

# Diss & District Neighbourhood Plan Issues & Options Consultation (1) Results Summary: PALGRAVE



## Introduction

This is a two page summary which can be read alongside the longer more detailed report, available on the DDNP website parish page for Palgrave, [www.ddnp.info/palgrave](http://www.ddnp.info/palgrave). It provides an overview of results for the first of two Issues and Options Consultations, which ran across all parishes involved in the Neighbourhood Plan from mid-July to mid-August 2020. This consultation is one element of the evidence and assessment work which will help determine the final policies and site allocations. All of the evidence compiled to support the Neighbourhood Plan will be made publicly available on the website – [www.ddnp.info](http://www.ddnp.info)

A total of 961 people took part across the DDNP area, with 93 taking part for Palgrave.

## Methodology

Respondents were asked to agree/disagree the extent to which the following list of local green spaces, important views and non-designated heritage assets were important to them. A benchmark of 80% agree/strongly agree has been applied to the data received. Those which didn't meet that 80% agreement benchmark are shown in italics. Suggestions for additional local green spaces and important views were also invited and are currently being considered for further consultation.

## Local Green Space:

**Of the 11 green spaces put forward, 10 reached the 80% benchmark. Those that didn't reach the 80% benchmark are shown in italics:**

PAL1: The Green; PAL2: St Peter's Churchyard; PAL3: Waveney Valley Meadows; PAL5: Parish Cemetery; PAL8: Village Meadows; PAL10: Playing Fields; PAL11: Unitarian Graveyard; PAL12: Priory Woods; PAL14: Burlington Close Greenspace; *PAL15: Goodrich Park*; PAL17: Drake's Meadows

## Important Views:

**Of the five views put forward, all reached the 80% agreement benchmark:**

View 1: View up the hill towards Palgrave; View 2: View down the hill towards Diss; View 3: View towards Oak Farm; View 4: View down towards Diss; View 5: Views down into the valley

## Non-Designated Heritage Assets:

**Of the six NDHAs put forward, three achieved the 80% agreement benchmark. Those that didn't are shown in italics**

*A) St Johns (Now Park House); B) Denmark Bridge; C) St John's Hospital;* D) Medieval Moat; E) Land at Lion Road (Medieval); F to F) Common Land 1066-1990

**Housing Growth/alternative sites:** Although for Palgrave there is no requirement to allocate sites for housing, allocating a small site can have a number of benefits. The allocation can, for example, specify the type of housing that is needed by local people, and this could help younger residents get on the housing ladder or enable older residents to down-size if they want to.

Did respondents think the Neighbourhood Plan should allocate a small site for around 10 houses in the village?

**Yes: 31% No: 61% No opinion 8%**

*\* A number of other sites were suggested during the consultation and are currently being assessed. Those that are considered potentially suitable for housing development will be consulted on again within the community.*

**Walking and Cycling:** The two priorities for walking and cycling in Palgrave were ranked as:

1. Extension of the Waveney Riverside Path from Lowes Bridge to Denmark Green to enable Fair Green residents to gain access to the supermarkets and the town centre without using Park Road.
2. Extension to the Victoria Road cycle track to provide a safer and more attractive traffic free route from Palgrave to Diss

**What policies did respondents agree should be included in the DDNP?**

- Strong guidance on **Housing Mix** as part of any future development: **80% agree**
- Ensuring **density** of new developments reflects the character of the surrounding area: **90% agree**
- The cascade used by South Norfolk Council for **affordable housing** should include mid-Suffolk parishes: **76%**
- That larger developments should set aside some plots for **self builders**: **56% agree**
- A requirement for development to reflect the **Design Codes** for the area to reflect local identity and styles: 75% agree (Design Codes for the area can be viewed at [www.ddnp.info/documents](http://www.ddnp.info/documents) )
- Protecting **dark skies** by limiting light pollution in certain areas: **87% agree**
- A requirement of developers to **improve areas for wildlife**, including creating new areas: **93% agree**

**Traffic:**

- Should the proposed allocation north of the cemetery in Diss provide a new road linking Shelfanger Road with Heywood Road? **39% agree** (53% no opinion and 8% disagreed)
- A requirement that any major development likely to impact **congestion on A1066** should assess and address the impact? **90% agree**
- Any development should provide measures to better manage **traffic speeds** through the villages in the Neighbourhood Plan: **94% agree**
- Diss Town Centre: Should the Plan have policies should support retail, enhance the town centre and make good use of empty shops? **93% agree**
- Should the Neighbourhood plan support the installation of new **broadband infrastructure**? **87% agree.**

Thank you to everyone who helped to promote the survey in Palgrave, and to those who took part. Your input is very much appreciated.

**The DDNP Steering Group  
November 2020**