North Norfolk Local Plan 2016 - 2036

Examination Library Document Reference A5.1.

(Appendix A- Consultation Statement - Examination Library Document Reference A5)

First Draft Local Plan (Part 1)

Regulation 18 Stage Public Consultation

Appendix A: Schedule of Representations - Comments Submitted by Individuals

BLANK

Appendix A: Comments Submitted by Individuals

Table of Contents

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[1]. All consultation and other supporting documents can be viewed in the Document Library[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. These comments were submitted by **individual members of the public** against a variety of proposed Local Plan policies. An additional table provides a combined summary of the comments, including the Council's response.

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 Proposed Policies

(Submitted by individual members of the public)

Sustainable Development Policies

Policy SD1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD1	Woodward, Mrs Josephine (1217427)	LP602	General Comments	Clearer ' better definition of sustainable.
SD1	Bell, Ms Jane (1218416)	LP799	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** p. 45 Par. 7.7 I applaud the Council's decision to give priority to Sustainable Development and the Brundtland Report as set out in Par. 7.7. p. 89

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD1)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	2	Two comments received, support for priority given to Sustainable Development and the Brundtland Report, one seeks clarification on what 'Sustainable' means.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Support for sustainable development, but seeks clarification on what 'Sustainable' means.
Council's Response		Support Noted. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supporting ways. This includes an economic, social and environmental objectives as defined by the NPPF para 7 - 10.

Policy SD2 - Community-Led Development

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD2	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree - Community led development should be subject to the same scrutiny as any development for compliance with planning law and stated policy aims of the Council. Consideration in favour of these developments rather than those of external developers would be appropriate and inclusive of the local community but should not be at the expense of quality, compliance, sustainability or policy.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD2)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, Community led development should be subject to the same scrutiny as any development. Consideration in favour of these developments would be appropriate and inclusive of the local community but should not be at the expense of quality, compliance, sustainability or policy.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial comments received or issues raised. Community led development should be subject to the same scrutiny as any development. Consideration in favour of these developments rather than those of external developers would be appropriate and inclusive of the local community but should not be at the expense of quality, compliance, sustainability or policy.
Council's Response		Noted, giving communities a greater say and control in planning is a central aim of government policy. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy SD3 - Settlement Hierarchy

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD3	Arnold Mr & Mrs (1210694)	LP077	Object	The designation of small growth villages along the coast is objectionable given the lack of existing facilities, the absence of any plans to change that, the more than considerable distances from medical centres and places of work and the total failure to integrate the problems of climate crisis. Occasional references are made to 'environment policies' but these are a merely token response to the most fundamental problems of our time. The housing plan looks like the accommodation of private sector housebuilding agendas, with their emphasis on profit generation rather than on the meeting of social needs. Housing needs to be where it is most useful and the travel distances are least and these criteria will not be met by building in small coastal villages
SD3	Allen, Roy (1218469)	LP778	General Comments	Langham is listed as having a community shop. There is no shop. Langham is listed as having a post office in a community shop. There is no post office.
SD3	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP409	Object	Building in small growth villages as identified in Policy SD3 has the danger of allowing 'urban sprawl' which results in East and West Runton becoming an extension of Sheringham and Cromer (which already have areas identified for development). When travelling the coast road from Cromer to Mundesley you are in Overstrand before you realise you have left Cromer and there is a danger that in Trunch in particular, but also in Southrepps, any development will eventually lead to the loss of identity of these individual villages. As a tourist, it is the green gaps between settlements that provide the interest -re-designating Trunch as a small growth village is the thin end of the wedge as far as planning is concerned. -If all the development goes ahead in North Walsham and Mundesley as planned there is a danger that Trunch and Southrepps will no longer be identifiable as individual villages with their own unique characteristics. -Remaining as a countryside village gives greater control to the local community in 'exceptions' and providing social housing whilst still retaining its individual identity. Trunch has a conservation area at its heart so any new development would need to be on the fringes towards North Walsham, Southrepps, Mundesley or Knapton. -Changing policy to allow small developments of mixed housing in other countryside locations would energise those communities and would address the housing needs that removal of Trunch (and Southrepps) from the small growth villages designation would create. -Currently, Trunch has quite a low water pressure in the village. Any further development locally - in Trunch or in the surrounding areas will only increase that problem. The new sewerage plant at Swafield will only reduce current problems it will not solve future problems caused by new housing developments. The infrastructure needs to be put in place before any development can reasonably be considered. -Mundesley already has a problem with traffic at school time and the doctors surgery there will be just as under pressure as those in North Walsham when new houses are built. Suggested alterations: Higher prominence for keeping villages as named in Policy SD3 as countryside villages, especially those on the coast and those within (or on the edge of the AONB) and by not allowing the current defined boundaries to be altered Return Trunch to a countryside classification. Change policy so that smaller mixed/social housing can be developed within the countryside Build on brownfield sites and infill before looking at greenfield sites.
SD3	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP428	Object	re-designating Trunch as a small growth village is the thin end of the wedge as far as planning is concerned. -If all the development goes ahead in North Walsham and Mundesley as planned there is a danger that Trunch and Southrepps will no longer be identifiable as individual villages with their own unique characteristics. -Remaining as a countryside village gives greater control to the local community in 'exceptions' and providing social housing

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				whilst still retaining its individual identity. Trunch has a conservation area at its heart so any new development would need to be on the fringes towards North Walsham, Southrepps, Mundesley or Knapton. -Changing policy to allow small developments of mixed housing in other countryside locations would energise those communities and would address the housing needs that removal of Trunch (and Southrepps) from the small growth villages designation would create. -Currently, Trunch has quite a low water pressure in the village. Any further development locally - in Trunch or in the surrounding areas will only increase that problem. The new sewerage plant at Swafield will only reduce current problems it will not solve future problems caused by new housing developments. The infrastructure needs to be put in place before any development can reasonably be considered. -Mundesley already has a problem with traffic at school time and the doctors surgery there will be just as under pressure as those in North Walsham when new houses are built.
SD3	Castleton, Mr Norman (1218485)	LP807	Object	There is far too much development proposed on green field and village sites. The services have not and will not keep pace with this and the environmental impact will eventually be catastrophic. Therefore, I cannot agree with the development of sites as herein proposed or with the developments of roads without due reference to public transport provision. Defences against flooding from the sea should also be consideration given the important nature of the Broads.
SD3	Walker, Mrs Kerry (1217345)	LP331, LP669, LP350	Object	~In the new draft plan 2016-2036 Hoveton as a settlement has increased its hierarchy position to a 'Small Growth Town'. This is despite Hoveton being a village of 1800+ residents with a parish council, a village hall, a village sign and a separate district council. Concerns raised regarding Hoveton's place as a 'Small Growth Town' including: ~Hoveton should not be considered together with Wroxham - considering the potential growth in Broadland and in the GNP ~Concerns over the impact of traffic on Hoveton ~Concerns over the air pollution levels in Hoveton ~Concerns regarding the road infrastructure ~Surface Water and Flooding ~~Growth in Hoveton should be limited to 150 in light of the constraints and planned growth in neighbouring authorities.
SD3	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP205	Object	Overdevelopment of Villages e.g. Southrepps. **Suggested alterations:** Higher prominence for keeping villages as named in Policy SD3 as countryside villages, especially those on the coast and those within (or on the edge of the AONB) and by not allowing the current defined boundaries to be altered Return Trunch to a countryside classification. Change policy so that smaller mixed/social housing can be developed within the countryside Build on brownfield sites and infill before looking at greenfield sites.
SD3	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP206	Support	Support the principle of development being targeted in designated settlements. Disagree with suggestions that the policy should be relaxed to allow market housing in smaller rural settlements. I do have concerns about the excessively large allocations being proposed for certain settlements, especially North Walsham, and also an excessively dense distribution of selected growth settlements in certain areas of the district. I agree with the overall approach, BUT I would seek an overhall in the distribution of allocations across the district. There needs to be a much more even distribution between the allocations for selected towns. In particular, there needs to be a less excessive allocation for North Walsham. There should be a re-think of which villages are selected as growth villages, with a view to a less uneven spatial distribution of these, across the district.
SD3	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP207	Object	Bacton should not be designated as a Growth Village owing to the particular character of the village and particularly the historically has a "scattered" or "dispersed" settlement pattern, characteristic of the north-east of Norfolk.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD3	Witton, Mr Edward (1216836)	LP241	Object	The Plan does not adequately promote sustainable development in rural areas (countryside) where it is needed to enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities. Alter the "Countryside Policy" to provide for sustainable development within a settlement area. Changing the term "countryside" to "rural housing" as the term "countryside" is ambiguous.
SD3	Woodward, Mrs Josephine (1217427)	LP601	Object	The need to look at a better way to assess and provide for perceived housing needs.
SD3	Woodward, Mrs Josephine (1217427)	LP603	Object	Bacton, Walcott and Happisburgh should not be categorised as growth villages due to issues relating to 2nd homes, affordability, impact on infrastructure, public transport and traffic. Concerns over the approach for North Walsham and the proposed housing numbers, particularly 1800 on a single allocation. Reconsideration of Bacton, Walcott an Happisburgh as growth villages and a complete rethink of the appropriate number of new houses for North Walsham particularly the 1800 planned on a single site.
SD3	Young, Mr David (1210531)	LP051	General Comments	I had suggested that new-builds on greenfield sites in the Countryside should be allowed subject to a permanent residence status restriction. I had suggested that plots could be limited to 2 or 3 dwellings so as not to compete with plots for exception sites for affordable housing. I cannot see any harm in allowing such small infill, or even fringe, development subject to the normal considerations of design, overlooking and so on. On reflection I would also suggest that a permanent residence status restriction also applies in the chosen area to the brownfield sites mentioned at the end of Policy SD3
SD3	Edwards, Mr John (1216139)	LP320, LP322	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** Wells-next-the Sea [Wells] is a small port located within a coastline designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty [AONB] which is increasingly impacted by a growing visitor economy. There has been a steady decline in traditional port, manufacturing and service employment and a steady investment in tourism and housing for holiday and second homes as well as inward migration for permanent residence. This has resulted in seasonally based employment and a significant distortion of the traditional local housing market. The classification of Wells as a Small Growth Town in the proposed Settlement Hierarchy does not reflect the special circumstances which the Town is facing. The pressures on the coastal settlements on the North Norfolk Heritage Coast are significantly different from those elsewhere in North Norfolk District, particularly with regard to housing, and are more aligned to the coastal settlements of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk District. Accordingly, the homogenisation of the Norfolk Heritage Coast settlements into the general policies of the Local Plan is inappropriate. This is particularly relevant to Wells and it is proposed that the Local Plan should focus, inter alia, on: • Developing housing appropriate to the special requirements of the Town, • Increasing full year employment opportunities, while • Safeguarding and enhancing the AONB which is a major driver of the current local economy. The special circumstances of the settlements on the North Norfolk Heritage Coast be recognised in the Settlement Hierarchy, and the subsequent policies.
SD3	Hurdle, Mr David (901803)	LP065	Object	In 2nd bullet point of 7.20 replace 'reduce' with 'minimise'.
SD3	Swift, Mrs Julie. Swift, Mr Roger (1216911, 1217093)	LP242 LP271	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** Southrepps has already had planning granted for in excess of fifty dwellings in the past couple of decades and there is a current planning application in for a further 15 houses in the village. Much of the growth has been in 'estate form' with the largest being Beechland's (which is still growing) and more recently Drury's Yard. We have a mix of housing in 'Upper Southrepps' which includes two Housing Association allocations, holiday homes, second homes and privately owned (permanently occupied) homes. The village has a thriving community and has managed to maintain a shop and post office. The village is not stagnating. Southrepps is a 'rural' village

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				with working farms, both arable and livestock. Its road network comprises of mainly single-track rural lanes - many with no pavements. Even the 'main' road through its centre is not capable of carrying two large vans side by side. The figures on the Parish Councils website from the new SAM2 unit are astounding – recording over 30,000 vehicles a month passing through the village in each direction. Further development in Mundesley will increase this further and so will further development in Southrepps. Further developments of up to 20 houses will put an intolerable strain on the road network in Southrepps and will endanger vehicular and pedestrian users of these roads. By necessity the sub-standard roads have to take farm vehicles, buses, oil delivery vehicles (as the village does not have gas), delivery lorries to the pub and shop. add to this supermarket and other delivery lorries for individual properties - the chances of two large vehicles meeting on the narrow roads are very high - at which point the roads get blocked with other vehicles queuing behind. It is incredibly dangerous and increases in traffic through the village will keep making it more dangerous. I, therefore, object to Southrepps being categorised as a small growth village as the roads cannot take anymore estate developments and the vehicles that would be created by this. It must be categorised as a 'countryside' village with development limited to under 5 properties. The change I am seeking is a re-classification for Southrepps from a "small growth village" to a "countryside" designation, thus limiting further development in the village. I would respectfully like to request a change of wording to point 2 to include 'or derelict': "Outside defined development boundaries in areas designated as Countryside residential development will be permitted only where it accords with other policies in this plan, or' 1. the proposal is for small scale development of typically no more than five dwellings; and, 2. the site comprises of previously developed or derelict land, and 3. development of the site would result in infilling or rounding off in a predominantly built up area. "This would allow such neglected plots (which are often local eyesores) to be put to the use of local families and the community where restricted public transport and plot size would make it unsuitable for affordable housing or agriculture. This seems to fit in to one of the key issues raised at Appendix 'Meet the planners' Event at Greenbuild 2017 at Felbrigg Hall (O: General Consultation Evidence) by local visitors that 'growth is wanted in smaller settlements. Policy of restricting growth only to large settlements is causing rural facilities to decline'. Also NPPF Making Effective Use of Land paragraph 118; 'Planning Policies and decisions should promote and support the development of under-utilised land' and 'support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land'.
SD3	Tickle, Miss Gemma (1217353)	LP373	Support	I would like to request that in the smaller villages and predominantly built up areas outside development boundaries small scale sustainable development be permitted also on vacant derelict sites which are a blight to the villages, a waste for the community and could provide homes for families wishing to stay in the area.
SD3	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP254	Object	Paragraph 77 of the NPPF states that: 'In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs.' Paragraph 78 of the NPPF states that: 'To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.' Policy SD3 does make limited provision for new development in Small Growth Villages. The policy states that: 'Small scale developments, including brownfield developments, community facilities and services will be permitted within the defined boundaries of the following Small Growth Villages.' Footnote 11 of the Plan notes that small scale developments are defined as infill development and new allocations of between 0-20 dwellings (to be selected in a Part 2 Plan). The policy goes on to note that: 'Outside defined development boundaries in areas designated as Countryside, residential development will only be permitted where it accords with other policies in this Plan. Or: 1. The proposal is for small scale development of typically no more than 5 dwellings; and 2. The site comprises of previously developed land; and 3. Development of the site would result in

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				infilling or rounding off in a predominantly built up area.' We strongly suggest that this policy is overly restrictive and does not comply with paragraph 16b of the NPPF, which requires that plans should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable. It is respectfully submitted that, as drafted, the Plan does not go far enough in enabling villages in North Norfolk to grow and thrive. It is well documented that shops and services have closed in many villages in recent years; this Plan should provide an opportunity to reverse that decline and should not artificially restrict housing to infill or densification in Small Growth Villages which do still have a range of facilities and provide a relatively sustainable location for future growth. Instead, it should provide the opportunity for Small Growth Villages to grow and attract new residents. It should provide a more flexible policy context in which development can be brought forward. Specifically, the existing provisions of the Plan should be replaced by a policy which states that developments of 0-20 dwellings should be permitted on land adjacent to settlement boundaries, or sites which are close to settlement boundaries, and are in sustainable locations. We have reviewed the 23 Small Growth Villages identified in the Plan, and believe that generally sites of twenty properties cannot be accommodated in these villages, where the settlement boundaries are drawn tightly, there is little land availability and there has already been infilling and densification of the existing built form. It is therefore likely that, in order to provide approximately 20 dwellings within the settlement boundaries of each of these villages as required by Policy HOU1, several, smaller sites could be required. Development of several, smaller sites is likely to have a greater impact in terms of impact on amenity on the existing residents and is unlikely to deliver any scale of infrastructure which could make a meaningful contribution to offset the impacts of development. Indeed, it is likely that many of the smaller sites will avoid providing any affordable housing, if they fall below the thresholds for affordable housing provision proposed by the Council in Policy HOU2. We suggest that the Policy should be amended to make provision to allocate sites which are adjacent to existing settlement boundaries, or close to settlement boundaries and in sustainable locations, for up to twenty dwellings. This would help to conserve the existing urban fabric of the villages, and would allow some controlled, sustainable expansion of the Small Growth Villages, which, as identified in paragraph 7.24 of the draft Local Plan, have a number of services, and act as limited service hubs for other nearby villages, thereby complying with the provisions of paragraph 78 of the NPPF. On this basis, my client's sites should be considered for allocation in Roughton. Land north of Chapel Road lies to the west of the existing settlement boundary, in an infill plot between the existing properties along Chapel Road. The Plan affords the opportunity to review the existing settlement and include these properties and my client's infill site within the boundary. The site lies in a highly sustainable location, only some 600m from the village centre and is connected by an existing pavement, enabling residents to walk into the village. Land east of Norwich Road lies adjacent to the settlement boundary, which is formed by the A140, and also lies within walking distance of Roughton's shops and services, and bus stops on the A140.
SD3	Fullwood, Mr Tony (1217463)	LP643	General Comments	The classification of Wells next the Sea as a Small Growth Town is appropriate within the hierarchy of settlements proposed in the Local Plan. However, there should be recognition that Wells has a finite capacity which is defined by its infrastructure. This includes the pedestrian environment; roads, car parks and the natural environment. Staithe Street is limited in width and will not be widened; the pedestrian facilities around the quay result in conflict with motorists and cyclists and on and off street car parking lead to safety and congestion issues. The natural heritage, including national and international landscape and biodiversity designations, are precious resources which have finite capacity before the very essence of the place are destroyed. This is not a proposal for building/ widening roads or car parking as this will tip the fragile balance between development and conserving the finest attractions of the town and result in unsustainable development. Increasingly, the success of the town at attracting visitors threatens to diminish the very attractions that people have come to enjoy. There is a danger that too much expansion of the residential and visitor population will kill the goose which lays the golden egg. The fragile balance between

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				development and the limited capacity of infrastructure and the built and natural environment at Wells should be acknowledged in the Local Plan and should result in an additional sub-category in the settlement hierarchy (Small Growth Town With Constraints) and by adding additional criteria to policies such as Policies ECN 6 and 7.
SD3	Tickle, Miss Gemma (1217353)	LP334	Support	I would like to request that in the smaller villages and predominantly built up areas outside development boundaries small scale development be permitted also on vacant derelict sites which are a blight to the villages, a waste for the community and could provide homes for families wishing to stay in the area. Request for change of wording of SD3 penultimate paragraph point 2 to also allow development of derelict sites outside of development boundaries.
SD3	Smith, Mr Anthony (1218514)	LP767	General Comments	On SD3, I agree with the criteria for residential development in Countryside areas outside defends development boundaries. Enforcing these criteria will help preserve the character of small villages, cherished by residents and sometimes quite fragile.
SD3	Mr Daniels (1217050)	LP263	Support	Recognises the benefits of allocating land immediately adjacent to built up areas, although this should ideally support sites with defensible boundaries rather than ribbon development which results in the coalescence of settlements
SD3	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. Designated landscapes etc. list of non preferred locations should include Greenbelt. Growth is most required where there are employment and services. Otherwise development in rural locations with little employment or few services only serves to generate additional car journeys. This is not sustainable and causes additional traffic, congestion, pollution and would fly in the face of the Council's own stated environmental policies. The trend towards moving out of centres of development to rural locations and suburbs in the late 20th century is no longer appropriate given the environmental damage this has been shown to cause through pollution and congestion. Proximity of development and affordable housing to areas of employment and services such as healthcare, schools and public transport hubs must be encouraged if environmental objectives are to be met. That is why the alternative policies would not be appropriate.
SD3	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP144	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** • Services in Little Snoring currently available do not fully meet the needs of the settlement. One small shop in village attached to caravan site which provides limited food range. Instead it is necessary to go to Fakenham. • The bus service is infrequent and quite limited. • There is no village hall. • The school is limited in capacity, has poor drop off and pick up provision. • Highways are generally narrow necessitating cars pulling over to allow passing and have limited capacity. Roads do not comply with modern standards. • Large vehicles use the village – cause difficulties with parking and traffic. • School bus blocks road when dropping off children. • Main A148 junction is of limited capacity. • Speed limit is 40mph more than many similar villages, making it difficult to get onto main road at busy times - further traffic movements would exacerbate this problem. • No development should take place without improvement of the junction and / or reduction in speed limits. Other access junction to A148 has speed limit of 60mph and an inadequate layout. • Broadband is nearing capacity and service would be impacted further, particularly those working or running businesses from home. • Limited capacity at Wastewater treatment works and parts have experienced problems with waste water. Quotes section 12.9.3 of current LDF – has network upgrade taken place suitable for additional housing? Surface water issues Kettlestone Rd – would be increased by further hardstandings. • It is not explained whether the desired allocation of 20 dwellings is in addition to sites already allocated but not yet developed? • Important that rural character of the village is preserved and that ribbon nature of village is not destroyed by infilling gaps with blocks of several dwellings between the roads and creating a single solid mass of housing.• Current mix of housing and green/open space within the village is very important to its character.• Preservation of green space is needed to maintain and encourage biodiversity and wildlife in the area.• Presently a good numbers of species of birds and flora in the village.• Green spaces and associated wildlife have a positive

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				effect on the well-being of residents.• Development of natural or semi natural green spaces should be avoided.• In line with ENV1 to ENV12 any existing areas of pasture, woodland and green space must be retained as wildlife corridors and for local amenity and biodiversity.• Ideally development would be on various small plots rather than one large site of many houses which would have far more adverse impact overall.• Limited development can be achieved without having specific larger allocated site. Little Snoring should not be regarded as a " small growth village" Small infill development rather than allocating site.
SD3	Johnson, Mr Jamie (1216384)	LP345	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Whilst it is commendable that some infill/rounding off sites within established settlements/predominantly built up areas within designated Countryside is permitted, the reality is that as SA points out "due to the rural nature of the district, there are limited amounts of previously developed land". This is further enforced by the draft plan's settlement-specific Proposals 12-23 all of which (with the exception of Briston) are described as having "very little previously developed land' /'very modest infill which will not address need". With regards to this lack of available brownfield sites across the district and the NPPF stipulating in paragraph 78 on rural housing that "Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive" and continues that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it can enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities" it would seem that a more flexible approach to small scale sustainable infill developments would be favourable. I would make a case that in line with paragraph 9.7, throughout the district on infill plots within established settlements/predominantly built up Countryside areas appropriate small scale development should be permitted on both available brownfield and greenfield sites, "provided no significant harm would be caused to the character or setting of the settlement or surrounding countryside" and "the scale of the scheme is appropriate to the location". This flexibility would also be in line with the NPPF's paragraph 68.c) which states "small to medium sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirements of an area" and continues "To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should: "c) support the development of windfall sites through their policy and decisions - giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes". . NPPF para. 84. On 'Supporting a prosperous rural economy' further states 'The use of previously developed land AND sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist'. . NPPF 'Making effective use of land' paragraph 118 c) and d) also state that planning policies and decisions should "promote and support the development of under-utilised land" and "support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land" and I can see few local residents objecting to appropriate and sensitive small scale development of a site which lies derelict, despoiled or neglected and degrades its settlement as unsightly under-utilised land which could be put to good use for the benefit of the settlement and community. . Bearing in mind the above points and adding the Government's current 'Guidance for councils in how to consider rural housing policies' which states 'all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas' and continues "and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence" would point to the fact that many smaller rural settlements are continuing to lose their local services and unless more flexibility is permitted for developments in the coming 20 years the trend for the loss of amenities, vitality and viability of these smaller settlements and villages will continue across the district. . The draft plan's vision for a 'thriving economy with vibrant and appealing towns and villages' in conjunction with the above points would seem to point to the fact that if smaller settlements and their communities and economies are to continue to be sustainable in this potentially economically uncertain time it would be a great and tragic loss if various infill sites in smaller villages and settlements which could not be used for agriculture lay empty and vacant, not making effective use of the land where they could be contributing to, enhancing and supporting the future of their settlement

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				and it's community. **Amend SD3** enabling increased support and flexibility towards appropriate small scale high quality development of infill/rounding off sites within established settlements/predominantly built up areas in designated Countryside 1. the proposal is for small scale development of typically no more than five dwellings; and, 2. The development is shown to enhance, respect and cause no significant harm to the character or setting of the settlement or surrounding countryside, and 3. development of the site would result in infilling or rounding off in a predominantly built up area. If this proposed iteration of criterion 2 is not considered acceptable then I would make a case for amending it to: 2) the site comprises of previously developed, derelict or despoiled land; and, . Evidence to support this is as above in addition to NPPF paragraph 118 on 'Making effective use of land' which states that planning policies should "promote and support the development of under-utilised land" and "support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land "Exemplary highly sustainable commercially available 'eco tourism' holiday lets which comply with the plan's paragraph 10.50Holiday Occupancy and 140 day commercially available letting)
SD3	Jones, Miss Debbie (1217499)	LP641	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I believe the wording to describe 'previously developed land' as 'defunct' and 'nonsensical' in the application of policy SD3 on which requirement '2' of: 'Outside defined development boundaries in areas designated as Countryside residential development' are concerned and thus should be changed or removed from the policy. Policy Glossary Dictates: Previously Developed Land OR Brownfield Land as 'Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures; land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time.' The reason this policy makes no sense is that it is restrictive for reasons that do not align with national policy guidelines and are rely too heavily on subjective appraisal. - land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings *these are barns and you can't exclude barn conversions and haven't in the past. This has been re written to confuse and is irrelevant. Land that was used in the past does not mean it will in the future and should be considered on its merits 'in the now' and not the former. - land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures *provision for development for this land is already defined, it doesn't need to be excluded in this policy. - land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens *some residential curtilage is large but within a 'village', a 'built up' area. However, a built-up area is subjective and therefore unfair to be inclusive, it provides an unclear argument for subjective refusal outside of national policy guidelines. - Parks *fine but highly unimportant as there few parks in the countryside. - recreation grounds and allotments * subjective and unimportant in planning terms. If land was formally used for something recreationally for 'bike repairs' or 'keeping a few birds' or 'storing the weekend boat', it may not in the future have that required use and may not have been used for that purpose before it's former use, acquiring that use through time and which may very well never had planning for that use in the first place. It should be considered on its now merits and value for development. Land in villages is finite so it should have the opportunity to change. - And, land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time *if land was used for 200 years and then for the last 50 the earth has taken over, the desire to reuse that land in the future in a village or other may not ever go away, therefore why restrict its re-use in light of the fact land within village boundaries is finite. Pointless and will create further decay in villages. Villages are not chocolate boxes, they are communities that mostly still enjoy many of the same families for many

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				generations. Excluding future development excludes future generations and breaking away from national guidelines will continue to be very damaging to the structure, wellbeing, and future health and survival of villages. Since the last Local Plan adoption, the countries population has increased 15%. Villages in North Norfolk outside of defined development boundaries have not grown organically as they have done through history. In fact, by your admission in 9.5; second homes take up to 40% of sea view dwellings. Many villages have suffered the same fate as planning admits it can not control this. If there is only a provision in planning for the next 20 years for Travellers, Gypsies and low income families then it is very likely that villages will become ghost villages and services which are minimal will completely dry up. Local people need to be able to organically develop within their communities. My story can be used as an example. My village has 65 homes. My parents have 6 children. These children constitute 8% of the village population. With no new homes built in the last 20 years all the families in the village have lost the potential to retain family cohesion. None of the children now live in the village despite a desire to. There is plenty of land which is developable, my parents have no local support from their children or grandchildren without getting in a car. What's the result? We now have a shortage of farmers because there's no community left for them to relate and interact with, so why become a farmer… to be lonely! And there's no young people to work in the rural business, pubs and shop, tourist retreats, no one wants to get in the car and drive for 15 miles for 30 minutes at 11pm at night to get home on a low wage burning fuel which costs money. And finally, families have little support from children locally. They can't build a houses' close by and that's leading to a void in social welfare. It will be a downward spiral from here. If this rule is implemented it will be because the final decision maker thinks they are saving villages, but in fact you will be destroying them, the final nail in the coffin. It's time to halt the damage of the last 20 years. SAVE OUR VILLAGES…. PLEASE I would like clause '2. The site comprises of previously developed land' to be removed from the criteria. **Remove clause 2 of policy SD3 'Outside defined development boundaries in areas designated as Countryside residential development'.**
SD3	Kloczkov (1210899)	LP094	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: I have seen all the Barns disappear or become houses, no more Barn Owls, I have not heard the Tawny Owl yet this year, No more bats we used to have loads, no more hedgehogs if we are lucky enough to have one a year it will end up squashed as a whole family did last year, the roads are not made for the volume of traffic that goes through each day car and lorries through the day and night some times, more houses means more traffic more damage to the ozone, we only have one bus in the morning and one in the afternoon , there is nothing apart from countryside nothing for people to do unless they drive there is no work in the village as such you would have to travel probably to Norwich, so please recognise we are a village so change our status to Countryside as that is where we are and what we are. Give some thing back to nature and mother earth let common sense prevail, let our wild life have their homes and be able to live as they should. Use the empty houses and buildings not build more do them up use them. S**outhrepps should be designated as Countryside** - use the empty houses and buildings not build more
SD3	Lincoln, Ms Karen (1209571)	LP634	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Hoveton has once again been joined with Wroxham for the purposes of this document, yet they are huge differences in the two villages. Hoveton has all of the facilities, such as the shopping centre, train station, medical facilities, schools and a great deal of the commercial enterprises within it's two industrial estates. Hoveton has a great deal of the facilities for tourists which includes large areas made into car parks and the more 'tourist specific retail facilities, such as fast food outlets and cafe's and while that does bring into the village employment opportunities, it provided little else for the residents of Hoveton. The premise that traffic is a problem only in the summer months is flawed. Traffic jams and tail backs occur on a daily basis, on many occasions it is simply the volume of traffic using the road, on others a single car parked on the 'other side of the bridge' and more frequently of late, accidents on the bridge or broken down farm vehicles. This leads to high levels of pollution in certain areas of the village, particularly around the bridge area. Yet Hoveton has very few recreational facilities for residents, such as parks and open spaces and many residents

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				avoid the 'shopping centre', choosing to shop elsewhere rather than fight for parking spaces or navigate their way over busy roads with only one real safe place for them to cross, or choke on the noxious fumes generated by traffic jams. Before bringing more people to the village, these things need to be redressed. The first and foremost traffic pollution and delays and secondly in giving residents areas in which to spend their leisure time and not have to fight visitors for a seat at granary staithe. N**o further housing development in Hoveton**
SD3	Lincoln-Stubbs, Ms Valerie (1218556)	LP771	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Weybourne should not be a small growth village for the following reasons: a. Does not have an adequate bus service for working people, as the last bus in the winter leaves Sheringham at 3.30 pm. This also prevents children from staying to after-school clubs. b. The village shop has recently been put up for sale. No guarantee that it will be sold and its future is thus very much in doubt. c. Already has a high proportion of second homes and holiday lets. The likelihood is that new development would be beyond the price of local people, resulting in new houses also ending up as non-residential. Villages with high proportions of second homes/holiday lets suffer with a breakdown of the functioning of the community, and make it more difficult for local facilities to thrive. The Parishes development is a case in point, with none of the houses currently in residential use. d. Weybourne is in AONB. Increased development would negatively affect this, and this could damage existing tourism. e. The surrounding area is a haven for internationally rare migratory birds. Increased development risks reducing the habitat available to these birds. This would potentially conflict with international agreements to which the UK is a signatory. f. Parking in the village is already inadequate. Further development would increase pressure. 2. Any development in North Norfolk should put the environment at its heart, in view of the current climate emergency: a. All housing should be made of passive houses; use of insulation, borrowed light, air/ground source heat pumps, solar panels, wind turbines and the installation of electricity storage facilities (batteries) should be standard b. The use of green roofs/walls should be used to reduce the impact on habitat, as well as offering insulation properties, rainwater and carbon capture etc. c. Soft landscaping should be the norm, to improve habitat for flora and fauna as well as the physical and mental health of residents. In addition this brings the benefits of rainwater and carbon capture. d. Housing should be built where there is a specific need, rather than being foisted on local communities on a formulaic basis from central or regional government. There is no point in building additional housing in small rural areas where there is no local demand and limited employment opportunities. e. Services such as schools, doctors' surgeries, playgrounds etc. should be built first, to ensure that there are adequate facilities for the new residents and to prevent developers from later reneging on agreements. **Weybourne should not be a small growth village**
SD3	Miles, Mr Richard (1216141)	LP166	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** By the redesignation 'countryside' areas, such as small villages into 'SD3' category you open the opportunity for inappropriate development which will continue to preclude local/young people from being able to afford property. All communities benefit from a mix of ages and backgrounds. Encouragement for the development of affordable housing by housing associations etc. can be achieved without risking opening opportunities for developers and wealthy groups turning villages into retirement communities. This is a risk if small villages loose their current status. The potential influx of older residents will require housing for 'lower wage' occupations such as nurses, care workers and police. Affordable homes reserved for these type of occupations can ensure a balance without commercially motivated development being the norm. R**econsider the need for small villages to loose their current designation of 'countryside'.**
SD3	Miller, Mrs Pat (1210642)	LP121	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Accepted that further housing must be built in Hoveton but essential that it cannot put further pressure on the current, overstretched infrastructure. • Congestion along the A1151 and across the river bridge through Wroxham and Hoveton is now a daily issue and cannot be associated with the holiday periods alone. Deliveries, parked cars, bin-lorries, road works etc. etc. quickly cause substantial hold-ups at many times

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				during the day on the majority of days. • The schools appear to have the capacity to expand and this will, hopefully, happen in line with the growth in housing and demand. • It is of great concern that the medical centre may not have the capacity to cope with an increased level of demand. This will not surprise any current resident since it is already extremely difficult to get an appointment within a reasonable time frame. • It is essential that an acceptable foul water drainage strategy is put in place for any new development in Hoveton and that Anglian Water can guarantee that it will not cause any further problems when the existing foul water sewerage network is surcharged due to rainfall. All demands on the infrastructure of Hoveton will be further increased by any developments in Wroxham. Whilst it states in the Draft Plan that any proposals that the Broadland District Council consider for Wroxham will take account of the suggested development in Hoveton, any development in Wroxham will have a substantive impact on Hoveton's infrastructure. How will the NNDC ensure that they are able to meet these additional demands? ac**cepted that further housing must be built in Hoveton but essential that it cannot put further pressure on the current, overstretched infrastructure.**
SD3	Needham, Mr Colin (1216785)	LP269	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Fully understand that there is a need for additional housing in the district and that land has to be made available. The designations of growth points is reasonably well argued in the documentation. However, the process of considering each community in isolation is flawed especially with regard to the impact of growth in community A on adjoining communities B,C,D.etc...For example, current developments under the existing plan in Mundesley have had a direct and measurable increase in the traffic (commercial and private) passing through Southrepps. The volume of traffic is now adversely effecting this community. Our road is narrow, has no pavements and is considered by many to be dangerous such that people get in their car to go to the village shop rather than run the gauntlet of parked cars, heavy lorries and nose to tail cars. Baseline traffic flows are dramatically boosted by holiday traffic especially during the summer and this is a impact that the consultation document suggests that holidaymaking will be encouraged as a positive driver for economic growth in the district. Any further increase in the housing allocation in for example Mundesley, generating commercial and commuter traffic through Southrepps will have consequences for Southrepps and other villages on the B1436. Should include detailed consideration of the impact of site allocations on adjacent communities. Specifically the adverse impact of increases in commercial, commuter and leisure traffic. If such developments can be properly justified, consideration should be given to mitigation and compensatory measures such as highway improvements, footpaths and cycle ways in all the effected communities.. Developers and landowners benefiting from land allocations should be the principal contributors to the cost of these measures.
SD3	Pope, Mr & Mrs G (1218477)	LP787	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Fakenham does not have the capacity to employ and service the number of people that could be involved.
SD3	Rahner, Ms (Dr) Chris (1217315)	LP324	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Having considerable landscape constraints to accommodate much growth, it seems astonishing that Cromer was identified as a Large Growth Town for 'large scale growth'. Unlike North Walsham or Fakenham, a considerable part of the town's income is derived from the tourist industry, and for this it is dependent on the care and preservation of its character, the designated AONB and also the adjacent areas/ landscapes visible from the AONB. As the Plan (12.2) acknowledges, these non-designated areas are important to the landscape setting of the town. In addition, the NPPF states 'that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing scenic beauty …' and views from any point of an AONB, this great asset of which Cromer can be justly proud, would certainly be included in this statement meant to protect the town from large and/ or unsightly developments.
SD3	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP061	Object	It is already very difficult for local residents to drive through and to Melton Constable. The village provides the doctors, school and shops used by local residents, including the surrounding area. No increased development should be allowed until additional parking and access routes bypassing the old part of the village are provided. The village and surrounding already

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				suffers pollution from the traffic and industrial area. No further development till additional parking and access route bypassing the old part of the village are provided.
SD3	Wheldon, Ms Ginny Wibberley, Mr Chris (1216703 1216702)	LP214 LP301	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Mundesley requires affordable homes for existing residents and young people wishing to purchase their first home. There isn't a need for more 'executive' style homes that are well out of the price bracket that locals can afford. Building 8 'affordable' houses will make little difference to the housing need in the area and the remaining 42 houses will attract second home owners and those wishing to buy holiday lets, this contributes little to the area. At the presentation your NNDC rep stated that new jobs will be created in the area and that the NHS will be contacted to ensure that sufficient resources are provided for the GP surgery - where will these extra jobs spring from? How will the NHS resolve the issue of our GP surgery currently being 2 Doctors down on it's quota and unable to recruit? Another potential 200 people moving into the village is going to stretch resources to breaking point. The plan is ill thought out as it is not sustainable. The village does not have the infrastructure to support a further 50 properties. The village school is I believe at or close to capacity. Only affordable housing should be built in Mundesley. Small developments of affordable housing around village which will fit in with existing community without negative impact.
SD3	Williams, Ms Katie (1209757)	LP009	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** SCHOOLING / EARLY YEARS: Ensure sufficient primary and secondary school places are made available from the point at which residents start living in the new homes. There should be no staged introduction to school places - places should be made immediately available for new local residents so parents do not have to cope with the stress of transporting children to out of village schools whilst also having to manage their own commutes to work. Following the publication of data on primary school entrance places in NNDC, it should be noted that Hoveton St John Primary School filled all 30 of its available places in 2019 and had to refuse 6 applicants. Given that a new development of 25 houses is already in the process of being built in Church Fields (which, by conservative estimates, will inevitably be home to at least several primary aged children), this situation will only get worse. Expanding the primary school therefore seems not only a logical, but an entirely necessary, step to meet demand. It is also necessary to consider secondary school places at Broadland High School. At the moment that school only teaches up to 16 years of age, but given the new influx of children through Hoveton's expansion (as well as Wroxham's allocation of new houses which has to be simultaneously catered for), this cut off warrants serious consideration as otherwise any young person wishing to stay in full time eduction beyond 16 years will need to travel into Norwich. This is create additional stress on Wroxham Road as those children will either depend on family members driving them into the city or catching local transport. I also believe that given the growth of the village, greater provision needs to be made for young children aged 6 months to primary school age. In my opinion, the current size of the nursery linked to Hoveton St John is insufficient to meet demand. I personally have to drive my son to a nursery in Spixworth three days a week so I can access childcare that starts early enough and finishes late enough to allow me to work a normal working day. MEDICAL CENTRE: Similarly, capacity at the Hoveton & Wroxham needs to be increased to meet the growing demands placed on it. I am sure with careful planning this can be achieved as the facility certainly seems large enough from a lay person's perspective. ROAD ACCESS: Stalham / Norwich Road (especially over the bridge) is already arguably at capacity during the peak summer tourist months. Any road works that need to be carried out should only be allowed to take place during the late evenings and through the night as otherwise the disruption is colossal and in my view entirely unacceptable for existing residents who have had to queue in excess of 30/40 minutes to get over the bridge. The answer is not to push drivers to take the detour via Coltishall, as all that does is create problems for that village, but to get a handle on Hoveton & Wroxham's own traffic bottleneck. Ultimately a by pass would be the answer, but clearly that comes at huge expense. TRAINS: Given the number of new residents who will be joining Hoveton and Wroxham, I think a review of the frequency and carriage numbers of trains travelling towards Norwich is warranted, especially as some of the other towns

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				requiring to take new homes are also on the same line. It is very likely that a significant proportion of the new residents will find employment in Norwich, so we should try and promote train use wherever possible to free up the roads. BIKE SCHEME: One viable way to get people to travel around the local area more, rather than depending on their cars so heavily, is to create a 'Boris Bike' type scheme with drop off hubs dotted around the wider area (including a large one at the station). This would obviously necessitate having to invest in good cycle paths, but I do think there would be a good deal of traction with tourists, plus it would be environmentally friendly. Broadly support this site , careful consideration and planning should be made to alleviate the increased demand on public services. It is my firm belief that development should only be able to commence once provisions to increase capacities at local schools, GP surgeries, dentists etc. have been firmly committed to. Development in Hoveton should in essence be conditional on securing these commitments to improve public infrastructure before construction work on the new houses can start.
SD3	Wilson, Mr Iain (Hill, Mr Iain Bidwells) (1217197 1217161)	LP305	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** • Supportive of allocating sites for small scale development • No detailed explanation is provided to why Edgefield has not been selected as Small Growth Village • Methodology is flawed • Fails to recognise that settlements, such as Edgefield are within close proximity to higher order settlements • Methodology restricts the ability of these settlements to grow, approach is unsuitable and unreasonable/ contrary to NPPF – para 77 . Growth would help maintain the vitality of rural communities.• Small Growth villages have been selected on service provision prior to site-specific constrains being considered -can the identified small growth villages accommodate the proposed growth? • Suggest that a broader range of settlements is identified , including those which are in close proximity to higher order settlements, to enhance their vitality. • Edgefield should be identified as small growth settlement • A bus is available to Holt which is 3 miles away which provides a range of services and amenities, including school• Edgefield is located on the main road (B1149,Norwich Rd) which provides connectivity and has a public house, meeting place, vehicle repair shop and a place of worship. • The Pigs provides employment opportunities. • Recommend that land off Plumstead Road is allocated for residential development. The site, which extends to 2.3 acres (0.9 ha) is entirely deliverable, and capable of making a contribution towards satisfying the Council's housing needs during the period to 2036. **Edgefield should be identified as small growth settlement** Recommend that land off Plumstead Road is allocated for residential development.
SD3	Sanders, Ms A (1217671)	LP661	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Alternative housing solutions should be sought away from existing towns and certainly from tourist assets. It is very short-sighted to insist that current infrastructure, already at a breaking point, can forever support the never-ending addition of yet more people, houses and cars. There comes a point where the decision has to be made to create new settlements and new roads, which should link up to the major arteries (A149, A140) south of town (in the case of Cromer). I understand this decision is unpopular with the Council because of the cost of road building and necessary amenities, but unless this decision is taken, life for the current residents will become more and more unpleasant, with barely working infrastructure caused by continuing densification, ever increasing traffic, ever increasing journey times, and fewer attractive spaces near town. As long as the Council still has the aim to make Cromer 'grow' (as per development plan) - an aim that seems to me at loggerheads with being a holiday resort - its decisions are bound to boomerang on its tourist industry, and on the future of our children. **Alternative housing solutions should be sought away from existing towns**
SD3	Binks, Mrs Susan (1217821)	LP667	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** North Walsham is full already! Many times the roads are completely blocked around the town and beyond. The car parks are also often almost or completely full

