



**Stalham Draft Development Brief Consultation**  
Land Adjacent Church Farm, Ingham Road

Responses to Public Consultation

2 July - 30 July 2012

## **Report of Representations**

### **Stalham Draft Development Brief Consultation, Land Adjacent Church Farm, Ingham Road**

---

The Draft Development Brief for Land Adjacent Church Farm, Ingham Road, Stalham was published for 4 weeks public consultation from 2 July to 30 July 2012. A total of 17 representations were received during this period. This document is a complete report of all representations received and duly made.

The tables in this document display the content of each representation, showing the representation number and the name of the person or organisation making the comment. It shows the nature of their representation (support, comment or object). Please note that this is an officer's interpretation of the representation.

This report will be made available to Council Members for discussion in relevant Committee meetings and will be publically available.

**North Norfolk District Council**  
**Planning Policy Team**  
01263 516318  
[planningpolicy@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@north-norfolk.gov.uk)  
Planning Policy Manager,  
North Norfolk District Council,  
Holt Road, Cromer, NR27 9EN  
[www.northnorfolk.org/ldf](http://www.northnorfolk.org/ldf)

**All documents can be made available in  
Braille, audio, large print or in other languages.  
Please contact 01263 516318 to discuss your requirements.**

## Report of Representations

### Stalham Draft Development Brief Consultation, Land Adjacent Church Farm, Ingham Road

| Comment ID | Name         | Organisation          | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments   |
|------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| STA01      | G Dann       | Broads Drainage Board | Support                     | <p>The site lies a short distance outside of this Board's drainage district. Although it will not be possible to confirm what impact, if any, this development would have on local drainage infrastructure until such time as detailed plans are submitted. I am pleased to note that your document mentions the possible use of SuDS, and that a FRA and drainage strategy are among the list of documents you will require as part of any future planning application.</p> <p>I am pleased to confirm that the Board has no objections to your proposed document, or requests for additions to the brief, but I would be grateful if you would notify the Board when any future planning application is submitted for this site.</p>   |
| STA02      | Judith Howes | Stalham Town Council  | Object                      | <p>The following are observations and comments made at the Council meeting held last evening and have been recorded in the Council minutes as such.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not agree with the proposed position of the light industrial units</li> <li>• Prefer industrial units to be on the boundary of the public footpath/Ingham Road (Eastern end)</li> <li>• Concern regarding drainage – Anglia Water originally said they could not accommodate additional dwellings until at least 2015 – they have now changed their mind</li> <li>• Road junction Ingham Road / Yarmouth Road / High Street / Lower Staithe Road will become congested</li> <li>• Junction too narrow to accommodate the additional traffic the proposed development will create</li> <li>• Against 3 and 4 storey dwellings – maximum height should be restricted to 2 ½ storey</li> <li>• Conceptual plan not accepted – needs negotiation</li> <li>• Town Council unhappy as previous comments have been totally ignored</li> </ul> |

| Comment ID | Name            | Organisation       | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments  |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| STA03      | Mrs D Hubbard   | Member of Public   | Comment                     | <p>Unfortunately, since the Tesco development and road rerouting because of that, Stalham traffic wanting to travel east is coming through Sutton and out onto the A149 at the Catfield junction. This is because it is much easier to do this than to use the congested Tesco junction, which at times during the summer months becomes gridlocked. If the proposed development at Church Farm goes ahead I can only assume that an already unacceptable problem will be exacerbated. I may add that the 30 mph speed limit through our village is not adhered to and there are no footpaths along most of the route which the children use when walking to and from school.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know if this problem is being addressed.</p>   |
| STA04      | Carrie Williams | Environment Agency | Comment                     | <p><b>Foul Drainage</b><br/> We are aware of capacity issues in the public sewerage network serving Stalham Staithe Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). This matter should be addressed in consultation with Anglian Water to ensure that pollution incidents associated with the surcharging of the sewers are not exacerbated. Evidence should be provided in support of any planning application for the site.</p> <p>With regard to the sewage treatment works, the Foul Water Infrastructure Statement (EA/AWS/NNDC) produced in support of your Site Allocations DPD considered the impact of the proposed growth in Stalham on water quality to establish the potential implications for meeting the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and Habitats Directive (HD). This Statement established that the proposed growth at Stalham can be accommodated within the existing volumetric flow consent.</p> <p>It should be borne in mind that as the flow 'headroom' in the consents for the WwTW is taken up by the proposed growth coming on line there is a risk that there will be deterioration in the downstream water quality. As the consent has been issued, this deterioration is considered to be 'planned' and we will not therefore object to development that causes this situation to occur. The potential impact of this deterioration on HD sites has already been assessed as part of the Review of Consents. However, the WFD has not been considered and therefore, as part of the next review of water company prices, the quality consent limits for WwTW will be reviewed and, if appropriate, tightened.</p> <p>We would not expect this to impact upon the proposed development at ST01, but might have implications for any further growth at other sites served by Stalham Staithe Sewage</p> |

