

Examination Library Document Reference A5.5

(Appendix E: Consultation Statement - Examination Library Document Reference A5)

First Draft Local Plan (Part 1)

Regulation 18 Stage Public Consultation

**Appendix E: Schedule of Representations -
Comments on Interim Sustainability Appraisal Reports &
Habitats Regulations Assessment Report**

BLANK

Notes

The Council undertook a major consultation exercise on the emerging First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) and a range of supporting documents between 7 May and 28 June 2019. The responses received were related to multiple proposed policies and sites in the Plan and the Council has therefore, through this document, attributed part, or all of the response to its relevant Local Plan policy, section, or other consultation document as relevant. The original consultation responses can be viewed in full on the [Consultation Portal](https://consult.north-norfolk.gov.uk)¹. All consultation and other supporting documents can be viewed in the [Document Library](http://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/documentlibrary)².

The following tables provide a summary of the comments submitted to the Council as part of the **First Draft Local Plan (Part 1)** document consultation on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Scoping and Sustainability Reports along with those received on the Interim Habitat Regulation Report.

Five separate appendices have been published in total: Appendix A (Individuals), Appendix B (Parish & Town Councils), Appendix C (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations), Appendix D (Alternatives Considered) and **Appendix E (SA and HRA)**. These documents should be read together in order to gain a full understanding of the feedback received.

‘OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:’ This wording is used throughout the document. It applies in two scenarios where either:

1. An officer has typed a summary based on their interpretation of the comments; or,
2. An officer has inserted part of a comment and therefore the text is a summary of this particular part of the original representation.

¹ <https://consult.north-norfolk.gov.uk>

² www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/documentlibrary

First Draft Local Plan (Part 1)

**Comments on Interim Sustainability Appraisal Reports
& Habitats Regulations Assessment Report**

Document	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments	Council's Response
Interim Habitats Regulations Assessment	Gill Mayhew (1210098)	HAB1	Support	Wildlife and protecting the environment: am concerned that the houses proposed at Mundesley [50] on the Cromer road site, should all be built with Swift boxes as we have declining swift colonies in the area. Also spaces should be left in fences for hedgehogs, and small mammals, and special attention should be paid to planting trees that are native ie, Oak, Hawthorn and field maple, new strains of Ash, and beech. I would like to see it written in the contracts given to building firms to include all the above as standard to their construction of homes	Noted, comments are site and policy specific and are outside the scope of the HRA.
Interim Habitats Regulations Assessment	RSPB Dr Phillip Pearson (1217391)	HAB2	General Comments	<p>Section 2.17 mentions little tern management that is currently happening. This needs to be updated as the Little Tern LIFE project. The RSPB is also undertaking management of the little tern colonies on behalf of Natural England and Great Yarmouth Borough Council. This needs to be clarified, as although the RSPB is committed to long term management of the colonies this needs to be delivered in partnership and it is not our role to manage statutory responsibilities.</p> <p>It should also be noted that there in recent years the little tern colony at Eccles has become the largest in east Norfolk. Whilst outside of the Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA this is functionally linked as the birds at the colony are from the SPA. in some years the majority of SPA birds can be located at this site. The HRA needs to reflect this site given it is wholly within North Norfolk District. The RSPB would be happy to share data and discuss future iterations of the Local Plan and HRA regarding little terns.</p> <p>The RSPB is also concerned that water quality issues may be down played. New development will create pressures on water recycling centres and water quality is still not suitable to meet either WFD, Natura 2000 or SSSI targets in many places. It is important that the latest information is provided on water quality in the HRA to make judgements on development impacts. Impacts may occur some distance from the new development. This should be considered further in the next HRA iteration and the RSPB would be happy to discuss this in more detail.</p>	Comments noted.