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				especially in the summer. At the doctors you have to wait ages for an appointment and cant get a dental appointment. There should be no development on this particular site.
SD3	Mr and Mrs T Davies (1218476)	LP786	Object	With reference to your plans to consider Little Snoring in the category of 'small growth village' I'd like to make the following observations: • Further development in the village (beyond that already planned) is likely to be into open countryside (as the current planned development already falls into this category) and this will have an adverse impact on the landscape, including look and feel of the village • The amount of social housing in the village is at a high ratio already • Further development will cause an impact on wildlife in the area • You suggest 'small growth villages' provide amenities for that villagers. We have a severe lack of facilities within this village – a pub (which has changed owners a number of times in recent years and is therefore not a particularly stable business) – a shop (which provides only basic items e.g. milk and bread) to service the campsite, not the villagers – full provisions need to be purchased in Fakenham • The Bus service is very infrequent • There is no adequate village hall (unlike other small villages) – only a prefab which is not a suitable or pleasant environment for villagers to meet and run social groups • Many of the streets within the village are mostly only passable by one car in each direction • The pre and junior school are both very small We ask you to reconsider your plan to include Little Snoring in this category – or provide sufficient investment in this village to satisfy your own criteria.
SD3	Mr and Mrs L de Soisson (1217257)	LP307	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: **deletion of Southrepps from Small Growth Village category**
SD3	Mrs Margeret Deeley (1209828)	LP014	Object	Whist I support the need for housing and also affordable housing in Briston for local people, after visiting the roadshow on the Local plan at the Briston Pavilion Thursday 9th May 2019, I have to say I am most concerned at the level of development planned for the village. 80 houses either side of Astley School – that is going to mean 80+ cars exiting onto the Fakenham road which already struggles at peak school time. Unfortunately, big lorries thunder through our village on their way to the farms and associated services. I know I was told that parking will be addressed but people will want to park outside their homes. At peak times, it is difficult to negotiate past Astley school – I agree that the pull in bays help, but it is still an issue. There is also the issue of only having a footpath on one side of the Fakenham road. As a resident, I already struggle to get a doctors appointment in Briston, mostly having to travel to Holt for a doctors appointment. I appreciate the developer will contribute to health facilities – but an extension to our local surgery is going to be a problem as there is no room to expand. North Norfolk is a huge tourist destination and the attraction is the small picturesque villages, of which Briston is one, visitors do not want to travel through identical over developed villages - we are about to destroy this with these plans. I am so unhappy that farmland is being considered for development – destroying our beautiful countryside which is one of the reasons we moved to Norfolk 10 years ago – we came from Essex – development there was appalling – no green spaces left! NNDC has recently approved planning permission for 10 houses off the Lane in Briston behind Holly House, this is then upping the amount planning to be built to in the time period to 90 houses. I appreciate the issues need to be addressed, but can Briston really support 90 houses without destroying the character of our village? I think not
SD3	Burns, Mr David (1216064)	LP157	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Trunch is designated 'countryside'. The implication of potentially losing control of boundaries and future development within and outside of them. Trunch as an important 'Conservation Town' with important buildings important sites of historical nature , limited facilities such as pavements, street lighting (only 4) should remain within the countryside category. Does not effect obligation for 20 houses for 2036 but ensures boundaries, allows some input in then nature of any development and the target of such development i.e. low cost housing for local young families such as recent positive developments. Tat Trunch remains within designated Countryside, this may mean it achieves more affordable houses.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD3	Broch, Mr Daniel Sworders Grimes, Mr Kelvin (Agent) (1217619 1217618)	LP658	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Policy SD3 states that: 'Outside defined development boundaries in areas designated as Countryside, residential development will only be permitted where it accords with other policies in this Plan. Or: 1. The proposal is for small scale development of typically no more than 5 dwellings; and 2. The site comprises of previously developed land; and 3. Development of the site would result in infilling or rounding off in a predominantly built up area.' We welcome the principle that small scale development is proposed to be permitted in the open countryside, and recognise that the policy seeks to allow appropriate, organic growth of villages. However, we strongly suggest that this element of the policy is overly restrictive and does not comply with paragraph 16b of the NPPF, which requires that plans should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable. It is respectfully submitted that, as drafted, the Plan does not go far enough in enabling villages in North Norfolk to grow and thrive. The criteria in this policy relating to new homes outside development boundaries will exclude all but a very limited number of sites from coming forward, because it only relates to previously developed land. The policy should be amended to remove the reference to previously developed land, to allow suitable, small scale greenfield sites which would round off or infill development boundaries to come forward.
SD3	Burke, Mr Stephen (1216753)	LP798	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** • New homes should only be built where appropriate infrastructure has been developed e.g. roads, electric vehicles, integrated public and community transport, health services (inc GPs), schools, digital access etc., and should be 'communities'
SD3	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP220	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Southrepps being designated 'Small Growth Village'. Firstly the HELAA and Background Paper 2 describes the village as having no infrastructure constraints, this is factually untrue. The Highway Infrastructure makes the Village unsuitable for Growth other than small sites of 5 or less. The main street narrows to a point where two vehicles struggle to pass, particularly large vehicles which are increasing every year. Residential Properties have front doors leading onto the main street. There is one footpath (PF18) linking Upper and Lower parts of village other than single track roads which are unsuitable for walking due to the speed and amount of local traffic. The primary school is not within the boundary of Southrepps so the HELAA should not state Southrepps as having a School. The majority of sites identified within the HELAA do not have access onto roads suitable to take development. This is a rural village and for the HELLA to show 16 sites with the possibility of 394 dwellings shows a complete lack of understanding of the uniqueness of the Village, which lies within the AONB and has several SSI's. Development, however small will affect the quality of life, not only of it's residents, but that of local wildlife and nature and will create further light and noise pollution of a sensitive area. Long Lane, Sandy Lane, Clipped Hedge Lane, Church street (in places) are all single track roads. The amount of through traffic is increasing every year as the District grows. The Village has very poor sustainable transport links and any growth will only lead to a further increase in traffic affecting air quality and peoples right to a quality of life. The allocation of a Small Growth Village and future development would not meet the requirements under the policy SD14 (numbers 1,2 & 4). Southrepps to be designated as Countryside.
SD3	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP222	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** how you can allocate for housing between 0-50 units in 'Small Growth Villages' and retain the character of the District. Southrepps for instance has 16 sites identified within the Village that could accommodate 394 dwellings (HELAA). The Highway infrastructure within a lot of these villages, including Southrepps, are not designed for growth. Development should be concentrated on major towns and allowing sites of 0-5 houses within Villages. Local Plan to recognise the affect that growth in Villages as proposed will not protect the character
SD3	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP224	Object	See rep LP220

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD3	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP216	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The proposal to allow 'growth villages' to accept developments of 0-20 will be misused by small developers. 10 applications for 10 houses will have the same affect as 1 application for 100 houses yet they will not contribute towards local infrastructure or to the wider community.
SD3	Hay-Smith, Mr Clive Alflatt, Mr James (Agent) (1217382 1217379)	LP536	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Secondary Settlement have a role of accommodating around 20% of all new residential development. Sheringham benefits from a range of services and amenities, including a Primary and High School, Leisure Centre, Medical Practice, alongside a range of shops, services and employment opportunities. Sheringham also benefits from a train station, which provides relatively frequent and direct connections to Norwich, West Runton, Cromer, North Walsham, Hoveton, Wroxham and Salhouse. Accordingly, Sheringham is a suitable location for additional growth.
SD3	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP048 LP049	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** In addition to infrastructure costs, the transport implications of planning decisions must be estimated, and everything done to minimise them. The pattern of out of town, car dependent housing schemes has to stop.
SD3	Rice, Mr Colin (1210475)	LP128 LP129	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Treating settlements that are not designated 'growth settlements' as countryside is a conceit as so many beautiful hamlets and villages are clearly not simply countryside and whilst part of the countryside are distinct from it. If this policy is pursued relentlessly they would whither away and die. Whilst development to meet identified needs should be encouraged in existing larger towns and villages, policy should also allow - rather than promote or encourage - limited development in the settlements that are not designated for growth. This approach is in line with NPPF paragraph 68(c). It does not say that small settlements should be allowed to whither and die: paragraph 78 'Rural Housing' requires that 'planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive'. Paragraph 2.1 of the June 2018 Interim statement of housing land supply notes that 75% of the dwellings built in the previous period occurred in larger settlements, i.e. as a matter of course meeting the proposed new policy of housing being restricted to 'growth settlements', and therefore undermines the proposed black and white policy of so absolutely restricting development in the 'countryside' settlements. Ideally there should be an intermediate designation of 'settlements in the countryside' within which new development is permitted. Proposed rewording (replacing the test 'and' with 'or' and adding another category based on NPPF): Within settlements in the area designated as Countryside residential development will be permitted only where it accords with other policies in this Plan, or: 1. the proposal is for small scale development of typically no more than five dwellings; or, 2. the site comprises of previously developed land; or, 3. the development would remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated of unstable land [as stated in NPPF para 118(d)] 4. development of the site would result in infilling or rounding off of a predominantly built up area. Alternatively, reintroduce settlement boundaries around the non-growth settlements that are currently misleading designated as 'countryside'.
SD3	Ringer, Mr Callum (1218564)	LP772	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** How are growth villages chosen? I would not be against, for example, further small developments in Bodham.
SD3	Table 1 Total Projected Housing Growth 2016 - 2036 (Duncan, Mr Phillip 1217309)	LP436	Object	see attached doc

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD3	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 3.1. The landowner and delivery partners support the plan vision of focusing a significant proportion of the required plan development towards North Walsham, Fakenham and Cromer. These are the largest and most sustainable settlements able to accommodate growth. The vision recognises the need to deliver a mix of resource efficient and secure residential development to meet local needs including affordable housing, homes for the elderly which is an appropriate strategy. Meeting all housing needs is consistent with the NPPF.
SD3	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The plan is justified, because it is an appropriate strategy, with land beyond the existing settlement boundary on the edge of the most sustainable and accessible settlements being released for development. Failure to release sufficient land would likely result in a plan that is not positively prepared. The plan is overall consistent with national policy and will result in sustainable development.
SD3	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The settlement hierarchy for North Norfolk, and in particular, the identification of Cromer as a Large Growth Town where the majority of new commercial, residential and other types of development will take place is supported. This is based on sound evidence that Cromer has the services and infrastructure to accommodate new development sustainably. The policy states that the distribution of development will have regard to the complementary roles played by Cromer, Holt and Sheringham in the central part of North Norfolk however, further clarity is required on this statement.
SD3	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP409	Support	building in small growth villages as identified in Policy SD3 has the danger of allowing 'urban sprawl' which results in East and West Runton becoming an extension of Sheringham and Cromer (which already have areas identified for development). When travelling the coast road from Cromer to Mundesley you are in Overstrand before you realise you have left Cromer and there is a danger that in Trunch in particular, but also in Southrepps, any development will eventually lead to the loss of identity of these individual villages. As a tourist, it is the green gaps between settlements that provide the interest. Higher prominence for keeping villages as named in Policy SD3 as countryside villages, especially those on the coast and those within (or on the edge of the AONB) and by not allowing the current defined boundaries to be altered
SD3	Bluss, Mr Andrew (1210045)	LP027	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: “green and pleasant land” is under constant threat from being covered by bricks, concrete and tarmac. Little or no consideration given to that once our unspoilt, beautiful countryside is gone forever and the impact a development on this scale would have on the wildlife. Dark sky would be diminished by the increase in light pollution.
SD3	Goodman, Mr Jonathan (1216747)	LP229	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Policy suggests that there is no housing requirements in the countryside for anyone other those meeting the affordable housing definition. There needs to be more requirement in the policy to allow for natural growth within villages to protect families who have been in villages for generations and wish to stay living in the same village but do not necessarily require to work away from home and/ or do not necessarily work in farming. With the 'millennial' work ethic, the council should embrace this position, most office based rolls can now be undertaken from almost anywhere in the world. I wish the council to make proper consideration for people who have either grown up in a village and who's family or parents are still living in the village and who do not rely on affordable or social housing, to be able to apply for planning to build a house close to family, a 3 mile radius, in order to provide support for

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				relatives and continue to enjoy family life. There are to many families who are split up because they do not meet the councils criteria, however family groups are important to the longevity and protection of villages Families in small villages who have been integrated to the community for many generations are generally responsible for many of the local services, working in the pub, the village shop, running fetes, the village hall, the church etc. They should be treated as minority groups who require support and special consideration from planning, the same as gypsies and people on low incomes. Outside defined development boundaries in areas designated as Countryside residential development will be permitted only where it accords with other policies in this Plan, or: - the proposal is for small scale development of typically no more than five dwellings; and, - the site comprises of previously developed land; and, - development of the site would result in infilling or rounding off in a predominantly built up area. -** and/ or the site provides a residential development to support local families stay within close proximity to each other, 3 mile radius.**
SD3	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	All the houses must be built in areas which have shops, schools, and employment within walking distance or with adequate public transport provision. We must not build any more schemes where it is necessary to have a car in order to get anywhere.
SD3	Gurney, Mr Simon. Lambert, Mr Jake Bidwells (Agent). (1217173 1217147)	LP357	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** We strongly recommend that Land off Bull's Row is allocated for residential development, comprising up to 25 dwellings. The site is entirely deliverable, and capable of making a significant contribution towards satisfying the Councils' housing needs during the period to 2036. Land Off Bull's Row was submitted as part of the 2016 Call for Sites consultation window and assigned the site reference H0180. Subsequently, the site received a preliminary suitability assessment within the June 2017 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). However, Policy SD 3 of the First Draft Local Plan consultation does not recognise Northrepps as a Small Growth Village. It is understood that the Council is seeking views on the appropriateness of its selected Small Growth Villages, before undertaking a process of identifying potential development sites. This representation is therefore split into two parts, designed to address the following: 1. Advocate the elevation of Northrepps from 'Countryside' to a 'Small Growth Village'; and 2. Alert the Council to the deliverability of site H0180, which should be allocated for small scale residential growth as part of Northrepps' 'Small Growth Village' designation. By facilitating the two points above, the Council will secure the delivery of a suitable small-scale growth site, capable of providing growth in the Plan period. 1. Northrepps The Council's Background Paper 2: Distribution of Growth, released as part of the First Draft Local Plan consultation, outlines the methodology used to justify the selection of the Small Growth Villages. Page 11 of the Paper acknowledges that settlements have been assessed at a high level, and further consideration will be given through the Local Plan process to other villages in North Norfolk, which may be more suitable for small-scale growth. While our client is supportive of the emerging Plan's intention to allocate sites across Small Growth Villages, in accordance with the NPPF, it is apparent that the methodology is flawed, and should be reconsidered to ensure that growth requirements to 2036 can be delivered. The starting point of this assessment was to assess only those settlements which had a school or a shop. From this initial sift, Northrepps was progressed through for further analysis. Northrepps Primary School is located within circa 325m (0.2 miles) from Land off Bulls Row. The school accommodates children between the ages of 2-11, and has a capacity of 52 pupils, with a current roll of 36 pupils. The school would therefore benefit from the support further small-scale growth in Northrepps to 2036 would bring. The next stage of the assessment sifted out those settlements which had a school or shop, but less than four of the 'secondary' or 'desirable' services. Northrepps contains two secondary services (public house and village hall) and one desirable service (place of worship). As Northrepps contains just three of the 'secondary' or 'desirable' services, it was discounted from further analysis. While this is an accurate reflection of the services available within Northrepps, this methodology is flawed. This is because some Small Growth Villages have been selected based on service provision alone, before site-specific planning constraints have been considered. Furthermore,

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				housing density in these locations is likely to be low, to reflect the character of the settlements, which adds further pressure on the spatial distribution of growth amongst the Small Growth Villages. The First Draft Local Plan seeks to allocate 400 dwellings across each of the Small Growth Villages. The draft settlement hierarchy outlined under Policy SD 3 includes 23 Small Growth Villages. To achieve the distribution of 400 dwellings across these Small Growth Villages, 18 dwellings must be allocated in each Small Growth Village. We are therefore concerned that many of the Small Growth Villages will not be able to accommodate 18 dwellings in the Plan period to 2036. The settlement hierarchy should therefore be reconsidered to ensure that 400 dwellings can be achieved across the Small Growth Villages. As outlined above, Northrepps contains a good range of services, including a primary school (with capacity), a village hall and a place of worship. These services can serve further growth, and require proportionate growth to maintain their vitality. By restricting the growth of settlements like Northrepps, the Council's methodology is considered to be contrary to paragraph 77 of the NPPF which states that: "To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services." In addition, Northrepps has a legacy of residential growth, with 40 dwellings recently completed following the approval of planning permission reference PF/14/1559. The settlement is therefore capable of absorbing further growth. Site H01080 represents an optimum location to deliver further residential growth of between 0-20 dwellings on a site less than 1 hectare in size (site area = 0.788ha), to reinforce Northrepps position as a Small Growth Village. The deliverability of this site is discussed in detail below. 2. Land Off Bull's Row, Northrepps (H0180) As discussed, Land Off Bull's Row received a preliminary suitability assessment within the June 2017 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA), with most criteria achieving Green ratings. These are summarised below: Assessment of Deliverability Suitable ● Access to Site: Green rated. Suitable access can be provided from Broadgate Lane. ● Coastal Change: Green rated. ● Contamination and Ground Stability. Green rated. ● Flood Risk: Green rated. ● Market Attractiveness. Green rated. The site is in a desirable location. ● Utilities Capacity: Green rated ● Utilities Infrastructure: Green rated. ● Biodiversity and Geodiversity: Green rated. ● Compatibility with Neighbouring / Adjoining Use: Green rated. ● Historic Environment: Green rated. ● Open Space: Green rated. ● Townscape: Green rated. ● Transport and Roads: Green rated. Some suitability criteria within the HELAA assessment of the site received Amber ratings. These issues are explored in more detail below: Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities: Amber rated. The HELAA comments that the site is within 2,000m of a school in Overstrand, but further than 1,200m from a shop. Northrepps Primary School is located within circa 325m (0.2 miles) from Land off Bull's Row. There is a village shop at Forest Park in Overstrand, which is circa 1.3 miles from the site. Considering the close proximity of Northrepps Primary School, and its capacity to accommodate new students, and the proximity of a shop in the local area, the site should receive a Green rating for this element. Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes: Amber rated. The site falls within AONB. This is reflective of most of the Small Growth Villages, so should not count against the ability of Northrepps, and Land Off Bull's Row, to accommodate further small-scale growth. Indeed, the recent 40 dwelling development in Northrepps (reference PF/14/1559) was also entirely located within AONB. Land Off Bull's Row offers an opportunity to 'round off' the village to the north, converting an underused area of grassland into an optimum small growth site. Considering the less sensitive location of the site within the context of the AONB, and its relationship with the existing built form, the site should receive a Green rating for this element. From this analysis, it can be ascertained that Land Off Bull's Row represents a suitable site for a small-scale residential development. The site can deliver 0-20 dwellings on a site less than 1 hectare, demonstrating compliance with North Norfolk's criteria for development sites in Small Growth Villages. Available The site, in its entirety, is owned by our client, and there are no leases or restrictive covenants on the site consequently, the site is readily available for development. Achievable The NPPF recognises that small and medium-sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				area, and are often built-out relatively quickly (Paragraph 68). The NPPF therefore requires Councils to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than a hectare. North Norfolk Council are endeavouring to adhere to this requirement, through the allocation of small sites in the Small Growth Villages. Land Off Bull's Row represents a clear opportunity to secure a site which can contribute towards this policy requirement, through the delivery of small-scale housing within the Plan period. Viable Development of the site for residential purposes is considered viable, taking into consideration the various policy requirements in relation to matters such as affordable housing provision. No abnormal issues have been identified which might make development unviable. Further evidence on viability can be provided on a strictly private and confidential basis, should this be deemed necessary. Summary To conclude, it is apparent that Northrepps should be considered as a Small Growth Village. The village contains a good range of services, and has the capacity to absorb further growth. Land Off Bull's Row offers the opportunity to deliver that further growth within the Plan period. The site represents a logical extension to the Northrepps through the conversion of underutilised grassland. This representation has demonstrated that the site is suitable and available for housing development, with no barriers to commencement. The site is therefore deliverable in terms of the NPPF Glossary definition. The promotion of Northrepps to a 'Small Growth Village'. Alternative site at Land off Bulls Row submitted.
SD3	Waddingham, R.N. and Family Agent- Hill Iain (Bidwells) (1217471 1217471)	LP596 LP608	Support	Briston is identified as a Large Growth Village, where new development will be focused. Briston benefits from a range of existing shops and services, including a Post Office, Co-op, Primary School and a Nursery. Further to this, Briston also benefits from multiple bus stops (with the closest bordering the site). These stops provide a variety of frequent services to Holt, Fakenham, and Norwich City Centre. Accordingly, Briston is a suitable location for additional growth.
SD3	Symonds, Ms Ann (1209801)	LP012	General Comments	This query is regarding the site assessment methodology. The land in question is HELAA reference (2017) H0016, (BEE05). According to the attached relevant sections of the suitability assessment report H0016 is considered more constrained (orange on map) for development and has been excluded, not only from development opportunities but also the potential site list. There were submissions for three additional plots surrounding this land: one that borders the land to the north-west; a second that borders the land to the south; and a third west of the land on opposite side of the road. These were all considered less constrained (blue on map) and identified as potential sites for development. There appear to be several distinct inconsistencies in the assessment. Two of the others are in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty –a highly sensitive landscape area but the plots are considered to only have the same constraints as a site that is adjacent to, not in, an AONB. All four sites were given amber lights. The market attractiveness of site H0016 under the first section deems the road network unsuitable and again under the second (impact) section the transport and local road network is considered to be unsuitable. Both assessment items were given a red light. However the plots directly opposite it and next to it, both accessed from the same road, were given green lights for both market attractiveness, considered to have suitable access with no major constraints; and under the transport and roads item are foreseen as having no detrimental impact on the functioning of the local road network. The same green rating was given to the plot that appears to require access through H0016 which has a red rating and is said to be unsuitable in terms of access. These are conflicting ratings and suggest they have not been assessed equally considering the conditions on the ground are the same. In summary why has H0016 got red ratings for transport and access where the other plots either reliant upon it for access or are accessed from the very same road within meters of one another received green ratings? Surely all plots should have the same rating if they are accessed off the same road? Why has H0016 got an amber rating for being next to an AONB when those in it also have the same rating? The result of the assessment in Beeston Regis is that the three other sites have been identified as potential sites, despite the inconsistencies in the assessment process. Though

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				overall no development is planned in Beeston Regis under the current draft local plan, it is important that the assessment is fair and considers all land equally and it appears that this has not been the case. It is believed that the methodology has not been applied consistently throughout the assessment of the four neighbouring plots. This could place site H0016 at a disadvantage in future calls, besides calling into question the validity of the assessment process. If there are inconsistencies in the assessments the process and its finding are not legitimate. I understand that the assessment will not finally determine the inclusion of the area in the plan but a negative assessment will result in the particular site being taken out of the 'pool' from the outset.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
Summary of Objections	40	The majority of respondents objected to growth in the Small Growth Villages and the Countryside. Housing development should be focussed where there is appropriate infrastructure, public transport, healthcare and other services including employment and the approach fails to integrate problems of climate crisis. many suggested that rather than allocating in these villages, development should be allowed on infill and brownfield sites. Concerns that the countryside is under constant threat of being developed; having an adverse effect on wildlife and dark skies etc. Others though objected that due to concerns that the Plan doesn't go far enough and should be promoting limited development in settlements not currently designated for growth, in order to enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities. Su**ggest that Bodham, Edgefield and Northrepps are identified as suitable Small Growth Villages.** Suggest amending the policy to remove reference to PDL and allow small scale development on greenfield land or vacant derelict sites. Also suggest**ed removing the wording 'Outside defined development boundaries...' altogether. More consideration should be given to provide housing for local people with families within a 3 mile radius.** One objection promotes the alternative option to provide new settlements and new roads instead. Raise concerns around Large Growth Town designations, specifically; Cromer, Fakenham, North Walsham. Small growth town designations, specifically; Hoveton, and Wells-next-the-sea. Large Growth Villages ;Briston & Melton Constable, Mundesley. And Small Growth Villages; Bacton, Happisburgh, Langham , Little Snoring, Southrepps, Trunch, Walcott. See specific settlement summary below. Suggest change to bullet point 7.20 'reduce' with 'minimise'.
Summary of Supports	10	Support the principle of development being targeted in designated settlements and recognises the benefits of allocating land immediately adjacent to built up areas. Growth most required where there are employment and services. Development in rural locations would generate additional car journeys. Suggested amendments to remove reference to PDL and allow small scale development on greenfield land or vacant derelict sites. Development should only commence when capacity at Schools, Doctors, Dentists is ensured. Support the identification of Briston as a large growth village.
Summary of General Comments	15	Most comments recognised that this is an appropriate strategy and is overall consistent with national policy resulting in sustainable development. General understanding of the need for housing and the policy is reasonably well argued. Housing should be located near to shops, schools, employment and public transport. One comment states that accepting development of 0 - 10 dwellings will have same impact as 100 houses but will not contribute towards local infrastructure or to the wider community. Suggest amendments to allow small scale new build on greenfield sites subject to occupancy restrictions. others raised concerns around Small Growth Town designations, specifically; Holt and Wells-next-the-sea and Small Growth Village Weybourne. See settlement summaries below. The exclusion of a site / Beeston was challenged on the basis of the 2017 HELAA assessment and its non inclusion as a selected settlement.
Overall Summary		A number of comments received to this policy. Key issued raised focused on: In order to meet environmental objectives, development should be focused where appropriate infrastructure, services, public transport and employment are in place and there is a specific housing need and the overall support for focussing development in Large Growth Towns, which are the largest most sustainable and able to accommodate growth. One representation disagrees and considers that the town infrastructures will be unable to cope and a more appropriate option would be to build a new settlement. There was some support for growth in villages, to address housing need and maintain vitality of rural communities. One representation questions whether small growth villages can accommodate the proposed growth without site-specific constraints being considered. In the main, it is considered that villages are unsuitable

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
		locations for growth. There is no local demand and limited employment or services. There is strong support for provision of affordable housing in villages, and for the protection of village character and green gaps between settlements. Many consider that allocating development in Small Growth Villages will have a knock on effect on the delivery of rural exception affordable housing schemes and a preference was expressed for small scale and suitable infill development coming forward. On the other side, some consider that growth in Countryside is overly restrictive and small scale development should be allowed on greenfield sites and on derelict neglected sites.
Large Growth Towns		Overall support for focussing development in Large Growth Towns, which are the largest most sustainable and able to accommodate growth. One representation disagrees and considers that the town infrastructure will be unable to cope and a more appropriate option would be to build a new settlement and roads.
Cromer		Concerns relate to Cromer's status a Large Growth Town, mainly due to the landscape constraints encompassing the town.
Fakenham		Concern expressed about the impact of major residential growth in respect of the lack of employment opportunities and services available.
North Walsham		One representation raises concern over the ability of North Walsham to accommodate growth due to the current volumes of traffic and the car parks being full. Concerns expressed about the capacity of doctors and dentist.
Hoveton		Concern about Hoveton's proposed Small Growth Town status (when it is a village) adding to the current heavy volumes of traffic experienced in the village and the resulting congestion, air quality issues. Concerns also expressed about the adequacy of education, health provision. Concerns over surface water, flooding and foul water drainage.
Sheringham		One comment considered Sheringham as suitable to accommodate growth as it has a wide range of services and amenities.
Wells		Agrees with Well's status of a Small Growth Town but should be recognised that the town has a finite capacity.
Briston		Concern raised about Briston's Large Growth Village Status, increasing traffic, especially by school and the impact on the character of Briston – development could lead to identical overdeveloped villages in a location where tourism is important. Concerns expressed about the capacity at doctors.
Small Growth Villages		feedback suggested that villages are unsuitable locations for growth. There is no local demand and limited employment or services. There is strong support for provision of affordable housing in villages, and for the protection of village character and green gaps between settlements. Many consider that allocating development in Small Growth Villages will have a knock on impact on the delivery of rural exception affordable housing schemes. Happy with small suitable infill development. On the other side, some consider that growth in Countryside is overly restrictive and small scale development should be allowed on greenfield sites and on derelict neglected sites and other settlements should also be promoted
Bacton		Objection to Bacton status as a Small Growth Village due to impact development could have on the character of the village which historically has a 'scattered or 'dispersed' settlement pattern. Express concerns about the adequacy of infrastructure, public transport and traffic and associated pollution. Difficulty getting to doctors, schools and shops. Parking and a bypass of the old part of the village is needed before development is built. Issue with the number of second homes and impact on housing affordability.
Happisburgh		Concerns expressed about the adequacy of infrastructure, public transport and traffic. Along with issues of the number of second homes and housing affordability.
Mundesley		Concerns expressed about the adequacy of infrastructure and services which are at capacity. Issues with traffic and housing should be affordable.
Northrepps		Propose Northrepps as Small Growth Village.
Little Snoring		Lack of services and facilities, public transport, issues with road network, broadband nearing capacity, Limited capacity at WasteWater treatment works. Important to preserve rural character and green space. Would impact wildlife.
Langham		No shop or post office.
Southrepps		Will lose identities, strain on road network, impact on wildlife, lack of public transport. Located in AONB. Would impact on quality of life for residents. Create light and noise pollution. Development in Mundesley will impact Southrepps. Respondents were against the identification of Southrepps as an infill village
Trunch		Low water pressure in village. Important Conservation Town. Limited facilities

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
Walcott		Concerns expressed about the adequacy of infrastructure, public transport and traffic. Along with issues of the number of second homes and housing affordability.
Weybourne		No public transport for working people, lack of services, new homes unaffordable to local people. Negative impact on AONB and wildlife. Parking inadequate
Alternatives		Bodham, Northrepps, Edgefield promoted as Small Growth Villages. Fails to recognise the settlements that are within close proximity to higher order settlements. Weybourne, Southrepps, Bacton, Walcott, Happisburgh should not be identified settlements. Alternatively put forward include, reintroduce settlement boundaries around the non-growth settlements that are currently misleading designated as 'countryside'.
Council's Response		Noted: Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including that of supporting rural economy, the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. The proposed approach which allows small scale infill development in selected small growth villages which contain some but limited services, the allocation of small scale housing sites and the provision for rural exception sites in areas of designated countryside will be reviewed in line with feedback evidence of need and the potential impacts on affordable housing provision.

Policy SD4 - Development in the Countryside

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD4	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP202	Support	A general presumption away from development in the Countryside (with exceptions as generally recognised) is very much the right approach to sustainable development in north Norfolk
SD4	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP048 LP049	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agriculture and food production is another heavy producer of carbon emissions. Has not only accelerated climate change, but also destroyed ecosystems that we rely on. NNDC does not have control of agriculture, but it should work with farmers and environmentalists to support organic farmers wherever it can. Planning permission for factory farms should stop.
SD4	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. The preservation of rural economy is essential. Development appropriate for this is necessary and should positively favour those working in the rural economy.
SD4	Johnson, Mr Jamie (1216384)	LP347	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Make a case that in addition to small scale greenfield infill site development being permitted outside of development boundaries for permanent residence restrictions, so to would the following categories be permitted: . 1. Exemplary highly energy/water/renewables efficient low carbon small scale sustainable build projects which can act as pioneering examples encouraging 'high quality sustainable and climate change resilient design with makes the best use of improvements in technology' (as stated in draft plan Aims and Objective paragraph 6.4). Also supported by NPPF para. 131 on 'Achieving Well Designed Spaces' stating 'Great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings' . 2. Highly sustainable commercially available 'eco tourism' holiday lets (which comply with the plan's paragraph 10.50 on available commercial holiday letting). (evidenced in NPPF para. 83 'Supporting a prosperous rural economy' 'Planning policies and decisions should enable: sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside') 3. Exemplary low carbon Self and Custom builds. . All of the 3 above categories would act as exemplars of water, energy, renewables and emissions efficiency, include ultra low emissions and plug-in vehicle facilities, biodiversity-enhancing landscaping and build technologies and support and present a vision towards the Government's outlined 'transition to a low carbon future'. The following categories should be allowed in the countryside: 1. Exemplary low carbon small scale sustainable projects in line with para 131 2. Highly sustainable commercially available 'eco-tourism' holiday lets 3. Low carbon Self and Custom Builds All of which would act as exemplars of water, energy, renewables and emissions efficiency, include ultra low emissions and plug-in vehicle facilities, biodiversity-enhancing landscaping and build technologies and support and present a vision towards the Government's outlined 'transition to a low carbon future'.
SD4	Dixon, Cllr Nigel (1218612)	LP738	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Allow more small scale development in rural villages to meet local demand by committing to do so on a case by case basis rather than linkage to specified available facilities.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD4)
Summary of Objections	2	This policy received two objections. Suggest changes to policy to allow for low carbon development in the countryside including small scale greenfield infill sites for permanent residence, low carbon small scale sustainable projects, 'eco-tourism' holiday lets, Low carbon Self and Custom Builds. Suggest that NNDC works with farmers to support organic farming where possible and should not allow permission for factory farms.
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy. Consider that the general presumption against development in the Countryside is the right approach to sustainable development in North Norfolk. But appropriate development should be allowed to ensure that the rural economy is preserved.
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment received. Allow more small scale development in rural villages to meet local demand by committing to do so on a case by case basis rather than linkage to specified available facilities.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised, consider that the general presumption against development in the Countryside is the right approach to sustainable development in North Norfolk. However others suggested that more small scale development is allowed in rural villages to meet local demand. Suggest that the policy should allow for low carbon development in the countryside including small scale greenfield infill sites for permanent residence, low carbon small scale sustainable projects, 'eco-tourism' holiday lets, Low carbon Self and Custom Builds.
Council's Response		Comments noted: The Local Plan supports the transition to a low carbon future and included policies throughout the plan to allow appropriate development in countryside locations in line with the approaches envisaged in national policy. Paragraph 79 in the NPPF also allows for exceptional development proposals in the countryside subject to truly outstanding and innovative design which also enhances the setting .

Policy SD5 - Developer Contributions & Viability

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD5	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP400	General Comments	Introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy on all new developments whatever the size, related to and proportionate to the number of properties to be built on site in order to provide a pot of money to build new roads and underground utilities before any building takes place. If is identified that the health and welfare of current local residents will be detrimentally affected by any new development, insist that provision is made in the levy for an increase in funding to the NHS In North Walsham a new link road between the B1150 and the A149 Cromer Road would need to be established and an increased provision of health services, school, dentists, broadband, water supply and waste removal before any further development was considered.
SD5	Walker, Mrs Kerry (1217345)	LP351, LP346	General Comments	Highlights the pressure on Hoveton's infrastructure, namely,: ~Road Infrastructure ~Water and Sewerage ~Education ~Health. Suggested that NNDC acknowledge the limits to growth for Hoveton based on the challenges of road infrastructure and the life span of Wroxham Bridge. That prior to any development in Hoveton conditions are placed upon all developments (major or minor) in respect to connecting foul water to the sewer network until such a time that Anglian Water have implemented their catchment strategy for Hoveton.
SD5	Woodward, Mrs Josephine (1217427)	LP604	General Comments	Developers must adhere to their promises with regard to contributions to infrastructure. Necessity of enforcing developer contributions to infrastructure.
SD5	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP255	Object	The Policy notes that: 'the Council will, subject to viability, secure site specific developer contributions in order to properly service, manage and mitigate the impact of development, which are directly related to development, and are necessary to make the development acceptable and cannot be secured by planning conditions.' Paragraph 4.4.17 of Background Paper 4, the Infrastructure Position Statement, lists the junction in Roughton of the A140 and B1436 as a congestion 'hot-spot'. We note that, on the North Norfolk policies map, land to the north of our client's site Land East of Norwich Road has been safeguarded for future junction improvements. Development of this site would take account of any planned improvements to the junction, and would make a proportional contribution to any improvements accordingly.
SD5	Smith, Mr Anthony (1218514)	LP767	General Comments	On SD5, point 1a, I would amend to read: "…developer contributions… that are necessary to make the development acceptable to the community." This would put the onus on developers to listen and pay genuine attention to the meeting the concerns expressed by a community targeted for development. In two consultations in my community in the past ten years, developers paid no attention to the views of the community, clearly articulated over many months. In the minds of some residents, such one-sidedness undermines confidence in the integrity of the process for determining planning applications.
SD5	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. The contribution made by developers and the evidence required to support development should include environmental impact, traffic generation, disruption to residents and traffic during development, and sustainability. It should also seek to prevent developers seeking planning permission purely to increase the value of their land / assets with no intention of going to construction stage; thus leaving land allocated but in effect unable to contribute to the overall target for housing. In particular a "meaningful" start must be made on site within 6 years or planning permission should be rescinded. Meaningful should be foundations and services and in particular the fulfilment of any section 106 agreements in full as a minimum.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD5	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP057	Object	The Plan fails to address the impact of increased visitors to the area as access is improved by the NDR. The road infrastructure in North Norfolk must be improved in line with the ever increasing traffic, including as more comes via the NDR and its planned extension. Consideration must be given to parking space needed by motor homes and caravans waiting to go onto sites. Local residents have more problems crossing roads, due to increased traffic. NNDC must get the Highways Agency and NCC to recognise that the District's roads are substandard.
SD5	Drury, Mrs Margaret (1210793)	LP086	General Comments	Re transport I would like to see developer money being committed to provide round town transport, e.g. by North Norfolk Community Transport. Without this our roads will be gridlocked.
SD5	Boyles, Mr Craig (1217440)	LP503	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Growth, housing, would likely impact on future Primary Care, Community Care and Mental Health service provision, as well as the provision of sub-acute services in community settings. Existing Primary and community care estate does not have capacity to accommodate significant growth. The N & W STP have identified the anticipated impact on infrastructure arising from these proposals. Existing health infrastructure will require further investment and improvement in order to meet the needs of the planned growth shown in this LDP document. Developments contained within would have an impact on healthcare provision in the area and its implications, if unmitigated, would be unsustainable. In instances where major policies involve the provision of development in locations where healthcare service capacity is insufficient to meet the augmented needs appropriate mitigation will be sought. The exact nature and scale of the contribution and the subsequent expenditure by health care providers will be calculated at an appropriate time as and if schemes come forward over the plan period to realise the objectives of the LDP. Policies should be explicit in that contributions towards healthcare provision will be obtained and the LPA will consider a development's sustainability with regard to effective healthcare provision. Before further progression and amendment of policies are undertaken, the LPA should have reference to the most up-to-date strategy documents from NHS England and the STP which currently constitute The NHS Long Term Plan and the STP Estates Strategy. The N & W STP has also identified shortfalls in capacity at existing premises covered by the LDP. Provision needs to be made within the emerging LDP to address the impacts of development on health infrastructure and to ensure timely cost-effective delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements, in the interests of pursuing sustainable development. the Plan. The Plan Should make reference to The NHS Long Term Plan and STP Estates Strategy. Timely cost-effective delivery of necessary infrastructure.
SD5	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP221	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** North Norfolk is poorly served by NHS Health provision. GP's and Dentists, along with other clinicians are in short supply across the Country and difficult to get appointment. Retention and attracting those available to North Norfolk is difficult. Live in Southrepps, dentist in North Walsham. The NHS dentist left, they couldn't recruit and my Dentist is now in Sheringham. Provision of emergency care is a lottery. Often long waits are required for ambulances to the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital. You are far more likely to die in North Norfolk in an emergency than you are in Norwich. North Norfolk needs an A&E ideally or a far better response in regards to emergency health requirements. Any further growth across the District should reflect reality rather than words as outlined in the Health Protocol March 2019 document. How can you ensure additional GP's Dentists etc. when they do not physically exist. If Council's refused growth until Central Government sorted out the issue it would focus their minds. Although I recognise that NNDC are not responsible for this provision the Local Plan is there to protect local residents and enhance their Health and Wellbeing. Developer contributions to build a new Health Centre is great.....but not if you have no GP's to man it. On the policy itself I would suggest a Health Impact Assessment should be required to be provided by Developers for a lower number than 500 properties. I would suggest the region of 200 properties (500 people) would be more realistic. The policy states consultation with Healthcare planning for 50. However, your approach to settlement hierarchy is going to lead to small growth in Villages

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				across the District. Ten developments of 5 or 5 developments of 100 will not be covered under the proposed policy but has exactly the same effect. Health & Wellbeing is a very important aspect of the Local Plan. Open and Green Space, cycleways, Play Areas, Quiet rural areas, Parks, indoor and outdoor affordable sports facilities etc. all play a major role in physical and mental health and take the pressure of the NHS at all levels. This should be at the forethought of the Local Plan and a vein throughout the whole document. Failure to do so will only make the District a busier but not better place. With regards to Developer Contribution the policy for S106 contributions should be altered to ensure that a 'levy' is obtained from all residential development including developments of 10 or under. It is not fair or reasonable that when your hierarchy settlement proposals are going to encourage small growth within Villages across the District that small developers do not contribute towards local infrastructure. 10 developments of 5 Houses within a Village adds no financial contribution but 1 development of 50 does. How is this right. Both examples bring the same number of houses/people and strains on local infrastructure. Introduce a levy on small developments. On the policy itself I would suggest a Health Impact Assessment should be required to be provided by Developers for a lower number than 500 properties. I would suggest the region of 200 properties (500 people) would be more realistic. With regards to Developer Contribution the policy for S106 contributions should be altered to ensure that a 'levy' is obtained from all residential development including developments of 10 or under.
SD5	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 3.5. The use of developer contributions to ensure the delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements, secure sustainable communities, and to meet the wider sustainability objectives and specifically manage and mitigate the impact of development is supported in principle. 3.6. The policy does not provide detail on how contributions will be calculated nor does it refer to any future Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) which could provide further detail on determining contribution levels. Further clarity is requested alongside recognition that contributions are subject to viability review. Part 3 which includes a list of contributions infers that contributions listed will be sought for all development proposals, however the policy wording should be changed to explain that contributions should be sought on a site by site basis, where deemed necessary to mitigate the impacts of a particular development. Further clarity is requested alongside recognition that contributions are subject to viability review.
SD5	North Norfolk District Council Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** These matters to be vital to the success of larger scale development throughout the District. Residents are entitled to expect that their infrastructure requirements will be fulfilled. While all of the infrastructure listed is of importance, medical provision is of growing concern to our residents. Would like to see a requirement for a complete and thorough assessment of the Health Impact of any larger scale development which is proposed. Proposals must be supported by a suitable, transparent viability appraisal. The present wording says only that they should be so supported.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD5)
Summary of Objections	3	Objections express concerns over the competing demands on developer contributions. Wish to see improvements in the road infrastructure and raise concerns with the provision of the NHS Health Service, GPs and Dentists are in short supply with difficulty retaining and attracting staff. Highlight the importance of providing Open Space, Cycleways, Parks, Sports Facilities to improve resident's wellbeing and to take the pressure off the NHS. Consider it unreasonable for small growth in villages to not contribute towards local infrastructure and suggest that a levy is introduced for small development. Plan fails to address impact of increased visitors.

Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy. Suggest that evidence/ contributions required should be submitted to support development. In order to prevent developers seeking planning permission to increase land value, work on site should start within 6 years or planning permission should be rescinded. Housing growth likely to impact on future Primary Care, Community Care and Mental Health service provision. Existing health infrastructure will require further investment and improvement in order to meet the needs of the planned growth. Suggest that mitigation should be sought where development is proposed in locations where capacity is insufficient to meet the needs. And policies be explicit in that contributions towards healthcare provision will be obtained and the Local Planning Authority will consider a development's sustainability with regard to effective healthcare provision. Suggest that reference is made to the most up-to-date strategy documents; the NHS Long Term Plan and the STP Estates Strategy.
Summary of General Comments	7	Support in principle for the use of developer contributions, considered vital to the success of larger developments. Policy doesn't provide detail on how contributions will be calculated or refer to future SPDs which could determine contribution levels. Others suggest that CIL should be introduced. Specific concerns raised in relation to impact on Hoveton's infrastructure - road, water, sewerage, education and health. Developers must adhere to their promises with regard to contributions to infrastructure. Suggested amendment to point 1a - "…developer contributions… that are necessary to make the development acceptable to the community.". Infrastructure requirements and medical provision must be fulfilled. Like to see a requirement for a complete assessment of Health Impact of any larger scale development proposed. And **must be** supported by transparent viability appraisal.
Overall Summary		Support in principle for the use of developer contributions, considered vital for the success of larger development schemes. Policy doesn't provide detail on how contributions will be calculated or refer to future SPDs which could determine contribution levels. Developers must adhere to their promises with regard to contributions to infrastructure and medical provision. Improvements needed to road infrastructure, concerns over the impact on NHS Health Service, Primary Care and Mental Health Services. Suggest that policies are explicit that contributions towards healthcare will be obtained. Supported by a Health Impact Assessment of larger scale development. Mitigation should be sought where capacity is insufficient to meet the needs. Refer to up-to-date strategy documents. **Suggest wording change 'Proposals must be supported by a suitable, transparent viability appraisal'.** Fails to address impact of increased visitors. Specific concerns over the impact of development on Hoveton's infrastructure. Suggest that levy for small growth in villages and planning permissions should be rescinded after 6 years if site not started to prevent land banking.
Council's Response		Noted, Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. Planning obligations assist in mitigating the impact of unacceptable development to make it acceptable in planning terms. Planning obligations may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission if they meet the tests that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They must be: •necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; •directly related to the development; and •fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development for local highways, water, and sewerage and energy networks. These issues have been taken into account in site assessment. The responsibility of planning and delivering healthcare lies with the Norfolk & Waveney Sustainable & Transformation Partnership. NNDC is a signatory of the Joint Norfolk Health Protocol and as such proposals for 50 dwellings or more are consulted on with healthcare planning and commissioning bodies who will determine whether any healthcare mitigation is required .

Policy SD6 - Provision & Retention of Local Facilities and Services

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD6	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. The retention of local facilities can only be sustainable if their costs and outgoings are sustainable and their customer base is retained. High taxes for businesses and the discouragement of their customers through high parking charges or lack of accessibility will erode sustainability of businesses and facilities.
SD6	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP382 LP435	Object	Proposed Policy SD6 This refers to "designated Health and Social Care Campuses at Cromer, Fakenham, High Kelling, North Walsham and Wells-next-the-Sea." Paragraph 11.4 of the Plan makes clear that "Land which lies within the defined boundaries of Selected Settlements will be designated as one of a number of Policy Area Designations", one of which is "Health Care Campus" where policy SD6 would apply. Paragraph 11.3 confirms that Settlement Boundaries are shown on the maps at the beginning of settlement sections. However, there are no such campuses shown on the Proposals maps. Without such being identified, the proposed settlement boundaries cannot be considered reliable. Clarification needed.
SD6	Ringer, Mr Callum (1218563)	LP772	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Could the council talk about change of use for buildings in more detail, for example, make it much harder for village pubs and shops to get change of use as this is detrimental to the social and cultural fabric of our area. Often these businesses are bought with the sole intention of running them into the ground. requests that NNDC adopt a policy which safeguards these asset, and encourages new ones to be created under community ownership.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD6)
Summary of Objections	2	This policy received two objections. Suggest amendment to policy to make it tougher for pubs and shops to change use. Health Care Campus are not shown on the Proposals map.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy for the protection of community facilities but considers that the retention of these facilities can only be sustainable if their costs are sustainable and customer base is retained.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Overall support for protecting community facilities, suggest amending the policy to reference change of use and make it tougher to change pubs and shops. Health Care Campus are not shown on the Policies Map.
Council's Response		Noted Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. Local facilities considered important are detailed in footnote 16. The change of Use between Use classes is governed by the Use Classes order. Ensure the identification of Health care campuses on the policies mapping

Policy SD7 - Renewable Energy

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD7	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Norfolk already makes a large contribution to renewable energy through the offshore wind farms along the coast- more than inland counties. The building of land based turbines and their inherent impact on the appearance and character of the countryside should be discouraged whilst there remains the ability to construct turbines offshore. Solar farms are also unsightly and completely uncharacteristic of the county. Steps should be taken to limit their development, particularly as land is required for agriculture. Reduction in the amount of land available for agriculture puts more pressure on the land that is remaining and encourages intensive farming to maintain yields. This results in poor environment and bio diversity and loss of habitat for wildlife. Solar farms should have surrounding hedges and appropriate wildlife (insect) friendly planting. They should not just be grassed over. Rain water run-off from the panels should be used for agriculture. onshore wind turbines should be discouraged Should limit Solar Farms Solar Farms should have surrounding hedges and appropriate wildlife (insect) friendly planting.
SD7	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP048 LP049	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Norfolk is extremely suitable for onshore wind power, as shown by our history of windmills. Wind power is an obvious way to cut carbon emissions and could be used to offset schemes. One of the first actions of this new council should be to stop the court actions which have used tax payers' money to delay two mid-sized turbines for years, after they had twice been given permission by government inspectors. Wind power is an obvious way to cut carbon emissions
SD7	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** This policy to be unnecessarily negative. Like to see the wording read “Proposals for renewable technology ... will be encouraged...” rather than “permitted”.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD7)
Summary of Objections	1	One objection received, Norfolk is suitable for onshore wind power and this is an obvious way to cut carbon emissions.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, raises concerns over the impact of wind turbines on the appearance and character of the countryside and the impact of solar farms on biodiversity. Suggest that hedges should be planted to retain wildlife.
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment, consider policy to be unnecessarily negative. Like to see the wording read “Proposals for renewable technology ... will be encouraged...” rather than “permitted”. Support for wind power as an obvious way to cut carbon emissions promoted.
Overall Summary		Mixed comments for this approach, seek to discourage onshore wind turbines and limit solar farms due to impact on the appearance and character of the countryside, agricultural land and on biodiversity. Suggest that hedges should be planted to retain wildlife around solar farms. However other comment that the policy is unnecessarily negative and there should be more support for onshore wind turbines in the district, to help cut carbon emissions. Suggested wording change “Proposals for renewable technology ... will be encouraged...” rather than “permitted”.
Council's Response		Comments noted: The policy approach is one that emphasises the importance of the landscape and recognises its sensitivity to wind turbine development of all scales. The approach has been informed by the 2019 landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Study.