| Comment ID | Name | Organisation | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments  |
|------------|------|--------------|-----------------------------|---|
|            |      |              |                             | <p>Treatment Works. We will not be able to comment on this aspect further until after the next water planning cycle has been completed. As stated above, this is not a reason in itself to postpone development of ST01.</p> <p><b>Surface Water Drainage</b></p> <p>We support the requirement for the development to consider the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) at an early stage. Working with natural flow paths on the site can provide a cost-effective way of managing surface water, potentially avoiding costly engineering solutions. We would therefore suggest that the site layout should be influenced by the requirement to manage surface water sustainably. This presents an opportunity to provide multi-functional benefits - providing open space for residents and workers, sustainable transport links, wildlife/ecological value, climate change resilience and flood risk management.</p> <p>Some forms of SuDS can require quite large land takes and should be planned in to the site layout at an early stage. Ideally surface water drainage should form part of an integrated landscaping scheme and we agree that SuDS can therefore form part of the proposed neighbourhood park. In the urban areas you could seek more innovative sustainable drainage features, such as water gardens to control urban surface water run-off. These types of features can bring a lot of interest to the public realm as well as providing multiple environmental benefits, including providing some cooling to mitigate against the heat-island effect associated with the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>The above approach would be in line with the principles set out in NPPF and would also link in with the ST01 Vision Statement which seeks to “encompass imaginative design and architectural solutions to create a locally distinctive development...”, “feature a high quality neighbourhood park and built development embedded within a strong natural landscape framework”, and “incorporate comprehensive and timely provision of necessary physical, social and environmental infrastructure”. The above approach (also known as Water Sensitive Urban Design) is still new to the UK but it is gaining in support from drainage professionals and planners given the multiple environmental and social benefits that it can provide. It is also often a very cost-effective way of managing surface water flooding when considered early in the design process. We would be happy to provide you with further advice on this type of surface water management.</p> <p>We would encourage the developer to engage with us at an early stage so that we can provide advice and support in the design of the surface water scheme. The involvement of Norfolk County Council will also be important given their future role in surface water</p> |

| Comment ID | Name | Organisation | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments   |
|------------|------|--------------|-----------------------------|--|
|            |      |              |                             | <p>management.</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b><br/> With new information becoming available on the impacts of climate change it is important that the new development is carried out in as sustainable manner as possible. This is in line with the objectives of the NPPF and the adopted Core Policy EN6. The measures outlined below are supported by Paragraph 7 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Climate change is one of the biggest threats to our future and will have far-reaching impacts on our economy and society. We need to improve our resilience and adaptation to the effects, particularly with regards to already stretched environmental resources and infrastructure such as water supply and treatment, water quality and waste disposal facilities. If new development is not carefully planned, it can add to these pressures. We think that this Development Brief offers an opportunity to direct new development to more sustainable practices.</p> <p>Further information on sustainable development measures that could be implemented can be found in the Communities and Local Government publication, 'Code for Sustainable Homes'. The UK Green Building Council has also recently published a series of documents to help LPA's and developers to understand sustainability issues. These documents are available on the UK_GBC website at: <a href="http://www.ukgbc.org/content/advice-planners-and-developers">http://www.ukgbc.org/content/advice-planners-and-developers</a></p> <p><b>Water Efficiency</b><br/> Due to water pressures in the region we consider it is particularly important that water efficiency measures are incorporated into this scheme. The current adopted policy require s a Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3/4 rating, however we would encourage you to seek the highest possible levels of water efficiency. As well as encouraging the sustainable use of an important resource, it would also reduce the burden on the town's sewerage infrastructure. As well as implementing direct water savings on site, you could consider indirect routes to encourage water efficiency in the existing community thereby achieving overall water savings and further reducing burdens on the existing town sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>Increased water efficiency will directly reduce consumer water and energy bills and reduce carbon dioxide emissions. The applicant should consider the use of water efficient systems and fittings such as dual-flush toilets; water butts; water-saving taps and showers; and appliances with the highest water efficiency rating as a minimum. Greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting should also be considered.</p> <p>Any submitted scheme should include detailed information (capacities, consumption rates,</p> |

