

Breckland Local Plan proposals (Regulation 18)

Mattishall Parish Council's additional comments on the Local Plan proposals (Regulation 18) sent to Breckland Council December 2025.

Policy GEN 01: Design and Sustainable Development.

Objection

Comments

Policy GEN01 should refer to Neighbourhood Design Guide SPDs for clarity and implementation. The Mattishall Design Guide and Code was prepared and adopted as part of the Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan review 2025. It is a material consideration for planning proposals in Mattishall and as a Supplementary Planning Document, should be referenced in the reviewed Local Plan.

The Mattishall Design Guide and Code offer detailed guidance that builds on the local plan's policies for specific issues or sites. Reference should be made to the Mattishall Design Guide and Code which details how to achieve this locally. This allows the local plan to remain high-level and succinct.

Policy GEN 03: Parish Hierarchy and Spatial Development Strategy

Local Plan **Paragraph 4.33**

Objection

Comments

Mattishall's 2025 Neighbourhood Plan's Spatial Strategy (Paragraph 8.10) supports a Settlement Boundary policy, informed by the Parish's housing requirement figure being more than adequately met.

Settlement boundary policies offer a framework for managed growth that balances new development with environmental protection. By drawing clear lines between a built-up area and the surrounding countryside, these policies provide certainty for developers and communities while directing growth toward more sustainable locations.

The Parish Council remains of the view that the "settlement boundary" approach within the current Local Plan should be retained. A Settlement Boundary policy is crucial to ensure that the character of villages is retained, and importantly that the countryside is appropriately protected. The "criteria" approach, which Mattishall Parish Council (along with many other Parishes)

opposes, risks unnecessary encroachment into open countryside/agricultural land creating increased pressure on fragile village social and physical infrastructure.

A defined settlement boundary creates a "presumption in favour of sustainable development" within the boundary, giving developers and landowners a clearer expectation of where proposals are more likely to be approved.

HOU 01: Breckland's Housing Requirement

Objection

Comments

The proposed Housing Hierarchy identifies the following settlements as "Key Service Parishes": Harling, Mattishall, Necton, Shipdham, Weeting. Yet no new development allocations have been made in Shipdham, or Weeting. Furthermore, no housing allocations have been made in Swanton Morley (a settlement of similar population to Mattishall).

The justification for large scale housing sites in Mattishall is not consistent with the approach taken in other Parishes and therefore not consistent with the spatial strategy of the Local Plan.

HOU 02: Distribution of Housing Development

Objection

Comments

The provision of a 17% buffer is both unnecessary and unreasonable. The NPPF requirement is for a 5% buffer, only mandating a 20% buffer where the housing delivery rate has not been met over the past three years. This is not the case in Breckland. A credible Breckland Local Plan could be prepared by reducing the housing requirement by 1,908. It is not clear how the current Regulation 18 approach would be considered "sound" as it detracts from the national guidance.

HOU 14: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings

Objection

Comments

This Policy should make it clear that only extensions and alterations to dwellings that are of good design should be supported. The principle is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which specifies that creating high-quality, beautiful, and sustainable places is

fundamental to the planning and development process. Breckland Council should consider linking this policy to its adopted Design Guide principles and Policy DES 01 to ensure that even small-scale developments like home extensions contribute positively to the character and quality of an area.

Additionally, the Policy should identify that where proposals come forward in areas with a Neighbourhood Design Guide and Code (SPD) the relevant neighbourhood design guidelines must be followed.

ENV 03: Improving Biodiversity

Objection

Comments

Mattishall Parish Council objects to this Policy as requiring new development to only meet the statutory minimum of 10% BNG. Given the importance the Plan takes to BNG, the Parish Council believes that there is strong justification for the Plan to set a higher required target. This is an established approach adopted by other Local Planning Authorities:

Guildford and Worthing: Both have adopted local plan policies requiring a 20% BNG, with their justification approved by a planning inspector.

Maidstone and Mole Valley: These councils have also adopted 20% BNG requirements in their local plans.

Tower Hamlets and Kingston Upon Thames: These authorities are among those who have been considering or have emerging policies with ambitious BNG targets of up to 30%.

ENV 07: Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Comments

It would be helpful if the Local Plan were to include a reference to a comprehensive list of NDHAs, possibly as an appendix to the Plan, or via an on-line mapping. Alternatively, or additionally the Policy supporting text should alert developers that NDHAs may have been included within Neighbourhood Plans.

ENV 13: Local Green Space

Support

Comments

Mattishall Parish Council agrees that the Local Plan should incorporate/acknowledge those areas already designated as Local Green Spaces in made Neighbourhood Plans. The inclusion of the additional site 033: Rayners Way / Dereham Road, Mattishall is also supported.

DES 01, DES 02 and DES 03 Design

Support

Comments

The supporting text to these Policies should be strengthened through referencing the existence and requirement to comply with relevant Neighbourhood Design Guides and Codes (Eg Mattishall Design Guide and Code SPD). Developers need to aware of specific material requirements in our Design Guide compliance to which must be demonstrated when making proposals.

INF 02: Transport Requirement

Comments

It would be helpful if this Policy clarified the definition of “major development”. The Parish Council assumes this would include residential proposals of 10 or more dwellings, but this should be explicitly stated.

INF 06: Developer Contribution

Comments

These Mattishall Parish Council submitted comments (above) have been compiled following consultation with the residents of Mattishall. A public meeting was held on 24th November 2025, attended by over ninety residents along with Members of the Parish Council and Cllrs Claussen and Plummer of Breckland District Council.

Details of the comments raised at this public meeting along with additional comments made via social media and received by the Parish Clerk are attached.

For the avoidance of doubt and to bring greater clarity this Policy and the associated text should be strengthened by making clear that any negotiated

Section 106 Agreement must (under planning law) be signed and in place before Planning Permission is granted. This is particularly important where Parish Councils may be being considered to take on future management roles such as maintenance of allotments, play areas etc.

Mattishall Parish Council requests this inclusion of a requirement that for major proposals (including those for 10 or more dwellings) developers are required to demonstrate they have consulted with the relevant Parish Council.

Additionally, Parish Councils should be automatically invited by the Local Planning Authority to participate in any Pre-Application discussions where major developments are proposed in the relevant Parish area.

Such an approach will enable parish councils and residents to influence a proposal early acknowledging that the LPA remains the decision-making body.