Policy SD8 - Fibre to the Premises (FTTP)

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD8	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP393	Support	Broadband provision needs to be better than good, currently, so as to be able to cope with future increased demand. In a rural setting, reliance on the internet for business and social use is crucial to delivering sustainable development. Underground all new utilities as this preserves the character of the local area.
SD8	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree to some extent. The introduction of broadband and fibre across the county is important. Reliable broadband is essential in order to reduce traffic journeys and congestion through commuting as employees could work remotely from areas of employment. Unfortunately where broadband has been introduced the nature of the broadband is inappropriate. Download speeds for recreational activities are good but upload speeds that are required by those working remotely continue to be poor. A policy of appropriate broadband should be encouraged so that employment and commercial use is prioritised through better upload speeds and not frivolous use. Providers of broadband infrastructure need to be made to do this.
SD8	Wilhelmy, Mr Guy (1216159)	LP172	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I endorse the Council's policy of ensuring the maximum provision of fibre optic communication to bring high speed Broadband to as many properties as possible. In my opinion, fibre optic connectivity is more effective and reliable than any other system of Internet connection and offers speeds far in excess of 5G. Fibre optic does not have the worrying health risks associated with 5G and completely eliminates the need for 5G anyway. 5G has been developed from a weapon system where the principal function appears to be the ability to target individuals with bursts of high power directed microwave radiation, it's that capacity that is of concern due to the damage that such radiation can inflict within the human body. I suggest that the Council should adopt a policy of only promoting fibre optic Internet connection for properties within the district and exclude 5G absolutely under its duty of care to protect public health. After all, the pipework and trunking already exists in the form of our telephone infrastructure to bring fibre optics to each property, in the UK we are particularly fortunate to already have such a well developed system. 5G may be considered a central government project but I believe local councils have a moral obligation to stand up for the rights of local residents and protect them from injury. At the time of writing I note that Glastonbury Council has ruled to implement the 'Precautionary Principle' due to serious concerns about the dangers of 5G, whereas fibre optic offers no such threat to our safety and in a very short time-scale could be made available to everyone. Furthermore, fibre optic promises to be much less expensive than 5G with higher speeds, greater reliability with much less maintenance. I suggest that the Council adopts a policy to promotes fibre optic only as the means of Internet connection for properties where 4G should continue to provide mobile Internet connection. Within the policy 5G should be excluded absolutely due to the absence of any credible independent scientific research to confirm its safety. The health dangers of 5G due to the intense directed microwave radiation is too dangerous to allow particularly when other councils have now imposed serious restrictions upon 5G installation. Fibre optic connectivity has none of these problems or dangers.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD8)
Summary of Objections	0	None received

Summary of Supports	3	Three support this policy, the introduction of broadband and fibre is important and should be available to every property. Will allow employees to work remotely, limiting travel and reducing traffic and congestion. Suggests that the policy should prioritise businesses/ commercial uses for better upload speeds.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Overall support for this policy, the introduction of broadband and fibre is important and should be available to every property. Will allow employees to work remotely, limiting travel and reducing traffic and congestion. Suggests that this policy should prioritise businesses/ commercial uses for better upload speeds.
Council's Response		Support welcomed. The proposed approach includes the requirements for employment premises as well as residential for FTTP. The Council is working through the Duty to co-operate to maximise the speed of rollout of 5G telecommunications to Norfolk, the Local Planning Authorities are engaging with the telecommunications industry including Mobile UK to produce shared objectives for extending 4G coverage and the rollout of 5G infrastructure in Norfolk guidance on the location of base and booster stations for the 5G network, taking into account material planning considerations. Policies SD8 and SD9 set out requirements around fibre to premises and mobile network.

Policy SD9 - Telecommunications Infrastructure

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD9	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: See also comments on SD8 re appropriate upload and download speeds for remote employment working. Provision of broadband alone may meet the policy but will not best serve the population if it is merely for entertainment use and does not prioritise business, employment and education. The siting of masts and infrastructure must be controlled whether they are necessary or not. It is possible to provide appropriate masts and infrastructure disguised as necessary to mitigate impact (there are good examples of this elsewhere in the country.)
SD9	Wilhelmy, Mr Guy (1216159)	LP173 LP179 LP372 LP374	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There is now huge concern over the safety of 5G and the threat it poses to human health and well-being. There is an urgent need for the Council to take account of this concern particularly as other councils are now making decisions in response to the potential damage and injury. At the time of writing it is understood that Glastonbury Council has ruled to impose the 'Precautionary Principle' out of its awareness of the dangers of intense microwave radiation from 5G transmitters and devices. Noise and vibration that are visible or audible are only part of the problem where it is suggested that we must now consider all of the electromagnetic spectrum in terms of pollution and interference of our quiet enjoyment of our property and district.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD9)
Summary of Objections	1	One objection received to policy, there is no evidence that 5G is safe to be used.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, the siting of masts and infrastructure must be controlled whether they are necessary or not. Suggests that it is possible to provide appropriate masts and infrastructure disguised as necessary to mitigate impact.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised, support for controlling the siting of masts and infrastructure and to disguise where possible.
Council's Response		Comments noted.

Policy SD10 - Flood Risk & Surface Water Drainage

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD10	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Agree with reservations. The policy should discourage building on flood plains.
SD10	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** However, fully paved developments without green areas offer poor sustainability and greatest environmental impact. Run off has to be managed and can lead to flooding. A balance is required with appropriate planning restrictions to stop the gradual erosion of green space in the future. Changes of garden areas to hardstanding should be discouraged without appropriate compensatory planting or soft landscaping elsewhere. A maximum hardstanding percentage should be introduced. Changes of garden areas to hardstanding should be discouraged without appropriate compensatory planting or soft landscaping elsewhere.
SD10	Broadhead, Ms Beverley (1217202)	LP289	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Infrastructure is under extreme pressure by adding blocks of housing development to existing developments. This needs to be rethought out in the light of drainage. Towns could also support 3 storey buildings as opposed to 2 storey.
SD10	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** New homes should not be built in areas that carry a flood risk.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD10)
Summary of Objections	1	One objection received, raising concern over the impact of new housing on drainage.
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy, should discourage building on flood plains. Suggest that fully paved developments without green areas and hardstanding over gardens should be discouraged to limit potential for run off and flooding. Introduce a maximum hardstanding percentage.
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment, new houses should not be built in flood risk areas.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised, general support for this policy. Housing should not be built on flood risk areas. Concern over the impact of new housing on drainage. Suggest that fully paved developments without green areas and hardstanding over gardens are discouraged to limit potential for run off and flooding. Introduce a maximum hardstanding percentage.
Council's Response		Concern is noted about the potential for flood risk from surface water. The plan seeks a combined approach in order to not materially increase surface water run off including the use of permeable materials through the design policies and consideration of an appropriate drainage strategy.

Policy SD11 - Coastal Erosion

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD11	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP384	Object	Proposed Policy SD11 The policy proposes to limit new development within the Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA). Footnote 25 states that the CCMA "can be viewed on the existing Core Strategy Proposals Maps". However, there is no such designation on the CS Proposals Maps. The maps do show a Coastal Erosion Constraint Area, which refers to CS Policy EN11 – which the text confirms was informed by Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) dating to 2006 -7. The Draft Local Plan refers to SMPs adopted 2012 and other studies undertaken since the SMPs were adopted. Therefore, it is expected that the Areas of Coastal Change/Erosion Constraint would be reviewed for the Local Plan 2016 – 36 and that the extent of CCMA would be clearly shown on a plan. There is a plan (Fig 5) included in the Draft LP which indicates the CCMA but it is not clear enough.
SD11	Burke, Mr Stephen (1216753)	LP798	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Villages and towns on the coast and at risk of erosion and flooding should be properly protected to maintain existing communities, encourage tourism and protect productive agricultural land and wildlife
SD11	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** New homes should not be built in areas at risk of coastal erosion.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD11)
Summary of Objections	2	Two objections to this policy. Villages and towns on the coast should be protected from the risk of coastal erosion and flooding in order to maintain existing communities, encourage tourism and protect agricultural land and wildlife. The Coastal Erosion Zone is not included on the Proposals Map.
Summary of Supports	0	None received.
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment received, new houses should not be built in areas at risk of coastal erosion.
Overall Summary		Representations relate to the concerns over the implications of coastal erosion. Want to see the protection of villages and towns along the coast. Consider whether the Proposals Map shows the Coastal Erosion Zone clearly enough.
Council's Response		The shore Line management plan provide the strategic approach to management of the coast. The policy approach seeks to reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding in appropriate development in vulnerable areas in line with national policy. Taken together with SD12 the approach seeks to provide a framework to address coastal adaptation.

Policy SD12 - Coastal Adaptation

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD12	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree but with comments. There are now many second homes in coastal villages. Allowing development to allow roll back and people to move because of erosion is fine for local residents. Development and gradual using up of the rural countryside to allow second home owners to relocate is not a good use of limited resources. Local occupiers affected by erosion should be given priority.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD12)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One supports the policy but suggests that coastal adaption should be for local occupiers and shouldn't allow second home owners to relocate.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. Coastal adaption should be for local occupiers and shouldn't allow second home owners to relocate.
Council's Response		Disagree. Coastal adaptation is for the whole community. Occupation is not a land use planning consideration

Policy SD13 - Pollution & Hazard Prevention and Minimisation

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD13	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Development itself causes pollution. All developments should have an environmental impact statement considered as part of the planning process. Noise in particular and effect on adjacent occupants, traffic disruption, dust and emissions, use of appropriate materials should all be considered. Noise from completed development (whether existing or new) should be rigorously controlled. The inconvenience of adjacent occupiers should be prevented. Developments that could potentially cause noise should have appropriate planning conditions attached to prevent that occurring. North Norfolk is one of the least light polluted counties in England. Long may this continue and a gradual erosion of this by inappropriate lighting schemes should be prevented. LED lighting with downward lighting only should be used. Schemes that allow uplighting and unnecessary light spillage should be rejected. All development should have an environmental impact statement considered as part of the planning process. Developments that could potentially cause noise should have appropriate planning conditions attached to prevent that occurring. Inappropriate lighting schemes should be prevented.
SD13	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP055	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Noise and outside light control zones must be introduced in rural areas. The increasing use of ride on mowers, strimmers and hedges means there is often a constant hum in villages! Many incomers do not feel secure unless they have outside lights on during the night. Cars are being parked on green areas, including public footpaths. Dog noise and waste, including plastic bags, are increasing hazards. Noise and outside light control zones must be introduced in rural areas.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD13)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy, important to minimise noise and light pollution. Suggest that development with unnecessary lighting should not be permitted. Noise and light control zones should be introduced in rural areas and all development should have an EIA.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Overall support for this policy, especially for minimising noise and light pollution. Suggest that development with unnecessary lighting should not be allowed, noise and light control zones should be introduced in rural areas and all development should have an EIA.
Council's Response		Support noted. EIA is a process of evaluating the likely environmental impacts of a proposed project or development. The screening provisions including thresholds are set out in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011

Policy SD14 - Transport Impact of New Development

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD14	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP395	General Comments	creating green cycle paths that do not use the roads at all would be beneficial to locals and tourists. The narrow roads without footpaths are very dangerous for inexperienced or young cyclists. As there is not much that can be done to the width of roads without knocking down heritage buildings, creating green cycle paths would be an alternative. Perhaps use the disused railway network paths? Alternative transport is not an option for many residents. The roads are too narrow and busy for cyclists to use when trying to get to somewhere with facilities. Carrying shopping on the bus or cycling with it from North Walsham is not easy, so cars are an essential part of the infrastructure in a rural location. Should be greater consideration for the safety of locals and tourists who wish to use environmentally friendly means of transport.
SD14	Swift, Mrs Julie (1216911)	LP243	Object	As a rule of thumb Highways estimate 7 car movements a day per property (often this can be far more if there are multiple cars at the property). Add to this delivery vehicles to each property (from supermarkets, online shopping, oil deliveries etc.). Even small developments can soon add a large number of extra vehicle movements a day. Rural villages like Southrepps have largely single track roads or at best narrow roads that will allow two cars to pass but not two delivery vans/lorries. Extra vehicle movements on inadequate road networks (often with no pavements) threaten both vehicle and pedestrian safety. Looking at Southrepps any developments over 1-2 infill houses will be a departure from both SD 14 and Core Strategy Policy CT5, both of which say: Development will be designed to reduce the need to travel and to maximise the use of sustainable forms of transport appropriate to its particular location. SD 14 and CT5 say Development proposals will be considered against the following criteria: · The proposal provides for safe and convenient access on foot, cycle, public and private transport addressing the needs of all, including those with a disability; · the proposal is capable of being served by safe access to the highway network without detriment to the amenity or character of the locality; · the expected nature and volume of traffic generated by the proposal could be accommodated by the existing road network without detriment to the amenity or character of the surrounding area or highway safety. Any development in a rural village, like Southrepps, cannot “reduce the need to travel and maximise the use of sustainable forms of transport” as there is little employment in the village, the bus service is inadequate, access to primary schools requires a car journey etc. It is not an easy area to live in without a car if you have children at school, a job, need to go shopping to a large supermarket, visit the doctors and so on. Most properties in the village have two cars or more. The recent Drurys Yard development in Southrepps containing 18 houses was given the requisite number of parking spaces seen to be applicable to the size of property. However, cars are constantly parked all down the access road as there are a lot more cars than parking spaces. Southrepps is a ‘rural’ village with working farms, both arable and livestock. Its road network comprises of mainly single-track rural lanes. Even the ‘main’ road through its centre is not capable of carrying two medium/large vans side by side. The figures on the Parish Councils website from the new SAM2 show over 60,000 vehicles a month are passing through the village (around 30,000 in each direction). The SAM2 also records that many of these vehicles are travelling in excess of 30mph. This volume of traffic has made the village roads increasingly dangerous for vehicle users, cyclists and pedestrians. Over half of the roads have no pavements or short stretches of pavement only. Elderly people, children, dog walkers, cyclists are experiencing 'near misses' on a regular basis. Every increase in traffic raises the danger levels within this village (and others like it). Developments in this village, therefore, cannot comply with the criteria above - they cannot provide for safe access; they cannot be served by safe access to the highway network without detriment to the locality; they cannot be accommodated by the existing road network without detriment to highway safety. Southrepps will see an increase in traffic with the proposed increase in development in Mundesley - as Southrepps is used as a cut through from Mundesley to the A149 and A140. This will put an intolerable strain on the road network through the village without

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				further development in the village itself. I agree with SD 14 (and Core Strategy Policy CT5) - but at present it is being ignored by the planners.
SD14	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP256	Object	The Policy states that: 'Development proposals will be considered against the following criteria: • Outside designated settlement boundaries, the proposal does not involve direct access on to a Principal Route, unless the type of development requires a Principal Route location.' However, paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that: 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.' The provisions of the policy do not comply with national policy in this respect; they create an additional, more prescriptive requirement which cannot be justified and is not robust. As an example, Land East of Norwich Road would be accessed via the A140, which is a principal route. The proposed access onto the A140 lies within the 30 mph speed zone, some 150m south of the roundabout junction of the A140 and the B1436, and cars would be decelerating towards the roundabout north bound, or pulling slowly up the hill away from the roundabout in a south-bound direction. We do not therefore believe that there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety of creating a new access here, or that the residual cumulative impacts would be severe. We assume that a robust highways assessment of each site nominated through the Call for Sites will be undertaken, and if, as set out in the NPPF, there would be no unacceptable impact on highway safety and no residual cumulative severe impact, sites should be given a positive rating as part of the site selection process, even if they are accessed from a principal route. The policy should be amended to comply with the provisions of the NPPF.
SD14	Hurdle, Mr David (901803)	LP066	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Point 5 under policy SD14 refers to Travel Plans for non-residential. Why not for large residential? Travel still generated! the word maximise is used about sustainable travel, in 1st sentence of SD14. So why not the word minimise when referring to car use, see my comments elsewhere? Cannot find any mention of county council transport policies, nor park and ride schemes to help minimise car use in town centres. Have I missed such references? Are you planning to consult visitors, a significant proportion of the population much of the year? If so, how? How successful has previous Local Plan been? Has it achieved the outcomes expected? Need to know when preparing this new one, i.e. lessons to learn! Travel Plans should be done for large residential developments. In 2nd bullet point of 7.20 replace 'reduce' with 'minimise'.
SD14	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Development should take place in areas where there is access to facilities and employment in order to limit road use. The impact of additional junctions, traffic lights and roundabouts on the flow of existing traffic should be considered. There are many examples – not necessarily in Norfolk- where a large development such as a supermarket or retail park has been allowed to have a traffic light controlled junction onto a major route causing long delays in through traffic. Inconvenience for many people on a daily basis result - all so that one business can make a profit. Development should take place in areas where there is access to facilities and employment in order to limit road use.
SD14	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP058	Object	The impact of more traffic due to development around the area must considered as a whole, not just around the new development. Residents in adjacent rural areas have increasing difficulty walking due to lack of safe routes and crossing points.
SD14	Spowage, Mr Richard (1216878)	LP329	General Comments	In future development proposals there is a need to assess level of commuting outside local area to ensure wider road infrastructure is not overloaded and ensure greenhouse gases from excessive vehicle use are minimised
SD14	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The transport criteria against which development proposals will be considered to be essential. Regard for the amenity and character of the local area is paramount, as is a provision of a comprehensive transport assessment for North Walsham as a whole. No mention of accessibility within this policy. Hope to see strengthened wording here as all larger scale development has significant transport implications and

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				should require a transport assessment of the type specified. like to see a requirement for accessibility to both new or existing means of transport to be demonstrated as part of this process.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD14)
Summary of Objections	4	This policy received four objections. Concerns over the adequacy of the road infrastructure to deal with cars resulting from new development. Considered extra cars could threaten both vehicle and pedestrian safety. The impact of increased traffic across the District should be considered. Suggest that Travel Plans should be required for large residential schemes. One comments that restricting direct access onto a Principal Route is in contradiction with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF and cannot be justified. There is no mention of County Council transport policies or park and ride schemes to minimise car use in town centres. Specific concerns over suitability of Southrepps to accommodate more growth.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, stipulating that development should take place in areas where there is access to facilities and employment in order to limit road use.
Summary of General Comments	3	Three general comments received. The transport criteria against which development proposals will be considered to be essential. Support for cycle routes away from roads, as narrow roads are dangerous for cyclists. Suggest these could be provided on the disused railway network. Acknowledges that cars are an essential part of the infrastructure in a rural location. There is a need to assess level of commuting outside local area to ensure wider road infrastructure is not overloaded and ensure greenhouse gases from excessive vehicle use are minimised. Regard for the amenity and character of area is paramount and the provision of a comprehensive transport assessment for North Norfolk as a whole. Like to see strengthened wording as all larger scale development has significant transport implications and require a transport assessment. Like to see a requirement for accessibility to both new or existing means of transport to be demonstrated as part of this process.
Overall Summary		Concerns over the adequacy of the road infrastructure to deal with cars resulting from new development. The impact of increased traffic across the District should be considered. Suggest that Travel Plans should be required for large residential schemes. One comments that restricting direct access onto a Principal Route is in contradiction with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF and cannot be justified. There is no mention of County Council transport policies or park and ride schemes to minimise car use in town centres. Specific concerns over suitability of Southrepps to accommodate more growth. New green cycling paths away from roads would be beneficial. Need to assess level of commuting to ensure wider road infrastructure not overloaded and minimise greenhouse gases. Suggest changes to policy as considered all development has significant transport implications and should require a transport assessment.
Council's Response		Comments noted. The primary purpose of the policy is to ensure that proposals consider safe access for all modes of access and address the transport implications of that development. Consider the suggestions of requiring Travel Plans on larger proposals in the finalisation of the policy approach .

Policy SD15 - Parking Provision

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD15	Hurdle, Mr David (901803)	LP067 LP068	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** As well as cycle parking in new developments should there not be a policy of simply providing cycle parking in town centres? why not simply ensure provision of cycle parking in town centres, whether development or not?
SD15	Hurdle, Mr David (901803)	LP069 LP064	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Does the proportion reflect that north Norfolk is the UK's third highest for people aged 65+? Can this specific question please be addressed? My experience is that there is insufficient such parking. And many visitors are blue badge drivers also.
SD15	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. Parking on rural roads in villages should be discouraged. Narrow roads which fall short of current design standards for width, sightlines, footways and alignment can become dangerous if partially blocked or narrowed or sightlines are blocked by inappropriate parking. Access for residents and emergency vehicles in particular can become difficult. Parking that does not impact on access roads should be encouraged and built into the development. Parking on rural roads in villages should be discouraged.
SD15	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP219	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Policy needs to reflect a differential between rural development and urban development. NPPF Section 9, para 105 a-e allows for a differential. To have the same parking standard in Sheringham/Cromer as in a rural village such as Southrepps does not make sense due to the lack of availability of sustainable transport. consider increase that parking standard for 3/4 bed house in rural locations to reflect NPPF considerations and local evidence
SD15	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP218	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The current parking standards (Appendix 1) are based on evidence from over 10 years ago and need updating. NPPF para. 105 (a-e) deals with local parking standards and clearly states what should be taken into consideration. To have the same standards for parking in Cromer/Sheringham as in growth villages such as Southrepps does not make sense. Due to the lack of public and sustainable transport options para 105 c (NPPF) there is a higher requirement for private cars. To have a parking standard of 2 spaces for a 2 or 3 bed house including the garage does not make sense. Many of the houses now built have small gardens and therefore the garage is used for storage. A 3 bed house then only has one parking space with the potential for 3 or more cars requiring parking, leading to parking on the roads but more often on pavements. The Council should also adopt a policy of not allowing conversion of garages if it reduces the parking below standard requirement. Outside of the main towns which are served with good transport links the parking standard should be increased for a 3 and 4 bed properties. To adopt a policy to stop garage conversion if it means that the parking provision falls below the required current standard
SD15	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Parking Provision In our experience, adequate and well designed parking is essential to a harmonious community. We would hope to see this policy upheld and implemented.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD15)
Summary of Objections	2	Objections suggest that there should be a differential between development in rural areas and urban areas in line with paragraph 105 in the NPPF.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, illustrates the importance of providing off-street parking. Existing issues with narrow roads falling short of current design standards making access difficult for residents and emergency vehicles in particular.
Summary of General Comments	3	Three general comments received, calls for increased levels of cycle parking in town centres and more well designed car parking is essential for the community. To include blue badge parking.
Overall Summary		The representations on the policy dealing with parking, call for increased levels of car and cycle parking. To ensure that parking is adequate and well designed and includes blue badge parking. Highlights safety issues relating to cars parking on narrow roads and access roads and reflect the different reliance eon cars between urban and rural areas
Council's Response		Noted. The local plan seeks to promote sustainable development and is reflective of the rural nature of the District where there is an overreliance on the private car. It is considered that poorly designed schemes can lead to inappropriate parking and highway issues and appropriate provision along side new development to minimum standards and above is necessary. The approach adopts the County Council standards.

Policy SD16 - Electric Vehicle Charging

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD16	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** It is a fallacy that electric vehicles are the cure for traffic pollution and carbon dioxide emissions. Electricity has to be generated and all electric cars do is move the point at which CO2 is generated from car engines to a central location in the form of a power station. There is a failure at central Government level to provide sufficient future power generation capacity to meet the predicted demand from electric cars or for phone charging, smart devices and home computers Windfarms are not enough and the government has failed to make provision for the additional power generation needed. It is nevertheless important to provide appropriate connection for when the real problem of future power generation is resolved. The way to reduce pollution is to reduce traffic. That can be done by making sure housing development takes place near areas of employment and broadband is suitable for home working.
SD16	Rose, Mr Alan (1217227)	LP580	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** With the rise of electric cars, it is important that more electric charging points for vehicles are installed.
SD16	Brooks, Mr David (1217039)	LP251	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** What infrastructure is being planned in order to provide charging points for electric vehicles in the anticipation of transition from petrol and diesel transport modes. There appears to be a considerable lack of this facility in the North Norfolk area.
SD16	Adams (1215905)	LP590	Support	Every new dwelling must be provided with a private parking space on the plot associated with the dwelling with access to a secure and safe charging point
SD16	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** New homes must all have one active standard charge-point for electric vehicles.
SD16	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** We recognise the need for vehicle charging points within proposals for development of all kinds and we welcome this policy. What we would like to see is the removal of the phrase where practical from the first line of the policy.
SD16	Dixon, Cllr Nigel (1218612)	LP738	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Should ensure electric vehicle charging infrastructure for public car park use (and to incentivise businesses to do the same) as well as points for new homes.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD16)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy, suggest that every new dwelling should be provided with a private parking space with access to a charging point. One doesn't consider electric vehicles as the solution for reducing traffic pollution and carbon dioxide emissions as it is just moving the point at which the Co2 is being generated to a central power station. Have to reduce traffic to reduce pollution.
Summary of General Comments	5	Five general comments received. Support for the provision of electric charging points for homes and public car parks but concerns with how these will be delivered with the lack of existing infrastructure in place. Suggest changes to remove the phrase where practical from the first line of the policy.
Overall Summary		Overall support for the provision of electric charging points, but concerns with how this will be delivered. Suggest change to wording to remove the phrase where practical from the first line of the policy.

Council's Response		Support noted. The provision of charging points reflects the move to providing the required infrastructure to support the wider role out of electric vehicles and the move to a lower carbon economy by 2040. The UK power generation as a whole is moving to a lower reliance on fossil fuel generation. The provision for such infrastructure is included in the Plan under SD16

Policy SD17 - Safeguarding Land for Sustainable Transport

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD17	Walker, Mrs Kerry (1217345)	LP331 LP631	Object	Hoveton is omitted from the list of settlements where land should be safeguarded for Sustainable Transport use.
SD17	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	Agree
SD17	Ringer, Mr Callum (1218562)	LP772	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** NNDC needs to be more pro-active in encouraging the re-building of the rail link in to Fakenham and also into Holt and the extension on the bittern line to serve this town, especially as it is an identified growth town. Safeguarding the track bed alone is not particularly visionary and the council should be more pro-active.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD17)
Summary of Objections	2	This policy received two objections. Would like to see the rail link to Fakenham and Holt reintroduced and Hoveton included in the policy list where land will be safeguarded for Sustainable Transport use.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Overall support for this policy. Would like to see the rail link to Fakenham and Holt reintroduced and Hoveton included in the policy list where land will be safeguarded for Sustainable Transport use.
Council's Response		The first part of the policy already provides an appropriate response for the safeguarding of track beds in the suggested locations.

Environment Policies

Policy ENV1 - Norfolk Coast AONB & Broads National Park

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV1	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP258	Object	Policy ENV 1 states that: 'Development will be supported where it is small scale; meets an identified local need and the natural character and beauty of the area is conserved and where possible enhanced.' The policy goes on to note that: 'Proposals for 'major development' in the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that they are in the public interest as asset out in national policy.' Major development is defined in the Glossary of the NPPF as 10 or more dwellings. However, footnote 77 of the NPPF notes that this is 'other than for the specific purposes of paragraphs 172 and 173 in the Framework', i.e. this definition of major development does not apply in the AONB; as set out in Footnote 41 of the Plan, what constitutes major development in the AONB is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account a number of criteria. Roughton lies at the southern extent of the Norfolk Coast AONB. Our client's site, Land north of Chapel Road, Roughton, lies within the AONB. We suggest that development of 13 units on this site would not constitute major development in this context. Such a development would comply with the description of small scale development set out in Policy ENV 1; it is small scale, it would meet an identified local need for housing, and it is considered that the site does not make a contribution to the natural beauty and character of the area as it has existing development to the north and south, and is relatively contained and separated from the AONB by the sloping topography. My client's other site, land to the east of Norwich Road, lies some 120m outside the AONB. However, the indicative masterplan which has been submitted in support of the representations (Appendix B) has taken account of the presence of the AONB to the North, and has sought to minimise the visual impact of the development by creating a natural woodland buffer along the northern boundary, and by setting back the properties from the A140, with generous planting and natural drainage features.
ENV1	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There are many other really important areas within the county that should also be given similar priority. It is a fact that the current coastal habitat and AONB will be lost due to erosion in the future. If biodiversity is to be preserved then wildlife must have other areas to move to. Unless inland areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity are similarly protected from inappropriate development there will be a gradual reduction in the county's biodiversity and important wildlife habitat. Inland wildlife habitat is also a natural resource that enhances the lives and physical and mental well-being of residents, promotes tourism and associated businesses and adds to the character of the area.
ENV1	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP387	Object	Proposed Policy ENV1 The approach suggested is "in the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that they are in the public interest as set out in national policy(42)" where Footnote 42 reads….. "42 This does not apply to development sites allocated by the Local Plan because the need for those developments and scope for them to be accommodated elsewhere outside the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty was assessed during Plan preparation." We do not consider the assessments conducted are sufficient to justify the approach proposed in Footnote 42. Our detailed comment on the Site Selection Methodology Background Paper 6 is set out in the attached analysis and feedback.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV1	Broch, Mr Daniel Sworders Grimes, Mr Kelvin (Agent) (1217619 1217618)	LP659	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Policy ENV 1 states that: 'Development will be supported where it is small scale; meets an identified local need and the natural character and beauty of the area is conserved and where possible enhanced.' This positive attitude to development in the AONB is welcomed. The site lies within the AONB, for five homes will be designed to minimise the visual impact, and to respect and enhance the setting of the environment and the landscape. The scale and character of the properties will reflect their setting, and the associate landscaping will ensure that they integrate into the environment.
ENV1	Ringer, Mr Callum (1218561)	LP772	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Object to any proposal to increase the AONB due to the impact this will have on house prices and the ability to build affordable homes.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV1)
Summary of Objections	3	One objected to the policy in that suitable development necessary to meet identified local housing need that does make a contribution to the natural beauty and character of the area should be allowed in the AONB. Remaining objections focused on the principle of development in the AONB , due to the impact on affordability of house prices and disagreed with the premise of allocation in the AONB throughout the plan
Summary of Support	2	Two support this policy, for the protection of the AONB. One comments that suitable development which is designed to minimise the visual impact, and to respect and enhance the setting of the environment and the landscape should be allowed. Suggest that other important areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity should be given similar protection.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received.
Overall Summary		Support received for the protection of the AONB, some suggest that suitable development necessary to meet identified local housing should be permitted under this policy. And suggest that other important areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity should be given similar protection. One objection disputes the approach to allocations in the AONB, that assessments are not sufficient to justify these developments (Footnote 42).
Council's Response		Comments noted: National policy dictates that whether a proposal is major development in the AONB is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting. The local Plan sets out the strategic policies - individual planning applications will be assessed on its own merits against the whole development Plan.

Policy ENV2 - Protection & Enhancement of Landscape Character

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV2	Bell, Ms Jane (1218416)	LP799	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Support; I trust that the Council will be faithful to the landscape protection objectives set out in this policy, given all the pressures for building development pp. 94, 95, 96 Par. 8.22, s.23.
ENV2	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP388	Object	Proposed Policy ENV2 refers to the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (LSA). However we note that the LSA is not applicable to all types of development as it only considers renewables and reservoirs. Clarification needed.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV2)
Summary of Objections	1	No substantive issues raised - clarification that the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment is not applicable to all types of development and only considers renewable energy development and reservoirs.
Summary of Supports	1	One comment of support received.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Protection should be given to important areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity. Clarification required as to scope of LCA and LSS.
Council's Response		Noted. The LSS assessed the sensitivity of the Norfolk landscape to the various types of renewable and low carbon development. The LCA identifies the landscapes valued features and acts as a framework for decision making that respects local distinctiveness

Policy ENV3 - Heritage & Undeveloped Coast

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV3	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP201	Support	A much-needed policy for north Norfolk. Suggest add to the policy wording: "provided that the relocation would not have a significantly adverse visual impact upon the landscape of the Undeveloped Coast area".
ENV3	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There are many other really important areas within the county that should also be given similar priority. It is a fact that the current coastal habitat and AONB will be lost due to erosion in the future. If biodiversity is to be preserved then wildlife must have other areas to move to. Unless inland areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity are similarly protected from inappropriate development there will be a gradual reduction in the county's biodiversity and important wildlife habitat. Inland wildlife habitat is also a natural resource that enhances the lives and physical and mental well-being of residents, promotes tourism and associated businesses and adds to the character of the area.
ENV3	Johnson, Mr Jamie (1216384)	LP341 LP539	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Where it is assumed that Figure 5. page 93 will be supplemented by new Proposals Maps, the area shown shaded green as 'Undeveloped Coast' should be amended in line with the current proposals maps to show established settlements within the area which are already developed and should be recognised as distinct from the wider 'undeveloped coast' area in which they are sited. For accuracy and clarity the following settlements should be removed from the green-shaded 'Undeveloped Coast' area on figure 5 and follow the current proposals maps demarcation including Stiffkey, Cley Next the Sea, Salthouse, Trimingham, Lessingham, Eccles on Sea including the Cart Gap to North Gap coastal ribbon, and Sea Palling.
ENV3	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP392	Object	Proposed Policy ENV3 The Plan (Fig 5) is insufficient to clearly show the proposed area of Undeveloped Coast.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV3)
Summary of Objections	1	No substantive issues raised: Figure 5 is insufficient to clearly show the proposed area of Undeveloped Coast.
Summary of Supports	3	Three support this policy. Overall support, much-needed policy for North Norfolk. Protection should be given to important areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity. Undeveloped Coast on Proposals Map needs to be updated to exclude existing settlements and consideration to add**ding to the policy wording: "provided that the relocation would not have a significantly adverse visual impact upon the landscape of the Undeveloped Coast area".**
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Support for policy, considered to be much-needed for North Norfolk. Protection should be given to important areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity. Consideration should be given to amending the Undeveloped Coast on Proposals Map to exclude existing coastal settlements. Figure 5 is insufficient to clearly show the proposed area of Undeveloped Coast.
Council's Response		Noted, Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. The majority of growth is located in those settlements identified as sustainable growth locations and as such are identified as outside the Undeveloped Coast designation. It is not appropriate to exclude smaller settlements which the policy seeks to manage appropriate development in . The boundaries will be reviewed along with the finalisation of policy SD3- settlement hierarchy. The map is an illustration, more detail can be found on the interactive proposals map on line. C**onsider updating policy in line with suggested policy wording: "provided that the relocation would not have a significantly adverse visual impact upon the landscape of the Undeveloped Coast area".**

Policy ENV4 - Biodiversity & Geology

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV4	Yardley, Mr Christopher (1218066)	LP688	Support	~I would also like to emphasize that the starting point for development should not be how to bolt on supposed 'net gain' in a specific development but to look to understand the impacts of the development on the existing site and wider biodiversity of the area ~I would also like to suggest that the policy be amended to include an additional key fourth point after 'all development proposals should' to the effect that the Council will engage with NGOs contributions towards the enhancement of biodiversity. Support additions to the proposed wording of the policy to enhance the value and meaning of the policy in line with NPPF guidance and wider community involvement.
ENV4	Spowage, Mr Richard (1216878)	LP326	General Comments	There is a need to emphasise councils duty to protect and enhance all wildlife and ensure suitable ecological information is supplied with any proposal to ensure correct mitigation is achieved both pre development, to prevent loss of species from sites, to post development ensuring long term protection and management of proposed mitigation. In addition the is need to ensure wildlife habitat mitigation is the primary aim and not part of a strategy of public open space which could be detrimental to target species. In addition mitigation needs to have regard for habitat connectivity seeking to link habitats and avoid fragmentation.
ENV4	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Norfolk is generally agricultural. The intensive nature of farming can have a negative impact on biodiversity and habitat if hedgerows are removed, field margins are planted, and insecticides are used. Developing land currently used for farming would have less impact environmentally and on biodiversity than the development of woodland, pasture land or dormant farmland .The development of land that currently provides biodiversity and its associated beneficial effects should be avoided
ENV4	Bell, Ms Jane (1218416)	LP799	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Strongly support the aims in paragraphs 8.22 & 8.23 and consider that those in paragraph 8.22 are of the highest importance. I am delighted to note that the 'provision of 'wildlife homes' is now an official stipulation with regard to ' development proposals'. However, I question the last paragraph (p. 96). If a 'designated site (etc.) may be adversely affected by a development proposal', why should the council consider a development application in the first place, if it is going to cause inevitable, irreversible ecological damage? That is what 'adversely affected' means. pp . 129; 135 – 137 Par. 9.49, 9.50
ENV4	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1217309)	LP396	Object	Proposed Policy ENV4 This proposes that developer contributions will be required based on "the emerging Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy57" . Footnote 57 confirms that "A Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) is currently being commissioned collectively by the Norfolk Authorities and Natural England". We do not consider it reasonable to propose a policy based on a study which has only just been commissioned, and for which there are no proposals for public consultation set out.
ENV4	Burke, Mr Stephen (1216753)	LP798	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** All developments should be subject to an environmental impact assessment to ensure they minimise their carbon footprint and an equality impact assessment to ensure they benefit all residents
ENV4	Buxton, Mr Andrew (1218433)	LP761	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Suggest a bold new environmental initiative by NNDC to aim to make North Norfolk a red squirrel only District by the end of this planning period. It would mean building on the start made by the Holkham estate and persuading land owners and residents on the land to the south to eliminate gradually the grey squirrel. This would for a start save the National Trusts woods at Felbrigg from the appalling damage inflicted on them by lack of control of grey squirrels, and is in tune with the HMG initiative to plant more trees. Other D.C's and counties would follow this initiative but NNDC could take most of the credit.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV4	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There are many other really important areas within the county that should also be given similar priority. It is a fact that the current coastal habitat and AONB will be lost due to erosion in the future. If biodiversity is to be preserved then wildlife must have other areas to move to. Unless inland areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity are similarly protected from inappropriate development there will be a gradual reduction in the county's biodiversity and important wildlife habitat. Inland wildlife habitat is also a natural resource that enhances the lives and physical and mental well-being of residents, promotes tourism and associated businesses and adds to the character of the area.
ENV4	Dixon, Cllr Nigel (1218612)	ILP738	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Ensure layout and land usage creates maximum habitat and area connectivity for wildlife and promotes the recreation of ecosystems essential to address part of the climate change agenda. The Plan should incorporate a requirement to involve a recognised wildlife conservation or preservation authority to both advise on the layout of major sites and become a delivery and maintenance partner.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV4)
Summary of Objections	2	Two objections raised the issue of emerging evidence. Not reasonable that the RAMS evidence to support this policy has only just been commissioned. One suggests that Environmental Impact Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment should be required on all development.
Summary of Supports	4	Policy considered important to the well-being of residents, the character of the area and tourism. One remarks that development on farmland would have less impact environmentally, and that development of land that currently provides biodiversity should be avoided. One questions why if 'a designated site will be adversely affected by a development proposal', the council should consider a development in the first place.
Summary of General Comments	3	General comments received focused on the need to ensure layout and land usage creates maximum habitat and area connectivity for wildlife and promotes the recreation of ecosystems essential to address part of the climate change agenda. Suggest that the policy should emphasise the council's duty to protect and enhance all wildlife, ensure that suitable information is submitted with any proposal to ensure mitigation can be achieved. Mitigation needs to ensure habitat connectivity and avoid fragmentation. One wishes North Norfolk becomes a red squirrel only District. A wildlife conservation or preservation authority should advise on the layout of major sites and become a delivery and maintenance partner.
Overall Summary		General support for this approach, majority of comments focus on how the policy could go further to protect biodiversity; that EIAs should be required on all development, and to ensure that suitable information is submitted during the pre-application stage to ensure mitigation is achieved. No development should be permitted on sites that currently provide biodiversity and where development would have an adverse impact on a designated site. A wildlife conservation or preservation authority should advise on the layout of major sites and become a delivery and maintenance partner.
Council's Response		Noted. Support welcome. We value the enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity and the opportunity to create/improve habitats to support wildlife through biodiversity net gain. Evidence contained within the emerging RAMs strategy will inform future iterations of the Plan and this policy area in relation to European Sites. Such a requirement has been identified through the interim Habitat Regulation Assessment which is available alongside this consultation statement and is included in advice from Natural England.

Policy ENV5 - Green Infrastructure

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV5	Woodward, Mrs Josephine (1217427)	LP605	General Comments	Provision is to be made for the enhancement of green infrastructure and a clear definition of the provision of green infrastructure.
ENV5	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP048 LP049	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** NNDC must work to lower the carbon costs of transport. It should support developing safe for pedestrians and cyclists, and cleaner buses, and delivery vehicles of all sorts. It could provide a fleet of cleaner cars for its own staff to use on council business. It could lobby for lower road speeds.
ENV5	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. See comments. Green infrastructure should be considered in terms of its overall contribution as wildlife corridors and prevent isolation of green areas in order to encourage biodiversity.
ENV5	Watson, Mr Martin (1215724)	LP118	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Many holiday-makers as well as local citizens want to enjoy the beauty of the North Norfolk countryside, keeping healthy by walking and cycling. The problem is that many of the roads that lead through the countryside are narrow and pose dangers to cyclists. There may be safe riding opportunities in campsites and caravan parks but on the open road there are many places where families cycling with children run real risks from motorised traffic. Not having safe cycling paths or tracks discourages holiday-makers with families from coming here as well as the local population from keeping fit on their bicycles. Re aims to: 'facilitate increased . . . . . cycling': discrete cycle paths and tracks are needed. I would suggest that particular areas of danger are identified and efforts made to eradicate the danger. An example is: the road from Weybourne to Holt. The whole road is narrow but the main danger is at the top of the hill. There the road bends to the left as it flattens out but the sides are steep banks and do not allow a cyclist to leave the road if a large vehicle is approaching at the same time. Children especially are at risk. There are many such examples in our area which could be made safe if cycle paths were available off the roads. Cycle tracks are required. Areas of danger for cyclists should be identified and efforts made to eradicate the danger.
ENV5	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP401 LP402 LP405	Object	Proposed Policy ENV5 and the Green Infrastructure Background Paper 5 The Draft Plan makes clear (paras 8.27 and 8.29) that the policy is informed by the Green Infrastructure Background Paper 5. However the Paper simply states that “Land allocations in Cromer seek to provide 600 homes and are outlined below” The principles offered in the GI paper are only in relation to those selected sites - The starting point for consideration of GI appears only to begin on the assumption that the sites considered are the best, not that a GI assessment is offered to inform site selection as set out in the Draft LP. This is therefore inconsistent. The approach in the GI paper appears inconsistent with the role of a Local Plan – it is suggested in regard to Cromer that “some of the formal sports pitches in the town could be considered at the threat of development as they are potentially attractive development plots within the settlement boundary” (p.13). One of the roles of the Local Plan is enabling retention of such valuable facilities – as is demonstrated in Policies SD6 and ENV7. The GI paper as an informing document appears inconsistent.
ENV5	Broadhead, Ms Beverley (1217202)	LP289	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Cycle paths, electric public transport, green spaces for outdoor leisure need to be a part of every built area. This must be as great a priority as built space. Present constructions provide little in the way of wild space.
ENV5	North Norfolk District Council Members for North Walsham	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Vital to the health and wellbeing of the people of the District. We welcome the GI Position Statement and the GI plan for North Walsham which is contained within It, stipulates a requirement for walking and cycling paths, green corridors for wildlife and extended provision for woodland. Makes no direct reference either to Pigney’s Wood or to the reclamation of the Dilham Canal. These are vital resources for the

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
	Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)			health and wellbeing of our town and they deserve to be incorporated within a strong GI plan linking any town extension to the town centre and countryside. We welcome mention of connectivity as without this the policy will not be helpful either to people or wildlife. We would like to see that there is rigorous testing of any assertion that green infrastructure cannot be delivered on a proposed site. If after such testing this can be demonstrated, then enhancement and mitigation must be delivered as close to the development site as possible.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV5)
Summary of Objections	5	Five objections: suggest that NNDC should lower the carbon costs of transport, provide safe pedestrian and cycle routes, encourage electric public transport and ensure that green spaces are provided for outdoor leisure as part of every built area. One objection raises concern over inconsistencies with this policy and the GI Background Paper.
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy and were in agreement that GI should be considered in terms of its overall contribution as wildlife corridors and prevent isolated green areas in order to encourage biodiversity. Cycle paths are needed to allow and encourage holiday makers and residents to enjoy the countryside walking or cycling. Roads are considered narrow and dangerous for cyclists.
Summary of General Comments	2	Two general comments received. GI is vital to health and wellbeing of the people in the District. Welcomes GI plan for North Walsham but makes no direct reference to Pigney's wood or Dilham Canal. Welcome more rigorous testing of whether GI can be provided, otherwise should be delivered close to the development. Suggests that a clear definition of the provision of green infrastructure is required.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Most comments highlighted the importance of GI for the health and wellbeing for residents. A number suggest that NNDC should lower the carbon costs of transport encouraging electric public transport and improve walking and cycle routes. Others suggest that green spaces should be provided as part of every built area and to prevent isolation of green areas in order to encourage biodiversity and to contribute as wildlife corridors. One seeks clarification of what green infrastructure is required.
Council's Response		Noted: agree, The plan positively promotes the provision of high quality on site GI and enhancement and improvement of the existing strategic network. Evidence contained within the North Norfolk Open Space and Sport Recreation a study will be used to inform future site specific requirements.

Policy ENV6 - Trees & Hedgerows

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV6	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. This is absolutely necessary to prevent the erosion of biodiversity, and to provide a network of wildlife habitat across the county and not just isolated areas. See comments on ENV1. As many trees, hedgerows, coppices, ponds and mature areas of woodland as possible should be retained. On any developed land trees and hedges should be retained and protected by planning conditions wherever possible.
ENV6	Rose, Mr Alan (1217227)	LP580	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Planting trees with new builds is also really important for the environment.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV6)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, to encourage the retention of biodiversity, to provide a network of wildlife habitat across the county and not just isolated areas
Summary of General Comments	1	One general comment received. Tree planting should be encouraged.
Overall Summary		Limited comments received and no substantive issues identified. The policy was supported and considered necessary to prevent the erosion of biodiversity and to provide network of habitat across the county. Tree planting should be encouraged.
Council's Response		Noted.