| Comment ID | Name | Organisation | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments  |
|------------|------|--------------|-----------------------------|---|
|            |      |              |                             | <p>etc) on proposed water saving measures. Applicants are advised to refer to the following for further guidance:</p> <p><a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/38527.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/38527.aspx</a>;<br/> <a href="http://www.water-efficient-buildings.org.uk">http://www.water-efficient-buildings.org.uk</a>; and<br/> <a href="http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk">http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk</a></p> <p>For the non-residential elements of this mixed use development we would recommend that developers are guided towards using equipment on the Water Technology List. This list contains products which have met an approved water efficiency eligibility criteria. These measures will not only help the environment, but directly reduce consumer water and energy bills and reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Businesses may also be eligible for tax savings through Enhanced Capital Allowance (ECA) if they invest in these products.</p> <p>The payback following investment in water saving devices is often higher in commercial units than residential due to the higher frequency of use. Simple measures such as urinal controls or waterless urinals, efficient flush toilets and automatic or sensor taps are therefore very effective. Likewise investment in water recycling schemes is also more viable in business settings. The proposed development brief should include a requirement for non-residential developments to meet at least a BREEAM 'Very Good' rating.</p> <p><b>Energy and Resource Efficiency</b><br/> Building, maintaining and occupying homes accounts for almost 50 per cent of the UK's carbon dioxide emissions. The NPPF requires planning to support the move to a low carbon future and promote energy efficiency and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. New developments provide an excellent opportunity to build homes and offices that are better for the environment and have cheaper running costs. Development should also seek to minimise the use of resources and the production of waste by incorporating, for example, passive systems using natural light, air movement and thermal mass, as well as using energy produced from renewable sources.</p> <p>The management of waste should be considered as early as possible during the design phase to ensure that minimal volumes of waste arise during the construction of the development, and the demolition at the end of its life. This can include measures such as preventing the over-ordering of materials, reducing damage to materials before use by careful handling and segregating waste on site into separate skips. The developer should consider how they will incorporate recycled/recovered materials into the building programme, including the use of secondary and recycled aggregates, and re-use of any on-site demolition waste.</p> |

| Comment ID | Name       | Organisation     | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments   |
|------------|------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|
|            |            |                  |                             | <p>Ideally zero waste should be generated by this development.</p> <p>The design of the development can also influence the ability of residents to be able to recycle their waste and we would suggest that designs incorporate facilities to aid in this, especially in multiple-occupancy buildings. We would also suggest that consideration is given to the provision for recycling within public areas. We recommend the following websites which provide ideas and further information:</p> <p><a href="http://www.wrap.org.uk">http://www.wrap.org.uk</a> and <a href="http://www.tcpa.org.uk/pages/towards-zerowaste">http://www.tcpa.org.uk/pages/towards-zerowaste</a></p> <p><b>Net Gains for Nature</b></p> <p>We would advise that, as part of any landscaping proposals, thought is given to maximise potential ecological enhancement. The NPPF sets out in Paragraph 9 that planning should seek positive improvements and includes an aim to move from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature in line with the Natural Environment White Paper (2011). When considering planning proposals local authorities are asked to aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and encourage opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments (para.118). According to the proposed development brief, the site does not currently have any noteworthy ecological value. It therefore presents an opportunity for significant environmental gain.</p> <p>In addition to the measures already identified within the draft development brief, the developer should also consider including the planting of only native species and use of low intensity/ time of year mowing regimes. Green/brown roofs and walls may also be considered. As well as providing additional invertebrate and bird habitats, they can contribute to increasing the energy efficiency of buildings and assist in attenuating rain water flow.</p> |
| STA05      | J & D Gant | Member of Public | Object                      | <p><b>Traffic</b></p> <p>Very concerned about excess traffic which will be using the chapel corner roundabouts exiting onto the bypass via Tesco, Stalham High street, Yarmouth Road through Sutton.</p> <p>A meeting held by Stalham Town Council last year with AWA stated the existing sewers systems were not adequate for an additional 160 properties.</p> <p><b>Doctors</b></p> <p>Both doctors' surgeries are over prescribed and at times it takes 3 weeks for a non-emergency appointment.</p>   |