				<p>Update little tern information to better reflect current distribution and ensure decisions about impacts from new development are appropriate.</p> <p>Review and update water quality information to ensure appropriate decisions are being made about new development and that water quality deterioration will not only be prevented, but measures will be in place to help achieve targets.</p>	
Interim Habitats Regulations Assessment	Norfolk Coast Partnership. Gemma Clark (121719)	HAB3	Support	<p>We are in agreement with the HRA recommendations and opportunities. We are also in agreement that there should be a separate policy for European sites due to the detail needed on developer requirements.</p> <p>We also agree that the HRA work is a strategic issue that needs to be considered across political boundaries.</p>	Noted, Support welcome
Interim Habitats Regulations Assessment	Natural England. Victoria Wright (1215824)	HAB4	Support	<p>Natural England is satisfied that the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Footprint Ecology, 1st May 2019) has provided a robust assessment of the Regulation 18 stage of North Norfolk District Councils Draft Local Plan Part 1, in accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and having regard to relevant case law.</p> <p>Natural England agrees that it is too early for the HRA to provide a conclusion that the Plan will not lead to any adverse effects on European site integrity. Further detail is required to determine if the mitigation measures proposed will be sufficient offset impacts.</p> <p>We trust that the recommendations of the HRA, including policy rewording and reassessment will be fully implemented through the next iteration of the Local Plan. This will be required in order for the Plan to be found sound at examination in public.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. The recommendations of the interim HRA will be used to update policies prior to the Plan undergoing final HRA.</p> <p>The final Plan will be subject to a further HRA assessment.</p> <p>The Council is working through the Duty to Co-operate including with Natural England on the Norfolk wide Green Infrastructure Recreation impact avoidance and Mitigation Strategy which will identify the mitigation required in relation to recreational impacts on Es.</p> <p>The final Plan will need to include the identified measure in this respect.</p>

Interim Habitats Regulations Assessment	RSPB (1217391)	LP379	General Comments	Natura 2000 and European Sites are the same. It is recommended that one term only is used and repeated throughout the Local Plan	Noted - consider the use of only one term throughout the HRA and Local Plan
Interim Sustainability Appraisal	Mr N Stubbs (1217346)	SA1	Object	<p>The opportunity to develop a sustainable plan falls well short of the degree of ambition we should be aiming for. '(SA) is a process to help ensure that plans achieve an appropriate balance between environmental, economic and social objectives'</p> <p>The plan does not appear to force developers to deliver the highest levels of 'green' development. Solar panels, ultra-high insulation must be compulsory.</p> <p>This is fundamentally wrong! Sustainability must be defined as meeting the highest environmental targets, no compromise!</p>	<p>Sustainability appraisal, SA and strategic environmental assessment, SEA, are tools used at the plan-making stage to assess the likely effects of the plan when judged against reasonable alternatives. A sustainability appraisal is a systematic process that is carried out during the preparation of a Local Plan. Its role is to promote sustainable development by assessing the extent to which the emerging plan, when judged against reasonable alternatives, will help to achieve relevant environmental, economic and social objectives.</p> <p>The SA provides a draft appraisal of the policies and proposals of the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). The process is iterative and a further version will inform the final policy considerations.</p>

Interim Sustainability Appraisal	Phillip Duncan (1217309)	SA2	Object	<p>Sustainability Appraisal (SA)</p> <p>The sites identified by number are not identified on a plan.</p> <p>It is not clear how the information presented in Table 7 was arrived at, eg what was assessed in cumulative assessment, what mitigation was assessed; different levels of information available and no detail.</p> <p>The colour bars and assessment of overall site do not appear consistent – for example site C43 and site C22/1 have the same colour ratings, apart from ratings for SA7, where C43 is better than C22/1. However the overall site scores show the opposite as C43 is suggested as “negative” whereas it is “positive” for C22/1.</p>	<p>Noted. Consider comments in the next iteration of the SA. The process is iterative and a further review will take place to inform the final Local Plan. The assessment follows a set methodology and SA framework as set out in chapter 6. Each objective is informed by a series of site specific questions that site behind each objective. Each appraisal is informed by the cumulative and in combination assessment of these. The differences between the SA scoring are detailed in the overall conclusion sections in the detailed appraisals contained in the appendices.</p> <p>C22/1 is edge of settlement, while C43 is loosely related to the settlement, which effects the overall assessment in a number of objectives, as well as the cumulative score and should help explain the difference.</p>
Interim Sustainability Appraisal	Norfolk Coast Partnership. Gemma Clark	SA3	General Comments	General comment to ensure that the emerging HRA informs the SA and that appropriate mitigation identified through the HRA is also built into the SA.	Noted.