Policy ENV7 - Open Spaces & Local Green Spaces

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV7	Armstrong J (1216455)	LP368	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: I set out below the 9 principal reasons why the private garden at 39 New Road should not be designated as Open Land Area. The area is private residential garden with no public access, it is separate from and different to the publicly accessible Pastures. 2. It does not fulfil the NPPF definition of "Open Space" (provided on p 69 of the NPPF 2019). 3. It does not fulfil NNDC's definition of "Amenity Green Space" (as defined in NNDC's "Amenity Green Space Study April 2019"). 4. It does not fulfil NNDC's definition of "Open Land Area" (as defined in the Draft Local Plan). This definition appears to be out of line with the NPPF definition. 5. The proposed designation is based on out of date information in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility of open space. This is contrary to NPPF paragraph 96. 6. The proposed designation of this area as Open Land Area would prohibit development. Such development could be of benefit to Blakeney and its Conservation Area. 7. The limited "visual amenity" provided by the garden falls well short of that needed to justify designation as Open Land Area. 8. The garden is not part of Blakeney's "composite green space". (Although this may appear to be the case from a bird's eye view.) 9. The garden itself does not appear to have been assessed in the review of open spaces but appears to have been designated as Open Land Area simply because it was deemed to be part of the Pastures which was designated under Policy CT1 in the Core Strategy of 2008 and the earlier local plan. the garden at 39 New Road should not be part of proposed designation OSP154 because it is separate from the Pastures and the garden itself offers no public access. . 2. It does not fulfil the NPPF definition of "Open Space" The NPPF definition of "Open Space" is "All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity." Thus, the NPPF definition of open space requires an area to be "of public value" and to "offer opportunities for sport and recreation" and able to "act as a visual amenity". The garden at 39 New Road falls well short of this definition as there is no public access and, therefore, no opportunity for sport or recreation. The ability of the area to "act as a visual amenity" is greatly restricted by the hedges along Little Lane and New Road which border it. Further examination of the "visual amenity" is provided below at point 7. In summary, the garden does not meet the NPPF criteria of "open space". . 3. It does not fulfil NNDC's definition of "Amenity Green Space" as defined in NNDC's "Amenity Green Space Study April 2019" (AGSS) NNDC does not provide a clear definition of "Amenity Green Space" in its AGSS, however, it provides guidance as follows: § p 3-4 says: "For the purposes of this review, the Amenity Green Space designation includes; public & privately owned accessible open space, churchyards, village greens, allotments & urban woodlands." § p 5 goes on to say "very small areas of open space… generally have been discounted from designation, with protection confined to those larger areas of land that contribute to the character of a settlement and provide functional open space." In other words, the NNDC definitions emphasise access and function. Clearly the garden does not meet these criteria. In summary, the garden at 39 New Road does not fulfil NNDC's definition of "Amenity Green Space". . 4. It does not fulfil NNDC's definition of "Open Land Area" (as defined in the Draft Local Plan). This definition appears to be out of line with the NPPF definition. - . It does not fulfil NNDC's definition of "Open Land Area" (as defined in the Draft Local Plan ENV7).Whether a parcel of land makes "an important contribution to the appearance of an area" is clearly subjective. Further it is impossible to argue that any piece of land does not make a contribution to the appearance of an area (though the contribution may be good or bad). I would make the following points in respect of this definition. - The NNDC Open Space Standards 2008 recommends a village of Blakeney's size (population 801 at the last Census) should have about 4 hectares of open space of various types. Blakeney has almost 9.5 hectares. § Blakeney has more than the recommended amount of open space in each of the categories listed in the NNDC Open Space Standards. The categories are: public park, children's play, playing pitches and natural/semi-natural green space. § Blakeney enjoys high quality recreational open spaces, including flood lit tennis courts, BMX track, young children's and

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				teenage children's play areas in additional to playing fields and more natural areas for information recreation. § In total, Blakeney has approximately 233% of the amount of open space required under the NNDC Open Space Standards. Furthermore, Blakeney is surrounded by vast areas of accessible coastal and rural open space including Blakeney Harbour, the Coast Path, Blakeney Point, Wiveton Downs, Friary Farm, to name but a few! When the promised study is completed, it will confirm that Blakeney is extremely well served in terms of open spaces. An area like the garden at 39 New Road, which provides, at most, a degree of visual amenity, is likely to be deemed "surplus" in the context of Blakeney's rich and plentiful open spaces. Conclusion I would conclude my comments by saying that the garden at 39 New Road should not be designated as an Open Land Area (either as part of the Pastures OSP154 or as a separate designation) for the following reasons: § It is private residential garden with no public access. § It does not meet the criteria of the various definitions of open space (neither NPPF nor NNDC) § NNDC's assessment has been based on out of date information. § The designation would prevent development which could strengthen the character of Blakeney's built environment. § It provides only minimal "visual amenity" to the surrounding area. Development would not reduce the contribution it could make. § It is not part of a "composite green space". § It does not appear to have been impartially reviewed as an open area but has been carried forward from previous plans.
ENV7	Armstrong J (1216455)	LP365	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**. NNDC have misinterpreted the NPPF guidance in respect of assessing potential Local Green Space The NNDC Amenity Green Space Study, April 2019 (AGS) provides details of how NNDC went about reviewing its policies in relation to the provision of new, and the protection of existing, green spaces of various types. Communities were invited to nominate areas which they felt should be considered for designation as Local Green Spaces. (See Appendix D of AGSS which shows the letter sent to all Parish and Town Councils in July 2017). There appears to have been no consideration as to whether these existing open land areas might be "upgraded" to Local Green Space nor to the fact that these "existing designations" themselves were under review. In summary, the AGSS explains that Local Green Space offers the highest level of protection which is reserved for green areas within settlements which are the most important to the local population. It cannot be correct that our beautiful district has only 7 such green areas 6 of which are ponds! I believe that through a combination of misinterpretation of NPPF policy and poor assessment process, NNDC has failed to give the population of North Norfolk the opportunity to award the highest level of green space protection to the most valued, demonstrably special, open spaces. Thus the Open Space & Local Green Spaces Policy ENV 7 is contrary to the NPPF.
ENV7	Walker, Mrs Kerry (1217345)	LP331, LP668	Object	~there is an inconsistent approach between NNDC and the BA in relation to the designation of open space in Hoveton. ~suggested the inclusion of three sites in the NNDC Amenity Open Space Review. hat NNDC include Riverside Park, Pocket Park and Granary Staithe as Amenity Green Space in the 2016-2036 Local Plan. That NNDC recognise its duty to co-operate with the BA and for the 2016-2036 local plan recognise its responsibility in setting a strategic vision for the sustainable development Hoveton's riverside. The removal of oversight and management of pubic open space situated in the areas of Hoveton which currently sit with the Broads Authority area.. In the absence of removal of open space responsibility from the Broads Authority an agreed policy approach between the two authorities to the strategic and operational management of PoS in Hoveton in the overlapping areas.
ENV7	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP259	Object	The policy requires that developments of 11 or more dwellings contribute to the creation of new and enhanced Open Space. I confirm that both my clients' sites would, if allocated, provide policy compliant contributions to open space provision, proportional to the scale and form of the proposed development.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV7	Spowage, Mr Richard (1216878)	LP325	General Comments	Any large development should include large areas of managed open space specifically to meet peoples varying needs - often linked to health and wellbeing. I wish to see a commitment for each urban centre to create new large parks to meet growing population needs.
ENV7	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree with comment. Policy SD13 should not be compromised by this.
ENV7	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP407	Object	Open space and Proposed Policy ENV7 Para. 8.34 makes clear that the NPPF requires policies to be based on "robust and up to date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreational facilities and opportunities for new provision" However, Para 8.38 of the Draft LP confirms that the policy approach is "based on the current Core Strategy approach" and that "an updated qualitative and qualitative (sic) study" is not expected to be drafted until later in the year. The Core Strategy was prepared using an Open Spaces study completed in 2006. Therefore the policy proposed in ENV7 appears premature and unreliable as it is not supported by robust and up to date evidence. This has a knock-on effect to town proposals where it is proposed to include within settlement boundaries (identified now) open land areas – yet the need is not yet known, hence the settlement boundaries should not yet be considered.
ENV7	Buxton, Mr Andrew (1218433)	LP761	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 3) No housing etc. on school and other institution land should reduce the amount of space for recreation/playing fields etc.
ENV7	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP216	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The current standards do not reflect the national standards as required by the NPPF. No mention is made of the word 'wellbeing' or 'health benefits' and this should be included to reflect the NPPF S8 para 96. The benchmark used for local standards should be the Fields In Trust benchmarks/guidelines for quality and quantity as a minimum and this should be stated somewhere within the policy or evidence. This will help ensure that developers understand their obligations. It should be recognised that when applying these benchmarks, local features and obstacles to pedestrian and cycle movement should be taken into account. In doing so, accessible and sustainable play and sport facilities will be maximised. It is not acceptable for Developers to say for instance that there is a play area within 800 metres if it is the case that a footpath is poorly maintained or not suitable for access by disabled or young children with pushchairs. 'Accessibility' in the wider sense of the word and inclusion for all should be a driver in enhancing social interaction, health and wellbeing and provision of equipment and standards. Provision for people with disabilities should also be included in the standards. North Norfolk being a rural area should seek to enhance Village and Countryside Provision with regards to Children's outdoor Play facilities NNDC should have within its policy that developments under 10 residential units should still contribute towards local infrastructure. The proposal to allow 'growth villages' to accept developments of 0-20 will be misused by small developers. 10 applications for 10 houses will have the same affect as 1 application for 100 houses yet they will not contribute towards local infrastructure or to the wider community.
ENV7	Emerson, Mr Peter (1209611)	LP003	Support	Just been to the NNDC display at the Sheringham Community Centre and spoke to your representatives. I was pleased to notice that Weston Terrace Allotment site was included in the Open Spaces as this is not only a good community space but also a magnet for wildlife. I have seen over the years over 50 species of birds either feeding, nesting or hunting on this small patchwork of gardens.
ENV7	Bell, Mrs Hilary (1209650)	LP004	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Pleased to see that the Weston Terrace Allotments have been designated as an open Space and not building land. This area is a haven for wildlife - birds, butterflies, pond creatures and small animals and as such is an important habitat.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV7	Terrington, Mr Peter (1215743)	LP155	General Comments	It is essential to protect the view, across the marsh, of The Parish Church. It is one of the most evocative an iconic views in the town. Any form of development on this marshy site must be prohibited and the open space preserved. Other iconic views, over the saltmarsh, to the north of the town are not protected from development by the open space designation. Only three relatively small areas, enjoying these views remain, others having been lost to development during the course of the current LDF. The three surviving areas of open space are: The Wells Sailing Club dinghy Park, opposite the sailing club. The Former Public Drying Grounds. East of the Shipwrights. The Main Quay, between Freeman Street and East Quay. The WSC Dinghy Park is leased from the NNDC and is open to the public access. The area offers magnificent views across the channel and salt marsh. NNDC is proposing to dispose of this area creating a significant risk that future development could take place. The Former Public Drying Grounds are partly owned by NNDC but significant areas of former public space has been lost through registration by Adverse Possession and has been developed for private car parking. The area is now divided into smaller plots. It is believed that some remain unregistered. There is a significant risk that further development of this former public land will occur if it is not designated as an Open Land Area. The Main Quay has historically been open to public access and the area was enhanced by the demolition of some buildings by the Wells UDC some 50 years ago. The area is used for car parking and the storage of fishing gear, but in recent years the paraphernalia associated with these uses has significantly changed the nature of this open space and reduced its landscape value. **There is a significant risk that further inappropriate development could occur unless the area is designated as an Open Land Area. Designation of the Dinghy Park, Former Public Drying Grounds and the Main Quay as Open Land Areas.**
ENV7	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP217	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** See rep ID P216 . Plus additional comments: Open space and play provision resonates with national planning policy, in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the promotion of its economic, social and environmental roles and the seeking of positive improvements in the quality of the environment, and people's quality of life. In promoting healthy communities, access to high quality open spaces can make an important contribution to health and wellbeing. Open space also plays an important role in meeting the challenge of climate change and flooding through integrating Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) and providing opportunities for conserving and enhancing the natural environment. To change the wording with EN7 to ensure that greater importance is reflected within the Local Plan in particular relation to Wellbeing and Health with Communities for the provision of formal and informal Open Space.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV7)
Summary of Objections	5	Objections focussed on concern that the approach should be more joined up with the Broads Authority in relation to Hoveton and the provision of Open space. Others focused on the opposition to specific designation for a variety of reasons including reliance on outdated assessments that underpinned the current Core Strategy and that parts of a wider site should be removed as they are private. The settlement boundaries should not be determined at this stage as the open land areas are not known yet. One suggests that no housing should be allowed on educational recreational land. One objects to the lack of designated Local Green Spaces.
Summary of Supports	3	support for the inclusion if allotments
Summary of General Comments	5	Three general comments received. Seeking reference to 'health and wellbeing' as mentioned in the NPPF (para 96). The benchmark used should be the Fields In Trust benchmarks/guidelines for quality and quantity as a minimum and this should be stated in the policy. The provision of children's outdoor play facilities should be sought and developments under 10 residential units should still contribute towards local infrastructure. The proposal to allow

		'growth villages' to accept developments of 0-20 will be misused by small developers. Open space provides a number of benefits and plays an important role in meeting the challenge of climate change. All large development should include large areas of managed open space specifically to meet peoples varying needs - often linked to health and wellbeing.
Overall Summary		Recognise that Open space provides a number of benefits and plays an important role in meeting the challenge of climate change and health and wellbeing. Raise concern that the policy is based on a 2006 study and therefore the settlement boundaries are premature when the need for open land areas is not known. Suggest changes to include the wording 'health and wellbeing' as stated in NPPF and mention the benchmarks which have been used. Suggest that all large development should include large areas of managed open space specifically to meet peoples varying needs and provide children's outdoor play facilities. Concerns that allowing 0-20 houses in Growth Villages might be misused by small developers. Concerns that developments for fewer than 10 houses will still have an impact and should contribute towards local infrastructure. No housing should be allowed on educational recreational land and that there should be more open space designated as LGS. Some challenged the designation of private amenity land as part of the wider open space designation.
Council's Response		Noted. Limited substantive issues+H15:J20 raised, some challenges to the continued designation of sites. Disagree (partly). Consider feedback in the development of this policy, the designation of sites and finalisation of appendix 2. Designated sites are identified on the proposals map, town strategy maps . The review, assessment and designation of open space sites is supported by updated evidence contained in evidence library in the 2018 Amenity Green Space Study and includes all those sites submitted by the local community of reassessment (parish and town councils) . The policy itself provides support for and the creation of designated and non-designated open space and the maintenance of visually and functionally important open spaces in both public and or private ownership . Evidence contained within the North Norfolk Open Space and Sport Recreation study 2019 will be used to inform future site specific requirements and update appendix 2.

Policy ENV8 - Public Rights of Way

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV8	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP260	Object	Policy ENV 8 states that; 'New development should create convenient attractive links with development and to the surrounding areas, assist with creation and a network of accessible green space and provide links to public transport and walking and cycling networks.' A public footpath (Roughton FP15) lies along the eastern boundary of Land east of Norwich Road. The indicative masterplan, which is submitted in support of these representations, demonstrates how a link will be provided from the site onto the footpath, creating a highly permeable development which can be fully accessed by pedestrians, and providing a pedestrian link to the village and the church.
ENV8	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. Recent issues surrounding access to the coast as a result of some national policy have caused concern. There are issues regarding access in certain areas of wildlife habitat and disturbance by inappropriate behaviour, noise and dogs. Organisations such as National Trust and NWT try to strike a balance between access for all at certain times of year and restricted access at other times to prevent wildlife disturbance or habitat erosion, especially where endangered species are concerned. Consultation with these and other experienced organisations or bodies is essential in developing a policy.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV8)
Summary of Objections	1	One objection received. Promoting a site in Roughton, that could provide links from the site to footpath (Roughton FP15) providing a highly permeable development fully accessible by pedestrians to the village and church.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, but also raises concerns over the potential impact on certain areas of wildlife from disturbance by inappropriate behaviour, noise and dogs. And suggests that consultation with National Trust and other experienced organisations is essential.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Generally supportive of policy, but also raise concerns over the potential impact on certain areas of wildlife habitat from disturbance by inappropriate behaviour, noise and dogs. Consultation with National Trust and other experienced organisations is essential.
Council's Response		Noted: agree, The plan positively promotes the provision of high quality on site GI and enhancement and improvement of the existing strategic network including public rights of way. Evidence contained within the emerging RAMs strategy will inform future iterations of the Plan and provided enhanced mitigation measures through partnership work.

Policy ENV9 - High Quality Design

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV9	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. See comments Larger properties and/or second homes built by individuals along the NN coast on infill sites are in many cases very poorly conceived and detailed, use inappropriate materials, are of unsympathetic character, too large and in no way serve to enhance the character or appearance of the area. We would welcome a policy to prevent the proliferation of such unsympathetic development.
ENV9	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Problem occurs with owners of larger gardens selling off part of the garden for development. In many cases this alters the character of the village / town by gradual urbanisation and constitutes a loss of green space / habitat and would contravene several of the ENV policies. We would like to think that this policy would prevent the proliferation of unsympathetic development.
ENV9	Cuthbert, Mr Andrew (1218313)	LP702	Object	When planning a village development, thought must be given to where vehicles are to be parked. In this modern age garages are an unnecessary extra building cost BUT off-the-road space for two vehicles per dwelling must be allowed for. ~More attention to detail by District Planners should be given to make sure developers use traditional material , skills and design commensurate with the local surroundings whether they are in an area of outstanding natural beauty or just plain North Norfolk.
ENV9	Drury, Mrs Margaret (1210793)	LP086	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I am not against innovative design, we have enough Norfolk Homes identikit houses. These measures will put up the cost but the climate demands it and incomers from other areas often sell property for way above the cost of houses here.
ENV9	Rayner, Mr Andrew (1217466)	LP635	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Build quality:- I hope the design and build of any new homes will be carefully considered as most developers seem to have a design identikit which does not include the local vernacular. They should all exceed current sustainability targets. Any design guidance should be enforceable.
ENV9	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** This policy is essential to North Norfolk District Council's proposals for North Walsham and we have drawn attention to this in our introductory comments. We appreciate that this policy demonstrates the way in which it is not simply one policy but a collection of policies which is required to support a well designed development. We would not like to see any weakening of this draft policy.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV9)
Summary of Objections	2	Two objections received. Design of buildings should be of traditional material, skills and design in keeping with the location whether in the AONB or not. Developers seem to have a design identikit. Consideration should be given to car parking on developments in villages; garages are unnecessary but off-the-road space for two vehicles per dwelling must be allowed for. Development should exceed current sustainability targets and design guidance should be enforceable.
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy. There is concern expressed about newly built infill dwellings along the coast and about the loss of residential gardens to development.
Summary of General Comments	2	Two general comment received, these measure will put up the cost of houses but is needed. Important for North Walsham - would not like to see any weakening of this draft policy.
Overall Summary		No substantial comments received or issues raised. There is support for a strong design policy. Some consider that design of buildings should be of traditional material, skills and design in keeping with the location whether in the AONB or not and concern that developers seem to have a design

		identikit. Consideration should be given to car parking on developments in villages; garages are unnecessary but off-the-road space for two vehicles per dwelling must be allowed for. Development should exceed current sustainability targets and design guidance should be enforceable. There is concern expressed about newly built infill dwellings along the coast and about the loss of residential gardens to development.
Council's Response		Comments noted. The creation of high quality built environment is fundamental to sustainable growth in North Norfolk. In conjunction with the emerging Design guide SPD, the purpose of this policy is to provide a set of design principles which when followed will result in improved design and ensure the special character and qualities of North Norfolk are maintained and enhanced.

Policy ENV10 - Protection of Amenity

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV10	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. Essential. Particularly in respect of noise, disturbance, and erosion of the character of a place.
ENV10	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP059	Object	The redevelopment of farm buildings adjacent to other peoples homes for second home/holiday lets must be considered.
ENV10	Adams (1215905)	LP588	Support	Road traffic noise is one of the most common causes of dissatisfaction with housing. The loss of amenity and adverse health effects of road traffic noise should be specifically covered. Housing should not be built close to busy roads and where at all possible an agricultural buffer should be maintained between main roads and residential development. This policy would not only provides a better living environment for the residents but also reduce the visual impact of the development. If it is the Councils aim to provide the best possible housing in the best possible environment for the benefit of its residents then consideration of the impact of road traffic noise on homes and gardens must be up there at the top of the list. **Include in the list "the impact of traffic noise on homes and private amenity space"**

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV10)
Summary of Objections	1	One objection received, raises concern over the redevelopment of farm buildings for second home/holiday.
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy, particularly in respect of noise, disturbance, and erosion of the character of a place. Suggest that this policy should consider the loss of amenity and adverse road traffic noise on new housing. Buffers should be provided between new housing and busy roads.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Buffers between roads and new residential development should be considered in the finalisation of the policy.
Council's Response		Noted: Consider the specific reference to the step back of residential development and buffers from main roads as a consideration in the finalisation of this policy and the inclusion in the list "the impact of traffic noise on homes and private amenity space"

Policy ENV11 - Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV11	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP385	General Comments	More emphasis needs to be made of the historic buildings in the area especially the churches. Church trails following bus routes, footpaths, cycle routes, etc. that are clearly marked would energise the local economy/community and provide more tourism to the area. Places that have been used in films are also potential sources of tourism.
ENV11	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP264	Object	We note the requirement of Policy ENV 11 that development proposals that would affect the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset and/or its setting, or any known or possible archaeological sites, will be required to provide, in the form of a heritage statement, sufficient information proportionate to the importance of the asset and the impact of the proposed development, to enable any impact to be accurately assessed. A pre-application advice request was submitted to the Council in 2018, for 50 units on Land east of Norwich Road. The Historic England response stated that 'developing the agricultural field would change the setting of the Grade II* listed building in a 'fundamental way', resulting in a harmful impact on the 'historic significance of that building though inappropriate development in its setting.' However, the Council's Conservation officer noted that the harm must be classified as 'less than substantial' for NPPF purposes, and the harm should therefore be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Taking account of the pre-application advice request received, the number of units proposed on the site has now been significantly reduced, to reduce the impact of the proposed development on the heritage assets. The revised scheme for the site only looks to accommodate 20 homes, rather than the 50 originally proposed. The indicative masterplan, which is submitted with the Call for Sites form and with these representations therefore shows; • A significantly reduced footprint of the proposed development, which is now focused in the north western part of the site, away from the setting of the church, to retaining an open agricultural field between the proposed development and the church; • Land is available for the use of the church (which is already used for informal car parking occasionally) to the south of the site; • The density of the development has been reduced; • The form and layout of the site is now much less compact, and has significantly more landscaping and open space provision within the site; • A view of the church has been created from the north west corner of the site down a tree-lined avenue through the development; this axis also provides a footpath and cycleway into the site; • The proposed vehicular access has been relocated slightly further south on the A140 so that it does not impact on the Grade II listed property Strand Cottage. Any impacts on heritage have therefore been carefully thought through and addressed. Further, if the site is allocated in the Part 2 Plan, a full heritage and archaeology assessment will be carried out, to inform future iterations of the layout of the site.
ENV11	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree
ENV11	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** As representatives of a historic market town with a conservation area which covers our town centre, we are extremely sympathetic to Policy ENV 11 and we welcome the resumption of conservation area appraisals for the District as a whole. We would not like to see any weakening of this draft policy.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV11)
Summary of Objections	1	One objection received in relation to application advice and with regard to a specific site.
Summary of Supports	1	Agree.
Summary of General Comments	2	Two general comment received wishes to see an increase in emphasis/protection of existing historic buildings. Welcome this policy and welcome the resumption of conservation area appraisals for the District. Would not like to see any weakening of this policy.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. General comments received supported the approach.
Council's Response		Noted

Housing Policies

Policy HOU1 - Housing Targets for Market & Affordable Homes

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU1	Amey, Peter (1209779)	LP011	General Comments	Before permitting further development in and around the Hoveton area consideration must be given to the ever increasing traffic flows through the village. This is a tourist area and the main A1121 is one of the worst areas of pollution in the county caused by the slow moving and often stationary traffic belching out fumes for the tourists to inhale whilst they walk around the shops, cafes and other amenities. More houses means more people and thereby more cars resulting in more noxious gases. It is not just the building development in Hoveton that is the problem but any development north of Hoveton that wishes to travel to Norwich or connect with the NDR. To keep poisoning residents and tourists alike is unacceptable and the problem needs to be addressed before any further development takes place
HOU1	Alexander Mr & Mrs (12118472)	LP782	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** My husband and I believe this development of 2000 houses on Farm land is a big mistake. Firstly in North Walsham we have not got the infrastructure at the moment to deal with the amount of people who are here now examples; doctors, dentists, home care, schools, hospitals, road structure, drainage and electric supply. Secondly we should build council homes for the waiting list of people in the area. They should be built on brown sites and owned by the council so they are affordable. We need the farm land to produce food for the country, why put profit for the few over the wellbeing of the community. - Most of the houses being built will be for outsiders coming into the area, not for the youngsters who live here and want to have a decent home with reasonable rent or houses to buy which they can afford. Also for the elderly downsizing homes that would improve their life. Also where are the jobs for the influx of people coming into the area?
HOU1	Cheeseman, Mr Alan (1218485)	LP677	Object	The proposed plan to build over 2000 new houses in the area is a serious misjudgement. To add an extra 2000 + households to the area would increase the population by almost 50%! The current infrastructure of the town will not be able to support this number of people. An influx of a great many more residents would mean increased traffic and movement of people in an area that already has a 'poor' system of roads. environments and habitats for our flora and fauna changed and lost forever. The area would benefit the community if it was used for sustainable agricultural food production, employing local people to manage it. There appears to be no apparent attempt to address the ever- present threat of climate change.
HOU1	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP438	General Comments	• Whilst second homes/holiday homes may stand empty for some of the time and may not contribute to the local economy they do ease the strain on the local NHS and traffic on local roads...insisting on full time occupancy for new build homes would help ease the 'community' situation but increase problems with lack of provision of infrastructure. • With larger new build executive 'second' homes, a way of deflecting ownership away from absent owners towards full time occupancy would be to increase the size of the garden. Make affordable homes more affordable. Restrict some new housing developments to full time occupancy.
HOU1	Cole, Mrs Teresa (1209821)	LP029	Object	I note in your Planning Minutes of October 2018 that the " latest household projection figures published in September had indicated a dramatic fall in population and household formation which suggested that lower housing targets in the Local Plan would be defendable The Government was revising its methodology as the projections suggested that the required number of dwellings would be less than the Government's policy position. Based on the figures, the Council's target had fallen from 520 dwellings per year to 438 per year, which would result in 8,700-8,800 new dwellings in the Plan period instead of up to 11,000 which had been agreed at the last meeting. " remove the allocation for development of the land at Runton Road/Clifton Park from the proposed draft plan

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU1	Cook, Mr Geoff (1216625)	LP209	Object	Sustainable Development I would question the need to provide up to 11000 more homes in North Norfolk with a projected increase in population of 10000 people, especially when more people are dying than are being born in the district. If the average number of people per house is 2 only 5500 houses would be needed and new developments and planned developments should reduce the number even further. It is unclear whether the proposed number of houses could even be built – "Council needs to consider deliverability of 30% more houses per year than currently" The plan needs to be consistent with the percentage of the older population (in 2011, 58% of the population was over 45 but in 2036 40% will be over 65) as this will clearly affect the planning assumption that the older population will increase and what housing is required.
HOU1	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP348	Object	The housing target is excessive, with too great an emphasis being placed upon projected figures for migration into the area from elsewhere in the country. I advocate a complete re-think, on the part of both the district council and Central Government, on the principle of working-in such a high projected figure of in-migration into Norfolk and this district, from other parts of the country, in the housing allocations.
HOU1	Young, Mr David (1210531)	LP051	General Comments	~Concerns regarding the impact of second and holiday homes on the housing supply and market. ~the occupants are not in situ for long enough to make any meaningful contribution to the life of the local area ~prices have escalated to a level far beyond the dreams of most local young families or individuals ~villages are in danger of atrophying to the extent of becoming "ghost towns" in the off season and their long-term viability being precarious. ~it is tempting to suggest the St. Ives option, under which all new-builds are for permanent residence only. In the context of North Norfolk, one could go further and require such permanent residents to have a "local connection" as per the Local Lettings Agreement, or at least such a connection to North Norfolk as a whole. Such a restriction would not need to apply to the whole of North Norfolk: perhaps only the coastal strip between Wells and Weybourne, or to the coastal AONB.
HOU1	Symonds, Ms Ann (1209801)	LP208	General Comments	Since Beeston Regis is in close proximity to Sheringham and services and amenities are shared Beeston Regis could be considered for overflow if Sheringham or Cromer become over burdened, or at least provide a more 'rural' form of residential development for those not wanting to be located in a town setting. Land in Beeston Regis considered as countryside should be considered for eco developments and green living options. The environment and landscape could dictate what type of sensitive development or other use takes place. By decentralising development it would relieve transport congestion and other issues faced by a growing population in the coastal areas.
HOU1	Swift, Mrs Julie (1216911)	LP249	Object	I believe that we are overdeveloping North Norfolk and I believe that could detrimentally impact our tourism, which is a large part of our economy. Towns like Holt and Cromer are thriving tourist towns. However, the majority of tourists come here to see the lovely market towns and villages with their brick and flint properties. They do not come to see sprawling housing estates that look exactly like the ones around London or in the Midlands. Mass produced designs that do not reflect the character of the area. Also the number of estates being built is already affecting the road network. Towns like Cromer are grid locked outside of the tourist season these days. People could stop coming the area due to the overdevelopment and poor designs of development and the Highways problems caused by all this development (no one wants to spend half of their holiday sat in a traffic jam through Cromer). What happens to the local economy if tourism decreases? The holiday homes will be sold flooding the market. We could end up in a depressed area with a mass of empty decaying old and new properties alike. I do not know where all these extra people are coming from to fill these thousands of new properties. Are they moving from old traditional properties? If so will they become holiday homes or even worse empty shells? I feel that NNDC are failing in their duty to protect the character of this lovely area in which we live and they are failing to consider Highway safety in the area as we do now have the road network to support this constant development proposed. Seeking a more sensitive approach to development in North Norfolk, with thought given to design and to the road networks in the area.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU1	Swift, Mrs Julie (1216911)	LP248	Object	Southrepps is a 'rural' village with working farms, both arable and livestock. Its road network comprises of mainly single-track rural lanes. The main road through the village is regularly used as a cut-through to the A149 and A140 from Mundesley. The 'main' road through the centre of Southrepps is not capable of carrying two medium/large vans side by side. The figures on the Parish Councils website from the new SAM2 unit already record over 60,000 vehicles a month passing through the village (30,000 in each direction). The SAM2 unit also records a high percentage of these vehicles travelling at speeds in excess of the 30mph speed limit. Further development in Mundesley will increase these traffic numbers further and will put an intolerable strain on the road network through Southrepps and will endanger vehicular and pedestrian users of these roads. I am seeking a more sensitive approach to development in North Norfolk, with thought given to design and to the road networks in the area.
HOU1	Swift, Mrs Julie (1216911)	LP247	Object	I am seeking a reduction in the number of new houses planned for Mundesley due to the impact it will have on the local area roads. As a rule of thumb Highways estimate 7 car movements a day per property (often this can be far more if there are multiple cars at the property). At an absolute bare minimum 2500 houses will generate a minimum of 17,500 car movements per day. The one way system through North Walsham is not designed to handle these volumes of traffic. It isn't just the cars - its the associated delivery vans etc. that will be visiting the properties as well. North Norfolk does not have the infrastructure to take this level of development. Also where will the occupants of these 2500 houses work? There is not enough employment in the area to sustain this level of increase. Creating employment areas is not enough - the brownfield site by Waitrose has been an eyesore for 20 years or more s no big companies want to be based here. Are we now going to be a housing area for London commuters? People who will not support the local area? Where are all the occupants for these houses coming from?
HOU1	Swift, Mrs Julie (1216911)	LP246	Object	I am seeking radical changes to bypass Cromer Town Centre for vehicles and a drastic reduction in the number of houses proposed. The roads cannot cope. A bypass however, will not help the lack of doctors available. For this I seek a reduction in the houses proposed. I work on the main road through Cromer and have done for 16 years. In the past during the "peak tourist" times like Easter and the Summer School Holidays the main road outside my office regularly ground to a halt due to the volume of traffic and getting into and out of work was difficult. However, outside of these peak times traffic flowed reasonably well. However, now the traffic is continually crawling through Cromer all the time. There are regularly queues to get through the town...and this is before the peak tourism traffic hits. The development up the Roughton Road has definitely had a noticeable impact already. As a rule of thumb Highways estimate 7 car movements a day per property (often this can be far more if there are multiple cars at the property). The Local Plan wants to add almost 600 extra houses - even at its bare minimum this would generate over 4,000 extra car movements per day through Cromer. In reality it would probably be nearer to 5,000+. The roads will be permanently grid-locked and in peak tourist season no one will be able to get into or out of the town. People who work or live in Cromer simply will not be able to get into or out of work/home. It isn't just the roads. The Doctors surgeries in the area cannot cope with more people. My husband has a heart problem and had to wait two weeks to see his doctor to discuss concerns he had with his health. This will only get worse with 600 new properties...adding thousands more people to the Doctors patient lists. It is no use building more surgeries if there are not the Doctors to fill them. Cromer surgery has lots of empty consulting rooms but cannot get the Doctors to work in them. Cromer does not have the infrastructure to deal with the planned increases in housing.
HOU1	Faulkner, Mr Anthony (1216674)	LP532	Object	Provision for new housing in the coastal parishes such as Blakeney should not include market housing but should be limited to affordable housing only, for which there is a great demand, due to the low level of pay in these areas compared with the high cost of property. Market housing is likely to largely, or entirely, be used as holiday homes and will not therefore contribute to the national need for permanent housing. Development in these parishes should be for affordable housing on exception policy land where the future use as affordable is guaranteed. This would keep down the cost of the land allowing housing associations to be able to fund the cost of building without the need for subsidy from market housing. Market housing should be allocated

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				to towns where there is opportunity for work, or inland villages on, or near, public transport routes to employment centres. These villages will benefit from some development, helping to retain shops, surgeries and other amenities and the houses are likely to become permanent residences, unlike those in the coastal parishes. Remove the allocation of market housing from the coastal parishes such as Blakeney. Select smaller sites for affordable housing on exception policy land, perhaps for groups of six to ten houses. Possible sites would be on part of BLA01 as an extension of Oddfellows, or on BLA05 because of its proximity to the primary school.
HOU1	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP266	Object	The Policy should be more flexible, s that more homes can be delivered in Small Growth Villages if sustainable sites are available. The policy should be amended to make it clear that the figures in Policy HOU 1 are not maxima, but minima. Policy HOU 1 makes provision for the delivery of 400 new homes in the Small Growth Villages; these will be allocated in the Local Plan Part 2. However, this figure should not be taken as a maximum. The NPPF aims to significantly boost the supply of housing. While the Plan seeks to make provision for the current housing requirement, this figure could increase, and the Plan should be sufficiently flexible to adapt to any increases in housing requirement in the near future. Paragraph 2.13 of the Background Paper 1 – Approach to Setting the Draft Housing Target – notes that 'the housing target likely to be included in the final Local Plan might change' and that before the Plan is due to be examined, the 2018 based ONS household projections will have been published, which could result in a change to the housing target in in the Plan. As set out in paragraph 7.18 of Background Paper 2 (Distribution of Growth), Roughton has key services including a primary school and a GP surgery, a wide range of secondary services including Post Office, public house and meeting place, and a number of desirable services including a petrol filling station and a place of worship. Roughton also lies only 3.2 miles south of Roughton Road railway station, which provides train services to Norwich. Bus stops in Roughton on the A140 provide easy access by bus to Cromer, which is located 3.7 miles to the north. North Walsham is only 6.5 miles away, and Norwich 19.6 miles. The housing target for villages which offer shops and services to their own residents and to those in smaller villages in their catchment areas should not be restricted to a total of 400 units, if further units can provide sustainable development, and can contribute to the continued vitality and viability of those villages.
HOU1	Taylor, Ms Siri (1216252)	LP188	Object	I question the need for the amount of housing proposed for Cromer, is this based on central government population growth projections? how does this tally with our actual local figures? Based on the overall number of houses proposed for the town (590 dwellings) how will Cromer's infrastructure cope with this huge increase in traffic and population. The doctors surgery is already under pressure, the roads cannot cope - especially during the summer gridlock. Cromer is the only large town development which has no bypass - nor, because of the geographical layout, is there any viable means of building one. What jobs can we offer these new residents? There are not enough affordable low cost or rental units in the proposed plans, I wonder whether the alternatives have been adequately investigated. Particularly the development of housing within existing structures e.g.: flats above town centre shops and in empty or redundant buildings, freeing up holiday homes by increasing their council taxes and developing more council controlled housing. As a town which relies heavily on tourism based on our landscape and coastal aspect - as well as our traditional, unhurried and uncrowded atmosphere, I suggest the plans should seriously take this into account. As a council which recognises the declared climate emergency this is the time for innovative thinking, surely it would be sensible to investigate alternative solutions to local housing needs.... or we seriously risk "killing the goose which lays the golden egg". Recalculate proposed number of houses. Investigate alternative housing in existing buildings - creative thinking! NNDC should strive to protect our tourism offer by limiting excessive new development, and aim to support the recognised Climate Change Emergency by protecting our important existing green amenity spaces.
HOU1	Mr Daniels (1217050)	LP257	Object	The plan needs to fully assess address the pressures arising from Norwich on the North Norfolk District housing market and seek to address this. The plan is too focused on North Norfolk District and does not fully consider external influences

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU1	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Evidence of how the original figure of 8000 new homes was arrived at should be included. In the interests of transparency the strategic housing market assessment should be appended to show how the council has arrived at this figure. Should the uptake of sites not be fully realised but at least 8000 (your figure) be built thereby meeting the Government's target would the council review the target and determine at that time whether it is appropriate to continue to the figure of 11000, whether the uplift is still appropriate or needed, or re assess the figure and lower it in order to avoid over development? Is there provision in the plan / policy to do so or is the county locked into building 11000 houses regardless of changes in demographic or demand? HOU1a and HOU1b are definitely inappropriate. Any policy should be capable of review during its life and not have a target simply set for 20 years
HOU1	Johnson, Mr Jamie (1216384)	LP345	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** It is commendable that the local plan is considering in paragraph 9.7 small developments of 2 to 3 dwellings on greenfield sites to address the need for growth, future viability and vitality of rural communities where conditions for permanent residence restrictions would be applied.
HOU1	Stubbs, Mr Nick (1217346)	LP335	Object	We already have a high proportion of holiday homes, indeed one of the few areas for development (The Parishes) has recently been completed, with every property sitting empty for much of the time - I understand they are all second homes. There is even a house in Beck Close which has been left boarded up which surely could be utilised. Location specific evidence needs to be gathered to confirm what are the actual needs of any town/village in the region, rather than a top-down diktat to build, simply providing profits for developers
HOU1	Johnson, Mr Jamie (1216384)	LP347	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Paragraph 9.8 I would imagine it would be prohibitively difficult to police a second homes occupancy restriction and I would therefore instead be in favour of the approach described in 9.7 where greenfield infill sites within existing settlements or predominantly built up areas of designated countryside are permitted for 2 to 3 dwellings development subject to a permanent residence restriction and respect and cohesion with the prevailing local character. . This would be in line with NPPF paragraph 78: 'planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive'. NPPF paragraph 68. 'to promote a good mix of sites, LPA's should support development of windfall sites through policy and decisions giving great weight to the benefits of using sustainable sites within existing settlements'. NPPF paragraph NPPF paragraph 118 on 'Making effective use of land' paragraph which state that planning policies and decisions should "promote and support the development of under-utilised land" and "support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land" .
HOU1	Kelly, Mr Sean (1216516)	LP198	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** What evidence do you have of any "identified" need for this scale of development in Mundesley? You have arbitrarily allocated this number to Mundesley in order to meet the government target for the number of houses to be built in North Norfolk. You have then, simply to reduce the work load arising from the development of a new Local Plan identified an area of land of sufficient size to deliver the allocation in a single parcel. There is a ready supply of properties of all types for sale in Mundesley particularly at the starter home end of the market which would be attractive to local residents. There is no requirement for anywhere near this number of additional homes in Mundesley and, as evidenced by the recent development on the north side of this site it is highly likely that proposals will be to build as many expensive high end homes as possible. The scale of the development is not appropriate for the site as because of the topography of the and it will completely dominate the surrounding area. Any development of the southern area of plot 1 in particular will be several feet above the level of surrounding properties in Church Road, Church Lane and the north end of Manor Road. Any development in this area will completely obscure the horizon for all properties in that area. Because of the elevated position of the site any large scale development will be visible for miles around. The site is surrounded on three sides by the conservation areas of Mundesley a development on this scale, especially at the southern end of the plot will impact negatively on those conservation areas by completely altering the character of the immediate surrounding area from

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				open farmland to dense urban development. There will be no point in having a conservation area. There are no employment sites nearby so a development on this scale will result in a significant increase in commuter traffic as. This is also true for travel to secondary and tertiary education as well as healthcare facilities and all retail activity except for immediate local store type shopping. Replace the large scale development in the proposed plan with a significantly smaller development on this site and identify other smaller scale sites in the surrounding area. Restrict development on this site to the north west of the site so it will not dominate the existing homes that surround the current proposal and will be less prominent in the landscape. Any public open space should be formed in the area adjacent to Church Road and Lane to reduce the overbearing nature of the current proposal on the surrounding properties.
HOU1	Needham, Mr Colin (1216785)	LP269	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I found the consultation documentation wordy, fragmented and hard to read so I may not have fully understood the basis for the calculations. My understanding is that there is a genuine social need for housing for residents to live in.I do not believe there is a social or economic need for allocated land for partially occupied second homes or homes to let for holidays. A community thrives when there are sufficient full time residents of all ages and aptitudes to make it work. Kids for schools, passengers for the buses, businesses for employment, support for neighbours, volunteers for community groups and indeed, congregations for churches and chapels. Allocating land in rural villages for developments suitable for sale for second homes and holiday letting will inevitably have an adverse effect on rural communities. The consultation document does not highlight or consider in detail this this adverse impact or offer remedies. The housing allocation should be calculated on the basis of need for those who wish to live (as full time residents) in the communities designated for growth. The construction of new houses on allocated sites and the conversion of existing houses for second homes should be positively discouraged. Within the limitations of planning policy this could be achieved by prescribing certain house types ,controlling housing density and the proportion of affordable and social housing in new developments.
HOU1	Noble, Dr Michael (1210275)	LP123	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** In Stalham a total of 150 new dwellings are planned. The Health Authority's view that that this will not impact on local medical services is over-optimistic. All GP services are under increasing pressure even without increasing the local population. This will also be true for local schools. The current proposals will therefore diminish services for existing residents and not provide the promised local employment opportunities. The use of greenfield sites is contrary to the historical aims of planning policy in this country and just adds to the environmental disaster we are leaving to the next generation. Surely a better use for these plots would be to provide green spaces such as parks with wooded areas for local families to enjoy. There are many good examples around the country which add quality to the health and wellbeing of the community and which would add to our environmental credentials by locking-up carbon rather than releasing more into the atmosphere. Please consult with local service providers such as surgeries and schools to gain a realistic view of the impact of further increasing the local population. Please consider how this land can be better utilised to add to services for existing residents, such as local employment opportunities and green spaces for the benefit of the whole community.
HOU1	pettit, miss claire (1215847)	LP333	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** In 12/1 where it puts that Cromer has been chosen for large growth, and the 600 extra homes, 12/2 it contradicts this fact by mentioning the significant landscape constraints which limit the potential for growth. The extra pressure that this development would cause on the special character of Cromer re traffic in our already snarled up central one way system, parking, health services , etc., would be detrimental to locals and holidaymakers alike. To lessen the scale and number of proposed houses required ,thus removing the need for an extra school.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU1	Price, Ms Amanda (1210607)	LP070	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** more restriction on second home and part time occupancy - it is unwise not to restrict some portion of the new housing to full time occupancy, and to owner occupation. In Wells local people are saying that even a 28% allocation at a 20% reduction in costs (I am sure new home builds will want to sell for as high as they can as many houses as possible) will still price local people out of the market, AND lead to even more houses standing empty for most of the year with only occasional lets. This is counterproductive for the local economy, So I would like NNDC t reconsider this policy. And also for those houses which are sold without such a restriction, there should be a higher Council tax and some tracking / monitoring of occupancy.
HOU1	Rayner, Mr Andrew (1217466)	LP635	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Type of development:- who is the housing aimed at? I fully understand the need for social housing and affordable (the definition of which means it is still usually expensive.). if its for second homes etc. then it is not acceptable.
HOU1	Rose, Mr Alan (1217227)	LP577 LP821	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Support house building - we all need somewhere to live. But what is planned is like adding a whole new town that's bigger than Stalham to North Walsham and I am worried that it is going to be done with hardly anyone having their say. When I attended a recent meeting in North Walsham to discuss the new Local Plan - there was just 32 people there. I spoke to a number of prominent businesses around the town and none of them were even aware that the Plan is being drawn up. Where were the voices of young people from the schools and the college who will inherit this town and have to live with the decisions being made that they have had no idea of or say in? The Town and District Councils should be engaging with these young people through the schools and college if this is to be an inclusive plan.
HOU1	Wells, MS Judith (1217777)	LP665	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** It is necessary to create additional housing in Wells next the Sea. The lack of affordable accommodation for the native community is already well-attested. My concern is that enforceable measures be taken to ensure that these proposed new properties do not become additional second/holiday homes, reducing the potential housing stock for local people. What will be done to ensure this?
HOU1	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP413	Object	Housing - Second home Ownership The Council confirms in para. 9.4 that new dwellings could be legally conditioned to ensure they could only be used as main residences, but that (in para 9.8) it is currently not minded to and will reconsider this following consultation. There is much written about the need for affordable homes and the pressure which second home ownership is causing on the potential to house local people. It is recognised in the Draft LP (e.g. para 9.25) that the District has a "low wage economy and in much of the area house prices are high". The Draft LP recognises (para 9.27) the high level of need for affordable housing. If a high percentage of the homes which are planned for are taken up by second home owners, this adds further to the housing need and therefore risks inaccuracies and underestimation in the overall assessment of need. This would therefore support the use of legal conditions to limit second home ownership.
HOU1	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP415	Object	Housing – Policy HOU1 The total growth proposed in Policy HOU1 for Cromer is very small in comparison to that proposed for the other Large Growth Towns. It is so low that it is more like the growth level proposed for Holt, a Small Growth Town. However, Cromer is (as noted in paragraph 12.1), the District's main administrative centre; a popular tourist destination; centrally located in the District on the principal road network and railway line to Norwich; and hosts the District hospital. As such, the town should have a greater allocation of housing than is proposed in order to ensure its vitality. Furthermore, Cromer has the second largest retail provision in the District (para. 12.5) and is a "net importer of employees" (para 12.4). There is therefore, a clear need for greater housing in the town in order to reduce commuting. The town road network is widely accepted as suffering from bottlenecks and consequent rat-running. Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority has confirmed to us that there would be significant benefit in a new link road to the south of the town, between Norwich Road and Felbrigg Road, with a first phase joining the A140 Norwich Road with Roughton Road. The NCC Officer responsible for