| Comment ID | Name           | Organisation     | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments  |
|------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---|
|            |                |                  |                             | <p><b>Planning</b><br/>Proposed planning 3-4 storey dwellings are detrimental to this area. Goal posts are being moved at every opportunity.</p> <p><b>Screening</b><br/>Most screening appears to be around Church Farm area with very little between existing properties on Yarmouth Road and proposed industrial units as this is where the noise will be concentrated.</p> <p>Planners and developers have a duty of care to new and existing home owners which is not being adhered to. Stalham residents are being railroaded and dictated to by planning and developers.</p>   |
| STA06      | Ross Holdgate  | Natural England  | Support                     | Natural England is generally satisfied with the content of the development brief and welcomes the inclusion of natural features within the proposed neighbourhood park. We note that section 4.2 of the document makes reference to the need to consider the impact of the development from extra recreational pressure on The Broads including Broadland Special Protection Area and The Broads Special Area of Conservation. We would like to emphasise that impacts to these designations may also potentially occur due to changes to local hydrology and water quality as a result of the development and should also be considered within the planning application. |
| STA07      | John Clements  | Broads Authority | Support                     | The Broads Authority welcomes the references in the brief to the proximity of the designated Broads area, and the attention paid to the need to minimize potential visitor pressure impacts on the nearby Natura 2000 sites within the Broads.  |
| STA08      | Duncan Edmonds | Member of Public | Object                      | <p>I wish to make the following comments for consideration by NNDC Planning Department and the Development Committee.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notwithstanding that this site should not have been chosen in preference to land to the west of the Recreation Ground for this development, it is inappropriate that any commercial / light industrial development be allowed on this site at all due to the extra traffic having to traverse Stalham and/or Sutton residential areas to reach it passing local schools with narrow pedestrian footpaths. This usage may cause unwelcome</li> </ol>   |

| Comment ID | Name         | Organisation                         | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments  |
|------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
|            |              |                                      |                             | <p>noise and visual blight to nearby residential properties. NNDC planners have already earmarked land to the west of Weavers Way as more appropriate to this use, as traffic would not have to traverse the Town centre and it would cause little or no visual blot on the landscape with suitable landscaping.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The increased sewage and drainage requirements will likely compromise an already at times overloaded system at Chapel Corner. Again, this problem would not have applied to land west of the Recreation Ground.</li> <li>3. Although the proposed public open space and footpath connection between Ingham Road and Yarmouth are welcome this area would have been even better placed as an extension to the existing Recreation Ground. The site in general has considerable landscape amenity providing a gap between ribbon development along Yarmouth road with open views to Ingham Church which will be obliterated by this development. Again, there would be no such loss of views on land to the west of Stalham.</li> <li>4. North Norfolk District Council has yet again not given the weight deserved to local views on this issue particularly to those of Stalham Town Council and interested residents of Stalham.</li> </ol> |
| STA09      | Sue Bull     | Anglian Water                        | Support                     | <p>There has been pre-development consultation with Anglian Water and we do not envisage any significant constraints in providing foul drainage of the site (treatment and network). With regards to surface water, the preferred method would be to SuDs with connection to a surface water sewer seen as the last option. There are no existing surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>I support the requirement for an approved Flood Risk Assessment and an approved Drainage Strategy (foul and surface water).</p>  |
| STA10      | Ken Hamilton | Norfolk Historic Environment Service | Comment                     | <p>The proposed development area was the subject of a magnetometer survey earlier this year, which revealed a series of features indicative of a probable Romano-British settlement.</p> <p>Any planning application within this area should be accompanied by the results of a programme of archaeological field evaluation by trial trenching. The Historic Environment Service are happy to advise on the scope of such works on request.</p>  |
| STA11      | Keith Miller | Member of Public                     | Comment                     | <p>Good idea probably everybody agrees but where are the parents going to be employed to</p>  |

