standing Advice 1: Ordinary Watercourse Consenting, Standing Advice 2:</p>	

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	Major Development below LLFA thresholds, Standing Advice 3: Minor Development and Standing Advice 4: Minor Development.	
MNP ENV9	<p>MNP ENV9: Flood risk and drainage</p> <p>1. Any new development should give adequate and proportionate consideration to its likely effects on all sources of flooding and surface water drainage, having regard to the latest available information on flood risk in Mattishall parish (e.g. mapping data available via the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency).</p> <p>2. Development proposals will be supported where they would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not increase the flood risk to the site or its wider setting from fluvial, surface water, groundwater, sewers or artificial sources; and • Have a neutral or positive impact on surface water drainage <p>3. To address surface water flood risk in the parish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable drainage systems (e.g. permeable surfaces, swales, green roofs/walls, attenuation basins) incorporating the four pillars of SuDs (water quantity, water quality, amenity and biodiversity) will be the preferred method of surface water disposal on all proposals and, in line the national policy, will be required on all major development proposals. • In terms of requirements for a site-specific flood risk assessment, areas at risk in the parish of surface water flooding shall be treated in the manner as areas falling within areas at risk of fluvial flooding. <p>4. Development proposals that do not meet the above requirements will be refused.</p> <p>Amend How does Box</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy brought forward from MNP1 with one additional paragraph at the end and reference to latest flood risk data. - Supporting text has been expanded to provide updated context with respect to parish flood risk. - Figure 16 (Localised flooding areas identified in local consultation) in MNP1 removed. New maps added showing areas at risk of surface water flood risk and fluvial flood risk 	In response to comment from NCC (LLFA)

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
MNP HOU1	<p>Amend policy as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals will be supported within Mattishall's Settlement Boundary, as defined on Map 17, provided they accord with policies in the development plan. 2. Outside the settlement boundary, non-residential development will be restricted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development for agriculture, horticulture, outdoor recreation, educational infrastructure essential to the existing education provision; • Uses appropriate for supporting a prosperous Local Service Centre, where such uses need to be located outside the settlement boundary and where proposals accord with other policies in the development plan; • A relocated GP and health centre in line with POLICY COM 3 of this plan 3. 3. Outside the settlement boundary, residential development will be restricted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural exception housing on the edge of the village where such schemes accord with the Local Plan; • Other types of residential development that need to be located in the countryside (e.g. essential housing for a rural worker); • Sites that are allocated as part of a strategic policy in the Adopted Local Plan. 4. All development proposals must be appropriate to the size and character of the settlement. 	Reg 14 comment from Breckland District Council
Paragraph 8.6	<p>Amend final sentence:</p> <p>Housing and other development will be expected to contribute towards improving local services and infrastructure such as transport, education, library provision, 3 2021 Census 62 MNP2 Reg 14 open space etc through either the payment of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), planning obligations (via a S106 agreement/ s278 agreement) or use of a planning condition(s). The mechanism for securing funding will take account of any changes published in response to the Planning Reforms proposed in the Regeneration and Levelling Up Act.</p>	To reflect enacting of LURA
Paragraph 8.7	<p>The Breckland Local Plan as updated by the partial review 2023 requires Mattishall to deliver 149 dwellings during the plan period 2011 to 2036. As at March 2022, a total of 120 dwellings have been completed and a further 85 dwellings have the benefit of planning permission or are under construction. This means the housing requirement</p>	To reflect the most recently adopted Local Plan.

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	figure for Mattishall, as set out in the adopted Local Plan, has more than adequately been met.	
Paragraph 8.9	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>The Issues and Options consultation clarified that the actual housing requirement figure for the district is yet to be determined and will depend on the outcome of a Housing Needs Assessment. The Issues and Options Consultation reported that using the Government’s standard for assessing local housing need, there is a minimum housing need figure of 672 dwellings per annum. Breckland Council has stated (Local Plan consultation event 13 September 2023) that the required figure for the district is likely to be 661 dwellings per annum. However, Breckland Council is now carrying out a new round of consultation that moves the Plan preparation forward. In particular, it is seeking views on Alternative Development Scenarios and Settlement boundaries. The methodology for determining the local housing need will take account of any national planning guidance published in response to the Planning Reforms proposed in the Regeneration and Levelling Up Act.</p>	To reflect enacting of LURA and the most recent Local plan consultation
Paragraph 8.10	<p>Amend paragraph</p> <p>The Local Plan Issues and Options paper included a consultation question with respect to the need to retain Settlement Boundaries in the district. It also posed questions as to whether Settlement Boundaries for some categories of settlements will be needed in the future. The most recent Local Plan consultation similarly asks whether the Council should continue to identify Settlement Boundaries in its Local Plan or develop a robust criteria-based policy instead. A criteria-based approach is not supported since Settlement Boundaries are an important mechanism for achieving sustainable development by promoting development contained within the built areas, avoiding sporadic development outside the settlement, ensuring that residents can access a range of shops and services within a 10 - 15-minute walk from their front door.</p>	To reflect the most recent Local Plan consultation
Paragraph 8.46	<p>Amend paragraph</p> <p>In 2019, the government announced the Future Homes Standard. This will be a set of standards that will complement Building Regulations to ensure an uplift in the energy performance of new homes. In January 2021, the government issued its response to a consultation which ran October 2019 to February 2020 where it confirmed that all new homes will be required to be equipped with low carbon heating and be zero-carbon</p>	Updated to reflect ministerial statement