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				infrastructure has confirmed that the Authority is supportive of South Cromer development which would deliver a developer funded link road and other essential infrastructure such as a school, in a co-ordinated and planned manner. We therefore consider that the proposed housing targets in HOU1 should be revised so that Cromer receives a higher level of growth which is appropriate to its functional importance and to deal with unresolved commuting, transportation and infrastructure issues. See attached Paper: why Cromer should have more development than is proposed
HOU1	Bluss, Mr Andrew (1210045)	LP027	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Concerns the countryside is under threat from development. Appreciate that councils/authorities have been set housing targets. My main concerns are:- 1) Who are they for 2) Where they are sited 3) What potential impact will it have. From what I know, it is proposed that upwards of 1500 homes are planned for the west of North Walsham. Recognised there is a national housing shortage but how will the building of these properties benefit the town? These homes are being planned for the expansion of the "silver haired" generation who will (According to NNDC) be migrating from outside the county over the next 17 years. All NNDC seem to care about is the number of houses they are required to build with little or no consideration of the full impact! What will this new population want with the proposed single primary school?
HOU1	Broch, Mr Daniel Sworders Grimes, Mr Kelvin (Agent) (1217619 1217618)	LP658	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Paragraph 77 of NPPF states: 'In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs.' Paragraph 78 of NPPF states that: 'To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.' The Plan identifies Large Growth Villages as settlements which are local service centres, and which support rural sustainability. Blakeney is designated a Large Growth Village. However, the Plan only designates one site for development in Blakeney for 30 dwellings. This seems very limited in terms of allocating housing growth to Blakeney, in light of the Plan's recognition of the sustainability of the village. Blakeney have a range of shops and services and thriving community facilities, it has a primary school, and a regular bus service along the coast. The Plan should allocate more development in Blakeney, in recognition of its role as a Large Growth Village. The plan should allocate more development here, in recognition of its role as Large Growth Village.
HOU1	Brooks, Mr David (1217039)	LP253	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There is a very high percentage of second homes in Blakeney, Salthouse, Cley and Weybourne. Although this may be beneficial to property owners and for trade during holiday periods this can have the effect of destroying local neighbourhoods. Impact on affordability for younger people who want to start on the property ladder as a high number of new properties are priced and aimed at 'second home' owners. Other areas of the country such as St Ives and in Northumberland are taking action to restrict sales of properties to second home owners and details were provided to David Young and Sarah Butikofer in May 2015. Is the Local Plan considering this aspect?
HOU1	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The 2018 Government Housing Delivery Test identified that North Norfolk have delivered 126% of homes required over the three-year period ending 2017-18 which is positive. Anticipated current Core Strategy target of 400 dpa will increase to 553 dpa. However, The housing requirement should be a minimum figure not a range limited to a maximum of 11,000 and arguably higher to provide the flexibility to deliver sufficient housing in accordance with recognised need throughout the plan period. Support the identification of 592 dwellings on sites in Cromer. However, to provide sufficient flexibility to deliver housing over the plan period – and for the avoidance of doubt, the wording should be amended to confirm that homes can come forward on allocated sites on the edge of the existing settlement boundaries of the Large Growth Town (within which Cromer falls) Releasing edge of settlement land for development in the instance Site C16 is both sound and justified, having regard to national policy and the supporting evidence base. Nevertheless, it should be made clear that the 592 figure and 909 figure for

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				the total growth (2016-2026) for Cromer is a minimum. Specifying a minimum requirement of 909 is a pragmatic and sound approach which will allow the plan to adapt to meet housing need over the plan period.
HOU1	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP048 LP049	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Building 11,000 houses, each with high carbon construction costs, and the associated infrastructure, will hugely increase carbon emissions. Dangerous policy, completely contradicting current knowledge, policies and priorities. New work and widespread consultation should be undertaken to produce a local plan fit for current circumstances.
HOU1	Ringer, Mr Callum (1218561)	LP772	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The council should priorities homes for local people, and make efforts to keep them affordable. Impose bans on second homes, as has happened in the south west. If possible, this should be included.
HOU1	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The Plan is generally sound having regards to the tests set out in NPPF. Plan prepared positively, it sets out a mechanism to meet North Norfolk's OAN. Housing numbers as a minimum number to be delivered in the plan period is an appropriate method of boosting housing supply and delivery
HOU1	Buxton, Mr Andrew (1218433)	LP761	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 1. Proposed 10,000 or so houses is far too wasteful of scarce land
HOU1	Philcox, Miss Charlotte (1210047)	LP026	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I know orders are coming from national government, but I'm concerned that the building of such a large number of new properties in a relatively small market town isn't sustainable in these times of climate change, real poverty, and environmental debilitation. The town doesn't have the infrastructure to support such a large development (e.g. doctors' surgeries and other medical/home care provision, are both already oversubscribed).
HOU1	Rayner, Mr Andrew (1217466)	LP635	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Increase in population: Such development will require new roads, access to the town centre and its shops. Existing Roads can just about cope, how will traffic be managed? 1800 homes equates to at least 1800 vehicles. Parking in town is already difficult and will the extra traffic will lead to pollution and congestion. as some of the site is to be earmarked for commercial use there will also be a likely increase in commercial/service vehicles as well.
HOU1	North Norfolk District Council Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	The level of development which is proposed for North Walsham would impose a considerable strain upon our town. We share the concerns of the Town Council that the scale of growth suggested for North Walsham is unprecedented. If such growth is to occur then we must have timely and appropriate investment in our infrastructure. The Western Extension Link road must join the North Walsham Industrial estate to the Norwich Road and that this road should be built before the construction of housing begins. Declared a climate emergency has significant implication for North Walsham as it is a growth town. We endorse North Walsham Town Council's requirement for a robust assessment of the threat which the proposed scale of growth would pose to medical provision within our town and we agree with them about the necessity for a new primary school accessible from a western extension link road running from the Norwich Road to the District Council's Industrial Estate.
HOU1	Willer, Mr Kevin (1210031)	LP022	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Opposing so many new dwellings in North Walsham, particularly on the western side of town. This kind of proposal is over development on a massive scale using many green belt areas. I understand the need for some housing but 2000 plus for North Walsham would be a disaster. The current

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				infrastructure into and around the town is totally inadequate and busy at the best of times. Another 5000 people in the town meaning probably 2000 plus cars will cause chaos. In particular roads such as the Grammar school road and the old roads through town, which already suffer with heavy traffic, would not cope with more. The new link Road proposed may well stop some lorries coming into the town and allow people access to new estates but will go no way into solving the traffic problems around the rest of the town, more cars will only add to it. The effect on the environment also concerns me. Living on the Skeyton Road and enjoying views of the countryside we are privileged to see a whole manor of wildlife extending from our garden over to Weavers Way. We see deer, bats, hedgehogs, pheasants nesting, skylarks nesting in the field, owls plus many other species. Nobody ever seems to give a dam about the wildlife in a time when we really should be caring about them and our environment. More cars causing congestion means more pollution. Our children walking to and from school already suffer enough pollution. The council do not consider the lives of all those, like us, who are directly effected by the proposals. Having houses being built behind us and next to us will destroy our current lifestyle destroying views of outstanding beauty and destroying a peaceful life, which is why we moved to our house in the first place. Our properties will no doubt loose value, our ability to sell as of now is limited due to the uncertainty of what will be happening in the fields around us. Effectively our lives are on hold awaiting noise and disruption. Do we qualify for compensation? As it stands no doubt the landowners of the fields identified as new dwelling sites are set to become very rich whilst current residents suffer. People enjoy the peace of Weavers Way, effectively North Walsham's piece of peaceful countryside, but now this is to be ruined by being surrounded by houses and a road going right through it. The services in this town are already stretched to the maximum. There is a mention of a new primary school but what of the impact on the high school and college? The Doctors surgery is constantly busy, it takes weeks to get an appointment, having attended the drop in session at the community centre today I heard the planner say that's a problem for the NHS there should be more doctors at the surgery. Great attitude and a typical one that suggests the desperate need to adhere to pressure and get building. In my opinion if the government can't sort important problems such as health care to meet communities needs then they should not be forcing councils meet such high housing targets! The planner also mentioned that the highways agency have provided evidence that North Walsham does not suffer traffic issues. This I cannot believe as I have lived in the town and regularly get caught in traffic. Surely there is a point when a town can become to big for it's own good? The only ones to benefit are the landowners, developers and council. Cannot see any benefits for current residents by over building like this. Object to preferred site in North Walsham.
HOU1	Willer, Mrs Jill (1210911)	LP099	Object	I have seen many changes and developments in and around the town. I truly believe that the town has almost reached it's capacity and any new builds should be limited to brown field sites. The number of new builds suggested needs to be scaled down. 2000 plus is unrealistic. We have just had new house builds on the Norwich Road, putting an extra strain on our doctors surgeries, dentists, drainage, water supply and the national grid. How would they cope with the population of another 2000 dwellings? The NHS dentists in the town are no longer taking on new clients, we cannot obtain new doctors due to the work overload and stress of it all! A population increase means more cars commuting to schools. There is suggestion of a new primary school but what of the strain on the high school and college? The town network cannot cope with all the extra traffic. To suggest an increase to the industrial estate with extra units as a solution to the lack of jobs in the town is ridiculous. The days of high employment in the town are long gone with the major employers of the 1970's and 1980's. We will have more houses than ever but less jobs than past times. One of the reasons for Crane Fruehauf closure was because of the poor road network to North Walsham and this has not improved since the closure, 20 years ago. Why not build between Norwich City limits and the NDR first. People need work and the vast majority of jobs are in Norwich. People already commuting between North Walsham and Norwich do not have a good road network (B road). It is immensely busy. More cars would put a strain on this. What about the nature habitat. There are 17 species of bees regionally extinct, 25 types threatened and 31 conservation

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				concern. We will not be able to survive in the future without them and nature. This proposal would see North Walsham expanding out of control over beautiful countryside. With the running out of oil for artificial fertilizers, our future generation will need the land to go back to organic growing in order to feed the population, instead of intense farming. They will need the green belt land that this proposed plan will take. Why should people who have already made there homes in North Walsham, especially on the west side, have to put up with all this disturbance and destruction over many years.
HOU1	Philcox, Miss Charlotte (1210047)	LP026	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: If it is to occur, such a large influx of homes for North Walsham must surely be targeted to those in need, not be simply yet another large estate of flashy, 'executive' style homes which are dependent on car use.
HOU1	Bluss, Mr Andrew (1210045)	LP027	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Cannot see a dentist at my chosen surgery because they have vacancies they cannot fill. Professionals cannot, it seems, be attracted to North Walsham despite the growing number of residents (now and in the future). Planned demographics of the residents due to live in this accommodation, what happens when the need for elderly care is required for those unable to live at home anymore? There is only one nursing home within North Walsham (Halvergate House) with limited availability within the remaining care homes. There is going to be a significant number of people who are going to need specialised care in their later years, putting an extra strain on an already overburdened healthcare system. This is a national problem but little or no provision has been made to account for this.
HOU1	Howe, Mrs Alex (1217494)	LP645	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There are 22 new houses currently being constructed in the Churchfield development and planning permission exists for a further 28 in the Tilia estate. These houses should be included within the required allocation of 150, reducing the new build requirement to 100. 6. Increasing number of second homes is creating an unsustainable need for new housing stock. Regulation and financial policies should be introduced to limit the growth of second homes, thus reducing the demand for new homes. 4. Ensure that the Church Field and Tilia developments are included in the 150 dwellings sought for Hoveton.
HOU1	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP763	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: The pattern of out-of-town car dependent housing schemes, aimed largely for the wealthy and holiday houses and second home owners, with only a few so called 'affordable houses', has been destructive. It has added to pollution and congestion, got rid of green field sites, undermined village communities and made many locals homeless. Change to supporting rental accommodation at reasonable costs, built to minimum construction costs and minimum us of carbon for heating and cooking, and with all costs offset, so there is no overall carbon gain. Use widespread consultation and expert in formation to help devise the policy.
HOU1	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP254	Object	Paragraph 77 of the NPPF states that: 'In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs.' Paragraph 78 of the NPPF states that: 'To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.' Policy SD3 does make limited provision for new development in Small Growth Villages. The policy states that: 'Small scale developments, including brownfield developments, community facilities and services will be permitted within the defined boundaries of the following Small Growth Villages.' Footnote 11 of the Plan notes that small scale developments are defined as infill development and new allocations of between 0-20 dwellings (to be selected in a Part 2 Plan). The policy goes on to note that: 'Outside defined development boundaries in areas designated as Countryside, residential development will only be permitted where it accords with other policies in this Plan. Or: 1. The proposal is for small scale development of typically no more than 5 dwellings; and 2. The site comprises of previously developed land; and 3. Development of the site would result in

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				infilling or rounding off in a predominantly built up area.' We strongly suggest that this policy is overly restrictive and does not comply with paragraph 16b of the NPPF, which requires that plans should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable. It is respectfully submitted that, as drafted, the Plan does not go far enough in enabling villages in North Norfolk to grow and thrive. It is well documented that shops and services have closed in many villages in recent years; this Plan should provide an opportunity to reverse that decline and should not artificially restrict housing to infill or densification in Small Growth Villages which do still have a range of facilities and provide a relatively sustainable location for future growth. Instead, it should provide the opportunity for Small Growth Villages to grow and attract new residents. It should provide a more flexible policy context in which development can be brought forward. Specifically, the existing provisions of the Plan should be replaced by a policy which states that developments of 0-20 dwellings should be permitted on land adjacent to settlement boundaries, or sites which are close to settlement boundaries, and are in sustainable locations. We have reviewed the 23 Small Growth Villages identified in the Plan, and believe that generally sites of twenty properties cannot be accommodated in these villages, where the settlement boundaries are drawn tightly, there is little land availability and there has already been infilling and densification of the existing built form. It is therefore likely that, in order to provide approximately 20 dwellings within the settlement boundaries of each of these villages as required by Policy HOU1, several, smaller sites could be required. Development of several, smaller sites is likely to have a greater impact in terms of impact on amenity on the existing residents and is unlikely to deliver any scale of infrastructure which could make a meaningful contribution to offset the impacts of development. Indeed, it is likely that many of the smaller sites will avoid providing any affordable housing, if they fall below the thresholds for affordable housing provision proposed by the Council in Policy HOU2. We suggest that the Policy should be amended to make provision to allocate sites which are adjacent to existing settlement boundaries, or close to settlement boundaries and in sustainable locations, for up to twenty dwellings. This would help to conserve the existing urban fabric of the villages, and would allow some controlled, sustainable expansion of the Small Growth Villages, which, as identified in paragraph 7.24 of the draft Local Plan, have a number of services, and act as limited service hubs for other nearby villages, thereby complying with the provisions of paragraph 78 of the NPPF. On this basis, my client's sites should be considered for allocation in Roughton. Land north of Chapel Road lies to the west of the existing settlement boundary, in an infill plot between the existing properties along Chapel Road. The Plan affords the opportunity to review the existing settlement and include these properties and my client's infill site within the boundary. The site lies in a highly sustainable location, only some 600m from the village centre and is connected by an existing pavement, enabling residents to walk into the village. Land east of Norwich Road lies adjacent to the settlement boundary, which is formed by the A140, and also lies within walking distance of Roughton's shops and services, and bus stops on the A140.We suggest that the Policy should be amended to make provision to allocate sites which are adjacent to existing settlement boundaries, or close to settlement boundaries and in sustainable locations, for up to twenty dwellings.
HOU1	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. It is pointless building homes on the coast to serve the local community if they are all snapped up by second home owners. That does not address the needs of the local community. That will just lead to continued demand for more housing. Second home ownership pushes up costs and demand for affordable housing. Second home ownership should be discouraged by charging full council tax, business rates where appropriate and by local occupancy clauses in developments. The acquisition of development sites by individuals for the purpose of second homes should be positively discouraged. There are many examples of homes of this nature on the coast built with inappropriate materials, out of character detailing and inappropriate size. Also too many overdeveloped sites are changing the character of the villages.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU1	Griffiths, Mrs Heather (1210796)	LP087	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Concerns about any significant development of new housing in Wells, due to the additional pressure on local infrastructure - particularly parking and the roads. We already have plans in place to restrict parking which means that people cannot park outside their houses. I suggest that we consider 'residents only' parking. I also question whether Wells has the amenities to support much more development. However, I do understand the need for limited development, and affordable housing in particular (which I believe should be restricted to local people only). Assuming that any approved development is sensitive to the local environment and contains all the basic infrastructure, I support the development at sites W07/1 and W01/1 as these would have the least impact on residents of the town and visitors.
HOU1	Dixon, Cllr Nigel (1218612)	LP738	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Stop the loss of housing stock to second, and holiday letting, homes across the District by introducing local primary residential conditions.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU1)
Summary of Objections	32	Many commented that the overall housing target was too large and the governments standard methodology was not easily understood or appropriate. Many respondents focused on proposed growth levels in their own towns citing growth was not appropriate for a variety of reasons from lack of infrastructure and service provision , road network, countryside locations and impact on existing views, agricultural production and inadequate employment opportunities as well as affordability issues and the potential to be used as second homes. Some however objected due to the allocations not being large enough commenting that the target was not sufficient and more development should be allocated in the smaller service villages such as Blakeney, and that the small scale target for infill development of 400 was not sufficient . Scale of development in North Waltham, Cromer, Hoveton , Wells and South Reps were mentioned specifically as not appropriate, but for a variety of local issues. There was a strong sense that the local plan should only be seeking to meet the housing need locally generated and that the target is objected to because it does not seek to prioritise local occupation. Others however thought that restricting occupation was not enforceable and would not result in any net benefit or affordability and at least eased the burden of growth on the health service and surrounding services.
Summary of Supports	4	Support was expressed where appropriate housing types and where the target could be reviewed or revised in light of more up today household projections . Greater transparency was called for in the over all figure. Support for growth in Beeston Regis to accommodate over flow from Sheringham.
Summary of General Comments	16	General comments also focused on the high housing target and the potential impacts on services and perceived infrastructure limitations as well as percept impact on house prices due to the competing demands of second home owners. Other however supported the need for the target to be used as minimum to provide the appropriate type of housing to meet all needs. some comments focussed specifically resources while others made general comments around the suitability of North Walsham to accommodate such a high level of growth.
Overall Summary		Majority of respondents raised concerns that the housing target is too high and that the District cannot accommodate the proposed level of development due to constraints, lack of infrastructure capacity , road network, service provision etc. and the need to only address locally derived need . However a number of representations argued that the housing target should be considered as a minimum or arguably higher to provide the flexibility to deliver sufficient housing for the recognised need throughout the plan period. There is widespread views that the number of second homes has an adverse impact on the local housing market and in particular prices out local people and limits the type and tenure of properties that are available for local occupation and being built. A number wished to see the introduction of occupancy restrictions, but some acknowledge the difficulty in enforcing them and that they may not improve affordability.

Council's Response		Noted: Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. The Local Plan seeks to address the Strategic needs of the District which are calculated using a standard methodology set out in national guidance. Local Plans should set out policies in order to address **all needs**, market, affordable, economic and social in line with national policy. Targets are set out as minimums. Plan making remains iterative and the target will be reviewed in line with evidence and the methodology in future iterations. Full details are published in background paper 1: The approach to setting the Draft Housing target.• Other policies actively support the provision of rural exception sites and affordable housing provision through the delivery of sites to address additional identified local need in neighbourhood plans and through community land trusts and provide flexibility • The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPFF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in a positive way that is aspirational but deliverable. In North Norfolk this necessitates the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2. • The proposed approach which allows small scale infill development in selected small growth villages which contain some but limited services, the allocation of small scale housing sites and the provision for rural exception sites in areas of designated countryside will be reviewed in line with feedback and evidence of need.

Policy HOU2 - Housing Mix

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU2	Addison Elaine (1210267)	LPO75	Object	I would urge NNDC to place a 45% obligation for affordable and social housing within this enormous development, along with a legally enforceable lock-in from the developers to deliver on this requirement.
HOU2	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP438	General Comments	There is a waiting list of about 3000 people on the housing list in the area I live. Although 'affordable' housing has been built recently some of the properties are still empty because they are not actually that 'affordable'. -More prominence and an active encouragement for self builds. People building their own homes are more likely to want to live in them and live in an area they like
HOU2	Woodward, Mrs Josephine (1217427)	LP594	General Comments	Consideration needed for the types of houses for the retired, elderly and those with dementia. Needs to be a clear strategy for the delivery of low cost homes for the young and for those who will need to provide the care for themselves and others.
HOU2	Edwards, Mr John (1216139)	LP317, LP322	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** Policies HOU 2 and HOU 3 are not sufficiently sensitive to the special needs of Wells; more closely aligned with Blakeney and other coastal villages along the North Norfolk Coast. The attraction of this location, together with the nature of employment in Wells, means that there is not enough affordable housing, particularly affordable housing for rent. Local analysis suggest that the current demand for rented housing in Wells is higher than the total housing proposed through the Local Plan. Policy HOU 2 would only require 28 affordable dwellings to be built and this is entirely inadequate. As the target for 80 dwellings is not being challenged in this submission, the housing policies for Wells need further refinement; they need to be more aligned with HOU 3, or there needs to be a separate policy reflecting recognition of the special circumstances in Wells [and any other settlement similarly affected] if a market force outcome is to be avoided, and the demand for local need met.
HOU2	Swift, Mrs Julie (1216911)	LP244	Object	Affordable homes now seems to relate to "Housing Association" homes only. There are a lot of young people in the area who are in work and do not qualify for (or want) a Housing Association home, but who want to buy a property themselves. As most smaller/cheaper homes are snapped up as holiday lets or second homes there are no properties that they can afford. Prices are artificially raised on properties they might be able to afford as they can be sold for holiday use. The Council must start imposing full time residency occupancy restrictions on cheaper properties to allow them to be purchased by local youngsters or elderly people whose incomes have reduced. They can do this as it states in section 9.4 (under Housing Policies).
HOU2	Smith, Mr Mark (1209582)	LP042	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** Seems to be a positive approach to affordable housing although a larger percentage of low cost home ownership could be beneficial in the long run as home ownership promotes more benefits for the occupiers and greater prosperity in the future for younger residents. Such help from the council may include low cost loans to assist with deposits. Maybe schemes such as Suffolk council undertook where low cost home ownership was available with no deposit and properties bought required completion of bathrooms, kitchens and decorations so to reduce the selling price initially. The mortgage was supplied by the council due to properties without working kitchens and bathrooms not being mortgageable. There was a time frame that the required work had to be completed by but basics would have been acceptable.
HOU2	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois	LP267	Object	The policy identifies two affordable housing zones in the District; Roughton lies within Affordable Housing Zone 1, where the proposed provision is at least 15% affordable homes on schemes of 6-25 units. These zones relate to viability, and do not correlate with the boundary of the AONB. Paragraph 63 of the NPPF states that: 'Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas.' The Norfolk Coast

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
	(1217056, 1217052)			AONB covers part, but not all of the District. As drafted, Policy HOU 2 requires provision of affordable housing on sites of 6-25 dwellings across the District, not just in the AONB. This approach does not therefore comply with NPPF paragraph 63. Policy HOU 2 should be amended to only require contributions to or provision of affordable housing on schemes of 6 or more dwellings for sites in the AONB: outside the AONB, the threshold should be 10 or more units, following the definition of major development set out in the NPPF glossary.
HOU2	Terrington, Mr Peter (1215743)	LP125	Object	High demand for second homes, retirement homes and properties for holiday letting; the risk is that most new development homes will be acquired for these purposes, being beyond the means of the working population. I am very pleased that the Council has recognised this risk and has attempted to keep the new build allocation, for Wells, to a sustainable level, particularly if the affordable homes target of 35% can be achieved! The viability of this target of course will depend on the sale price of the land. You will recall that with the Hopkins Homes development, at Market Lane, although the developer adhered to the 40% affordable homes allocation, it was necessary to reduce the building code requirements to make the development viable. Due to the chronic shortage of affordable housing, in Wells, for local people, as highlighted in the most recent "Homes for Wells" Housing Needs survey, it is essential to specifically include an Exception Site, in the Local Plan for Wells. I would urge that the strip of land WO1/1 should remain outside the development boundary, for Wells, and that the site is developed as an exception site
HOU2	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP073	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Any housebuilding in future should be for rent at reasonable rates to provide homes for local people – a return to council housing.
HOU2	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. In some areas provision of houses of a certain type / size will encourage second home owners. These types of property should have local occupancy rules to prevent lack of this type for local people.
HOU2	Rose, Mr Alan (1217227)	LP580 LP821	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Whenever groups of houses are built, consideration needs to be given for a mixed community of social housing. There also should be adaptations made to include those with physical/mental disabilities, not necessarily living together in the same place but being included within the community. The Council could work with charitable organisations to possibly share the costs for the build. Other living considerations should also be taken into account such as fostering with families whose own children have flown the nest and could have rents adjusted for the work they are doing with young children in care. Looking at older people the same thing can be done for them - being included in family situations but who are currently overlooked by the Local Authority. Provide: 1. Social housing 2. First time buyer/affordable housing 3. Supported living in small community plots mixing young and old 4. Design community living into the plans We could take a close look at what's been done in places like Holland where plans are made in a joined up way, thinking about long term health and care needs. But if we don't have our say there's a risk that developers will just squeeze in as many houses as they can as cheaply as possible.
HOU2	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP417	Object	Housing - Affordable – proposed Policy HOU2 The Affordable Housing Zones 1 and 2 as identified in the Draft LP (page 122) are inconsistent with the Zones shown in the NNDC Interim Plan Wide Viability Assessment (2018). This brings into question the reliability of the background information and translation into policy. This affects proposed Policy HOU2.
HOU2	Bates, Mr & Mrs Clive & Eileen (1215840)	LP124 LP703	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Need to make available affordable homes so young people can live in the village and bring up their families, do we need more expensive properties so a % of them just become second homes as has occurred on another large development in the village.
HOU2	Bluss, Mr Andrew (1210045)	LP027	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: A chronic demand for a greater proportion of social housing and/or affordable homes for first time buyers. Developers are only obliged to provide a small number of these

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				type properties for those people requiring them. How is that to help the residents of North Walsham who need that type of housing? Developers want to make money. There is little appetite/profit margin for the mass building of social/affordable homes.
HOU2	Burke, Mr Stephen (1216753)	LP798	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** North Norfolk needs: • More affordable rented homes - at least half of the projected developments • More housing with care to enable our ageing population to continue living independently and with the support they need
HOU2	Rice, Mr Colin (1210475)	LP130	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: The plan should be responding to the increase in self-build housing, which provides a route for individuals to build their own home at a more affordable cost than market housing. Remarkably, other than requiring a few self-build sites within the specific Town and Village Proposals, there are no policies in the plan that actively encourage or support this route to home ownership. Whether officially 'market' or 'affordable' housing, self-build is likely to be a method that is actually affordable to those undertaking it, and deserves more recognition in the plan. Although the council's register of interest in self-build may not be currently large, there is large latent interest in self-build. A survey commissioned by the Building Societies Association (BSA), published in October 2011, and quoted in the House of Commons briefing attached, suggested that 53% of people in the UK would consider building their own home given the opportunity
HOU2	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP763	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: The pattern of out-of-town car dependent housing schemes, aimed largely for the wealthy and holiday houses and second home owners, with only a few so called 'affordable houses', has been destructive. It has added to pollution and congestion, got rid of green field sites, undermined village communities and made many locals homeless. Change to supporting rental accommodation at reasonable costs, built to minimum construction costs and minimum us of carbon for heating and cooking, and with all costs offset, so there is no overall carbon gain. Use widespread consultation and expert in formation to help devise the policy.
HOU2	Drury, Mrs Margaret (1210793)	LP086	General Comments	I am dismayed at the number of additional homes within the plan. As stated many of these will be taken by retirees into the district and will not be affordable for those working locally. We need many more affordable homes, including homes at affordable rents, for local working people. I would agree with imposing main residency conditions on all new developments.
HOU2	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 3.13. Housing need is likely to change throughout the plan period and will vary at a local level. The changing requirements for affordable housing, type and tenure, optional standards, self and custom build, specialist elderly and care provision and other needs should be reflected in policy wording which is flexible and not too prescriptive.3.14. Support the policy. However, housing mix should be informed by local requirements and site specific market indicators as defined in NPPF paragraph 61.3.15. By setting specific requirements at the time of writing, the policy wording proposed particularly Affordable Housing, Required Market Housing Mix and Required Affordable Housing Mix is currently too restrictive. **To ensure the Local Plan can accommodate changes in housing requirements up until 2036, policy wording should instead allow for developments to address future need, identified at the time of an application.**3.16. Similarly, other than for affordable housing which is zoned, no flexibility is made within the policy to allow for variance in local needs as a result of site specific considerations.3.17. Some degree of flexibility is required to adapt to changing needs over the plan period. To ensure development brings forward the right kind of homes in the right places, policy wording should require development to deliver a mix of housing which satisfies the most up to date housing need assessment, rather than restricting development to the composition table set out in the table.3.19. A similar approach should be applied to 'specialist elderly / care provision'. Whilst the development plan should prepare for an ageing population, a set requirement for sites which can accommodate in excess of 151 units requiring a minimum 80 bed spaces and further 40 bed spaces for each additional 150 dwellings thereafter is too restrictive and inflexible to change. 3.18. As such, policy wording

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				should read: “Unless the proposal is for a Rural Exceptions Scheme, Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, or specialist(65)residential accommodation all new housing developments, including those for the conversion of existing buildings, shall provide for a mix of house sizes and tenures in mix of different housing sizes and types, informed by the most up to date needs assessment or other robust evidence, as well as the Borough wide housing mix monitoring target in the table below or any local target set by a Neighbourhood Plan, taking into account site specific considerations.” For a robust Local Plan, which can adapt to changes in need, the table in the policy should be removed, replaced with a broader policy which requires development to address specific housing need such as mix, optional standards and housing for older people according identified need at the time of an application.
HOU2	Cuthbert, Mr Andrew (1218313)	LP702	Object	~more attention should be given to making a higher percentage of new builds "AFFORDABLE" . In order that young couples can afford to buy and start their home OWNING journey at the bottom of the ladder. ~can each development in our villages only be allowed with the proviso that a percentage of the dwellings be for sale at an affordable price earmarked ONLY for LOCAL need.
HOU2	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP052	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** More detailed consideration needs to be considered to the needs of 'elderly' people and who is included in this description. Many men and women who have recently turned 60 will not receive their pension until 66/67 or a bus pass. Many will hopefully live possibly another 20/30 years and their requirements for homes and services may well change a few times during their remaining lifetimes. Many people 'retiring' are likely to move a few times and have different needs, after retiring. The proposals do not appear to recognise the diversity and changing needs of people of various ages.
HOU2	Drury, Mrs Margaret (1210793)	LP086	General Comments	We need many more affordable homes, including homes at affordable rents, for local working people. I would agree with imposing main residency conditions on all new developments.
HOU2	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The plan anticipates up to 10,000 new homes over twenty years, of which about 2,000 should be affordable. This is quite wrong. If we need 10,000 new homes then 10,000 of them should be affordable. They should be built by housing associations, local authorities or developers, all of which should be on a not-for-profit basis. We don’t need any more large houses which local people cannot afford, we need houses which local people can afford, over which local people should have priority allocation, and which should be a mixture of sale, mixed rent/mortgage, and rent. They should only be available to people who live or work in the District and have done so for a specified number of years, perhaps 2, and all the houses should have irrevocable clauses in them which maintain that residence condition for a specified number of years, at least 20. (Some exceptions should be allowable, for example some houses should always be available for refugees, and for people escaping from domestic violence).
HOU2	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** This policy is of great relevance to us as it will dictate the level of social, rented housing and low cost market housing available to our constituents. North Walsham is located within Affordable Housing Zone 1. This means that on any site of more than six houses our requirement for on site provision of affordable homes is a minimum of 15%. We are not convinced that this target is high enough to meet the housing need within our town. We would instead favour a target of 30%. We are concerned too that provision for Low Cost Home Ownership must reflect actual levels of income within North Norfolk rather than levels of average income for England as a whole. We would hope to see a higher target for affordable homes and careful oversight of the provision for Low Cost Home Ownership. Special concern to us as it expresses North Norfolk District’s Council’s requirement for affordable housing on larger sites and we have doubted whether this policy truly takes account of the level of our need for social rented housing.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU2	Dixon, Cllr Nigel (1218612)	LP738	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Provide more shared equity affordable homes across the District either through schemes with Housing Associations or through a NNDC funded scheme.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU2)
Summary of Objections	10	Objections comment on the shortage of affordable housing in the District and the need to build more in the new plan. A number of comments focused around the need for houses for first time buyers some preferring an increase in low cost home ownership models, rather than housing associations while other supported more rented properties. The requirement for affordable housing percentage was supported but some challenged that it was too low. Others suggested that the zonal approach was not supported by the Council's viability study and lower percentage should be required in the identified zones away from the coast. Affordable housing thresholds were also challenged in that a higher threshold in line with national policy should be applied outside the AONB. More housing with care is needed to enable the ageing population to continue living independently with the support they need. Specific issues raised about Wells-next-the-Sea, although the overall number of homes was not challenged it was thought the application 35% affordable housing would not address local need. No need for large houses and housing should be available to people who live or work in the District. The Affordable Housing Zones 1 and 2 as identified in the Draft LP (page 122) are inconsistent with the Zones shown in the NNDC Interim Plan Wide Viability Assessment(2018). One representations comments that the approach doesn't comply with the NPPF Para 63 and should be amended to only require contributions to or provision of affordable housing on schemes of 6 or more dwellings for sites in the AONB, outside the AONB, the threshold should be 10 or more units, following the definition of major development set out in the NPPF glossary.
Summary of Supports	1	Although there was limited direct support there was indirect support contained in comments for the policy approach in that it recognises the need to address affordable housing, ensure appropriate type and size of homes are sought and that the proposed policy recognises the need for elderly accommodation.
Summary of General Comments	14	General comments mainly focused on the preference for more affordable housing at a price and tenure that suits local need and for homes for the elderly and people with dementia that could be adaptable. Some support for self build but not tied to the settlement hierarchy. mixed opinions were given on tenure, with some favouring low cost home ownership products to get onto the housing mkt while others thought more rented / social prices should be delivered. Generally considered that the provision for Low Cost Home Ownership must reflect actual levels of income within North Norfolk rather than levels of average income for England as a whole. Others commented that the policy was too restrictive and prescriptive and not flexible enough to respond to the changing needs over the plan period
Overall Summary		Most comments raised concern about the shortage of affordable housing within the District and the need to encourage more, **at a price and tenure that addresses local need with the** provision for Low Cost Home Ownership reflecting actual levels of income within North Norfolk rather than levels of average income for England as a whole. Generally there is support for a higher affordable percentage being required. Concerns around the perceived impacts of second homes on the price of homes was a common team . Support was also implied for more elderly accommodation and adaptable homes however there were others that said the approach was too restrictive and not reflective enough to local circumstances and challenged the evidence base on viability zones and the lowering of the affordability threshold outside the AONB.
Council's Response		Noted: agree, disagree (partly) - Consider comments in the development the policy. Affordable housing need is identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and evidence shows a clear need for rented properties and two /three bedroomed properties which the policy advocates . The Council consider that affordable homes should be genuinely affordable reflecting the local economy and support for price controls in accordance with local income is however also welcomed. The policy is designed to deliver the identified strategic needs of the District while Other policies in the plan actively support the provision of rural exception sites and affordable housing provision through the delivery of sites to address additional identified local need in neighbourhood plans and through community land trusts brought about through community planning powers. Policies HOU8 & 9 focus on the requirement for minimum space standards and accessible and adaptable properties. The Council supports self building in accordance to sustainable distribution principle. The viability zones reflect the conclusions of the Plan wide viability study and market values/development costs across the district and the approach across the distribution and allocations meets the identified need for affordable housing . Affordable Housing thresholds reflect the rural area designation of north Norfolk under the s.157 Housing Act 1985.

Policy HOU3 - Affordable Homes in the Countryside (Rural Exceptions Housing)

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU3	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP203	Support	Support for this policy, but further clarification is required. It essential that the existing settlement should offer something by way of facilities, as opposed to just being an existing cluster of private dwellings. The development of sites which not meet these criteria would potentially have a harmful or undesirable effect upon the environment and quality of life of existing residents. It is essential that such sites brought forward under this policy demonstrably have the **overall support of the local community. Clarification of what is meant by the "facilities" provided by an existing settlement. Provision in the policy for demonstrable community support, consisting of the support of the parish council and preferably also an approved local consultation exercise.**
HOU3	Edwards, Mr John (1216139)	LP317,LP322	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**. Policies HOU 2 and HOU 3 are not sufficiently sensitive to the special needs of Wells; more closely aligned with Blakeney and other coastal villages along the North Norfolk Coast. The attraction of this location, together with the nature of employment in Wells, means that there is not enough affordable housing, particularly affordable housing for rent. Local analysis suggest that the current demand for rented housing in Wells is higher than the total housing proposed through the Local Plan. Policy HOU 2 would only require 28 affordable dwellings to be built and this is entirely inadequate. As the target for 80 dwellings is not being challenged in this submission, the housing policies for Wells need further refinement; they need to be more aligned with HOU 3, or there needs to be a separate policy reflecting recognition of the special circumstances in Wells [and any other settlement similarly affected] if a market force outcome is to be avoided, and the demand for local need met.
HOU3	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree Only if local occupancy and not second / holiday homes.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU3)
Summary of Objections	1	Objection concerned that a bespoke rural exception policy should be set for Wells -next -the Sea.
Summary of Supports	2	conditional support for this approach- Development should be well related to settlements with facilities and are not just a cluster of private dwellings and have the support of the local community and clarification of facilities.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received.
Overall Summary		Limited number of comments received on this policy. Clarity is sought over the definition of 'facilities' and the requirement for proposals to be well related to settlements with local facilities and how housing need will be calculated.
Council's Response		Noted - No substantial issues raised, consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. Clarity over the definition of 'facilities' and how housing need should be demonstrated. Consider restricting policy to those settlements with a level of service provision. Wells is identified as a small growth town and as such the exceptions approach detailed actively support the provision of rural exception sites and affordable housing provision through the delivery of sites to address additional identified local need. The Council and other policies support the delivery of growth to address local needs through

		neighbourhood planning and through community land trusts brought about through community planning powers. As an exception to planned development occupation is limited to those that meet the Councils local occupancy policy i.e. those that have a strong connection to the local community in perpetuity.

Policy HOU4 - Agricultural & Other Key Worker Accommodation

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU4	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. See comment. The policy must stop these homes being subsequently sold for other purposes or for second homes.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU4)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy; restrictions should be in place to restrict these houses being sold for other purposes/ second homes.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Support this policy; restrictions should be in place to restrict these houses being sold for other purposes/ second homes.
Council's Response		Comments noted. The council will impose a restrictive occupancy condition to ensure the that any dwelling remains available to meet the needs of the particular business

Policy HOU5 - Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU5	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP142	Support	Agree

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU5)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One support for this policy.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantive issues raised
Council's Response		Noted

Policy HOU6 - Replacement Dwellings, Extensions & Annexed Accommodation

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU6	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP060	Object	These policy has a risk of increasing the number of properties including some holiday let/bed no breakfast, second homes and multiple occupancy. The policy must only be for full time homes and ensure the 'improved' property is revalued for council tax.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU6)
Summary of Objections	1	One objection received, concern that this policy would result in an increase of second homes and suggest that occupancy restrictions should be in place.
Summary of Supports	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Concern expressed that replacement dwellings and extensions and annexed accommodation would increase the number of second homes.
Council's Response		Comment noted. The approach aims to allow moderate change to properties in the rural area but also to retain a range of housing types in the countryside to ensure choice and variety. It should be noted that not all extensions require an application for planning permission due to permitted development rights laid down by national policy.

Policy HOU7 - Re-use of Rural Buildings in the Countryside

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU7	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP200	Object	There should be a presumption against the conversion of isolated farm buildings into dwellings, especially in the AONB or Undeveloped Coast. The policy should, through criteria, provide a presumption against the residential conversions of the more ISOLATED rural buildings into dwellings, preferably anywhere within the Countryside, but certainly within the AONB and Undeveloped Coast.
HOU7	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree - Would be best if used under policy HOU4 as a priority.
HOU7	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP054	Object	The rural areas are suffering as absent landowners/farmers convert properties/buildings they are no longer using into holiday rental properties. The designs are often not in character with local buildings and the increased traffic and parking needs is all harming the quality of life for local residents.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU7)
Summary of Objections	2	Comments reflected that there should be a presumption against the conversion of isolated farm buildings into dwellings, especially in the AONB or Undeveloped Coast. Concerns that buildings converted into holiday lets are not in character with local buildings and result in increased traffic and parking needs which harm the quality of life for local residents.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, would be best if used under policy HOU4 as a priority.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received.
Overall Summary		Issue raised advocated a presumption against the conversion of isolated farm buildings into dwellings, especially in the AONB or Undeveloped Coast and the linkage of the policy to HOU4. Concern expressed that buildings converted into holiday lets are generally not in character with local buildings and result in increased traffic and parking needs which harm the quality of life for local residents.
Council's Response		Noted Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy and that of HOU4. It should be noted that permitted development rights laid down by national policy are also a consideration.

Policy HOU8 - Accessible & Adaptable Homes

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU8	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree
HOU8	Broadhead, Ms Beverley (1217202)	LP289	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Building construction must be of the Passivhaus standard.
HOU8	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** All new homes should be built to current 'adaptable house' design standards.
HOU8	Dixon, Cllr Nigel (1218612)	LP738	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Ensure design and build standards require low or neutral carbon footprint energy usage by specifying renewable energy source systems to passive-house standards to address part of the climate change demands agenda and prepare for new regulations which are inevitable during the life of the Plan.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU8)
Summary of Objections	1	comments focused around the requirement for higher construction standards (Passivhaus standard)
Summary of Supports	1	One support received.
Summary of General Comments	2	comments highlighted the need to adaptable properties and the requirement to build to low or neutral carbon footprint
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. Where comments were received they focused on construction standards
Council's Response		Comments noted

Policy HOU9 - Minimum Space Standards

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU9	Johnson, Mr Jamie (1216384)	LP342	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Although the proposed minimum space standards should be applauded for their benefit to well being and healthy spaces there should be some caveat pertaining to tourist and holiday accommodation which, if in keeping with much of the distinctive historic character holiday accommodation of the area (as highlighted in paragraph 9.61) is often below the figures set out in Table 2 Minimum gross Internal floor areas and storage.
HOU9	Johnson, Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. See comment Not at the expense of HOU6 or ENV policies.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU9)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	2	Conditional support for the approach - tourist accommodation should not be an exception.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. Limited comments received on this policy. Where comments were received they focused on support in relation to the benefits of providing healthy spaces to improve well being
Council's Response		Comments noted

Policy HOU10 - Water Efficiency

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU10	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree
HOU10	Buxton, Mr Andrew (1218433)	LP761	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Water is going to be in short supply and new developments should in principle rely on existing supplies and not imported water from elsewhere which will become more and more controversial as time goes on. If this constraint reduces the number of new dwellings in N.Norfolk so be it.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU10)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy.
Summary of General Comments	1	One comments that new development should rely on existing supply of water, not imported, if this constraint reduces the number of new dwellings in North Norfolk so be it.
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. No substantial issues raised.
Council's Response		comments noted

Policy HOU11 - Sustainable Construction, Energy Efficiency & Carbon Reduction

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU11	Addison Elaine (1210267)	LPO75	Object	obligations placed on developers for carbon-neutral developments.
HOU11	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP142	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. BUT not if the materials used are inappropriate under policy HOU6. Not if materials provide poor durability or high maintenance as that may affect uptake and older people in particular.
HOU11	Mooney, Mr Raymond (1210675)	LP112	General Comments	Whilst supporting the need for a draft plan in order to avoid a piece meal approach to future development. Instead of meeting sustainability for developers and mitigating the environmental impact of the development, there needs to be a much bigger emphasis of reducing, let alone mitigating the environmental impact. Following the declaration by NNDC of a Climate Change Emergency after the draft plan was published. The draft Plan in it's current form is not fit for purpose. To include solar thermal (solar heated hot water), solar PV (electric) air source & ground source heat pumps, and these should be policy requirements for all new builds. Carbon-off-setting modelling for entire project, so that we work towards this whole development being carbon neutral. We are losing a lot of land, we will be generating a lot of greenhouse gases, we must offset this somehow.
HOU11	Rose, Mr Alan (1217227)	LP582	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** New houses should look at using solar and heat pumps and the saving of rainwater for all houses to be used for flushing (WC's), cleaning cars, etc. There could be a central parking area away from some towns such as North Walsham to then use an electric bus into the town centre for shopping or work. This would reduce the environmental impact and also take away a lot of traffic from the town.
HOU11	Drury, Mrs Margaret (1210793)	LP086	General Comments	The policy states that "The above standards should be achieved as a minimum unless, it can be clearly demonstrated that this is either not technically feasible or not viable". I do not think there should be any let out for developers. All new homes should be built to good design and space standards. All should be designed to as near Passiv house standards as possible, with grey water recycling, solar water heating, solar heating and/or ground source heat pumps. Each large site should include some allotments and new planting of trees and wild areas. I am pleased to see electric vehicle charging included.
HOU11	Brooks, Mr David (1217039)	LP251	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Climate change is a major concern so how is the Local Plan encouraging existing and new builds to use Solar Panels and Heat Pumps in order to reduce reliance on fossil fuels?
HOU11	Burke, Mr Stephen (1216753)	LP798	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** • All new homes should be built to the highest environmental standards and energy efficiency, located close to local facilities to minimise car use
HOU11	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP223	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: S**ince the start of the plan a Climate Emergency and Zero Carbon targets have been announced the plan needs to reflect these and be more robust in its approach. A move away from Houses with Gas/Oil, installation of solar panels as standard, provision of electric charging points within each residential unit.
HOU11	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP763	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: . I hope your declaring a climate emergency means you will follow the demands of the Extinction Rebellion, to tell the truth, to take action and to support a Citizens Assembly to direct policy. Telling the truth will mean acknowledging the harm done by recent policies, as well as giving full facts about the costs and benefits of any future plans. Since declaring the climate emergency, all housing needs to be at minimum construction costs and with the minimum use of carbon for heating, and any carbon costs need to be offset.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
HOU11	Broadhead, Ms Beverley (1217202)	LP289	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Establishing a 'North Norfolk Rule' for reducing the impacts of Climate Change. The “Merton Rule” was established in 2003 to ensure that all commercial buildings have to create at least 10% of their energy from renewables. This is old hat. Renewables are far less expensive and much more available than in 2003 so such a rule needs both to be upgraded and considerably widened. We argue that the new Local Plan should establish a new North Norfolk Rule. This would set staged targets for efficiencies of energy, carbon removal, water reduction, waste recycling and other aspects of promoting a circular economy over the life of the Plan. The Committee on Climate Change effectively mandates this action. Such a Rule should be designed into planning permissions/conditions.
HOU11	Bell, Ms Jane (1218416)	LP799	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Strongly support this crucially important policy as a response to paragraphs 9.49 & 9.50. (Paragraphs 9.76 & 9.77 are particularly valid.) However, it lacks equally crucial detail and there is a huge difference between desirability (the auxiliary verb 'should', i.e. 'duty', 'obligation', is repeated) and an enforceable imperative. Suggested Change In practice, are developers going to install, for example, photovoltaic panels and ground source heat pumps? Are they prepared to cover the cost which will have to be passed on to the owner? And what happens if/when it becomes statutory (?) for gas consumption to be phased out? p. 235
HOU11	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** All new homes must be carbon-neutral as far as possible. This means: a. they must be able to generate most of their power, heating, and hot water requirements through solar thermal, solar PV, and ground source and air source heat exchangers. These technologies all exist and if they are incorporated into new build their add-on cost is negligible. This will increase demand for local supplies of the necessary products, installers, and maintenance staff, thus creating more local industries and local jobs. b. They must be as well insulated as possible. Probably triple-glazed, and meeting the highest standards of thermal insulation. c. The process of building them must be as low-carbon as possible and any surplus embedded energy must be mitigated. All new homes must be sustainable. This means: b. They must not have gas or oil supplies to them. c. Biomass boilers are not sustainable and must not be installed.
HOU11	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There are useful elements within this policy; in particular, those enumerated within item 1b - “incorporation of measures to maximise opportunities for solar gain through building orientation...” and so on. Just the same, we are not persuaded that the policy is sufficiently demanding. As we have observed elsewhere, North Norfolk has declared a climate emergency. A reduction in CO2 emissions of only 19% below the target emission rate of the 2013 edition of the 2010 Building Regulations would seem a paltry ambition when there are so many examples of Passiv or carbon neutral housing to be found. We believe too that this policy should make provision for schemes of community energy, for example air and ground source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels. We would like to see a higher target for the reduction of CO2 emissions with a requirement for community energy schemes to be designed into new developments of all kinds, whether residential or employment sites.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU11)
Summary of Objections	3	Objections received to this policy generally supported it but thought it did not go far enough, considering that the policy could do more to ensure that all homes are of the highest environmental standard and move towards carbon-neutral .