| Comment ID | Name               | Organisation     | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments   |
|------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|
|            |                    |                  |                             | support them? No work in whole area.   |
| STA12      | Gerald Neve        | Member of Public | Comment                     | <p>I attended the meeting at the Baptist Chapel concerning the above development. My concerns are about the sewage and its ability to cope with the added volume. Also, what is going to happen about drainage? The water lays all around the roundabouts now after rain. The railings are always getting hit by larger vehicles – lorries, artics, school buses etc. As for the pedestrian crossings its dangerous crossing now as a lot of vehicle <u>don't</u> stop.</p> <p>As for the industrial units will they be all one-man units? There's no employment in Stalham now as it is.</p>  |
| STA13      | C Hoy              | Member of Public | Objection                   | <p>I feel i need to put pen to paper about the development. I attended the meeting and I don't think that this development has been thought out properly. The pavements are too narrow and the roads.</p> <p>Also, for the amount of traffic, children coming out of schools both schools, the surgeries will not cope. To see my doctor now I have to wait 1 month. The drains will not cope it floods now at the roundabouts. Where is the employment in Stalham for youngsters or anyone for that matter, Tesco I suppose.</p>  |
| STA14      | Rev Ron Skivington | Member of Public | Objection                   | <p>Thank you for coming and putting on the display. Certainly many within the church and those I listened to in the hour plus I was there, and people who have spoken since have very serious and grave doubts about both what is planned and where it is sited.</p> <p>Yes Stalham needs low cost affordable housing for the young people who grow up and wish to continue living in Stalham. Yes we could do with a greater variety of types of jobs available locally. However in days when we speak of potential shortfalls in crop production to feed us over the coming years it seems nothing short of criminal to be building on what is prime agricultural farmland (I know that is a done deal, but it is very short-sighted and so raises matters of conscience).</p> <p>It was incredible to be told that the man from the highways had not even visited Stalham and therefore had no idea of traffic flow at peak times, how buses on Yarmouth Road at present prevent vehicles moving up or down, and how very few vehicles don't drive straight over the top of the roundabout outside the Baptist Chapel (I did observe some of the officials on the day spend 2 minutes standing at the railings watching traffic). It is not a good junction. It</p> |

| Comment ID | Name           | Organisation     | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments  |
|------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---|
|            |                |                  |                             | <p>doesn't cater for large vehicles well. Several people have almost (me included) been knocked off bikes by cars, the railings have also acquired 2 if not 3 fresh sets of dents since the 12<sup>th</sup> July. The road simply is not suited to the vehicles that will be using it.<br/>           *when you add into the mix 3 schools with children walking<br/>           *being dropped off / collected. Believe you have the recipe for a fatality.</p> <p>Another issue is exactly who will use the industrial units. I was told that "we don't know yet", so we are talking about building blind (a) what no-one may even want to use and therefore remain empty and potential sites for vandalism, (b) or what type of buildings may be most suitable for the people who it is hoped may occupy them. Surely individual units should be built on brownfield sites. 5 minutes drive to Catfield and units here lay empty, so where is the sense in building others? I was told yes but some only want new units? Well knock them down and rebuild which would be cheaper in the long term. Or maybe offices will be their ultimate use, but having worked in offices for several years the whole specification is different to a car workshop.</p> <p>It was also (?) that the boards have the words "nice views across open fields" I guess as a selling point – what about the nice views that are being lost?</p> <p>There are also issues about all manner of basics, sewage, the fact water will run off the site and the junction outside the chapel floods badly now with rainwater.<br/>           It is also of concern locally that our locally elected Council have raised over 35 issues all of which seem to have been ignored or overruled.</p> <p>I am aware you are under all sorts of pressures and constraints, guidelines and timescales but I believe Stalham is about to have hoisted on it something that will work against the heart of what is a good community and this is a scheme that is fundamentally flawed at many levels. An open meeting / discussion may be beneficial chaired by our Local M.P may help?</p> |
| STA15      | Mr & Mrs Howes | Member of Public | Objection                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious concerns regarding the detrimental visual impact the proposed industrial units will have on Yarmouth Road</li> <li>• Yarmouth Road is made up of residential properties both sides of the road including a junior school</li> <li>• Proposed development – is the only open space between Stalham Town &amp; Sutton</li> <li>• Planning brief - does not show or indicate provision for a dense landscape that would provide a shield to existing properties and Yarmouth Road from the proposed industrial units</li> </ul>   |