	(121719)				
Interim Sustainability Appraisal	Pigeon Land Ltd. and JM Clifton. (1217026)	SA4	General Comments	<p>The sustainability appraisal objectives for the site identified in Policy C10/1 have been analysed. We concur with the scoring for the following objectives:</p> <p>SA2 (+2), SA3 (+1), SA4(+2), SA9 (0) SA10 (+1), SA11 (+1) , SA12 (+2), SA13 (+1), SA15 (+2), and SA16 (+1).</p> <p>Further assessment has been made in relation to the scoring of the following sustainability objectives and we wish to make further representations as follows:</p> <p>SA1 – (score -1)</p> <p>This objective seeks to promote the efficient use of land, minimise the loss of undeveloped land and to protect the most valuable agricultural land. This site, whilst technically undeveloped is located directly on the edge of Cromer and is bounded by housing to the east, an existing tourist site to the west and a railway and water recycling centre to the south. Its allocation for development recognises this as it will meet the identified needs directly on the edge of this Large Growth Town. Its overall sensitivity to development is therefore significantly diminished as a result. It has some value in landscape terms as an edge of settlement site, but its release for development purposes would protect much more sensitive sites from being developed and has the potential to improve a key gateway into the town. The site is also no longer in agricultural use having ceased to be farmed in the early 2000s. On this basis, its development would have a positive impact overall. (score +1).</p> <p>SA5 – (score 0)</p> <p>There are no recognised pollution risks identified with bringing this site forward for development. The site has not been the subject of previous development and any contamination risks are very limited. The allocation of this site enables new homes and essential infrastructure to come forward on the edge of the town in one of the</p>	Comments noted. Consider comments in the next iteration of the SA.

			<p>most sustainable options for expansion of the town. This in itself would reduce the need to travel and maximise the use of sustainable transport. This represents a significant positive in consideration of this sustainability appraisal objective. (score +1).</p> <p>SA6 – (score -1)</p> <p>This sustainability objective refers to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity assets within the site. . The site is in proximity to nationally and locally designated sites but is visually and functionally separate and not likely to affect these sites. The development of site C10/1 would enhance existing public right of way linkages. This has the potential to reduce burdens on European Sites in the locality by diverting visitor pressure away from those areas. The opportunities offered in connection with this development, including on-site biodiversity enhancements, mean that overall the impact would be neutral. (score 0).</p> <p>SA7 – (unknown score)</p> <p>Green Infrastructure is an important part of sustainable development. This objective seeks to increase the provision of green infrastructure within the site. Through the proposed scheme the site will facilitate the improvement of the existing green infrastructure by provision of new areas of public open space and landscaping as part of the scheme, including Bridleway BR22. The scheme will also provide improved connection to the existing public footpath to the southeast of the site. Consequently, by improving the existing footpaths and their connectivity with the surrounding area, and through the provision of new public open space and landscaping, the proposal will improve the provision of green infrastructure, therefore, the site should score positively for this objective (score +1).</p> <p>SA8 – (score -1)</p> <p>This sustainability appraisal objective seeks to protect, manage and enhance special qualities of the site’s landscape. This site is located to the north of a nationally designated landscape (AONB) but the railway line and water recycling centre to the south create a definitive visual separation from that sensitive landscape. The site is</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>an edge of town location. Its development offers the opportunity for the creation of new landscaping along its southern boundary and along the existing public right of way network. The site will be designed in such a way to ‘soften’ the hard edge of the town with an open vista to its frontage and provision of open spaces within the site. Cumulatively these measures would provide protection of the more sensitive landscapes in the vicinity. Whilst there would be a change to the site’s landscape from bringing this site forward for development, overall it would act as a well-designed buffer between the town and the more sensitive rural landscape that surrounds it. Therefore, the site should score positively for this objective (score +1).</p> <p>SA14 – (score 0)</p> <p>A thriving economy is an essential part of sustainable development. In order to ensure that the local economy is robust it is necessary to provide good quality housing in optimal locations that attract a skilled workforce to both work and live in the area. This in turn encourages further inward investment into the locality. This development would provide a desirable scheme within one of the District’s major growth towns. Further, the new residents would support the retail and service sector of the town, contributing to its overall vitality and viability. Collectively, to support and encourage investment in the District it is necessary to bring forward high quality housing schemes. This site would enable such an opportunity to be realised to the benefit of the economy of Cromer itself and the wider District. There would also be a positive effect in respect of construction jobs during construction of both the new homes and the new school, together with jobs that will be created in the new school. Therefore, the site should score positively for this objective (score +1).</p>	
Interim Sustainability Appraisal	Natural England. Victoria Wright (1215824)	SA5	General Comments	<p>We are generally satisfied that the methodology and baseline information used to inform the scoping report appears to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive [2001/42/EC] and associated guidance. Our advice is that further updates to the SA should ensure a robust assessment of the environmental effects of Plan policies and allocations on statutorily designated sites and landscapes including, taking into consideration our advice above and, in particular, the findings of the evolving HRA. The SA will need to identify appropriate mitigation to address any adverse impacts</p>	Noted