Summary of Supports	1	One specific response supported the policy.
Summary of General Comments	9	General comments supported the need for a policy but a larger emphasis was needed on ensuring developers deliver appropriate and high environmental standards in response to the declaration of a climate change emergency by the Council. All new homes should be carbon-neutral, sustainable, Passive House standards, with solar and heat pumps and grey water recycling and the policy approach should be more prescriptive with developers moving away from reliance eon fossil fuel for heating now. Support for Large sites including allotments, planting of trees and wild areas along with electric charging points within each residential unit was clear.
Overall Summary		The policy doesn't go far enough - all homes should be of the highest environmental standard and should be located close to facilities to minimise car use and the policy should be more robust to meet the growing challenges. Should introduce a new North Norfolk Rule. Plan out of date as developed before climate emergency declared. Policy lacks crucial detail to make it enforceable. New homes should be carbon neutral to Passive House standard with solar, heat pumps and grey water recycling and electric charging points. Any carbon needs to be offset. Large sites should have allotments and trees/wild areas. Introduce Park and Ride. Suggest that this policy make provision for schemes of community energy, for example air and ground source heat pumps etc. and like to see a higher target for the reduction of C02 emissions.
Council's Response		Noted. Climate Change is recognised as an important consideration to the Council and further consideration will be given through the finalisation of policies. It is recognised that the challenge for the Local Plan is to take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change in a way that contributes positively to meeting local, national and international climate change challenges and commitments. As such the emerging Local Plan incorporates climate change at its heart and seeks to addresses a wide spectrum of matters from adaptation and improved resilience through a number of standalone and integrated policies and proposals which must be taken as a whole. The Local Plan supports the transition to a low carbon future in accordance with the 2015 written ministerial statement and the Government's new net zero target moving toward net carbon by 2050 .Meeting the target by 2050 will require further significant increase in the use of renewable technologies and the switch to low carbon heating such as heat pumps. The Government is consulting (Oct -Dec 2019) on a future homes standard through building regulations that includes options to increase energy efficiency standards for new homes in 2020 and a requirement to ensure future homes to be future proofed with low carbon heating by 2025. Changes in national policy will also need to be considered in the finalisation of this policy.

Economy Policies

Policy ECN1 - Employment Land

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ECN1	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP143	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Employment areas should consider the availability of local workforce and not encourage commuting and travel of long distances.
ECN1	Bluss, Mr Andrew (1210045)	LP027	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: The argument that you need to hold space for industry is a false one. Heavy industry left North Walsham for a reason. It is not coming back in any way shape or form in the scale it was. The economy has changed. So to should the thought processes of those who seek to hold this valuable land "in reserve". Shouldn't retain this land for employment.
ECN1	Burke, Mr Stephen (1216753)	LP798	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Support for businesses and jobs should focus on keeping young people in North Norfolk, developing green energy and cutting edge digital developments, modern tourism and farming, caring for an ageing population, employing an older workforce.
ECN1	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** ECN1 identifies a total of 285.54 ha of land to be designated/allocated and retained for employment generating developments. This figure should be amended to a minimum in order to plan positively for employment and housing growth and realise the Council's objective of delivering social and economic benefits. Total land to be designated/ allocated for employment should be a minimum.
ECN1	Archson George (1210391)	LP043	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** EMP08 & F10 I welcome the possibility of more employment possibilities in EMP08.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ECN1)
Summary of Objections	2	Objections focused on the Council providing support for businesses and jobs for young people. Develop green energy and cutting edge digital development, modern tourism and farming, caring for an ageing population, employing an older workforce. Shouldn't keep hold of industrial land in North Walsham, the economy is changing.
Summary of Supports	2	In support of the policy the Council should consider the availability of local workforce and not encourage commuting and travel of long distances. Welcomes the possibility of more employment on EMP08
Summary of General Comments	1	Comment focused on the opinion that total land to be designated/ allocated for employment should be a minimum in order to plan positively for employment and housing growth.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised on the distribution or quantum of employment allocations
Council's Response		Noted

Policy ECN2 - Employment Areas, Enterprise Zones & Former Airbases

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ECN2	Terrington, Mr Peter (1215743)	LP154	General Comments	The Great Eastern Way industrial Estate has been in a downward spiral of decay fro many years, beginning when the former Cartwright & Butler factory closed. This building is now abandoned and is in a derelict state. Some of the smaller units are also unoccupied and in a poor state of repair. The parking area between the former C&B factory and the smaller units is cluttered with abandoned containers and boats. The Wells Town Council has brought the matter to the attention of the NNDC on several occasions and the Enforcement Board was aware of the situation. It is believed that the derelict property is in the ownership of a single owner. There is a potential purchaser for the site and a sale and regeneration of the site could be facilitated by the Council, using its powers of compulsory purchase. The area, east of the old railway cutting, is outside the development boundary of Wells. It is a brownfield site. Historically it was associated with the import of coal, brick making and lime production with some residential use. After the Second World War the northern end was used predominantly by the fishing industry and to a lesser degree by commercial enterprises. More recently there has been an increase in marine use, for boat storage, with a growing number of small recreational cabins and artisan workshops. The southern half of the area has seen further residential development by way of a substantial increase in the footprint of existing properties and addition of ancillary cabins in the gardens of existing properties. There is a significant storage facility for the fishing industry to the extreme south of the area. A proposal was made to bring this are into the development boundary of Wells in the last LDF but this was rejected.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ECN2)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	1	Suggestion that the potential for employment opportunities could be enhanced by regenerating the Great Eastern Way industrial Estate and enhancing the landscape character of the site. Greater flexibility for unlocking the employment, recreational and residential potential of the area east of the old railway cutting would be achieved by bringing this area within the development boundary of Wells.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Specific comments received promoting the Great Eastern Way Industrial Estate in Wells on the Sea including the site east of the old railway cutting into the settlement boundary to provide flexibility of employment, recreation and residential coming forward.
Council's Response		The policy does not identify employment allocations but sets the policy content for its use. The Great Eastern Way Industrial site is already designated for employment.

Policy ECN3 - Employment Development Outside of Employment Areas

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ECN3	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP143	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Should not be implemented at the expense of HOU6 which should also apply as far as possible to employment development.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ECN3)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	Conditional support for the approach - it should not be at the expense of HOU6 which should be applied to employment development.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. One comment of support for this policy however it should not be at the expense of HOU6 which should be applied to employment development.
Council's Response		Noted. Disagree. Policy HOU6 manages the impact of replacement dwellings. The provision of employment outside of employment Areas is a separate matter.

Policy ECN4 - Retail & Town Centres

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ECN4	Walker, Mrs Kerry (1217345)	LP331, LP350	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** ~Questions the approach to retail provision and growth in the Local Plan. ~why does the draft Local plan only plan 10 years in advance and has not taken the evidence from the 2017 Retail Study to allocate floor space for the whole 20-year period up to 2036 ~the proposed approach will cause further leakage to Norwich or other centres. ~the suggested approach of providing opportunities for future development on surface car parks around the centre will impact on car parking capacity and may increase leakage ~the proposed approach will not address the dominance of Roys. Seeks the removal of planning powers of the BA in respect to Hoveton's retail growth. The increase in floor space for convenience food over the 20 year plan period. The creation of a policy to protects A1-A5 independent shops in the extended primary shopping area as set out in and recommended by the evidence in NNDC's 'North Norfolk Retail and Main Town Centre Uses 2017 Study' Incentives for existing and new independent retailers outlets to uptake the allocated growth in retail floor space for Hoveton. ~raised concerns over the BA role in retail and suggested there are complexities as a result of the dual authorities
ECN4	Broadhead, Ms Beverley (1217202)	LP289	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** NNDC need to radically rethink what 'community' looks like. The traditional high street both at village and town level are changing. Digital technologies and vital services need to be embedded in the centre of town alongside places where people can work and live. Many shops have undeveloped, potential living and work spaces above them and the council should be working with landlords to develop these 'slack' spaces, where existing infrastructure is in place, rather than looking to build on valuable green field spaces. The high street is changing, but having people living and working in centres will increase footfall, increase out of hours business potential and small, independent retail outlets will then begin to find a market. Reducing the need for car travel will make places more attractive, create less pollution, increase overall health and wellbeing.
ECN4	Philcox, Miss Charlotte (1210047)	LP026	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Existing sites within the town (e.g. brownfield, empty commercial properties) must surely be considered as a priority before new builds, to reduce environmental impact and make the most of developmental opportunities we already have, whilst also improving and reinvigorating the town centre.
ECN4	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP048 LP049	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Food and eating habits are another source of carbon costs. Again, NNDC is not in control, but , working with others like the Tourist Board, it can help to educate people into the benefits of more vegetarian diets and promote this is all its institutions and among local restaurants and hotels. It can also promote simple cooking as opposed to highly processed foods. It can support allotments, and local farm sales. No more supermarkets should be given planning permission. They have heavy carbon costs. The treatment of waste is another area it could influence.
ECN4	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP143	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree. The sustainability of local centres of facilities such as shops and businesses depends upon those businesses having trade. Excessive parking charges and lack of parking for users and operators discourages use of such businesses. This should be borne in mind when setting rates.
ENC4	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Support a policy which privileges a town centre first approach and we would question the advantage of further large scale retail development at a distance from our primary shopping area. North Walsham is a historic market town. It is important to us that our town centre be protected both in terms of its

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				independent retail offer and its historic fabric. We welcome the statement that development that under the draft plan proposals would be supported "provided that development respects the character of the centre, including its special architectural and historic interest, and assists in maintaining its retail function." North Walsham's market lies at the heart of our conservation area and the market contains many listed buildings. The conservation of these buildings is vital to the appeal of our town. We are minded to favour the locally derived impact threshold for North Walsham and we too would be inclined to permit residential use above the ground floor level. We believe that it is always preferable that historic buildings be occupied rather than left empty. We would like to see this policy upheld and implemented.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ECN4)
Summary of Objections	3	Objections focused on the perception of changing highstreets, Digital technologies need to be embedded in the town centre alongside places where people can work and live utilising spaces above shops and the need to put town centres first. The overall quantum of need was questioned in relation to the evidence study asking why the plan only looks 10 years in advance in relation to floor space requirements. The proposed approach will cause further leakage to Norwich or other centres. Developing car parks will impact on car parking capacity. The proposed approach for Hoveton will not address the dominance of Roys. The roll of the Broads Authority (BA) was also questioned and suggested there are complexities as a result of the dual authorities.
Summary of Supports	1	Support for the policy recognised that town centres remain the focus for retail commenting that no land use planning matters such as the impact of high car parking fees should be taken into consideration when setting rates
Summary of General Comments	2	General comment supported the a policy which "privileges" a town centre first approach and questioned the advantage of further large scale retail development at a distance from the primary shopping area - with particular reference to North Walsham's . Brownfield land in town order should be prioritised to reduce environmental impact, improving the town centre .
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Comments acknowledged that the high street is changing, and suggests that digital technologies should be embedded in town centres, alongside places where people can work and live, potentially above shops. Support a town centre first approach. Questions why the plan only plans 10 years in advance and does not use the 2017 Retail study to allocate floor space for the plan period. Should prioritise brownfield central locations to reduce environmental impact and improve town centres, also reducing the need for cars. Policy and building on car parks will lead to people traveling to other centres. Excessive parking charges and lack of parking for users and operators discourages use of such businesses.
Council's Response		Noted Consider adding the retail projection 2026 - 36 in the final document. The issue of retail capacity is considered by the 2017 NNDC Retail and Town centre study Town centre. Retail evidence found a limited scope for additional convenience and comparison goods floorspace across the district over and above planned commitments but growth would help to address leakage in comparisons goods where investment would help claw back investment and increase footfall. The policy seeks a town centre first approach utilisers the sequential approach in order to enhance local provision and utilise appropriate retail growth to contribute to the public realm and visual amenity of surroundings in order to enhance town centres. The policy adopts a whole town approach across Hoveton as the BA is the relevant planning authority for part of the town centre.

Policy ECN5 - Signage & Shopfronts

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ECN5	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Well-designed signage and shopfronts are another important element in the appeal of our town's retail offer. As we have stated above, North Walsham's market lies within a conservation area. Signage has been neglected over the years. It is our position that advertisements and shopfronts should follow the guidance contained within the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD rather than simply having regard to the Guide. We would hope to see a more strongly worded policy than the one proposed here.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ECN5)
Summary of Objections	0	No comments received
Summary of Supports	0	No comments received
Summary of General Comments	1	Well-designed signage and shopfronts are another important element in the appeal of our town's retail offer. Advertisements and shopfronts should follow the guidance contained within the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD rather than simply having regard to the Guide.
Overall Summary		Limited comments were received on this policy. Well-designed signage and shopfronts are important to the retail offer in towns and should follow the guidance contained in the Design Guide rather than having regard to the guide.
Council's Response		Noted: Consider clarification in future iteration of the Plan

Policy ECN6 - New-Build Tourist Accommodation, Static Caravans & Holiday Lodges

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ECN6	Fullwood, Mr Tony (1217463)	LP644	Object	The policy is too permissive for the expansion of existing sites given the sensitive locations within which most existing sites are located. The scale of proposed development and the ability to absorb the development should be more closely related to the capacity of a location's infrastructure and the visual impact it will cause**. Amend criterion 4 as follows: 4. in the case of business expansions and replacement developments, it is clearly demonstrated that the proposal would result in net benefit in terms of landscape impact and the screening of development throughout the year and ecology when compared to the existing development and would not have a significantly detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring land uses, nor on the character of the area or its infrastructure by virtue of increased activity and noise and also impacts on light and highway safety and the operation of the highway network.**
ECN6	Tickle, Miss Gemma (1217353)	LP340	Support	To help local investment and financial support of local services I would like to request that a point is added to the policy so small scale development of 1-3 units can be built on vacant or derelict infill/rounding off plots in smaller villages and settlements outside development boundaries where the development meets the conditions of paragraph 10.50 (Holiday/Seasonal Occupancy and 140 day commercial letting). Often these plots are neglected and an eyesore for the village and community and it would be much better use if they could be bringing investment and visitor spend into the area rather than laying empty as an unsightly waste. This would be felt most beneficially in some of the smaller villages in the east of the district. I would respectfully request that an extra point is added between point 2 and 3 (which I'll call 2.b for now) as follows: New-build tourist accommodation, static caravans and holiday lodges(90)will be supported where: 1.the site lies within the settlement boundary of a selected settlement; or 2.the proposal is for the expansion of an existing business; or 2b (requested extra point). outside defined development boundaries in areas designated as Countryside small scale development of maximum 1-3 sustainable units would be permitted where it would result in infilling or rounding off in a predominantly built up area/settlement and only where it meets the conditions of paragraph 10.50 (Holiday/Seasonal Occupancy and 140 day commercially available letting). 3. the proposal is for a replacement static caravan site or holiday lodge accommodation which would result in the removal of an existing clifftop static caravan site or the relocation of existing provision which is within the Coastal Change Management Area or Environment Agency Flood Risk Zone 3;(91); and in the case of all of the above, in the case of business expansions and replacement developments, it is clearly demonstrated that the proposal would result in net benefit in terms of landscape and ecology when compared to the existing development and would not have a significantly detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring land uses , nor on the character of the area by virtue of increased noise and also impacts on light and highway safety and the operation of the highway network. Supporting evidence: NPPF Paragraph 84.On Planning policies encouraging opportunities to use land and sites that are physically well related to existing settlements. NPPF Paragraph 83.a) on Planning policies enabling sustainable growth in rural areas through well-designed new buildings. NPPF Paragraph 83.c) On Planning policies enabling 'sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside'.
ECN6	Johnson, Mr Jamie (1216384)	LP529	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Para 5.7 the economic prosperity of North Norfolk irrevocably linked to the success of the tourist sector. If sensitively conceived small scale developments of 1-3 units on infill/rounding off sites within existing settlements in the designated Countryside were permitted e.g. on both brownfield, derelict/neglected and greenfield sites, it could provide the desirable diverse mix of tourist accommodation more widely across

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				the district as well as delivering the 'positive impact on the economy' whilst also satisfying several NPPF policies on fostering and enabling a thriving sustainable rural economy without compromising the natural environment which draw tourists to the area whilst offering increased visitor options and year-round amenities. Following the loss of the current Local Plan's policy EC2 which allows the re-use of buildings in the countryside for holiday accommodation provided they comply with the former policy EC9 (Holiday and seasonal occupancy conditions' which restricts holiday use to short term lets/occupancy), I would suggest that such infill development in existing settlements in designated Countryside could be restricted to the same limitations mentioned in draft local plan paragraph 10.50 (holiday/seasonal occupancy conditions and 140 day commercial availability) to enable increased local investment and broader area-wide economic benefits. NPPF Paragraph 83 "Supporting a prosperous rural economy" states "planning policy and decisions should enable a) the growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas" and also enable "c) sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside" . If the conditions proposed below are deemed too lenient then I would suggest each development could be required to conform with 1 or more of the following suggestions: 1) It caters to 'eco tourist' holiday makers; specifically serving the district's long distance cycling and walking paths. (Similar low impact walking/hiking/cycling accommodation schemes have been highly successful across Canada, Scotland, etc.). Schemes could also cater to specific open air leisure enthusiasts such as paddle boarders, canoeists, etc. . 2) The development adds diversity to the tourist stay opinions by offering exemplary eco water, energy, construction and renewables efficiency. Such development would offer ultra-low emission and plug-in vehicle charging facilities, secure bicycle parking, include family bicycles as standard and follow growing trends towards low carbon semi-off grid tourist stays 3) The development would extend the tourist season. The development would also incorporate various biodiversity encouraging measures in its build and landscaping and could be partnered with local/national nature conservation groups such as Norfolk Wildlife Trust or The RSPB to promote the protection/appreciation/study of local/migrating species. . 4) The development would cater for wheelchair users and the elderly by incorporating accessible and adaptable facilities. . 5) The development would follow draft local plan's paragraph 10.49 (being situated in an area proven to be able to incorporate further visitor numbers without detrimental effect to the environment). . 6) The development would focus on an element of an Art/Craft/wellbeing retreat/workshops where participants make work as well as visiting and exploring distinctively local craft/cottage industries. . 7) The development celebrates Norfolk's culinary traditions and crafts where guests can attend workshops learning skills involving locally sourced ingredients whilst also visiting distinctively local food producers, makers and growers. . 8) The development celebrates Norfolk's architectural and historic assets. Some supporting evidence: NPPF Paragraph 80, 102, 131, 151 and 154.
ECN6	Wilson, Mr Iain (Hill, Mr Iain Bidwells) (1217197 1217161)	LP304	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Whilst the general principle of Policy ECN6 is advocated, notably the support, in principle, for the development of new build tourist accommodation, it is requested that changes are made to the policy to ensure that it is consistent with, and sufficiently flexible to respond to, market requirements and conforms with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As drafted, Policy ECN6 contains a presumption against new build tourist accommodation in the countryside, unless it relates to the expansion of an existing business; precluding the opportunity for new business ventures to locate in a rural area. This is notwithstanding that at paragraph 10.49 of First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) it states that in order to support the tourism economy and provide facilities that will also benefit the local community 'new tourist accommodation and attractions will be permitted in areas that can accommodate additional visitor numbers without detriment to the environment.' It is, therefore, suggested that rather than excluding new build tourist

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				accommodation in the countryside, Policy ECN6 should recognise that applications for new build tourist accommodation, which is not linked to an existing business, will be permitted in the countryside where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the environment. It is, therefore, recommended that the policy is revised in order to ensure that the policy is consistent with the NPPF and, crucially, that the requirements of the tourism sector are met, allowing the economic benefits detailed at paragraph 10.45 to be realised
ECN6	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP143	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Development should not be at the expense of any ENV policies and subject to similar requirements to HOU6.
ECN6	Rice, Mr Colin (1210475)	LP131	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 1. By permitting individual holiday homes that build on the character of such homes in the coastal strip (as recognised in the LCA p.155), some of the demand for second homes could be met without there being a negative effect on availability of the existing housing stock for local people. 2. As noted in NPPF paragraph 154, LPAs should recognise that even small-scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting GHG emissions and indeed can act as exemplars.
ECN6	Rice, Mr Colin (1210475)	LP132	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The plan as drafted does not recognise the place of small scale holiday cabins that are not situated within large scale commercial caravan or chalet parks. These currently form part of the long-established character of places such as Bacton, Walcott, Eccles, and Sea Palling and are overlooked in the plan. By allowing small-scale growth and development, the existing communities will continue to prosper and the demand for second homes could be met without such disruption to the general housing market. This would be in accordance with NPPF paragraph 83(c) which says that 'Planning policies and decisions should enable sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respects the character of the countryside'.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ECN6)
Summary of Objections	3	Objections recognised the importance of tourism to the North Norfolk economy, however comments were mixed with some considering the expansion of existing sites within sensitive locations as too permissive and the policy should consider the scale of development, the infrastructure available in that location and the visual impact of development. Other respondents felt that the policy should be more flexible and allow new build tourist accommodation in the countryside which doesn't have a detrimental impact on the environment. Such as small scale tourist accommodation infill / rounding off built up areas and existing settlements that meet certain criteria. In order to provide a mix of accommodation across the district and deliver positive impact on the economy without compromising the natural environment.
Summary of Supports	2	Support for the approach suggested that the policy should also allow for small scale development on vacant/ derelict infill/ rounding off plots in smaller villages outside development boundaries which are subject to holiday occupancy conditions. To improve neglected sites and bring investment into the

		area, which is considered could be especially beneficial to small villages in the east of the District. Development should not be at the expense of any environmental policies and subject to similar requirements to HOU6.
Summary of General Comments	2	Respondents suggested that by allowing individual holiday homes that build on character of the homes in the coastal strip would meet some of the need for second homes without have a negative effect on the availability of the existing housing stock for local people. LPAs should recognise that even small-scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting GHG emissions. The policy as drafted doesn't recognise the importance of allowing small scale holiday cabins in places such as Bacton, Walcott, Eccles and Sea Palling where these currently form part of the long-established character and would allow existing communities to prosper and also meet the demand for second homes.
Overall Summary		Some support for this policy, recognising the importance of tourism and the environment on North Norfolk's economy. The majority of comments suggest that the policy should be more flexible and allow for small scale tourist accommodation which wouldn't (their emphasis) have a detrimental impact on the environment within the countryside rather than just be focused on the settlement hierarchy. However, another respondent considered the policy to be too permissive, need to carefully consider potential impact of extending existing businesses within sensitive locations.
Council Response		Noted Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy and in relation to core strategy policy EC 2, and general consistency with other rural policies and those in relation to the expansion of existing business'

Policy ECN7 - Use of Land for Touring Caravan & Camping Sites

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ECN7	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP143	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Development should not be at the expense of any ENV policies and subject to similar requirements to HOU6.
ECN7	Johnson, Mr Jamie (1216384)	LP523	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Make a case for an amendment to criterion 3 changing the excluded area to flood risk zone to 3b only so that small scale sites (of upto 5 units) in flood zone 2, 3a or 'dry islands' could be permitted where they are protected by hard sea defences (where the adopted defence strategy is predicted by to “Hold the Existing Line” for the next 85 years until at least the year 2105 (Coastal Management Study). As some Flood Zone 3a land is deemed less suitable for building permanent residential dwellings it would seem that a good way to utilise such land would be for sensitively landscaped low impact glamping/shepherds hut sites (using restricted seasonal occupancy, flood warning technologies and selected egress routes to mitigate against risk). This would allow such land to meet economic, social and environments gains for the area whilst having very low impact on the character of the surrounding Countryside. These sites would have to meet criterion 4 of policy ECN7 and would provide a low impact sustainable addition to the tourist offer and would be in line with the stipulation stated in NPPF paragraph 83. on "Supporting a prosperous rural economy"; "planning policy should enable a) the growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas" and also enable "c)sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside” .**Amend criterion 3** ‘Flood Risk Zone 3’ to ‘3b’ to allow small scale sites of up to 5 units in flood zone 2, 3a or 'dry islands'. The use of land(92) for touring caravan and camping sites(93)will be supported where: 1. the site lies within the settlement boundary of a selected settlement; or 2. the proposal is for the expansion of an existing business; or 3. (requested amended point) the site lies outside of the boundary of a selected settlement but does not lie within the AONB, Heritage Coast, Undeveloped Coast or Environment Agency Flood Risk Zone 3b. Sites which lie in areas protected by hard sea defences in flood zones 2 and 3a will be supported where seasonal usage restrictions are applied to mitigate against flood risk.* . *If more restrictions where deemed desirable then potential 2 and 3a Flood Zone sites could be made to satisfy one or more of the following conditions. Sites are: 1) are small in scale being 5 units or less, 2) are within a Tourism Asset Zone, 3) are compliant with local draft plan paragraph 10.50 (holiday occupancy restricted with 140 day commercially available lettings stipulation), 4) are comprised solely of Shepherds huts (which are less visually imposing on the landscape and encourage a diverse low impact tourist stay option aside from traditional camping). (Also their raised design makes them much more in keeping with the current flood resilience advice from the environment agency). 5) are accompanied by a site specific Flood risk assessment detailing compulsory flood safety measures such as warning systems and egress routes etc. 6) The sites would fall within infill/rounding off sites within existing settlements/predominantly built up areas within designated Countryside. 7) Each unit will be highly sustainable using Solar PV/solar thermal, renewable technologies and other sustainable off grid technologies for water, heating and power efficiency and sustainability. Sites could cater specifically for the district's long distance walking and cycling paths to avoid travel by car and also provide family bicycles, secure bicycle parking and charging points for ULE and plug-in vehicles. . Any proposed site within flood zone 2 or 3a where protected by hard sea defences would still have to meet the criterion in point 4 of the policy ECN7.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ECN7)
Summary of Objections	1	Objection focused on allowing a more permissive approach and made the suggestion that the policy should allow for: small scale sites of up to 5 units in flood zone 2, 3a and 'dry islands' and low impact glamping/shepherds hut sites in Flood Zone 3b (using restricted seasonal occupancy, flood warning technologies and selected egress routes to mitigate against risk). To allow this land to meet economic, social and environments gains for the area whilst having very low impact on the character of the surrounding Countryside.
Summary of Supports	1	One comment in support of this policy but development should not be at the expense of any ENV policies and subject to similar requirements to HOU6.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Limited comments and no substantive issues raised. Objection focused on allowing a more permissive approach by allowing more flexible development of small scale sites of up to 5 units in flood zone 2, 3a and 'dry islands' and low impact glamping/shepherds hut sites in Flood Zone 3b (using restricted seasonal occupancy, flood warning technologies and selected egress routes to mitigate against risk). Stating that this would allow economic, social and environments gains for the area whilst having very low impact on the character of the surrounding Countryside. One comment received in support of this policy but suggests that development should not be at the expense of any ENV policies and subject to similar requirements to HOU6.
Council's Response		Support noted. Disagree with a more flexible approach around flood risk. The National Planning Policy Framework sets strict tests to protect people and property from flooding which all local planning authorities are expected to follow. Where these tests are not met, national policy is clear that new development should not be allowed. In plan-making, local planning authorities apply a sequential approach to site selection so that development is, as far as reasonably possible, located where the risk of flooding (from all sources) is lowest, taking account of climate change and the vulnerability of future uses to flood risk.

Policy ECN8 - New Build & Extensions to Tourist Attractions

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ECN8	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP143	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Development should not be at the expense of any ENV policies and subject to similar requirements to HOU6.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ECN8)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One comment of support received, development should not be at the expense of any ENV policies and subject to similar requirements to HOU6.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised.
Council's Response		Noted

Policy ECN9 - Retaining an Adequate Supply & Mix of Tourist Accommodation

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ECN9	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP143	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Development should not be at the expense of any ENV policies and subject to similar requirements to HOU6.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ECN9)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One comment of support received, Development should not be at the expense of any ENV policies and subject to similar requirements to HOU6.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised.
Council Response		Noted

Vision, Aims & Objectives

Vision, Aims & Objectives

Section	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
Vision & Aims	Addison Elaine (1210267)	LPO75	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Obligations placed on developers for carbon-neutral developments.- My initial observations of the published local plan for consultation suggests very little regard has been given to green or climate change issues. There is for example little regard given to the carbon foot print caused by digging up agricultural land. E.g. just ploughing farmland creates 15-20% of atmospheric carbon dioxide. I would urge NNDC to conduct carbon calculations modelling for this development on greenfield sites. What impact will there be on local wildlife with the removal of hedgerows and other current habitats? I would urge NNDC to ensure that wildlife, SSSI's, and the natural environment are taken into greater consideration than, say, the incident at Bacton cliffs which caused national humiliation.
Vision & Aims	Addison Elaine (1210267)	LPO75	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** My initial observations of the published local plan for consultation suggests very little regard has been given to green or climate change issues.- There are other climate issues which have been mentioned in the consultation document, but these issues fall short of placing obligations on developers. This shortfall includes the following: • No cycleways to support new housing • No commitment to carbon offsetting • No obligation for developers to use renewable technology • No obligation for developers to use rainwater harvesting • No obligation for developers to install electric car charging points on new homes • No park & ride There should also be more attention given to identifying brown field sites. The plan, seems to us, to be focused on housing for commuting rather than including planning to increase the local economic activity to thereby increase the opportunity for local employment. The extra commuting will obviously increase the amount of greenhouse gases being produced. I would urge NNDC to conduct carbon calculations modelling for this development on greenfield sites. What impact will there be on local wildlife with the removal of hedgerows and other current habitats? I would urge NNDC to ensure that wildlife, SSSI's, and the natural environment are taken into greater consideration
Vision & Aims	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP056	Object	*Maximising the economic, environmental and social benefits of tourism* must be allowed if it is detrimental to local, full time, residents. The benefits must be balanced, not 'maximised'.
Vision & Aims	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP385	General Comments	More emphasis needs to be made of the historic buildings in the area especially the churches. Church trails following bus routes, footpaths, cycle routes, etc. that are clearly marked would energise the local economy/community and provide more tourism to the area. Places that have been used in films are also potential sources of tourism.
Vision & Aims	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP393	Support	Broadband provision needs to be better than good, currently, so as to be able to cope with future increased demand. In a rural setting, reliance on the internet for business and social use is crucial to delivering sustainable development. Underground all new utilities as this preserves the character of the local area. **Change the order of the bullet points making Broadband provision a higher priority.**
Vision & Aims	Spowage, Mr Richard (1216878)	LP325	General Comments	The proposal fails to mention provision of local open access parks of sufficient size to support local residents and children needs for a space to enjoy outside activities from football, cycling, running, flying kites or just walking dogs**. I wish to see a commitment for each urban centre to create new large parks to meet growing population needs.**

Section	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
Vision & Aims	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 3.2. The broad plan objective of delivering sustainable development and meeting accommodation needs of existing and future residents by delivering the quantity of homes necessary to meet assessed needs and providing a variety of house types, sizes and tenures is supported.
Vision & Aims	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP053	Object	All developments should be quality, and not an undefined 'high quality'. It is also unclear what is meant by 'context'. Recent developments converting farm buildings, right beside existing old farm houses, may seem to be 'quality' and in context, but they are not in character to the local surroundings, style and local building materials. Consideration must be given to whether designs using lots of timber/metal cladding; large cobbles not flints and rendered facades are in keeping in North Norfolk. They may be in context on TV design programmes and other parts of East Anglia, but they are spoiling the local character.
Vision & Aims	Woodward, Mrs Josephine (1217427)	LP598	General Comments	How is the plan managing potential impacts on climate change and the detrimental impact of extra environmentally damaging emissions. Emphasising the need to consider the long term effect of our actions
Vision & Aims	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP048 LP049	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** In addition NNDC needs to work with others, such as Norfolk County Council, on a range of policies where it does not have full control but can have some effect, or, at the very least lobby for change. There is no shortage of ideas and knowledge. Some of my own are listed below, but I seriously recommend wide consultation and the use of environmental experts.
Vision & Aims	Woodward, Mrs Josephine (1217427)	LP597	General Comments	Consideration of the impact the North Norfolk plan in it's current form will have on Norwich itself. Add explanation and consideration as to how our local plan will impinge on our neighbouring areas.
Vision & Aims	Smith, Mr Mark. (1209582)	LP038	General Comments	There is no mention throughout the NNDC Draft Local Plan of any collaboration or feedback from any discussions that may have taken place to combine housing needs across councils as part of a Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework (not what I can find it this massive document so apologies if I have not found it). Against the preferred approach of NNDC the alternative SD3A could have been preferred but used to satisfy the allocation of more than one council and minimise if not avoid altogether the need to extend villages, small towns and in some cases large towns. A more strategic plan to mitigate congestion could have been utilised that would have less impact on established settlements in all factors from pollution to safety. **Publish any document that corresponds to cooperating with neighbouring councils.**
Vision & Aims	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP048 LP049	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** NNDC have declared an intention to plant trees. Estimates for how much carbon each tree will offset and in what timescale needs to be publicised.

Section	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
Vision & Aims	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP062	Object	The section needs to considers all local residents, not just those in towns. The health and well being of people living in rural areas during the winter months when they are among the very few people still about. Walking through villages with empty second homes, rental properties and neglected vacant homes is not good for well being and a sense of community. Many villages lack paved footpaths and access to public footpaths is often difficult as people have no safe routes to cross the increasingly busy local roads. The document only seems to consider people living in towns or having access to them.
Vision & Aims	Burke, Mr Stephen (1216753)	LP798	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The plan is a great opportunity to create a better North Norfolk for all who live and work and visit here. A chance to create a **long-term vision for North Norfolk** and to meet the changing needs of our population. **it's important we are ambitious for the future of North Norfolk** and how it can lead the country. VISION Making North Norfolk the most environmentally friendly place in the country, where everyone has access to a decent affordable home and transport, where people of all ages can work and learn and businesses can thrive, where people can access the health, care and support they need, where all our communities are nurtured and protected. To achieve this vision, we need a revised local plan that makes this vision the framework for future development and incorporates its priorities into all planning and development briefs.
Vision & Aims	Ringer, Mr Callum (1218565)	LP772	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: There is a general weakness throughout the document with regards climate change. Although consideration is giving, the document is not exactly radical, particularly given our precarious coastline.
Vision & Aims	Hull, Mrs Alicia (1210435)	LP048 LP049	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Plan out of date as developed before declaring a climate emergency. Planning authority in best place to control carbon emissions in all aspects of construction and to initiate carbon reduction schemes. Council declared intention to become a zero-carbon district and set goals to this effect. Policy now has to be carbon costs. Every policy and scheme needs to be questioned and costed for carbon with expert evidence sought. There are many alternative cleaner technologies. First aim with housing is to see how much can be achieved using existing structures. Then building techniques need to be assessed, and the performance of different building types and other equipment in reducing domestic carbon production. Any building has a cost, so offsetting the carbon produced is vital. Exact carbon estimates for all projects. Choosing those using the least. Increasing carbon saving measures with measurements. wide consultation.
Vision & Aims	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** Sections 4.4.1 on Climate change, and 4.4.2 on energy. This document, and the undated paper 'Planning for Climate Change' are extremely well produced and comprehensive, but they pre-date the climate crisis. HM Government, and NNDC amongst many other authorities, have declared a climate emergency which requires drastic action and change.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Vision & Aims)
Summary of Objections	9	Responders commented that following the recent declaration of climate change emergency by NNDC more emphasis should be placed in the plan in tacking the effects of climate change and delivering sustainable development. Suggested amendments to wording of 'Enabling Economic Growth' Aim and Objectives to ensure economic, environmental and social benefits of tourism are balanced and not maximised. Further clarity was also sought on the interpretation of words in the Contextual sections of the Plan e.g. All developments should be quality, and not an undefined 'high quality'. Working in

		partnership across the District was also thought to be important and a missing element to the Plan by some. In objecting those that responded thought the Plan should consider all local residents and not just those in towns and those living in rural areas, raising concerns such as lack of footpaths , lack of consideration for Historic environment and the impact on wellbeing and sense of community, Caring for an ageing population and older workforce. It is important that the vision is ambitious and is a great opportunity to create a better North Norfolk. Suggested that the vision should make North Norfolk the most environmentally friendly place in the country, developing green energy and cutting edge digital development and set out the framework for future development and incorporate the priorities into all development briefs. Conduct carbon calculations modelling for new development on greenfield sites. Should ensure that wildlife, SSSI and the natural environment are given greater consideration.
Summary of Supports	1	One respondent supported the aims and Vision specifically but requested that the order should be changed making Broadband provision a higher priority in the bullet points.
Summary of General Comments	8	Several commented on the Vison and that the Plan itself needs to focus on sustainable development, detail wider impacts across the county especially in relation to housing provision and how the plan is managing the potential impacts of emissions and climate change.
Overall Summary		Most respondents provided general comments on these sections with several commenting on the Vision. Concerns expressed that that the plan is weak in relation to climate change and out of date as written before the declaration of a climate change emergency. Consider the planning authority in the best place to control carbon emissions in construction and through carbon reduction schemes, suggest that carbon calculations modelling are undertaken for greenfield development. More consideration should be given to wildlife and natural environment and too much emphasis is placed on the towns, and the ability to create footpaths in rural areas and the ability to increase the provision of open space as well as the importance of caring for an ageing population and older workforce. Suggested that the vision should form the framework for future development and all development briefs. Suggested changes to the aims and objectives section, included better broadband and more emphasis on historic buildings and the provision of open space. Raise the importance of NNDC working with other authorities.
Council response		Noted: Consider comments and clarifications in future iteration of the Plan. Sustainable development and Climate Change is recognised as an important consideration to the Council and further consideration will be given through the finalisation of policies. An interim Sustainability Report accompanies the consultation on the First Draft Local Plan. It is recognised that the challenge for the Local Plan is to take a proactive approach through the development and use of land to contribute to mitigation and adaptation to climate change in a way that contributes positively to meeting local, national and international climate change challenges and commitments. As such the emerging Local Plan incorporates climate change at its heart and seeks to addresses a wide spectrum of matters from adaptation and improved resilience through a number of standalone and integrated policies and proposals which must be taken as a whole. The Local Plan supports the transition to a low carbon future, provides specific policy approaches for greater resilience to climate change, seeks environmental enhancements and the provision of higher quality development including the provision of open space and greater connectivity to the wider GI network. The approach to housing numbers and how the Council has addressed cross boundary land use issues is contained in the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework and Statement of Common Ground , which sets a high level vision and objectives and a number of formal agreements relating to cross boundary issues where a common approach has been agreed. Partners have committed to ongoing cooperation and this includes the evidence base and use of specialist inputs from across the region. The document is published alongside this consultation and will be updated as part of the iterative process.

First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) Comments

Comments on Proposed Sites

(Submitted by individual members of the public)

BLANK

Town & Village Proposals

DS1: Proposed Allocations

Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS1	N/A	Binks, Mrs Susan (1217821)	LP667	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** All brownfield sites should be used before any greenfield sites are touched.
DS1	N/A	Bluss, Mr Andrew (1218558)	LP027	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Brownfield land used would help preserve an equal amount of greenfield.
DS1	N/A	Broadhead, Ms Beverley (1217202)	LP289	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The proposals for towns and villages need to be more holistic in nature bringing into account environment, carbon emissions, future technologies, the demise of retail, the increase in aged, single occupancy accommodation, affordable rentable housing for families and improved cycle and footpaths. Development of towns and villages in North Norfolk separates housing development from high street rejuvenation, employment and local services. The addition of housing developments expanding a settlement ignores infrastructures that already exist.
DS1	N/A	Burke, Mr Stephen (1216753)	LP798	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** • Better use should be made of existing housing stock, e.g. reducing under-occupancy and empty homes, as well as occupying other under-used buildings etc.
DS1	N/A	Buxton, Mr Andrew (1218433)	LP761	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 2) Developments on agricultural land should be very closely scrutinised and reduced where possible in favour of “brownfield “ sites or simply scaled down; or perhaps judiciously built up .
DS1	N/A	Castleton, Mr Norman (1218485)	LP807	Object	There is far too much development proposed on green field and village sites. The services have not and will not keep pace with this and the environmental impact will eventually be catastrophic. Therefore, I cannot agree with the development of sites as herein proposed or with the developments of roads without due reference to public transport provision.
DS1	N/A	Daniels (1217050)	LP263	Support	Recognises the benefits of allocating land immediately adjacent to built up areas, although this should ideally support sites with defensible boundaries rather than ribbon development which results in the coalescence of settlements
DS1	N/A	Daniels Jennings, Mr Jon Cheffins Planning (Agent) (1217050 1217047)	LP268	Object	A number of sites are identified as being rolled forward from the existing Local Plan and insufficient detail or evidence is provided to demonstrate that a site is actually available, suitable and achievable. Need to undertake a full assessment of the sites rolled over from the local plan to ensure that they meet all of the criteria detailed within paragraph 11.10. Such an assessment should also provide evidence that these sites will be actually brought forward.
DS1	N/A	Dixon, Cllr Nigel (1218612)	LP738	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Create reserve sites which can automatically come forward if the 5 year land supply isn’t continually met during the life of the Plan and thus ensure developers don’t simply contrive to build where they want. Make requirements for allocations over a certain level of housing units to include mixed use (residential and employment) land allocations to give maximum flexibility to create local employment or infrastructure provisions to enable communities to become more sustainable in terms of less reliance on road travel to work.

Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS1	N/A	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1217309)	LP419 LP422 LP427 LP430 LP432	Object	Town proposals We note from para. 11.7 that the Council has done "some initial work", but para 11.9 suggests "a detailed site assessment of each of the options has been completed". The two statements do not seem consistent. Para. 11.10 notes that "Sites have been assessed against a detailed set of criteria and have been subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal," and refers to the methodology set out in the "Background Paper 6 - Site Selection Methodology and results." Our detailed comment on the Site Selection Methodology Background Paper 6 is set out in the attached analysis which shows many concerns. Paragraphs 11.11 and 11.12 of the Draft Local Plan confirm that the decision on whether a site should be proposed as a draft allocation was made on the basis of the Background Paper 6 and that "as a result the Council is satisfied that the types of development proposed are likely to be deliverable". However, in relation to para. 11.12 of the Draft Local Plan, we see no evidence in the Background Paper 6 or elsewhere that a site proposed only for housing (C22/1) has been either assessed or been demonstrated to be able to deliver sports facilities. If there is a need for such facilities, other sites too should have been assessed for such potential, but this does not appear to have been the case. Similarly, Paragraph 12.11 suggests the four sites proposed in Cromer are intended to deliver "…two residential care homes…" but it does not appear that any sites were specifically assessed for suitability or delivery of this use, and none of the proposed town policies specify a residential care home. We find inconsistencies in approach in relation to the three Large Growth Towns which are not adequately explained by the location being in or outside of AONB. For example Para 12.8 of the Draft Local Plan suggests, in relation to Cromer, that one of the main considerations influencing the suggested location of development sites is the need to "ensure a choice of medium sized sites are available to improve the prospects of delivery" This statement does not appear borne out. There is no evidence for why this suggested approach is only used for Cromer and not the other Large Growth Towns. In fact, the proposed allocations in North Walsham rely on only two large allocations. Both of these are identified in the Draft Local Plan as having complexities to deliverability, including the need for preparation and adoption of a comprehensive development brief before the site can be brought forward. Indeed, the Draft Local Plan notes (~in para 16.37) that in regard to deliverability of the largest of the two North Walsham sites, "the deliverability of the site will be complex and may take a number of years to come to fruition". The proposals at North Walsham represent a comprehensive mixed development including residences; link road; primary school; employment and Green Infrastructure. A similar comprehensive approach is evident for Fakenham. No such comprehensive approach to development is evident for Cromer. The Draft Local Plan proposals for Cromer appear piecemeal rather than representing good place making. We note that the sites submitted to the Authority include an opportunity through site C41 for a masterplan approach to the town development, including provision of homes, GI, link road, school and other necessary infrastructure in a cohesive way. Furthermore, in our recent discussions with the Highway Authority, the Authority has confirmed that realisation of such a link road is a high priority. In addition to the apparent inconsistencies identified above, our analysis of the Site Background Paper 6 also raises doubt about the sites proposed for Cromer to deliver appropriate growth for this Large Growth Town. We do not consider the proposed approach or Site Allocations for Cromer to be sound due to the many issues and inconsistencies identified above and in our comments attached and below on: the Background Paper 6; Sustainability Appraisal ; and Draft Local Plan: Alternatives considered. The evidence presented does not justify the approach.
DS1	N/A	Godfrey, Mr Paul (1210905)	LP097	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Phasing of housing is not specifically offered as an option within the documentation. There is no reason why new sites allocated in the Local Plan should not be phased. They would then be available for development should building rates increase and the vast majority of

Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					existing allocated sites are built-out. However, if house completions remain at existing rates these newly-allocated sites could stay on a reserve list and valuable countryside would be protected. This would be particularly important if Government predictions of population and household growth are reduced further. The SHMA assessments are based on Office for National Statistics, population projections, which are best guest at a point in time. Existing local plans (core strategies), already contain inflated housing targets. Reported in the press recently a number of schools have up to 50% vacancy for places. Brownfield sites should be prioritised for development.
DS1	N/A	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord, Ms Hannah Payne, WSP Indigo Payne (Agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Committed to delivering a proportion of the requirement in the short term. The policy does not include a housing trajectory however, for the local plan to be sound it is imperative that smaller unconstrained sites such as Site Reference C16 come forward to boost supply in the short term allowing large sites to come forward in the medium to longer term. The landowner and development partners are committed to delivering housing in the early part of the plan period on land at Overstrand Road.
DS1	N/A	Needham, Mr Colin (1216785)	LP269	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Fully understand that there is a need for additional housing in the district and that land has to be made available. The designations of growth points is reasonably well argued in the documentation. However, the process of considering each community in isolation is flawed especially with regard to the impact of growth in community A on adjoining communities B,C,D.etc..For example, current developments under the existing plan in Mundesley have had a direct and measurable increase in the traffic (commercial and private) passing through Southrepps. The volume of traffic is now adversely effecting this community. Specifically the adverse impact of increases in commercial, commuter and leisure traffic. If such developments can be properly justified, consideration should be given to mitigation and compensatory measures such as highway improvements, footpaths and cycle ways in all the effected communities.. Developers and landowners benefiting from land allocations should be the principal contributors to the cost of these measures. Our road is narrow, has no pavements and is considered by many to be dangerous such that people get in their car to go to the village shop rather than run the gauntlet of parked cars, heavy lorries and nose to tail cars. Baseline traffic flows are dramatically boosted by holiday traffic especially during the summer and this is a impact that the consultation document suggests that holidaymaking will be encouraged as a positive driver for economic growth in the district. Any further increase in the housing allocation in for example Mundesley, generating commercial and commuter traffic through Southrepps will have consequences for Southrepps and other villages on the B1436.
DS1	N/A	Philcox, Miss Charlotte (1210047)	LP026	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Existing sites within the town (e.g. brownfield, empty commercial properties) must surely be considered as a priority before new builds, to reduce environmental impact and make the most of developmental opportunities we already have, whilst also improving and reinvigorating the town centre.
DS1	N/A	Sanders, Ms A (1217671)	LP661	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** New site proposed. Why is the area south of Roughton considered not suitable? It would be close enough to town (better public transport would be needed) and would be well positioned for road connections (without making the coastal road traffic even worse). Alternatively, the industrial sized fields north or northwest of Northrepps, but away from the village. Access to the A149 would take longer, but the settlement would lie behind the Cromer ridge and so be invisible from Overstrand.

Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	ID	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS1	N/A	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (Agent) (1217056, 1217052)	LP261	Object	New site proposed. The policy requires that all development and other works comply with the North Norfolk Design Guide. Development of both of my client's sites would fully comply with the proposed guidance set out in the draft North Norfolk Design Guide. We note that the Residential Development section of the draft Design Guide classes developments of 10-49 units as medium scale development, and that the Guide would class our clients' sites as village fringe sites. The Density Guide sets out a Framework for appropriate development in these locations, and notes that appropriate densities of developments in these locations would be 10-30 dwellings per hectare, with irregular form, loose grain and less compact, with landscaped edges and buffer. This guidance is reflected in the indicative masterplans for both of my clients' sites.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS1)
Summary of Objections	9	The responses primarily focus on concerns over allocating Greenfield Land for new development and suggest that Brownfield land and the existing housing stock (Extending or bringing empty homes back into use) should be prioritised in order to limit the environmental impact. They suggest that a more holistic approach is needed for proposals in towns and villages, not just focussing on housing and settlements in isolation. And detailed consideration should be given to the impact of site allocations on adjacent communities. Concerns raised over inconsistencies within this section and the Site Assessment Methodology, specifically in relation to site assessments for Cromer; sites haven't been assessed for their suitability to provide sports facilities or a Care Home including the proposed site C22/1. There is no comprehensive approach taken to development in Cromer like in Fakenham and North Walsham. One member of the public raises concern over the lack of evidence to demonstrate that sites rolled over from the previous plan are deliverable. Two new sites proposed in Roughton.
Summary of Support	1	One support. Recognises the benefits of allocating land immediately adjacent to built up areas, but should be with defensible boundaries rather than ribbon development resulting in the coalescence of settlements.
Summary of General Comments	6	The comments suggest that housing should be phased and new sites should be on a reserve list until existing allocated sites have been developed. One respondent points out that a housing trajectory hasn't been included and suggests that smaller unconstrained sites (including site C16) come forward to boost supply in short term, to allow larger sites to come forward in longer term. The impact of growth in each settlement shouldn't be considered in isolation. Development should be focussed in central locations in order to help reinvigorate town centres and to scrutinise and reduce the amount of development on agricultural land. Priority given to Brownfield Land. Make requirements for allocations over a certain level of housing units to include mixed use (residential and employment) land allocations to give maximum flexibility.
Overall Summary		DS 1 is a generic policy that seeks to allocate the preferred sites "on mass" subject to the separate requirements of each individual site policy. The responses primarily focus on concerns over allocating Greenfield Land for new development and suggested that Brownfield land and the existing housing stock (Extending or bringing empty homes back into use) should be prioritised in order to limit the environmental impact. Housing should be phased and new sites should be on a reserve list until existing allocated sites have been developed. Development should be focussed in central locations in order to help reinvigorate town centres and to scrutinise and reduce the amount of development on agricultural land. Feedback suggest that a more holistic approach is needed for proposals in towns and villages, not just focussing on housing and settlements in isolation. Concerns also raise that there is no comprehensive approach been taken to development in Cromer and sites haven't been assessed for their suitability to provide sports facilities or a Care Home. One respondent points out that a housing trajectory hasn't been included and suggests that smaller unconstrained sites (including site C16) come forward to boost supply in short term, to allow larger sites to come forward in longer term. Concern over the lack of evidence to demonstrate that sites rolled over from the previous plan are deliverable. One respondent supports the policy recognising the benefits of allocating land immediately adjacent to built up areas but without leading to the coalescence of settlements.

Council's Response		The Council is charged with providing sufficient sites to meet identified need. There is very limited brownfield land across the District, suitable sites are identified in the brownfield register. The Local Plan focuses the majority of development closely related to the defined large towns as set out in SD3, to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. Policies H0U2, SD2 and SD3 set out the distribution and type of development required and Policy DS1 seeks to allocate sites required from these policies subject to each specific site policy. The detailed methodology undertaken is set out in Background Paper 6. Settlement considerations including environmental constraints, the potential impact of development on landscape and views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size, the impact on infrastructure and cumulative impact have all been considered when determining the overall housing numbers for each place and the preferred sites. The additional sites put forward in Roughton will need to be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan.

Proposals for Cromer

DS2: Land at Cromer High Station

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS2	C07/2	N/A	N/A	N/A	None received.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS2)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary	No comments received	

DS3: Land at Runton Road / Clifton Park

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS3	C10/1	Adams, Neil Bamford, Mrs Janice Bowyer, Mr Jeff Britton, Mrs Frances Bromley, Miss Jennifer Clarke, Mr Mike Couse, Mrs Irene Dunn, Ms Danika Dunn, Mrs Doreen Hollis, Mr Paul Hollis, Ms Lynette Beall, Mrs V Benedettini, Mrs Jean B, Mansell Prior, Mr Pat Ransome, Mr & Mrs Ratcliffe, Mr Kenneth Sault, Mrs Kathryn Sharp, Mrs Pamela Shaw, Mr & Mrs (1218480 1218392 1218390 1218432 1218431 1218398 1218553 1218554 1218395 1218379 1218482 1218467 1218429 1218558 1218551 1218557 1218399 1209781	LP741 LP780 LP775 LP813 LP812 LP795 LP818 LP819 LP791 LP773 LP743 LP768 LP809 LP822 LP815 LP820 LP796 LP776 LP817 LP793	General Comments Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The site lies within the parish of East Runton. The previous Plan tried to designate this land for development, and that one of the reasons for rejecting it was the desire to prevent continuous development between Cromer and East Runton. I do not believe this development should take place for the reasons listed: • The water treatment works south-west of the site is a source of bad smells. The proposal notes the problem, but we are aware that it will require extensive action on the part of Anglia Water to remedy the situation and increase the capacity of the plant to cope with such a development. Planning developments around such plants are known to be too sensitive to the local situation, especially when such planning involves residential housing and schools. • The site is bordered by 2 main roads and a railway line, hardly a suitable environment for schools and small children • Priority should be for the development of the brownfield Former Structure Flex site, which would involve the removal of contaminated land. • Strongly support the existence of an (unofficial) green belt between Cromer and East Runton, to preserve the identity of East Runton and to provide a distinct boundary to Cromer town. • Although proposed site has good links to the bus and train network, development here would adversely affect the traffic density along the A149 and Clifton Park/Howards Hill/Central Road, creating a "Rat Run" along these roads which were never intended to cope with such traffic density. • Is the government wise to try to push so much new housing onto an area which has few employment opportunities, and slow communications to Norwich and beyond. The councils can build all the houses they wish, but if people don' t want to move here for work then they are creating problems for themselves - the majority of incomers will be retirees who will put additional pressure on our GPs, hospitals and social services. • Although we have a brand new GP surgery, it has not attracted medical staff to come and work here and the practice is still understaffed. An increased population will make matters worse. • Many of the residents of Clifton Park were attracted to the area because it was on the edge of town, with easy access to the countryside. One of the selling points of North Norfolk is its attractive towns and villages, and access to beach and countryside is an important factor. We have spoken to a number residents who would seriously consider moving away if this access is made more difficult. • The site itself increases the biodiversity of the area, being an area of heathland which provides a habitat for many species of birds and animals. Bats, Skylarks and Newts have been noted there in the past. • The site is enjoyed by dog walkers who enjoy the paths around the site, and for those living or camping nearby who wish to walk north to the coast or south to the Co-op and other retail outlets on Middlebrook Way. • Previous housing developments have been to the South of the town, where future pupil number would be derived from. Placing a school on C10 to the West of the town would increase the already often gridlocked traffic flow through the town centre several times a day. • Any proposal to build a "Two Form Entry" Primary School on this land flies in the face of known existing

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
		1218632 1218587)			capacity in the current educational establishments. More so, given the recent County Council investment at Suffield Park Infants and Nursery School. Indeed the District Council's attention was drawn to this and previous anomalies when this site was postulated in the last local development consultation. • the housing and infrastructure is meant to withstand a "once in 30 years' storm. However, the impact of global warming seems to indicate (a) that these storms will become more severe and (b) that they will occur more frequently than every 30 years. This puts greater volumes of water into the ground at one time than has previously been the norm. This is a real danger to the stability of the cliffs and accelerating coastal erosion. In 2004 one of the reasons that planning permission was refused on this site was because of the danger of flooding during a 30 year storm. • This portion of the coast is not in the area scheduled for protection in the Shoreline Management Plan. The Plan itself is working on models for sea level rise which are already being superseded and it would be unwise to build anything new so close to the coast. Ally development here should not go ahead without substantial investment in coastal defences, or including the section of the coast between Cromer and East Runton into the existing Shoreline Management Plan.
DS3	C10/1	B, Mansell (1218558)	LP822	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** •In the summer time it takes a considerable time to get out to the Runton Road. This will obviously increase if this proposed building development goes ahead. •The proposed Primary School will also increase this traffic onto the Runton Road. It appears the school will be on the apex of the hill which is bad enough now with cars parked on the verge restricting the width of the road. When parents start bringing or collecting their children from school this will be particularly dangerous area. •There are several footpaths across this site which walkers use to avoid the traffic fumes from lorries, busses and cars using the busy Runton Road when walking to East or West Runton. It is a quiet and safe way to reach these villages. •There should be a natural green belt between Cromer and East Runton otherwise it will end up with an urban sprawl and a loss of this countryside forever.
DS3	C10/1	Beall, Mrs V (1218467)	LP768	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I strongly oppose this site my reasons: being it is in an area of natural beauty used by so many locals and holiday makers. We have wildlife such as fox, muntjack deer, hedgehog (serious decline) plus many many more this is without insect life, and bees.
DS3	C10/1	Benedettini, Mr Nathan (1217266)	LP310 LP312	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Objection to proposed development of greenfield site adjacent to Clifton Park for housing and primary school. Plan identifies these facts: i) the area adjacent to Clifton Park is a greenfield site; ii) it is adjacent to a recognised Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; iii) there is a need to retain existing green spaces. Yet the plan contradicts itself insomuch as it proposes to develop this greenfield site for housing needs and a primary school. Many consider this site part of the wider local area of natural beauty. Many people (in the summer this can be in excess of one hundred people daily) use this land for walking, dog walking and exercise. Provides accessible green space away from car and noise pollution, surrounded by plants and wildlife. Provides a means of access between Cromer and East Runton that avoids having to walk along roads and inhale car fumes. Important as

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					the coastal path is not available to walk directly due to holiday parks, i.e. to walk the coastal route requires walking along the road in part at least. Used bu wide range of wildlife including hedgehogs, deer, foxes, birds and amphibians. Improves well-being and manage the stress of daily living. MIND's report on ecotherapy; identifies the benefits to mental wellbeing from being able to taking walks outdoors, the benefits to services of such activities as limiting the need and demand on local primary care services and wellbeing services. This will create an urban sprawl from Cromer into East Runton, removing their separate identities as towns and villages, placing ever-increasing demands on already over-stretched infrastructure, and changing the uniqueness and appeal of Cromer's identity itself. It states that the Education Authority has indicated that the levels of housing proposed in Cromer will necessitate the provision of a new Primary School. There is no current need for a new primary school - the need is created by the proposed housing development. This is where the plan is flawed. It focuses on developing Cromer as a large town in contradiction to identifying the need to maintain and protect Cromer's natural beauty. As the town is developed, it will lose that identity which is its unique draw. The town relies on tourism and its appeal is its identity as a quintessential English seaside town that has not been subject to overdevelopment as other towns. It has a uniqueness, for instance, the local shops are not chain-stores as in other English towns. As a large town; will attract national/international chains to compete for local shopping development. This development would place further demands on local infrastructure that are operating at or above capacity already, such as the local water and drainage facilities, the coastal road through East Runton that is often blocked due to its narrow width, the Cromer one-way system that is at standstill at certain points each day, and the local GP surgery at Cromer where it is difficult to get urgent appointments due to staffing despite its recent expansion. Proposed expansion of Cromer is at a time when there are calls to take a stand for the planet and curb climate change. The plan does not benefit the local environment. It is proposed to meet national guidance on housing need. This government is going to change soon. Its priorities will change. And a key change will be greater focus on our climate. NNDC need to take a stand and do what is right for the environment. Do not need more housing and a school. Need to protect what we have and limit exploitation of the natural environment that locally we treasure, and which itself is the draw of the North Norfolk coast to tourists. Must protect green spaces at all cost to limit the impact of climate change, to maintain local ecosystems, and maintain this area as a beacon for outstanding natural beauty.
DS3	C10/1	Benedettini, Mrs Jean (1218429)	LP809	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I note the proposed site is also outside the catchment area for Cromer Group Practice. Some species are already endangered such as the native hedgehogs that are seen on this land.
DS3	C10/1	Benson, Mr Roger (1216144)	LP167	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Object to infilling between the two settlements. Cause significant traffic congestion in Cromer and East Runton. It is unsustainable in transport terms the development will change the character and views from and to the AONB which is close to the site and looks over it towards the sea. Will remove the one last bit of gap between the settlements and make this part of the AONB into a land locked area without views to the sea which aren't over a vast suburban sprawl. Affect numbers of way and public open spaces (such as Incleborough Hill) which will have their views of the Coast. The development is neither needed nor sustainable - it will not supply the social housing which Cromer needs

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS3	C10/1	Bridgman, Mr Chris (1216497)	LP195	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Object to the inclusion of this piece of Land in East Runton **L**and is in East Runton -it should not even be being considered. Would close the gap between Cromer and East Runton (which will be detrimental to the tourist trade which keeps the shops open in East Runton). Contrary to the NNDC stated aim of ensuring that different settlements are kept separate and would spoil the village location of East Runton. Sites R07 and C24 (within 30 yards) have been rejected because they spoil the surrounding countryside. This is inconsistent. In the 1960s it was ruled that this was an important piece of land in maintaining the character of the settlements of Cromer and East Runton especially with the prominent housing at Wyndham Park. Rejected in the past due to proximity to the Treatment works which is under an abatement notice at the moment. It is not suitable for housing. Not clear who is intending to pay for these properties as it seems unlikely that anyone would wish to spend money to buy properties with an immediate view of the treatment works. The Treatment works cannot cope with what it is asked to do now, and there are problems with smells - why build next to a known public nuisance? Rejected in the past due to proximity to the railway line. This has not changed and it is not a suitable location for a school. No mention made of the Bridle Path across the site which has to be maintained. Only two footpaths are mentioned whereas there are five in regular use. Mill Lane is a narrow road and not suitable for access to a school. No potential to widen it or put in pavements. Dangerous for infant children to be walking to school this way even with their parents. It is important to maintain the whole of this area as an entrance to Cromer not just the bottom part of the field. No proper plan for traffic management. The coast road is already busy especially during the summer. Appears to have been submitted in order to obtain planning permission only - the school and self build housing being the carrots. After that any builder could apply to vary. The land is outside the development boundary of the town.
DS3	C10/1	Bridgman, Mrs Margaret (1216419)	LP192	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Object to the inclusion of this piece of land which is in East Runton. The land is not in Cromer - It is in East Runton which is not indicated in the plan – therefore there should be no building here. Important in providing a distinct gap between Cromer and East Runton. Development would erode the distinction between the two. East Runton is a rural village and wish to maintain this and not become another Suffield Park. Quotes 11.10 BP 7. The importance of this land in providing a gap was stated in the ruling in the sixties which pointed to the proximity of the houses at Wyndham Park which would mean that any building would destroy the obvious separation of the two settlements. East Runton relies heavily on tourism. Has a unique mix of rural and seaside setting and the prospect of coming to something which is just part of a larger resort is a completely different experience which could have an adverse effect on trade. 2003, Council rejected building on this land because of the proximity of the Treatment Works and the Railway Line. The Treatment works has an abatement order on it at the moment. It is unsuitable to deliberately place housing and a school next to a known public nuisance. The proximity of the railway line makes it unsuitable for the location for a school Increase in traffic on the A149 which is already very busy during the summer months. Mill Lane is not suitable for an increase in traffic taking people to their houses or to and from the infant school. It is a country lane without pavements. Children walking along it on their own would be in danger. No scope to widen the road so that pavements could be introduced. The treatment works cannot cope with the sewage during the summer now and is ill prepared for an increase in the number of users. No coherent plan to deal with the

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					extra traffic that will be generated other than to say that the site is within walking distance of Cromer Station. Risks changing the entire character of the area and entirely spoiling the rural nature of East Runton. Does not bring sufficient benefits to justify the risk.
DS3	C10/1	Britton, Rev Tim (1210259)	LP095	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** That the land at Runton Road/ Clifton Park should be removed from the local plan. 1)Provides a gap between the settlements of Cromer and East Runton. Policy ENV 1 states: 'Development proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance: ...2) gaps between settlements, and their landscape settings.' The development of this site would remove that gap, not protect or conserve it. It is undeliverable. a) If at least 2 of the 8 hectares is to be used for a school, that means only 6 hectares are available for housing, open space, and buffer zones north and south and along the existing footpaths. The land at Howards Hill coloured green is just over .2 hectares. Nearly the same amount of land is covered in woodland, which paragraph 8.31 states should either be retained or compensated for. The buffer zones are unspecified, but also reduce the amount of land available. Although 90 dwellings seems very low density per hectare, the shape of the site and the need for road access to the dwellings and the school means that where houses are built the density would have to be very much out of keeping with the surrounding area. b) The plan recognises the need for any developer to deal with rerouting the sewage pipes. It also recognises that Anglia Water would have to upgrade their treatment plant to cope with the increased need, and that any developer would have to mitigate exposure to smells. Residents bordering the site already suffer from exposure to smells at times; new houses on the site would be closer to the source so an upgrade would be essential. Would a developer commit to development before the upgrade happened and its effectiveness assessed? And would Anglia Water commit to an upgrade before the development was certain? It might be possible; but the risks make the deliverability far from certain. 3) The proposal for about 90 homes is unnecessary - despite the central government's plans. The need for new homes is to house the homeless and provide affordable homes within range of employment. Building homes to enable people to retire beside the seaside is not a priority, and Cromer is not the best place to provide homes within range of employment - unless there is a remarkable move to provide a lot of employment away from the big cities.
DS3	C10/1	Broome, Mr Trevor (1210902)	LP096	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Removal of this proposal from the Draft Plan . Sits outside the Cromer boundary and forms part of the Parish of East Runton forming a valuable green amenity and what is critically, a natural break between the village of East Runton and Cromer Town, in an area of natural beauty, with a pedestrian link along Mill Lane. Been the subject of several applications to develop for housing and has continually been rejected as an inappropriate site for this purpose, fully supported by the Runton Parish Council and NNDC, so why the change? Landscape is distinctive in its character; supports many forms of wild life and provides a haven for those living in the area and holidaymakers alike to walk their dogs and to enjoy the peace and tranquillity that this area provides. The site is totally inappropriate for a development of this magnitude and a school, as the adjoining road infrastructure cannot possibly support the amount of increased vehicle movements that will access the A149 from housing and school alike, along an already heavily congested route in and out of Cromer and East Runton, especially at holiday periods when traffic volumes are high and access to and from all the caravan sites along the Runton Road is required. Furthermore, with a single carriage way through the village of East

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					Runton, which creates a massive backlog of traffic through the summer months, safety of pedestrians and especially children is already of great concern and can only increase. Further concerns are the smells emanating from the AW Plant that adjoins this site and the noise from the railway along the Bittern Line, both occurring on a regular basis. What impact will this large development have upon our already stretched GP services, where patient numbers are already incredibly high and waiting time for appointments ever increasing.
DS3	C10/1	Brownsell, Mr Andrew (1209759)	LP008	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Jobs, houses, improved infrastructure required but not at expense of protecting Cromer's natural environment and communities way of life and health. • Vital that we protect and enhance Cromer's unique natural environment – green space and woodland must be protected – use of green spaces and woodland enhances people's wellbeing • Protect Cromer as an important tourist destination, by protecting and enhancing the natural, green and historic areas • homes and jobs are needed, but this should not be at the expense of current local communities' way of life • improved infrastructure for transport is needed, but this should not be at the expense of current local communities' environmental health (such as increased emissions) • increased emissions has negative effects on the fragile natural environment, such as Cromer's coastal area and cliffs – resulting in negative climate change effects such as coastal erosion
DS3	C10/1	Brownsell, Mrs Caroline (1216042)	LP153	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Raise objection to the proposed development at C10/1 No division between East Runton and Cromer. Totally destroy the beauty of the local coastal area which people from near and far enjoy. Please refuse this planning for future generations to enjoy.
DS3	C10/1	Burge, Ms Sue (1210530)	LP050	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** -Unsuitability of Mixed use Runton Road/Clifton Park land for building development. East Runton and Cromer are separate and provides land which enhances its attraction for tourists and locals. Important for birds and wildlife, a green area which attracts many people and adds to the Cromer cliff-front from an aesthetic point of view.- highways -an increase in traffic on a road which is already congested and which has three bus services running along it, all of which are likely to be delayed with an additional 100+ cars seeking access onto Runton Road/Coast Road. Buses are essential to reducing emissions and pollution and serve both tourists and the local community and support a significant non-car owning population. Additional negative emissions will be considerable and are likely to cause health problems.- are there enough jobs in Cromer to support such a development. If this new population need to travel distances to work then clearly roads will become congested at key times.- Converting empty houses/shops etc in town would help to provide central and attractive accommodation.
DS3	C10/1	Cahill, Mr Bernard (1215877)	LP136	Object	to object to the proposal at C10 (land at Runton road/Clifton park) because this is one of the last greenfield sites of this size available to the local population as an open space for recreational purposes e.g. jogging, dog-walking, exercising and rambling . This plot of land lays in the village of East Runton and must not be annexed to a Cromer proposal. The document states that the Education Authority would prefer this site in order to serve the runtons area but i find this justification far too flimsy for such an important piece of property. This section of land is traversed by two paths that extend throughout the site together with a further path (north/south) that are used by many people for social purposes but also to avoid the main roads to Cromer

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					and East Runton. The erection of 90 additional houses in this area will result in additional security fears for Anglian water and the Railway authority in addition to a steep escalation in the number of complaints to the local authority about the fowl odours from Anglia Water, given the prevailing winds.90 dwellings could be accommodated in 3 or 4 blocks of apartments on the brownfield site at Runton road near shipden Avenue.
DS3	C10/1	Cole, Mr Geoffrey (1215904)	LP134	Object	Removal of this site from the proposals being considered for development for the reasons given ~This land is in East Runton and not Cromer, and provides the gap between Cromer and East Runton. The development of this site would remove this gap. ~The land currently provides a valuable green amenity and a natural break between the village of East Runton and Cromer in an area of outstanding natural beauty. ~I note the wording 'approximately 90 dwellings' - whereas documentation from the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party of 21st May states a consideration suitable for 90-120 dwellings and a primary school - is this the correct figure? ~I believe that this land is covered by 'half year rights' - and therefore cannot be built upon without the risk of litigation ~There are already concerns about traffic volume which is high especially during holiday periods. This type of development will only exacerbate the situation and cause even greater backlogs of traffic through the village of East Runton increasing the safety concerns of pedestrians and especially children. ~Are you wanting to discourage tourism to the area - as this will certainly have a detrimental effect on this... ~This site is an important asset to local people and visitors who regularly walk there and enjoy the open space it provides ~The site is an important resource for migratory birds which nest and feed on the land, and has become a wildlife sanctuary for rabbits, deers, foxes, lizards, grass snakes, bats and butterflies. The land also has an abundance of plant life - some of which are also becoming rare. ~The document states a requirement by central government to build a certain number of houses - however, I am aware that this number has been downgraded ~it is unwise to build so close to the coast with the known rise in sea levels and the danger of flooding and ongoing current concerns about the stability of the cliffs opposite this site.
DS3	C10/1	Cole, Mrs Teresa (1209821)	LP013	Object	Removal of this site from your listing of proposed developments. ~This land forms the critical gap between East Runton and Cromer. As this land (Muckle Hill) is in East Runton doesn't that mean that under the 'Settlement Hierarchy' this land should only be considered for small scale developments? ~Development of this land would have a negative effect on the quality of the landscape by reducing the rural character leading into East Runton Village, and there is a great need to protect the natural beauty and character of this area. ~There is concern that services will not be available to support the planned housing developments . ~I have real concerns about the increased risk of surface water flooding to the area once this becomes a housing development and the risk of surface water flooding to the adjoining surrounding areas. ~It will not be a pleasant walking journey to any school on the site and I am sure many children will be brought to school by cars via the already congested town and village roads. ~Road safety will definitely be an issue as there will be a definite increase in the volume of traffic not only through the town to access the school, but in general.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					~Do you really want children to be playing in an open space next to a railway line amidst the chemical output from the treatment works? This plant can be very noisy – is running 24 hours a day – and produces some unpleasant odours which have a direct output to Muckle Hill. ~The landscape at Muckle Hill is quite distinctive in character consisting mainly of bushes, and grasslands with natural footfall pathways throughout - and supports a variety of animals and wildlife. The loss of this natural habitat is of concern. ~This land is special to the community providing a tranquil natural resource, rich in wildlife which does not have to be accessed 'out of town'
DS3	C10/1	Cooper, Mr & Mrs Sheila & John (1218417)	LP732	Object	~it would a great shame and very short sighted of the council to include this last remaining piece of green land in the development plan to be built on. It would trigger the urban sprawl along the coast road joining East Runton to Cromer and increase the amount of traffic using the A149 coast Road which is almost to capacity most of the time already ~Can the Doctors schools Hospital and the AWA sewage plant cope with the influx of people. ~We lived on Clifton Park for many years and the odour from the AWA sewage plant was for most of the holiday season unbearable we were unable to use the garden and had to close all the windows. ~This piece of land is full of wildlife all of which would lose their habitat. ~Many dog walkers use the fields, if they were built on these people Would be road walking or getting their cars out to go elsewhere. ~Building homes and a school near a railway line is not the best idea kids will try to play on the railway however high you put the fence. ~There is a bridle way across the land and a lane which goes from Cromer to Runton they would have to remain. ~With the climate changing and the seas getting higher and stormed predicted to be more violent the Runton Road car park may not be there for ever, this is the only open land left on the coast.
DS3	C10/1	Crisp, Mr Geoffrey Crisp, Mr Geoffrey Crisp, Mrs Helen (1215929 1215929 1215913)	LP138 LP740 LP151	Object Object	Make a nature conservation area. ~I do not approve of the proposed development plans for the land referred to as "at Runton Road/Clifton Park". ~The loss of yet more green space that is constantly used by locals and visitors. The Runton Road field is by far more a car park than an open recreational area. ~The loss of habitat for wildlife and birds such as the Skylark (they nest on the ground in that field), Woodpeckers, Thrushes, Whitethroats and other Warblers and many other little birds that are on the RSPB red list. Muntjac deer also inhabit the field. ~The effect on holiday makers who will no longer have lovely views from the camp sites on Sandy Lane looking out towards the sea and for the visitors in the caravan parks looking out onto a lovely green space. Both will look either over or at houses. Not the views they spend their money every year to see. Hardly fair to jeopardise the very income the town relies so heavily on. ~The ability of the sewer farm to cope with yet more sewage. I would expect the council to conduct a full and very, very, very thorough investigation as to the ability of the present farm to cope with yet more washing machines, baths, showers, toilets etc. pumping into its system. this is next to the Cromer sewage treatment

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					plant, this plant has a history of being both noisy and smelly at times and lorries coming and going at all times of day and night. I would not build houses or a school on this land. ~Access to the site is concerning too. Where will the access be Will it be off the Runton Road, or via Fulcher Avenue or will it be via Clifton Park. Clifton Park is already an much busier road with lots of traffic using it as a short cut to Morrisons. ~What of our local families on Cromer's housing waiting list. Will any social housing be offered to them ~Light Pollution. Another very sensitive issue these days. There is already so much light coming from caravan parks up and down the road that nighttime hardly ever happens. ~it is very important to keep this green space between Cromer and East Runton. I think its important to locals and visitors alike. And important to East Runton too. It would be a dreadful shame if East Runton became a suburb of Cromer. ~It is a very diverse little patch of land which could even be made into a nature reserve ~The development of this land is unnecessary The development of 90 properties and a primary school is not viable. There is not enough room The development of 90 properties and a primary school is unnecessary
DS3	C10/1	Cullen, Miss Margaret (1215682)	LP140	Object	remove c10/1 from plan push any new housing inland in less prominent sites. ~no housing/schools on what's left of our beautiful coastal strip. ~No to C10/1. A green and natural area for quiet and peaceful recreation by residents and holidaymakers alike. ~The view from the train as it comes around the curve into Cromer looks right down this shallow valley and out to sea. It is uplifting and glorious for all our visitors and a wonderful welcome to our town. ~If is it necessary for more houses do it inland where it will not impact on the very reasons why people want to be here in the first place. "remove c10/1 from plan push any new housing inland in less prominent sites"
DS3	C10/1	Cullen, Mr Chris (1216505)	LP197	Object	Preserve the Runton Road/Clifton Park area. ~It seems ironic that at the same time the people of Cromer are fighting for better mental health services for the area, there is the threat of taking away aspects of the locality that aid the community's well-being e.g. walking in green spaces, connecting with nature. ~Environmentally, bringing people to an area where employment opportunities are scarce can only mean more road use. ~East Runton will effectively become a suburb of Cromer if this development proceeds, which will kill the village atmosphere. "Preserve the Runton Road/Clifton Park area."
DS3	C10/1	Cushion, Mr Brian (1210093)	LP030	Object	Removal of site from the Local Plan. ~Consider this site has too many disadvantages to be considered as an appropriate development area of this nature. ~the site is not adjacent to Runton Road, Cromer. It is on Cromer Road, East Runton and wholly within the parish of Runton. This misleading naming can only be an attempt to deceive local residents. ~It is understood that Primary Schools in Cromer are under subscribed, and given the proposals for considerable development off the Norwich Road, it would seen more appropriate to consider further spaces for that scenario.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					~The site is currently open space of a scrubby grassland nature, but serves as an important buffer between Clifton Park and more intensively used land in East Runton. It has become an area for regular dog walkers and any development would also destroy any ecological elements which must have accrued since its change from agricultural land as seen on 1988 Air Photographs. ~It is rather grotesque that as the existing Clifton Road development provides a harsh edge to the urban area, it is in Runton parish that it is proposed to alleviate this by a carbuncle-like development. ~This proposal would easily be a precedent for further linear development along the A149. ~The suggestion that the development should be set back from the Sewage Works, whilst superficially obvious, does not detract from the fact that undesirable smells that emanate from it, do extend well into the site with the prevailing wind. Any further development of the facility is likely to further exacerbate this situation. ~I would submit that you are deliberately underplaying the "limited constraints" on the site. ~No mention is made of the obvious increase in traffic along an already heavily over-used A149, especially in East Runton, hardly an encouragement for sustainability. "Removal of site from the Local Plan. The only acceptable option would be a low-key i.e., undeveloped open space."
DS3	C10/1	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1217309)	LP427	Object	1. Selection of this site goes against the long held desire to maintain an undeveloped gap between Cromer and E. & W. Runton – this is ignored in the Conclusion. 2. A school in this location would confirm and compound the joining of Cromer with East Runton 3. The site is currently a valued space for informal recreation 4. The conclusion suggests The site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal. This statement applies to many other Cromer sites, including those not identified as Preferred Options, for example: C11; C18; C19; C19/1; C34; C44. Furthermore, the summary assessment in the SA is inconsistent – see detailed comments on SA. 5. The conclusion suggests "This is considered to be one of the most sustainable and suitable of the Cromer alternatives". There is no evidence for this conclusion, particularly as it is noted as not being in walking distance of schools and has risk of flooding.
DS3	C10/1	Edmonds, Mr Philip (1218478)	LP788,	Object	Keep as open space corridor This area east Runton NOT suitable development. No increase capacity Anglian Water Sewage Plant. No detailed environmental survey this site e.g. Rare Sandy Heath between Coast and ESKER. Entrances to site unlikely to be sanctioned Norfolk Highways – The A149 should not have to cope with a school esp 'primary' and houses This area south of the A149 will no longer be available for caravan sites to the north of A149 have missed something large number houses built Northrepps / towards Roughton why build a school other side of town. Site to be left as heathland/natural area/civic amenity.
DS3	C10/1	Empson, Mr & Ms Michael & Isabel (1218559)	LP823	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** We, the undersigned, used to live, a very few years ago, at Howards Hill West and Howards Hill Close, respectively. We know that the late Mr Clifton intended, but never did, build on the land adjacent to Clifton Park. Which land we believe, is actually in the Parish of East Runton. It had crops grown on it at one time, and we know that it is now mess. (It needs the Bagot goats on it!) WE ARE AGAINST BUILDING HOUSES ON IT BECAUSE IT WOULD JOIN CROMER TO EAST RUNTON. At the moment it is a green space between the two. Also building a Primary School on the very steep land by the Railway line, where there is a look-out defence Bunker left from the

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					War, is to us not a good idea at all. We have often walked the footpath adjacent to the Old Zoo Site and the footpath that runs along the bottom of that land, on the edge of the Railway Embankment, has never felt safe. We would think a School on that bit of land would have to be built on stilts. We understand that only a few of the Clifton Park Residents received an informal plan of what it proposed. We also understand that you may not have had a formal planning application, but WE ARE DEFINITELY NOT IN FAVOUR
DS3	C10/1	Fleming, Mr Thomas, Fleming Mrs Hazel. (1215937, 1210090, 1218382, 1217356)	LP145, LP028, LP774, LP339	Object Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** Site to be left as heathland/natural area/civic amenity. • The proposal is located within close proximity to the water treatment plant and is a source or bad smells. The issue has been noted but Anglian Water would be required to remedy the situation. • Priority should be the development of the old Structure Flex site, to the east of Clifton Park. This is a brownfield site, the development of which would probably involve the removal of contaminated land, but would be easier and preferable to the work needing to be done on the proposed site. • Support the existence of an unofficial green belt between Cromer and East Runton, to preserve the identity of East Runton village and to provide a distinct boundary to Cromer town. • Although the proposed site has good links to the bus and train network, we believe that a development here would adversely affect the traffic density along the A149 and Clifton Park/Howards Hill/Central Road, creating a "rat run" along these roads which were never intended for such traffic density. Previous housing developments have been to the south of the town. Placing a school here to the west of the town would increase the already often gridlocked traffic flow through the town several times a day. Further the roads and train track do not provide a safe environment for children. • We question whether the government is wise to try to push so much new building onto an area which has few employment opportunities and slow communications to Norwich and beyond. The councils can build all the houses they wish, but if people don't want to move here for work then they are creating problems for themselves as the majority of incomers will be retirees who will put additional pressure on our GPs, hospitals and social services. Please note that the properties on the Parkview development are not selling. • Although we have a brand new GP surgery, it has not attracted medical staff to come and work here and the practice is still understaffed. An increase in population will make matters worse. Also, the one NHS dental practice in Cromer is full and the waiting list for this practice was closed over a year ago and is still currently not taking new patients or allowing them to register on a waiting list. Mobile phone reception in this area is patchy. Also fibre broadband is currently at full capacity, with no sign of new high speed fibre junction boxes being installed in the near future. • Many of the residents of Clifton Park were attracted to the area because it was on the edge of town with easy access to the countryside. One of the selling points of North Norfolk is its attractive towns and villages, and access to the beach and countryside is an important factor for health and wellbeing. A number of residents would seriously consider moving away if this access is made more difficult. The properties in Clifton Park are mainly inhabited by retired people. It is a quiet residential area. The building work will cause noise and disruption for a prolonged period of time. Once building work has been completed, the traffic flow along Runton Road and Clifton Park/Howards Hill will be greatly increased. This will lead to increased pollution and noise. The site itself increases the biodiversity of the area, being an area of heathland which provides a

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					habitat for many species of birds, animals and insects. Skylarks, newts and bats have been noted there in the past. • The site is enjoyed an amenity by dog walkers who enjoy the paths around the site, and for those living or camping nearby who wish to walk north to the coast or south to the Co-Op and other retail outlets on Middlebrook Way. • Loss of wildlife habitat, green space, trees and general rural outlook. Although this area is scrubland, it is an important wildlife habitat and green space. There are also many trees here. This area is also well used by dog walkers and holidaymakers from the caravan parks. I would like to see this area retained as a designated wildlife area. Loss of pleasant outlook for the caravan sites and potential loss of tourism. The caravan sites will look onto a housing estate instead of a green space. • Danger of flood risk and cliff erosion. • This portion of the coast is not in the area scheduled for protection in the Shoretime Management Plan. The Plan itself is working on models for sea level rise which are already being superseded and it would be unwise to build anything new so close to the coats. Any development here should not go ahead without substantial investment in coastal defences. • There are very few full-time employment opportunities in Cromer and the surrounding area. Any work available is seasonal. • Is there a need for more housing in Cromer?
DS3	C10/1	Goodliff, C (1218421)	LP744	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The land has been used for a long time as a kind of common by local people. It is a community asset where residents meet each other regularly and where they take strolls several times a day, with or without their dogs. It is an asset not only for people who live here all year around, but also for many people from the adjacent caravan parks. The climate often makes walking impossible along the coast because of high winds; and it is at times like this that people need to resort to a place that is more protected, but open (so as to avoid being hit by branches). Particularly for the elderly residents the area is a great asset, as they often cannot embark on longer walks on one of the footpaths. It is also one of the few areas where dog owners can safely let their dogs off the leash. In short, it would be a great loss of the community living here, if the site were developed.
DS3	C10/1	Hall, Mrs Zoe (1218468)	LP769	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Strongly object to this proposal. I walk here with my dogs, as do other people. It is a beautiful natural area with many types of wild flowers and birds. There are a lot of bushes and undergrowth for small mammals to live and for birds to nest in. Far from being a building site it should be an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Would be detrimental to Cromer to have a large estate here. Would possibly mean 180 cars. Access to this site would be solely from the east/west Runton Road; only on route in and out. Main road and town is already congested enough, especially at Carnival time. There would be more pollution. I do not think that every pocket of land between small towns should be developed. We need open spaces. Even large towns have parks. Visitors come to this coast is because of the natural beauty. Opposites this field is a holiday park. Their outlook would be spoilt. The town benefits from and relies on visitors. Lot of people come to Cromer because it is not over-populated or built up. We should preserve the coastal area. P.S. I forgot to mention facilities for Doctors and Schools.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS3	C10/1	Han Harrold, Mrs Sau (1218405)	LP797	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** See rep ID P780 above . Plus additional comments: • Building on Greenfield Land when a more appropriate Brownfield site is available nearby – the old Structure Flex site. • Building beyond the existing built up area of Cromer • East Runton should be preserved, as this is very important to their respective identities. • The Plan acknowledges that the existing infrastructure is inadequate for the increased population and that a new Primary School will be required. I contend that this inadequacy of infrastructure could also encompass medical facilities (GP's, hospitals), social services and roads.• Currently a well utilised public open space enjoyed by many including dog walkers and bird watchers from Clifton Park and further afield. • Provision of public open space is essential for the health and well-being of the existing population. • Development of this scale would destroy this area of open space and not leave any meaningful spaces for enjoyment of nature.• Open land at Howards Hill is inadequate as it is inaccessible expect for one narrow path. • Dwellings should be for local people only to avoid an unmanageable population increase. • Two footpaths crossing through a housing estate do not compensate for the loss of a large area of natural habitat. • any "areas of scrub and grassland" retained will be so small as to be rendered meaningless.• The AONB will be adversely affected, there is a rich variety of bird and animal here including Kestrels, owls and woodpeckers. • Expensive mistake to build school and housing close to Water Recycling Centre: Health issues and potential lawsuits, could be a breach to duty of care. • Enhancements to the foul sewage network will be expensive and ultimately may still be inadequate.
DS3	C10/1	Hawkes, Mrs Victoria (1217707)	LP664	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Removal of this site from the draft local plan. Would be a tragedy to lose yet another piece of grass and scrubland which is enjoyed by many people who walk their dogs or use the footpaths both locals and visitors. The land is natural vegetation that flourishes unchecked providing a wonderful habitat for many species of wildlife. Crossing this corridor of land when walking between Cromer and East Runton is much more attractive than using the concrete footpath that runs by the very busy coast road where there is constant traffic. The intrusion development would spoil the feeling of leaving the town behind and being in the countryside by effectively joining Cromer with East Runton. '"research showed a two-hour dose of nature a week – spending time in parks, woodland or on the beach – significantly boosts health and wellbeing" and "powerful healing qualities" of being in a natural setting, "We are increasingly finding that the richness in biodiversity of a setting seems to be important' This is particularly pertinent when there is so much focus on mental health and wellbeing. The creep of houses and a school on this richly diverse piece of land would be totally detrimental to the amenities that this land provides.
DS3	C10/1	Hill, Mrs Janet (1216125)	LP164	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** This development is inappropriate in this location. Generate a colossal amount of traffic through the Town of Cromer and village area of East Runton (as all traffic will enter and exit the site via the Coast Road) - both these areas are beyond capacity for the road network to cope with and frequently become significant 'jams'. Development is unsustainable in transport terms The development will have a significant adverse impact on the AONB as although it is located just outside the boundary of the AONB, the rising land to the south and west is crossed by numbers of public rights of way and public open spaces (such as Incleborough Hill) which will have their views of the Coast - which is the characteristic defining element of the AONB - substantially adversely

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					impacted by the development of this one remaining open green view of the coast The development will significantly harm the individual characters of the settlements of Cromer and East Runton and make for a large ribbon of coastal sprawl development. The development is neither needed nor sustainable.
DS3	C10/1	Hoad, Mr David (1215907)	LP152	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The removal of C10/1 from the draft plan. A School in a residential area populated by predominantly retired residents is inappropriate. Further the surrounding road system would not support this. In order to fill the School, would need to attract pupils from outside the catchment area thus resulting in more traffic through an often grid locked town centre, along the already overstretched A149, or via Central road/Howards Hill/Clifton Park. The boundary between these 2(3) roads is a narrow, dangerous blind summit. - Access from the two spurs off Clifton Park to any development would prove inadequate for two way traffic, since any further residential development would also result in more traffic. -Junction of Clifton Park with the A149 is effectively a cross road with the existing caravan site. Clearly any additional turning traffic would prove an increased hazard to all. * Presence of the 'unofficial' green belt between E. Runton and Cromer maintains their separate identities. Such a loss would constitute urban sprawl and at the following considerable cost:-Loss of a varied and established wildlife habitat. - Provides access to the shoreline and beach by residents and neighbouring caravan & camping site users, walkers and cyclists as part of a healthy open environment leading to a sense of well-being. - further development would result in an increase in the volume of water running into an unstable cliff top. In the light of inevitable climatic changes and lacking further investment in sea defences, this could lead to disastrous consequences in the future.
DS3	C10/1	Hodges, Mrs Janet (1218470)	LP779	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I walk over there bird watching, to see the butterflies and wild flowers. It's a beautiful quiet place in which to spend time. Please keep it as such. New Zealand are very strict on coastal planning because it destroys the environment. With all the worry of global warming we all have to preserve the wildlife that we have, especially England because it is getting so urban. Friends come here on holiday because of the tranquillity of our area, and the natural beauty. It would totally destroy Cromer to have a building project at the side of the town which would almost link with the lovely village of East Runton. Bearing in mind the pollution angle to have ninety houses would mean so many more cars which would impact of the infrastructure of the town, which is at full capacity now! This main road is already busy enough, but during the summer months and at carnival time it is impossible. Parking is at a premium in the town already. Cromer as a lovely holiday destination. We must maintain our Blue Flag status by restricting more building.
DS3	C10/1	Horsley, Mrs Anna-lise (1216400)	LP190	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I strongly object for these reasons: The government has declared a Climate Emergency. Piece of land is an essential "lung" and green buffer between Cromer and East Runton and is part of an important wild life corridor and vital for nature conservation. The site joins on to an "aonb". Building on this site would spread light, noise and other pollution to the AONB. Traffic would increase and road safety would be affected. Cromer does not have a bypass so the increase in traffic would be dreadful. This site is one of the reasons why people visit Cromer for its unspoilt rural areas, walking, cycling and enjoying nature. To obliterate this large area of natural habitat would be a tragedy. Are there sufficient jobs for all these new residents? The GP practice in Cromer (the ONLY one) is already overstretched. How would the health needs of all these people be met? The houses on