| Comment ID | Name | Organisation | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments  |
|------------|------|--------------|-----------------------------|---|
|            |      |              |                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees – at present there are several trees on the boundary of the site with Yarmouth Road – these will be lost – environmental issue</li> <li>• Industrial site – an area has been designated at Steppingstone Lane – why have they now been included on a residential site?</li> <li>• Proposed dwellings – far too high – maximum height should be restricted to 2-storey in keeping with existing properties along Yarmouth Road / Ingham Road.</li> <li>• Highways – Yarmouth Road is excessively busy especially at school starting and leaving time – numerous coaches transport pupils from outlying villages to the school – Yarmouth Road is narrow in places including a slight curve and hill</li> <li>• Chapel Corner – traffic hazard now – existing railings are constantly being damaged this situation can only be made worse with all the additional traffic the proposed development will generate</li> <li>• Flooding – frequent occurrence at Chapel Corner – town drains are working to capacity now – frequently overflows into the head of the river at Stalham Staithe</li> </ul> <p><b>Stalham Brief – Thursday 12 July 2012</b></p> <p>Condescending attitude of planning officers at the viewing who more or less said ‘this is what you are getting – hard luck’. Obviously it was not a brief but a decision already decided by the officers of NNDC.</p> <p>Democracy is totally out of the window the land owner stands to gain financially plus NO PART of the proposed development is near his property. It must be a case of /not what you know but more who you know?</p> <p>Several years ago we were told by [a planning officer] at a site visit to our property plus our neighbour when we extended our land ‘do not think you will ever get planning permission for any development – it is A1 agricultural land this can only be used for garden purpose’ what a farce – by looking at the proposed site provision has been made to extend the development (south/east boundary) and this would in fact bring any development to the back of several existing properties.</p> <p>When I reminded [the planning officer] of his comment regarding A1 agricultural land therefore no development would be allowed he said ‘I can’t remember’ – very convenient.</p> <p>At the brief it was mentioned that any industrial units could not be on Ingham Road because of the two schools – <b>wrong</b>. Stalham High School has a playing field opposite the proposed site but the infants school is on Brumstead Road opposite the rear entrance to the church –</p> |

| Comment ID | Name             | Organisation           | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments   |
|------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
|            |                  |                        |                             | nowhere near the proposed development. I think this proves a point that the planning officers are not familiar with the town of Stalham consequently they do not care what is built or where it is as none of the live in or near Stalham.   |
| STA16      | Sarah Vergette   | Sutton Parish Council  | Comment                     | <p>Sutton Parish Council has serious concerns regarding the above proposed development in Stalham and considers that a development of this size given that it also includes light industrial units, would be better situated closer to access to the A149. The Parish Council has been informed there is a site near to Sidney House which would be far more suitable and Stepping Stone Lane could be used to access the A149 without going through the town.</p> <p>They are most concerned regarding the increase in traffic movements in this area of Stalham. There are three schools in Stalham which would be affected by the traffic and the school at Sutton would also be affected as traffic would most likely go through Sutton to access the A149.</p> <p>Many children walk from Sutton to Stalham to go to school and in some areas there are no footpaths and safety is a great concern to the Parish Council.</p> <p>There has already been an increase in traffic through Sutton due to the new cameras on the A149. The Street in Sutton is already very dangerous with speeding traffic going through; cars are parked on the side of the road adding to the problems.</p> <p>The Parish council is also concerned regarding on-going surface water and sewage problems in Stalham and Sutton and another development would exacerbate these problems.</p> |
| STA17      | Stephen Faulkner | Norfolk County Council | Comment                     | <p>The officer-level comments below are made on a without prejudice basis and the County Council reserves the right to make further comments on the emerging Development Brief.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure Delivery</b></p> <p>While there is reference in the draft Development Brief regarding Infrastructure Provision (Section 5.7), it is felt that there ought to be further reference in the document to:</p> <p>(a) the likely quantum of infrastructure provision and broad costs;</p> <p>(b) the overall viability of the proposed housing development taking into account the infrastructure needed; and</p> <p>(c) the mechanisms needed to deliver the infrastructure e.g. whether through S106, a</p>  |