				to designated sites and landscapes and other aspects of the natural environment including water and BMV land.	
Interim Sustainability Appraisal	Broads Authority Natalie Beal (321326)	SA6	General Comments	Page 117, table 6: - HOU4/SD16 – seems like it should be negative as these houses will be in areas isolated from sustainable modes of transport – that is why they have their own policy. An occupier would probably rely on the private car to get to key services. - SA3 is often negative and it says that all new development will have some kind of impact, but this is not consistent. For example, should ECN2 and ECN3 therefore rate negative for the same reasons?	Noted I the explanation is contained in the full appraisal on page 223. The policy brings positive benefits of living on site for work These polices are concerned with employment uses. The actual use class at this stage is unknown and cannot be judged at this time.
Interim Sustainability Appraisal	Norfolk County Council/ Historic Environment (931093)	LP739	Support	4.6 Landscape, Townscape and the Historic Environment This section provides a good summary of the baseline information for the historic environment. It highlights the importance of non-designated heritage assets as well as designated heritage assets which is welcomed and links into with other parts of the Plan. 6. Table 4 suggested changes in red SA9: To protect, manage and where possible enhance the historic environment and their settings of heritage assets including addressing heritage at risk	Consider feedback in the review and finalisation of the SA Objectives
Interim Sustainability Appraisal	Norfolk Police (1217249)	LP734	General Comments	First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) - Interim Sustainability Appraisal (Pg.134) 10. Evaluation of Significant Effects SA Objective: SA11 to reduce crime and fear of crime Typo - Mitigation Proposal: The design policies and the North Norfolk Design Guide reflect Secure by Design principles. Should read: Secured by Design As per accompanying email please find comments for:	Noted- correct typo within SA Objective SA 11 to stated 'Secured by Design' not 'Secure by Design'

Interim Sustainability Appraisal	Adams (1215905)	LP589	General Comments	<p>This plan covers up to 2036. The percentage of the population brought up with computers and smart phones will increase dramatically. The use of electric, maybe autonomous vehicles will increase making traveling easier without impacting on sustainability. Online shopping and home deliveries will increase. Internet access to medical services will increase. Many of the criteria currently used to determine "sustainability " will diminish in importance or disappear completely. Hopefully this will make it easier to offer greater flexibility and enable more people to achieve what they would like.</p>	<p>Noted. The SA objectives are informed by a base line evidence review which identifies the key issues affecting the District. The production of the final SA report is iterative and will be informed by the base line evidence.</p>
----------------------------------	-----------------	-------	------------------	---	--