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	ready by 2025. A ministerial statement in December 2023 noted that further advice will be provided through Building Regulations in 2024	
Paragraph 8.55	As part of MNP1, Mattishall residents expressed concerned about parking provision in new developments, with 94 per cent agreeing that adequate, well-designed parking should be provided for each dwelling. Policy MNP HOU6 translates this community concern into a policy. It requires that off road parking is provided to development plan standards. At this point, this is Policy HOU06 in the Breckland Local Plan (as amended by the partial update 2023), together with Appendix 2 to that plan.	To reflect the adopted Local Plan.
Paragraph 9.13	<p>Amend paragraph</p> <p>Children in Mattishall mostly go to high schools in Dereham. Mattishall Primary School is the only primary school in the Parish, located in the middle of the village on Dereham Road. With an increasing population, there was concern from residents as to how the primary school will cope with increasing numbers. In the 2022/23 school year there were 187 pupils on the register, with a capacity of 210. Current Norfolk County Council projections suggest the catchment numbers will exceed the school capacity in 2023/24 and 2025/26 but fall below the school's capacity in other subsequent years. Any necessary investment and expansion of the school was overwhelmingly supported through consultation with residents as part of the MNP1 consultation. This will help to ensure that all Mattishall children will be able to have a place at the primary school. This is seen as an important component in the community functioning of the village both in its own right and as a Local Service Centre.</p>	To update figures to reflect most recent data
Paragraph 10.2	<p>Amend paragraph</p> <p>10.2 Mattishall is defined as a Local Service Centre in the adopted Breckland Local Plan. Mattishall residents and neighbouring visitors benefit from the businesses and services in the Parish. The designation as a Service Centre recognises the importance of the range of services provided in the village.</p>	Correct formatting
Glossary	<p>Amend reference to National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>Often abbreviated as the NPPF, this document sets out the government's national planning policies for England. The NPPF was first published in 2012 and revised most</p>	To reflect updated guidance

Location	Change to MNP2 (Regulation 14 version)	Reason
	recently in December 2023. The policies in the NPPF must be taken into account when preparing local and neighbourhood plans.	
Appendix 3	<p>7.18 to be amended to say:-</p> <p>View 4: Farm Field with public footpath bordered by Thynnes Lane and Welgate. Summer and winter views looking east and south.</p> <p>A locally valued view from the public footpath (a popular rural walking route) looking across open countryside.</p> <p>Key contributing features to sense of place are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Views across fields towards open countryside - Views of village housing boundary at Cedar Close - Landscaping provided by tree belt that reaches taller than the houses and therefore providing visual screening - Key off-road route from West to East end of village on Public Footpath 	
Create new Appendix 6	Appendix 6 to show the Minerals and Waste sites and to include this link: https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/policies-and-strategies/environment-and-planning-policies/minerals-and-waste-planning-policies/adopted-policy-documents	In response to comment from NCC (minerals and waste)
Maps	Ensure all maps have the correct spelling of Mattishall	
COM1 Map 18 Page 80	Insert Bowls Club as a Community Facility (ie next to 3, Memorial Hall)	In response to community comment received at Reg 14
9. Community PROJECT	Page 87 Under the Heading "Project". Add additional sentence under "f": A particular project: Provision of a defibrillator at the Kingfisher residential site" will be pursued.	
Map 4 Page 23	NDHA No. 11 to be changed to "Congregational Chapel, Old Moor, off Stone Road"	
Appendix 7	Addition of Appendix 7 – Great Crested Newt Strategic Opportunity Area	In support of policy ENV7
Appendix 8	Addition of Appendix 8 – SSSI impact zones	In support of policy ENV7