| Comment ID | Name | Organisation | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments   |
|------------|------|--------------|-----------------------------|--|
|            |      |              |                             | <p>Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or a combination of both.</p> <p>As such it is felt that the Brief ought to provide more detail on all the infrastructure and services needed and indicate when it will be delivered /phased. It may be useful to have a draft “heads of terms” agreement appended to the Brief addressing these issues more fully.</p> <p><b>Economic Development</b></p> <p>Norfolk County Council is pleased to see some modest commercial use proposed and feels it is in scale and in keeping with the town. Hopefully it will generate footfall in the town centre during and after working hours. However, the screening between it and the new housing development looks insufficient. Whereas there is a great deal proposed elsewhere that just seems to separate two areas of housing. If businesses thought they were going to be in conflict with neighbours, it would reduce the attractiveness of the site.</p> <p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b></p> <p>The proposal site is partly underlain by an identified mineral resource (sand and gravel) which is safeguarded as part of the adopted Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, and Core Strategy policy CS16 ‘Safeguarding’ is applicable. The County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) would object to any future planning application on this site unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the applicant carries out investigations to identify whether the resource is viable for mineral extraction, and</li> <li>2. if the mineral resource is viable, the applicant considers whether it could be extracted economically prior to development taking place. It is the view of the MPA that the Environmental Statement in support of this planning application should address the issues above.</li> </ol> <p>The development brief should be amended to include information on the presence of safeguarded mineral resources on site, and a requirement for any future planning application to consider prior mineral extraction, as detailed above.</p> <p>The following wording is suggested to be included in the development brief:<br/> Mineral resource safeguarding<br/> Any future planning application would need to contain, within its Environmental Statement,</p> |

| Comment ID | Name | Organisation | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments  |
|------------|------|--------------|-----------------------------|---|
|            |      |              |                             | <p>details of investigations to identify if the mineral resource (sand and gravel) underlying the site is viable for mineral extraction. If investigations identify a viable resource the ES would need to include an assessment as to whether the resource could be extracted economically prior to development taking place.</p> <p>If the resource could be extracted economically prior to development taking place, then this must be carried out in order that the mineral resource underlying the site is not needlessly sterilised (in accordance with NPPF).</p> <p>A duty is placed upon Local Planning Authorities to ensure that mineral resources are not needlessly sterilised, as indicated in National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 143, and the guidance on safeguarding minerals published jointly by DCLG and the BGS. Paragraph 144 states that “When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should: not normally permit other development proposals in mineral safeguarding areas where they might constrain potential future use for these purposes”. The policy section of the development brief does not include reference to the adopted Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy which forms part of the development plan; it is considered that this section should be revised prior to final publication to take this and the requirements of the NPPF into account in relation to mineral safeguarding.</p> <p>There are opportunities for the sand and gravel from on-site resources to be used in the construction phases of developments. This will improve the sustainability of the project by reducing the need to extract sand and gravel from other locations, reducing the carbon cost of the project by reducing the quantity of aggregate needing to be transported to the site, reducing the quantities of material removed from the site as part of the ground works operations, and ensuring that resources in other areas are not unnecessarily extracted, so that they can be available to sustain future growth. There are also opportunities on restoration for areas in which mineral has been extracted to form part of sustainable drainage systems, areas for recreation/open space, and/or renewable energy schemes, such as ground source heat pumps. Norfolk County Council as the statutory authority for Mineral Planning in Norfolk wishes to be kept informed as this proposal is progressed through the application process.</p> <p><b>Public Right of Way</b><br/> PROW Stalham FP4 is shown outside the northern boundary of the development plan. This may appear a missed opportunity to connect potential new residents to the network of PROW that lie to the north of the site which would allow them access to explore the countryside. It is therefore suggested that the boundary is redrawn to incorporate this. This would also provide an opportunity for Norfolk County Council to obtain developers planning obligation money to upgrade and maintain the PROW.</p> |



| Comment ID | Name        | Organisation  | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments  |
|------------|-------------|---|-----------------------------|---|
|            |             |   |                             | If the PROW is not brought within the development boundary consideration should be given to connect the internal paths of the development to it in any case.  |
| STA18      | Nigel Dixon | Norfolk Count Council Member for Hoveton & Stalham Ward | Comments                    | <p><b>Overall Vision for the Site</b><br/>While there are significant concerns over the intensity of the proposed development, in terms of traffic generation and access to the main routes, I am supportive of the aim and aspiration for a mixed use development but I don't think commercial use is successfully deliverable on that site.</p> <p><b>Broad Principles</b><br/>Given the intended mixed use there are major problems regarding access and traffic flow to and from the employment area off the Old Yarmouth Road (OYR). This is likely to generate significant regular and routine commercial traffic, some of which will be LGVs. The access route from the west will be via the Tesco junction on the A149 to the mini roundabouts at the OYR cross roads and then along the relatively narrow OYR to the site entrance. This road has high pedestrian use as it serves 2 large residential developments and the Middle School and the footways are narrow with no verge separation from the vehicle carriage. The access route from the east will be split between those who will use the same Tesco junction, as per the western route, and those who will use the Catfield junction off the A149 via Sutton High St and Stalham Green to the OYR entrance. This route is narrow, with few footways, has many bends and has major subsidence points caused by excessive use by LGVs. Increasing traffic flow along this route would have a major impact on both road safety and residential amenity. I have discussed these access route problems with Highways and there are no affordable effective remedies available in the foreseeable future. If these problems had been recognised and properly evaluated at the allocation stage then it's unlikely this site would have been allocated in the way it has been. My conclusion is that, however desirable commercial and employment use is on the site, it isn't fit for purpose and it should be moved to another site. I therefore cannot agree to the broad principles of access, traffic movement and mix of use regarding the proposed employment area.</p> <p><b>Guidance for Future development</b><br/>Given the above, I suggest the site use be amended for residential and community use only and that the employment, together with possibly some of the community, use be moved to other sites within the Town boundary. By taking a broader approach, taking other sites into account, a better solution for this site could be found for both Stalham and adjoining villages.</p> |

| Comment ID | Name        | Organisation     | Objection/ Support/ Comment | Comments   |
|------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| STA19      | D Southwood | Member of Public | Comment                     | <p>I am writing to you to express my concerns regarding the development of land opposite the Yarmouth / Ingham road in Stalham. As far as I understand it, the plans are to build 160 new homes on the 9 hectare site (along with other facilities) My view is that this will ravage our town more than other things already have.</p> <p>Before the council allowed Tesco to build on the market site, Stalham was a bustling market town, with many variety or shops down the high street, Let alone a extremely busy market which people would travel from miles around to come to and purchase there weekly items. Since Tesco has come to our town we have lost the Entrepreneurial/family shops such as the newlands the flower shop, the family run fish shop and consequently the craft shop that took its place. We also used to have more variety in food shops. For example summer-fields and coop and the local veg shop, that was always busy.</p> <p>With these new buildings built and the family's and such forth moved in. Stalham's infrastructure will not be able to cope. Both the primary and the secondary schools are already full, and without overcrowding the schools (such things would lower the results of said schools).</p> <p>I do not know were the council are planning to allow access to the proposed new development. I assume it will be both on the Yarmouth and the Ingham roads. Both of these roads are already very busy (even more so in the summer months). What with young children walking up the Yarmouth road most days of the year to get to the primary school and a proposed hike in the amount of traffic shooting past, I think the council is putting unnecessary worry in the minds of both parents and children. There has already been one fatal incident on the Yarmouth road in the last 12 months, and I believe there may be more on both roads which could be avoided (as well as other roads in Stalham).</p> |