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					this site would be for sale. Cromer needs affordable rentable housing. As jobs in this area are mostly in the low paid service sector many people simply won't be able to afford even the deposit required for a mortgage. Many affordable rentable flats could be created above the shops etc. in Cromer town centre. This site would lead to even more house building or other land use encroaching on to Howards hill. The green area on the plan which incorporates a large area of established trees, ferns, wildflowers and bushes overlooking the railway embankment. Yet more of the essential "lung" could be cut away and destroyed. If all the planned new houses are really needed, there are large fields just outside Cromer where nature has already been pushed out. The topography could allow buildings to be below most sight-lines. Surely these would be more suitable for building land.
DS3	C10/1	Jamieson, Ms SallyAnne (1219330)	LP825	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** You only need to cross Runton Road and there's the start of several lovely walks. Exercise my dog on this piece of land. It is absolutely beautiful in its own right, there's lots of wildflowers and it is a proper English meadow. Building on this site is very short-sighted – being so close to the sea and holiday accommodation, it has to be regarded as a valuable asset for Cromer's lifeblood tourist industry. Honestly, if this wonderful site is going to be built up, I don't think I'll be spending my future holidays in Cromer. And that goes for a lot of other people in the Wyndham site too. Please protect this beautiful and valuable natural asset.
DS3	C10/1	King, Mr David (1209787)	LP137	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Remove C10/1 as a preferred site. C10/1 is an area used by both wildlife and humans alike. An abundance of wildlife can be seen of varying types and sizes on any given visit to this space, similarly, people of all ages and abilities can be found here also. There are no other spaces with such a unique blend of offerings to be found anywhere else within the vicinity. The proposed development will completely remove this space from the landscape, having detrimental outcomes for both the wildlife and local residents. This space currently provides a clear distinction and separation between Cromer and East Runton; in fact, the path along Mill lane is used extensively by both locals and holidaymakers to explore and connect the two locations. This proposed development will effectively join East Runton with Cromer, something that I do not believe has been requested. The addition of the proposed residential homes will bring with them additional vehicles, requiring access to and from the 'estate'. This access would almost certainly be from the coast road, an already busy area at the best of times and even busier during the infamous Cromer Carnival week. This additional traffic would certainly cause havoc on the coast road for locals; visitors and public transport.
DS3	C10/1	King, Mrs Sarah (1215908)	LP135	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Remove C10/1 as a preferred site. If this proposed site were to be implemented then the loss of wildlife habitat would be a devastating loss to the coastal area. There are many species of wildlife which inhabit this area, some of which are rare in the united kingdom. I would propose that a full ecological survey be carried out on all of the species in this designated area before the actual impact of implementing this proposal can be truly considered. This proposal effectively removes the demarcation between East Runton and Cromer meaning that they merge into one much larger area, I feel that this is not a positive step. It will create a loss of identity between the two places and that would be a real shame. The only access to this site would be from the main coast road, this would create a potential for accidents and also put pedestrians at risk. The footpath along this stretch of road between East Runton and Cromer is already well used, an increase in emerging traffic

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					from the proposed development would add significant risk to both pedestrians and emerging vehicles. I also feel that a 2 form entry school would not provide a significant offering to the primary school provision within the area, pupils would not have sufficient time at a provision of this nature before needing to move up the school ladder. They would be far better served to begin the school journey at somewhere they can carry on attending throughout the whole of the primary timeline.
DS3	C10/1	Langbourne, A (1218422)	LP745	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Local people need this space. I am disabled and cannot go far, and to take a stroll along the cliff path in Cromer is too far for me (and others like me); also, it is too built up and often far too crowded with visitors. This is the only area I can go to feel I am close to nature and listen to birds. Also, I would have to give my dog into a shelter if this land were taken away from people living here.
DS3	C10/1	Leigh, Mr Chris (1216481)	LP194	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Leave the green area around Clifton Park undisturbed for future generations. NNDC claim to have agreed that there is a 'climate emergency' and immediate action is required for the sake of future generations. One of these actions must surely be to limit to an absolute minimum the destruction of what little 'green' land is left, such as that at Clifton Park. If more homes are really required then an analysis of the number of empty properties/second homes etc. should be undertaken with the view to making these available to satisfy such requirements.
DS3	C10/1	Mallin, Dr Christine (1217441)	LP534	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** For this land to be protected and preserved as an area of natural beauty. The removal of it as a site allocated for development in the Local Plan. Extremely concerned about proposed development for the following reasons: (i) it forms a natural break between the settlements of Cromer town and East Runton village avoiding urban sprawl. This break helps retain the distinct character of Cromer town and East Runton village. (ii) the site is located within the Coastal Shelf as defined in the LCA and is adjacent to the AONB. Furthermore the site helps provide a further barrier between the coast and inland. (iii) loss of natural habitat for various species of mammals, birds and insects including bats, lizards, deer, foxes, etc. and various birds including birds of prey (such as buzzards and kites). (iv) detrimental impact on flora and fauna, for example, many wildflowers can be observed. (v) loss of the amenity value of this beautiful area which is enjoyed by local residents and tourists alike. The loss of such a beautiful place would have an immediate impact on those living nearby and also on those visiting it, both tourists who bring valuable economic benefits to the town and to local people who recognise its unique character and visit it on a regular basis to enjoy the peaceful environment which it provides. Green spaces where people can walk and enjoy nature are increasingly seen as essential to good mental and physical health and to lose this area would impact negatively on many people. (vi) infrastructure concerns which include - increased traffic in the area should the development go ahead and resultant safety concerns with a potential increase in road accidents - the impact on GP services which are already under heavy pressure- the presence of the sewerage works
DS3	C10/1	Miss Roisin Dunne (1217322)	LP327	Object	Preserve the land. This land is priceless to the town of Cromer. By building upon this land, the natural and authentic essence of Cromer will be lost. It is this that makes Cromer so appealing to tourists and by building on this land, tourism will be dramatically affected which East Runton and Cromer both heavily rely on. This land also creates a distinction between Cromer and East Runton, and by approving these plans both towns

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					will combine into one huge estate which is sure to turn tourists away. Most importantly, Cromer already struggles with traffic and congestion during peak times of the year and it is simply not big enough to allow for a whole new estate to add to these congestion issues. Once this land is lost, it can never be replaced. The preservation of this land is vital to this area and to see it destroyed would negatively impact the surrounding community. There are plenty of other places inland which would be much more suitable.
DS3	C10/1	Mr Martin Bailey (1217357)	LP338	Object	There should be no housing development on this particular site. This small remnant of natural landscape is the last survivor of a once beautiful landscape to the west of Cromer, before the advent of large-scale developments resulting in sprawling suburbia with indifferent architecture and hundreds of holiday homes to the north of the A149. Whilst Cromer is fortunate in being able to offer its visitors splendid beaches, access to the countryside remains poor, although several well-known long-distance footpaths originate in town. The site at Clifton Park/ Runton Road is the starting point for several walks, and has the potential to be much more than it currently is: a somewhat neglected site (neglected by local government), overrun with brambles and one dilapidated structure on its north-east border, where vagrants stay overnight and much rubbish has accumulated over the years. In spite of this state of affairs, the place is much-loved by residents; it is constantly in use by bird watchers, dog walkers, people with prams and children, and visitors from the adjacent holiday home park. The local flora, thriving on the acid sandy soils of this area, provides perfect habitats for a range of rare and endangered species of birds. As the site has been left uncut it provides a plentiful supply of seeds for many species, and the thick thorny nesting cover of the hedges, in particular the blackthorn, bramble and gorse, have up to now ensured that many species have survived in this small area – species that cannot survive in the large-scale industrial farming operations found around Cromer, or in the thinning (not well-maintained) hedges along public footpaths. Many of the birds found at the site are indeed on the RSPB's 'red' species list of conservation importance and are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981: the linnet, sky lark, song and mistle thrush, starling, sparrow are all common sights on this land destined for development. As with all coastal developments nowadays, most of the planned dwellings will in all likelihood be grabbed by second home owners; they won't be permanently used, and so won't be of any benefit to the local community, let alone play any part in solving the housing crisis. On the other hand, removing this last vestige of landscape will result in the removal of a long list of species from the Cromer landscapes. It will also result in the disappearance of a much-loved and much-used asset for local people.
DS3	C10/1	Mr Tony Dyball (1218474)	LP784	Object	I would like to protest against the use of this land for building yet more homes in and around Cromer. This area is a very important piece of land regarding wild life and flowers, etc. I understand there will be up to 90 houses being built on this small area. This would very likely mean 100-150 cars trying to force their way on to the coastal road, which I do not think is acceptable. Could you please give details of how much money out of this deal between the Council, the land owner and the builder will be allocated towards the infrastructure of Cromer to accommodate possible upwards of 200 adults and children. The new surgery is already struggling and Cromer School classrooms are full to capacity, so I assume you will designating some of that land for a new school and surgery, or will you be building them somewhere else? Not only do I think you should not be allocating this very important piece of natural beauty for building purposes, but Cromer has not got the facilities to accommodate another 90 more homes close to the centre of town.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS3	C10/1	O'Shea, Mr Anthony (1217311)	LP323	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The area designated c10/1 should be left as an open space. Object on the grounds of over development on the coast road spoiling an area of outstanding beauty. This proposal would link up Cromer and E. Runton ,ribbon development along the coast as can be seen on our own south coast. Want this remaining green area to be preserved it should never have been put forward as a site for development. If necessary the council should purchase the land for the community.
DS3	C10/1	Pettit, miss claire (1215847)	LP332	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** For the land at Runton Road /Clifton Park be removed from the first draft local plan. For Cromer to lose this special site which provides a natural boundary between it and the village of East Runton would be detrimental in many ways a) loss of an important green space which has been used and enjoyed for years by local and holidaymakers for a variety of uses. Many use it to walk their dogs, as I have done for the last 9 years, it is crossed by several footpaths/rights of way. Green spaces like this are becoming scarce now so this one should be protected and cherished for future generations. It is rich in birds (we have recorded 74 different species), many of which nest here , and wildlife abounds including rare plants such as orchids. Trees + shrubs including elm,walnut, wild damson and sloes. Even wild strawberries grow too . b) To build on this land would pretty much join Cromer to E.Runton. Do we want a coastal sprawl ? c) The water treatment works on the boundary can be noisy and smelly at times d) Raised land in the middle of site provides a viewpoint across the sea and area, also people who arrive by train see the Cromer view not houses ! e) Brownfield sites / infill sites could be used for extra housing without encroaching on the green spaces (When its gone , its too late) f) The old Jewsons site E of Clifton Park, Old doctors surgery site Overstrand Road are examples.
DS3	C10/1	Rahner, Ms (Dr) Chris (1217315)	LP324	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** No housing to be planned for this site. It is a sad fact that in the past, such developments have been given the go-ahead so that at the present moment, only a small strip of natural landscape has survived between Cromer and the plots of land already used or earmarked for further caravan/ camping sites that one passes before reaching East Runton. In addition, on the north side of the road, a mass of 'holiday homes' already covers the landscape. It is hoped, that this precedent is not going to work in favour of, but against the planned 90 dwellings. For several decades, this land has served the surrounding community well, by providing a safe green space for children to be close to nature (as opposed to parks), for the elderly to have a stroll and a place where residents can relax and meet their neighbours. In addition, it has provided the last refuge for many native species of birds (currently 31, according to current surveys sponsored by the NWT (Norfolk Wildlife Trust)), after the adjacent land to the west of it was allowed to be cleared and tarmacked for yet another caravan site. The land is also crossed by public footpaths catering to the ever increasing type of visitor who seeks to spend time in nature and to walk through an attractive countryside. Already many of the long-distance paths are marred by urban/ suburban sections or caravan sites, and they tend to start further and further away from the centre of the holiday resort, necessitating some visitors to use their cars rather than walk to the start of the footpaths. In view of this trend, 'Cromer welcomes walkers' - the official invitation as one drives into the town - is in danger of acquiring a hollow ring. Will Cromer's 'huge panoramas of land..' - as eulogised by the Walk Cromer initiative (https://walkcromer.co.uk) - turn into a coastal sprawl, one town merging with another (as will be the case with Cromer and East Runton if the plan goes ahead)? Cromer is well on the way of concreting over

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					its natural – and therefore also economical - assets. It is hoped that in this instance, common sense will prevail and that the plan to develop the site will be rejected. In addition, the Highway Authority indicated that ' localised highway network improvements associated with each of the proposals will be required' (12.9). Indeed, to service 90 more households, the coastal road would need widening with access points to the new development – which will hardly be consistent with the proclaimed intent to protect the AONB surrounding the town. Even if built, such a road would not be able to cope with the additional traffic generated by yet more development. As a final point, I would like to draw attention to point 12.9 of the Local Plan which states 'There is a general need to improve open space provision including new allotments together with improved access to the countryside'. In my opinion, this site might fulfil to a limited degree, such a requirement. Almost limitless car parking is available across the road, and there are several routes from the town centre to the site. There is no doubt that some gentle 'improvement' of the site in consultation with nature/ wildlife trusts would greatly enhance it for both wildlife and the public, whilst the strip of land adjacent to the coastal road could be reallocated for allotments.
DS3	C10/1	Ratcliffe, Mr Kenneth Shaw, Mr & Mrs (1218399 1218587)	LP796 LP793	Object Object	Also the habitats of thousands of insects and hundreds of other small animals will be disturbed.
DS3	C10/1	Salsbury, Mr Steven Salsbury, Mrs Jill (1210394 1217378)	LP083 LP367	Object Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Object to C10, which is unsuitable because: • it will practically merge East Runton with Cromer having a negative impact on both.• The area, with tracks crisscrossing it, is extensively used by dog walkers, walkers and joggers. It provides a pleasant rural walk to and from East Runton. • it is an important wildlife habitat. - it will increase pressure on services • it will increase the volume of traffic which both Cromer and East Runton would have difficulty in coping with. In East Runton, for example, the coast road is narrow and is a single lane at one point, and is certainly not suited for any increase in traffic. • more noise and pollution. Particularly felt by the Clifton Park residents. Houses there are built to optimise the sea views. The proposed development would not only spoil there view, but the new houses would be overlooked and have no privacy. • loss of scenic beauty. • Replacing this valuable green space with 90 houses and a school would have a dramatic negative visual impact.
DS3	C10/1	Sanders, Ms A (1217671)	LP661	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Consider upgrading the site to a major tourist asset. Pleasant access to several footpaths linking Cromer and the villages to the west of it. Cromer seems to be changing, and not for the better. As a town mainly known as a holiday destination, it is doing very little to make it more attractive to visitors. The only focus seems to be on the beaches. Cromer's weather makes it unpleasant to be by the beach/cliff and dangerous to be in a wood - necessary to offer open countryside attractions inland, within easy walking distance and not along roads! C10 is where one can take a stroll even in a gale. It is a beautiful wild space with a ready-made wildflower meadow where a large number of different species grow without interference by or cost to the Council. A bit of management (e.g. curbing the bramble thickets) would result in creating a major wildlife attraction. Whilst 'open spaces' are supposed to be planned for the housing development, these would invariably be urban, and so much the poorer for it. We hear on a daily basis that children should be encouraged to explore nature, but we seem to

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					be doing the opposite, making it ever more difficult for children to find out about it. This piece of neglected land supports wild lupines, dog rose, yarrow, several species of cranesbill, tormentil, stitchwort, birds' foot trefoil, sheep sorrel, cats-ear, etc.etc, not to mention masses of blackthorn which is magic in the spring with its profuse blossoms and which is inhabited by several blackcaps and whitethroat families. It is in fact surprising that these two species are found so close to human habitation. To destroy all this in order to cover it in houses (some of which will inevitably be second homes, or retirement homes for people who do not actually need accommodation in Cromer) would be very sad.
DS3	C10/1	Sault, Mrs Kathryn (1209781)	LP776	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Also the habitats of thousands of insects and hundreds of other small animals will be disturbed
DS3	C10/1	Saunders, Mr Richard (1215911)	LP149	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Strongly oppose the proposed development on land at Runton Road/Clifton Park and this should be removed from consultation. This proposed development would seriously impact on the health and well-being of the local and tourist community. It is a haven for wildlife and bird life , providing walks accessing the coast and countryside as well as routes to local shops. The area is used by dog walkers, tourists from the caravan parks and the local community. The water treatment plant is in close proximity to the proposed development and the strong smells emitted from this plant are not conducive to building new homes in the vicinity. The boundaries separating the settlements of Cromer and East Runton would be redefined and potentially be a threat to urban sprawl. The volume of local traffic would increase along the Runton Road and Howard's Hill and with an increase in pedestrian activity during the tourist season this could culminate in an issue of road safety. The pressures on infrastructure would be greater with the risk that the local GP surgery and dental surgeries would be unable to cope with the demand.
DS3	C10/1	Saunders, Mrs Susan (1210010)	LP019	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Object strongly to the proposed development. Loss of open space. The site is important to the local landscape, local community,tourists,dog walkers and walkers and the proposed development would result in the loss of open space which is important for its recreational use, rural character and appearance. Threat to wildlife and natural beauty. The local biodiversity would be affected by this proposal. Many species of bird life are prolific in this area including Kestrels, buzzards, sparrowhawks as well as wildlife such as deers and pipistrelle bats whose habitat is possibly in the barn situated on the proposed site. Urban sprawl. The communities of Cromer and East Runton would merge threatening the character and identity of the two settlements. Visual impact. Clifton Park commands an elevated position designed to optimise panoramic sea views for its residents. The majority of properties situated on the perimeter have Juliet balconies, decking and summer houses erected for the purpose of enjoying the environment. The proposed development would be overlooked and privacy for the site would be compromised. Volume of traffic. The number of vehicles accessing Howard's Hill, Clifton Park and Runton Road would significantly increase and during the tourist season the safety of pedestrians would pose a risk from the increase in vehicular activity using the road network. Infrastructure. An increased demand for the provision of local health care from GP and dental surgeries must be taken into consideration as a rise in population asks the question as to whether these services will be sustainable in the future.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS3	C10/1	Shillcock, Mrs Susan (1210562)	LP063	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Oppose the proposed development, this piece of land to be protected and preserved. All land is precious and all aspects of it should be very carefully considered before any irreparable damage is done. Once natural land is altered it is irreversible. The piece of land behind Clifton Park has a very short life span compared to land inland, due to erosion of the coastline, not in our lifetime or in the next generations but eventually it will be taken from us as nature will not adhere to our will or housing plans. What will then happen to these homes that people have invested in. More so the land is question is stunningly beautiful and uniquely diverse and deserves our unreserved protection. Our modern world is dominated by development and financial gain, however we are becoming increasingly aware of the damage we are doing to our planet and what we are denying future generations. This is a prime example of profit verses preservation. This habitat should be left undisturbed as it gives home to pheasants, monk jacks, birds, insects, caterpillars and many species of wild flowers. This is not just waste land, of which there are many areas that could be developed with out such losses to our environment. We would willingly accommodate any one from the council or planning to visit my property and see first hand the beauty of this land, not just to highlight the view that I could lose but to see how its destruction can be justified. The approach into Cromer is through villages and natural landscapes, if this land is lost it will completely change the entrance and first impressions of Cromer. These characteristics, charm, beauty and history should be treasured as it is these qualities that keep tourists and visitors returning to this town. Cromer is a quaint unspoilt seaside town and although that doesn't mean that it can't be touched by progress, Its main entrance road with stunning views should not be compromised and have to follow the development demand of other typical inland areas where the effects would be less catastrophic. There is a caravan site directly opposite. A tourist area should not look directly onto a housing estate. This is unfair to those who pay large site fees to come to a coastal location and away from what you find in a built up urban residential area. This piece of land is an asset to Cromer's tourism and the town as a whole. Cromer should be proud that it has kept its unspoilt identity and has not been spoiled like so many other seaside towns in the disguise of progress. Cromer's naturalness and self will to remain Cromer can not be underestimated and compared to other areas of the country. There has been significant housing development already in the area i.e. Holt, which has also now lost some of its unique charm and character and its surrounding area is now indistinguishable from anywhere else in the country. The Runton Road is not wide enough to take the extra traffic from 90 homes, this will also create dangerous driving conditions in Clifton Park, Howards Hill and Central Road where traffic is parked on both sides of the road. We strongly believe the proposed school will not actually take place and this is just a sweetener to get the plans passed. The school in Cromer has been sufficient for many years. If so then the extra traffic and need for parking would also adversely affect the surrounding area. The development if it takes place it more likely to attract out of the area buyers, so will not ease the housing shortage for locals. They will be used for second homes and will then remain empty for periods of time and won't be beneficial to the town or its economy. The sewage works is inadequate now, this will need vast amounts of investment and updating should it have to support this development, which will cause lots of lengthy disruption to the town as well as making this site not ideal to develop and for people to have to live near it. Is there not any way this land could be bought from the owners but made use of in its natural state and protected. This would keep the green belt area and clearly define the boundaries

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					between Cromer and East Runton, which residents of both would want to protect. This would be able to then be enjoyed by the whole of Cromer not just the people who buy the new houses.
DS3	C10/1	Shillcock, Ms Rachel (1218547)	LP814	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The site lies within the parish of East Runton. The previous Plan tried to designate this land for development, and that one of the reasons for rejecting it was the desire to prevent continuous development between Cromer and East Runton. I do not believe this development should take place for the reasons listed: • The water treatment works south-west of the site is a source of bad smells. The proposal notes the problem, but we are aware that it will require extensive action on the part of Anglia Water to remedy the situation and increase the capacity of the plant to cope with such a development. Planning developments around such plants are known to be too sensitive to the local situation, especially when such planning involves residential housing and schools. • Priority should be for the development of the brownfield Former Structure Flex site, which would involve the removal of contaminated land. • Strongly support the existence of an (unofficial) green belt between Cromer and East Runton, to preserve the identity of East Runton and to provide a distinct boundary to Cromer town. • Although proposed site has good links to the bus and train network, development here would adversely affect the traffic density along the A149 and Clifton Park/Howards Hill/Central Road, creating a "Rat Run" along these roads which were never intended to cope with such traffic density. • Is the government wise to try to push so much new housing onto an area which has few employment opportunities, and slow communications to Norwich and beyond. The councils can build all the houses they wish, but if people don' t want to move here for work then they are creating problems for themselves - the majority of incomers will be retirees who will put additional pressure on our GPs, hospitals and social services. • Although we have a brand new GP surgery, it has not attracted medical staff to come and work here and the practice is still understaffed. An increased population will make matters worse. • Many of the residents of Clifton Park were attracted to the area because it was on the edge of town, with easy access to the countryside. One of the selling points of North Norfolk is its attractive towns and villages, and access to beach and countryside is an important factor. We have spoken to a number residents who would seriously consider moving away if this access is made more difficult. • The site itself increases the biodiversity of the area, being an area of heathland which provides a habitat for many species of birds and animal. Skylarks and Newts have been noted there in the past. • The site is enjoyed by dog walkers who enjoy the paths around the site, and for those living or camping nearby who wish to walk north to the coast or south to the Co-op and other retail outlets on Middlebrook Way. • Previous housing developments have been to the South of the town. Placing a school on C10 to the West of the town would increase the already often gridlocked traffic flow through the town centre several times a day. • the housing and infrastructure is meant to withstand a "once in 30 years' storm. However, the impact of global warming seems to indicate (a) that these storms will become more severe and (b) that they will occur

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					more frequently than every 30 years. This puts greater volumes of water into the ground at one time than has previously been the norm. This is a real danger to the stability of the cliffs. In 2004 one of the reasons that planning permission was refused on this site was because of the danger of flooding during a 30 year storm. • This portion of the coast is not in the area scheduled for protection in the Shoreline Management Plan. The Plan itself is working on models for sea level rise which are already being superseded and it would be unwise to build anything new so close to the coast. Ally development here should not go ahead without substantial investment in coastal defences, or including the section of the coast between Cromer and East Runton into the existing Shoreline Management Plan.
DS3	C10/1	Simpson, Mrs Deborah (1218481)	LP742	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** This site does not fall within Cromer Town boundaries but is in fact in East Runton. There is an existing green belt which should be retained to separate Cromer from East Runton. Development of that area would add to the existing problems with traffic along Runton Road and into the town centre as all the facilities such as drs. surgery / hospital / schools are all on the other side of the town centre. The area provides a social amenity at present. It is a pleasant area to walk in. It provides a short cut to Sandy lane / Holt Road and to East Runton. The benefits of open land and exercise are well documented. The problems with flooding near the main road and Clifton park point to an overworked drainage system which would be made worse by further development. There is a real risk of lack of stability in the nearby cliffs. I question the need for a new school when Cromer and Sheringham have falling numbers. In addition there is already spare capacity at Suffield Park Infant School due to a recent building programme. West Runton school children currently use Sheringham Community Primary School which is nearby.
DS3	C10/1	Smith, Mrs Amy (1217006)	LP250	Object	Object to the development of approximately 90 dwellings and a primary school on the site.
DS3	C10/1	Trott, Mrs Anne (1217376)	LP366	Object	The proposed development will destroy a valuable local asset and the proposals for this area of land should be removed. This area of land supports a wide variety of plants, animal and bird life. It is used for recreation by a variety of different people who walk and run across the network of well-established paths. As such it is a most valuable asset supporting the physical and mental well-being of the community. Its destruction would accelerate the decline of bio-diversity. Once assets like this are alienated they cannot be replaced.
DS3	C10/1	Vaton Mr W. Uddin. Turvey, Miss Lorraine. Trott, Mr Benjamin, Trott, Dr. Michael. Trimmer, Mrs Janice. Trimmer, Mr Mark. Trimmer, Mr Mark. Thomas, Mr Darren. Taylor, Ms Siri,	LP774, LP339, LP816, LP670, LP016, LP015, LP007, LP005, LP174, LP187,	Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** • The proposal is located within close proximity to the water treatment plant and is a source or bad smells. The issue has been noted but Anglian Water would be required to remedy the situation. • Priority should be the development of the old Structure Flex site, to the east of Clifton Park. This is a brownfield site, the development of which would probably involve the removal of contaminated land, but would be easier and preferable to the work needing to be done on the proposed site. • Support the existence of an unofficial green belt between Cromer and East Runton, to preserve the identity of East Runton village and to provide a distinct boundary to Cromer town. • Although the proposed site has good links to the bus and train network, we believe that a development here would adversely affect the traffic density along the A149 and Clifton Park/Howards Hill/Central Road,

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
		Stowe, Mrs Bernice. Stow, Mr Paul Stevenson, Mrs Elizabeth (1218382, 1217356, 1210106, 1217834, 1209913, 1209733, 1209658, 1209658 1216225, 1216252, 1216222, 1218610, 1218560)	LP810, LP811, LP824	Object Object Object	creating a “rat run” along these roads which were never intended for such traffic density. Previous housing developments have been to the south of the town. Placing a school here to the west of the town would increase the already often gridlocked traffic flow through the town several times a day. Further the roads and train track do not provide a safe environment for children. • We question whether the government is wise to try to push so much new building onto an area which has few employment opportunities and slow communications to Norwich and beyond. The councils can build all the houses they wish, but if people don’t want to move here for work then they are creating problems for themselves as the majority of incomers will be retirees who will put additional pressure on our GPs, hospitals and social services. Please note that the properties on the Parkview development are not selling. • Although we have a brand new GP surgery, it has not attracted medical staff to come and work here and the practice is still understaffed. An increase in population will make matters worse. Also, the one NHS dental practice in Cromer is full and the waiting list for this practice was closed over a year ago and is still currently not taking new patients or allowing them to register on a waiting list. Mobile phone reception in this area is patchy. Also fibre broadband is currently at full capacity, with no sign of new high speed fibre junction boxes being installed in the near future. • Many of the residents of Clifton Park were attracted to the area because it was on the edge of town with easy access to the countryside. One of the selling points of North Norfolk is its attractive towns and villages, and access to the beach and countryside is an important factor for health and wellbeing. A number of residents would seriously consider moving away if this access is made more difficult. The properties in Clifton Park are mainly inhabited by retired people. It is a quiet residential area. The building work will cause noise and disruption for a prolonged period of time. Once building work has been completed, the traffic flow along Runton Road and Clifton Park/Howards Hill will be greatly increased. This will lead to increased pollution and noise. The site itself increases the biodiversity of the area, being an area of heathland which provides a habitat for many species of birds, animals and insects. Skylarks, newts and bats have been noted there in the past. • The site is enjoyed an amenity by dog walkers who enjoy the paths around the site, and for those living or camping nearby who wish to walk north to the coast or south to the Co-Op and other retail outlets on Middlebrook Way. • Loss of wildlife habitat, green space, trees and general rural outlook. Although this area is scrubland, it is an important wildlife habitat and green space. There are also many trees here. This area is also well used by dog walkers and holidaymakers from the caravan parks. I would like to see this area retained as a designated wildlife area. Loss of pleasant outlook for the caravan sites and potential loss of tourism. The caravan sites will look onto a housing estate instead of a green space. • Danger of flood risk and cliff erosion. • This portion of the coast is not in the area scheduled for protection in the Shoretime Management Plan. The Plan itself is working on models for sea level rise which are already being superseded and it would be unwise to build anything new so close to the coats. Any development here should not go ahead without substantial investment in coastal defences. • There are very few full-time employment opportunities in Cromer and the surrounding area. Any work

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					available is seasonal. • Is there a need for more housing in Cromer?
DS3	C10/1	Walsh, Mr John (1210621)	LP092	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Objection to this site, an alternative should be found. Regardless of whether or not we do need this scale of housing in this region (where there has already been substantial development over the last decade). C10/1 is totally inappropriate for development for the following reasons: • It has not been used for any agricultural or commercial use in many decades. • The site is an important asset to local people and visitors who regularly walk there and enjoy the open space it provides – there are limited alternatives in the Cromer area. • This site acts as an important green belt separating Cromer from East Runton. • The loss of this space would promote the coalescence of Cromer and East Runton. • Development of the site would further suburbanise our coastal environment and degrade its seaside aspect which may deter summer visitors. • The site has become an important resource to resident and migratory birds many of which nest, shelter and feed there. Also a diverse array of wildlife depend on the site which includes lizards. Britain has recently been declared one of the worst countries in Europe for depletion of wildlife. • The site has developed a diverse plant community some of which are becoming rare in North Norfolk. • Building here will increase road traffic onto the already very busy A149 and into Cromer Town Centre which in turn will add to pollution and increase pressure for new roads. • The Council recently declared 'a state of climate emergency' but development on this scale is ignoring the spirit of that declaration. • It appears that every scrap of green space in the Cromer area is to be 'infilled' promoting further suburbanisation.
DS3	C10/1	Watts, Mrs Sally (1210021)	LP021	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Not suitable area. The time for using these locations for building home was forty years ago when there was the work for the people living in the area. The rising sea levels make both of these sites viable in the short term only. Given the rate that the cliffs are eroding to the North of both sites it could only be in a worst case scenario a matter of a few decades before any properties built were literality 'beach front properties'

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS3)

Summary of Objections	91	Feedback focussed on concerns over development on land which is considered to be a crucial gap between East Runton and Cromer and the wish to retain the existing town and village boundaries. Several other reasons including concerns over the smells from the AW plant and noise from railway line as well as flood risk should there be heavy rainfall were also cited. A149 is very busy all year, and more so in Summer. Concern that Clifton Park, Howards Hill and Central Rd would become rat runs. Capacity concern at WRC and potential impact on services and the lack of employment opportunities in the area were also raised. A number claimed that a school is not required and that the 90 dwellings are unnecessary. Many are concerned with the impact development would have on wildlife and biodiversity including some endangered species, while also highlighting that the site is used for recreation. Some objected with regards to potential impact on amenity for the surrounding area. Safety concerns raised for children next to railway line and treatment works. Suggestions that brownfield sites should be given priority over this site including Former Structure Flex. One raises inconsistency with the assessment with sites R07 and C24 being rejected as they spoil surrounding countryside.
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	3	Comments recognise that houses and jobs are needed, but should not be at expense of local communities' way of life. Need to protect and enhance Cromer's unique natural environment and protect green space, woodland and historic areas which enhances people's wellbeing and is important to tourism. Improved infrastructure for transport is needed, but this should not be at the expense of current local communities' environmental health, such as increased emissions which has negative effects on the natural environment, such as Cromer's coastal area and cliffs – resulting in negative climate change effects such as coastal erosion.
Overall Summary		Feedback focus on concerns over development on land which is considered to be a critical gap between East Runton and Cromer and wish to retain town and village boundaries. Several other reasons including concerns over the smells from AW plant and noise from railway line and flood risk should there be heavy rainfall. A149 is very busy all year, and more so in Summer. Concern that Clifton Park, Howards Hill and Central Rd would become rat runs. Capacity concern at WRC and potential impact on services and the lack of employment opportunities in the area. A number claim that a school is not required and 90 dwellings are unnecessary. Many are concerned about the loss of green open space which has a range of wildlife and biodiversity (including some endangered species) and is used regularly for recreation use which is important for people's wellbeing. Some object to the potential impact on amenity for the surrounding area. Safety concerns raised for children next to railway line and treatment works. Suggestions that brownfield sites should be given priority over this site including Former Structure Flex. One raises inconsistency with the assessment with sites R07 and C24 being rejected as they spoil surrounding countryside.

Council's Response		Noted. Consider comments in the development of the policy. Landscape and settlement considerations including the potential impact of development on landscape and views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size and whether the site preserves the separate identity of a settlement and the importance of natural and built features, along with a site specific SA have all informed site selections. Background paper no6 published with this consultation provides full detail on the methodology used and the results of each site assessment. A separate SA has also been published which has informed site selection. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development and site specific requirements. This includes highways, water and sewerage. The Council continues to work with Anglian Water in order to identify site specific issues and who have subsequently recommended that an Odour Risk Assessment be undertaken in relation to this site to inform policy development on this site. The Council has used current evidence base and engaged with relevant bodies including Children's services to identify where additional supporting school infrastructure may be required as a result of new development in Cromer and they identify this site as its policy preference. It is recognised that there is a requirement for further ongoing dialogue to support any final policy position in order for the Council to fully commit to securing an education site through the Local Plan process. Concern is noted about potential flood risk and its implications - the Council has engaged fully with the Environment Agency and other relevant key professional bodies/persons - The site is located in Flood zone 1 - low probability. Concern is noted about the impact on biodiversity/wildlife. The Council will take into account consultation feedback from bodies such as Norfolk County Council, including the education authority, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Natural England to inform decisions regarding the likely impact of developing a site for biodiversity and geodiversity and continue to work with site promoters to take into account biodiversity and geodiversity features. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact identified.

DS4: Former Golf Practice Ground

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS4	C16	Watts, Mrs Sally (1210021)	LP021	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Not suitable area. The time for using these locations for building home was forty years ago when there was the work for the people living in the area. The rising sea levels make both of these sites viable in the short term only. Given the rate that the cliffs are eroding to the North of both sites it could only be in a worst case scenario a matter of a few decades before any properties built were literality 'beach front properties'
DS4	C16	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1218558)	LP430	Object	1. The walk to Roughton Rd train station appears outside what would be considered an easy walking distance. A measurement “as the crow flies” shows the site is c. 1.3 km distant and the actual walking route appears much greater than this. 2. Local knowledge describes this site as having unstable ground due to the presence of below ground water channels. 3. The Proximity to SAC and SSSI is “less than 400m”. Other sites are less than this. 4. The site is within both the AONB and the undeveloped coast: other sites not within undeveloped coast. 5. The conclusion suggests The site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal. This statement applies to many other Cromer sites, including those not identified as Preferred Options, for example: C11; C18; C19; C19/1; C34; C44. Furthermore, the summary assessment in the SA is inconsistent – see detailed comments on SA. 6. The conclusion suggests “This is considered to be one of the most sustainable and suitable of the Cromer alternatives”. There is no evidence for this conclusion, particularly due to distances to train station and from SAC, risks of flooding and contamination.
DS4	C16	Hammond, R. Hon Robert Harbord Ms Hannah WSP Indigo Payne (agent) (1219344)	LP828	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Supports the proposed allocation and is committed to delivering a range of housing on the site addressing the recognised the quantitative and qualitative need within the borough and the settlement of Cromer. Landowner in advanced discussions with delivery partners who are committed to bring this site forward for development as soon as possible , with intention of new homes being delivered in the first few years post-adoption of the Local Plan. 3.24. The site is suitable and available for development, with single ownership and there are limited constraints, committed to development during the first years of the plan period.3.25. It is welcomed that that the policy provides a degree of flexibility over the number of dwellings that can be delivered on the site. 3.26. Further design and technical work is being undertaken but the site has the potential, subject to type of dwellings and density, to provide additional homes as it is not considered at this stage that there are any significant constraints to development of the site. 3.27. The site is located in a highly sustainable location, close to the Town Centre associated amenities and public transport. Sustainable development should be encouraged in such areas. 3.28. The site is large enough to vary densities to create different character areas. The need to provide particular tenures should not be included within the policy as an absolute requirement. It is a sound approach to allow an appropriate mix to come forward at the time of submission of an application in accordance with up to date market evidence.3.29. Total of 9 persons awaiting a self build plot; only one confirmed their preferred location as Cromer. The requirement to provide self build plots on site should therefore be based on demand at the time of submission of an application.3.30. As the site is not considered, in the supporting text, to be intrusive in the wider landscape, development should therefore be sustainably maximised alongside the introduction of appropriate new landscaping. 3.33. The SA has regard to the potential for likely significant environmental effects associated with the site’s development. The report identifies that the site scores positively as it is located edge of settlement with good access to local healthcare services, education facilities, peak time public transport links, leisure

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					and cultural opportunities and employment, in close proximity to the Town Centre. This confirms the site as a sustainable location for development.3.34. The only constraints, which can be overcome through on site mitigation readily are the site's potential negative biodiversity impact owing to its proximity to the coastline SSSI and SAC and a small proportion of the site being potentially susceptible to surface water flooding. Through careful layout, design and landscaping, these can be mitigated. Paper 4 confirms that other than potential foul sewerage capacity issues, specific infrastructure delivery is required in conjunction with the allocation of the site. The policy highlights that Anglian Water have advised that enhancements to the foul sewerage network capacity may be required before development can proceed. We request this be removed from the policy as foul sewerage capacity issues will be identified and addressed as necessary as part of an application submission. Paper 6 supports the site as a Preferred Option and summarises that it is suitable to be allocated for residential development for approximately 180 dwellings and that it is considered to be one of the most sustainable and suitable of the Cromer alternatives. SHMA This shows that Cromer is located in the Central Norfolk Strategic Housing Market Area. It supports the allocation of the site for housing.3.40. The HELAA identifies the site as a deliverable site which could accommodate a gross capacity of 252 units. The site is therefore, available, suitable and achievable within the early years of the plan period.3.41. The site at the lowest risk of flooding from rivers. The site is therefore sequentially preferable to other sites where there is a greater probability of flooding.3.42. The SFRA identifies that a small part of the site, like many other sites across North Norfolk, is at some risk of ground and surface water flooding, but it is considered that this can be handled satisfactorily via detailed design. The site will include sustainable urban drainage to mitigate any potential risk.3.43. In accordance with proposed policy, the site will include sustainable urban drainage as appropriate. The site will be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy at application stage. We therefore propose that the policy be re-worded to read as follows: "Land amounting to approximately 6.4 hectares is proposed to be allocated for residential development comprising approximately 180 dwellings which can include elderly person's accommodation, affordable homes and self-build plots, public open space, and associated on and off site infrastructure. Development proposals would need to comply with a number of policies elsewhere in this Plan and the following site specific requirements: 1. Careful attention to site layout, building heights and materials in order to minimise the visual impact of development; 2. Provision of appropriate internal open space; 3. Retention and enhancement of hedgerows and trees (access permitting) around the site, including the protection of existing woodland within the site; and 4. Provision of a landscaped buffer along the northern and western boundaries
DS4	C16	Salsbury, Mr Steven Salsbury, Mrs Jill (1210394 1217378)	LP083 LP367	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** C16 is unsuitable, within the AONB, the AONB Partnership's vision stated that 'the area will still be essentially unspoilt with a strong feeling of remoteness, peace and tranquillity..', yet these proposals will have an unacceptable impact on the natural environment and air quality. The volume of traffic generated would have difficulty being accommodated by the existing road network. I'm not convinced that there are enough job opportunities in Cromer. Many jobs are seasonal, so many residents would be travelling to other towns and Norwich for work. Large scale building work near the coast would cause the land to be more unstable, hastening erosion. The region, too, is traditionally drier than

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					other parts of the UK, and with longer spells of dry weather already being experienced with climate change, water shortages could be a real problem.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS4)
Summary of Objections	3	Limited comments received. Members of the public raise concerns over the potential impact on the natural environment, water supply, air quality, road network and the AONB. The amount of employment opportunities in Cromer and the viability of this site considering rising sea levels and potential for coastal erosion.
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	1	Support received from the landowner who confirms that the site is available, suitable and achievable and able to deliver housing within the first few years following the plan's adoption. Committed to delivering a range of housing on the site recognising the need within district and Cromer. Further design and technical work is being undertaken. Suggests that the requirement to provide self-build plots should be based on demand at the time of submission of an application.
Overall Summary		Limited response received. Some concerns over the potential impact on the natural environment, water supply, air quality, road network and the AONB. The amount of employment opportunities in Cromer and the viability of this site considering rising sea levels and potential for coastal erosion. Support received from the landowner who confirms that the site is available, suitable and achievable and able to deliver housing within the first few years following the plan's adoption. Committed to delivering a range of housing on the site recognising the need within district and Cromer. Further design and technical work is being undertaken. Suggests that the requirement to provide self-build plots should be based on demand at the time of submission of an application.
Council's Response		Noted. Consider comments in the finalisation of the Plan. Clarification on availability and further design and technical work being undertaken in welcomed. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development for local highways and water. Comprehensive site assessment has been undertaken on all sites, covering but not limited to environmental impacts and highways impact. Further details are set out in published Background Paper 6. Assessment has been informed by site specific sustainability appraisal. The proposed allocation would need to comply with all relevant policies in the Local Plan in order to secure planning permission including but not limited to those on the natural environment and air quality. The Council has engaged fully with the Environment Agency and other relevant key professional bodies/persons. It has used the most up-to-date flood risk evidence base in order to identify the likely flood risk of sites. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact (for example the need for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems). The site falls outside of the coastal erosion risk zone. The approach to self build and how the level of demand identified through the self build register (low) that relates to the potential provision will be reviewed as part of Policy HOU2

DS5: Land West of Pine Tree Farm

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS5	C22/1	Redmond, Mrs Erca (1216750)	LP230	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Preferably no new build or football pitches in chosen locations.** From Christopher's Close, access to the A149 is often difficult due to the volume of traffic coming into Cromer over the railway bridge, which is narrow and unsafe for pedestrians. Despite the speed restrictions, car and motorbikes speeding coming out of Cromer is very common. The traffic often builds and backs up in Norwich Road, indeed to outside Christopher's Close. Have had delays getting to the boathouse and boat in water for 10 minutes from the emergency call despite us only being 1.25 miles from the boathouse/pier. Northrepps has a dark sky policy and the light pollution from the proposed football pitch lights which violate this. The area is a haven for wild life. Our water supply is often erratic or poor to non-existent during the busy times when the population is expanded due to tourists even without any extra houses. i understand the residents in Stephen's Road suffer badly with this too. It is difficult to get a doctor's or dentist appointment. The hospital waiting times for blood or X rays is unacceptably high with the current and no extra population. I understand the schools are full too. The town carparks are often full during peak tourist times. Preferably no new build or football pitches in chosen locations. If outline granted, Mini roundabouts at both the Christopher's Close and Station Road access to Norwich Road. New access road to both main arteries to the town not just Norwich Road. An approach to the owners of cut through by the Zoo to make this an official route avoiding the town centre for use by locals. More car-parking, more schools and healthcare facilities. A full survey of water pressure, demand and infrastructure. More affordable housing, and rental choices for our young families and key workers. **If allocation goes ahead then suggest that mini roundabouts are provided at Christopher's Close and Station Road. New access road to both main arteries to the town not just Norwich Road. More car-parking, more schools and healthcare facilities. A full survey of water pressure, demand and infrastructure. More affordable housing, and rental choices for our young families and key workers. Why not look to the central parts of rural Cromer opposite Cromer Hall used as a campsite? This is closer to town and has lower use roads in and out without using the two main road arteries**
DS5	C22/1	Roper, Mr Ron (1218558)	LP762	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** C22/1 will have a severe environmental impact upon an AONB which has almost the same protection as a National Park and forms part of a natural green field boundary separating the parishes and falling into line with the council policy of maintaining a visible separation and protection on these, just as the coast road Cromer, Runton boundary and Cromer, Overstrand boundary, these green belts now form the majority of AONB left within the Cromer parish as much of this special allocation has already been lost due to encroaching development and continues to be eroded with camp sites, pick your own farms, temporary car parks, and boot fairs etc,This is also the breeding grounds of protected species such as brown hares, roe deer, barn owls, bats and honey buzzards as well as game birds breed for gun sport which bring in revenue to the area and it is also used for exercising dog's with horses so all this would be jeopardised, and once lost cannot be replaced. The football pitches will be managed privately and it will be argued that to pay for their maintenance they will be used to the maximum permitted level causing noise and light pollution in an area covered by a dark sky policy adopted by the council to aid those of us in this area with observatory's and telescopes and more disturbance and pressure on nearby protected species. These facility's are not within Cromer will mean that the major way of access will be by car leading to more environmental damage, congestion and disturbance to a relatively quiet suburb of Cromer with mainly retired inhabitants occupying a majority of bungalows with few children in the vicinity. The amount of traffic created by this scheme would overload an already overburdened network as Cromer only has

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					one through route with the main shopping facility's on one side of the town which lead to heavily congested roads in summer with the added problem that Roughton Road and Hall road will be used as rat runs to avoid the Norwich road congestion. Roughton road is already reduced to a cart track in places due to the recent development's laying pipework and the continual disruption caused by heavy construction traffic over many years, this country road also has two pinch points at each there end making passing of large vehicles impossible and dangerous. There will be no footpath or cycle way connecting this development with the 3 parish's that it will be a part of thereby requiring pedestrians and cyclists to navigate an extremely busy road system. The BBC recently reported that these fringe development's place a dependence upon the owning a vehicle because of the lack of planning in providing shops, doctors, transport links, schools and other amenities needed in everyday life, thereby adding to further traffic problems in this area. This land is also prone to flooding as it is relatively flat with no run off possible other than through drainage via existing road networks. Other infrastructure effects associated with this will be water, gas, and sewage with also lower broad band speed, plus doctors and hospital appointments as these have also been effected by the recent development in Roughton Road so further development will obviously need to be addressed along with school uptake within the plans to allow for expansion and growth as these are not covered. One area which already suffers noise pollution is Cromer go cart track so maybe this would be a better location for the football pitches as it's close to a major trunk road surrounded by trees and most importantly away from housing.
DS5	C22/1	Watts, Mrs Sally (1210021)	LP021	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Not suitable area. Cromer just does not have the infrastructure in place or likely to be put in place to support the traffic, schooling or health needs of this amount of development. I would love to see local people being able to afford to purchase or rent a home in Cromer but this is not going to help anyone but those who want to see a profit.
DS5	C22/1	Salsbury, Mr Steven Salsbury, Mrs Jill (1210394 1217378)	LP083, LP367	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**:C22/1 is unsuitable. within the AONB, the AONB Partnership's vision stated that 'the area will still be essentially unspoilt with a strong feeling of remoteness, peace and tranquillity..', yet these proposals will have an unacceptable impact on the natural environment and air quality. The volume of traffic generated would have difficulty being accommodated by the existing road network. I'm not convinced that there are enough job opportunities in Cromer. Many jobs are seasonal, so many residents would be travelling to other towns and Norwich for work. Large scale building work near the coast would cause the land to be more unstable, hastening erosion. The region, too, is traditionally drier than other parts of the UK, and with longer spells of dry weather already being experienced with climate change, water shortages could be a real problem. Overall, the proposed developments will certainly not improve the quality of life, health and well-being of its residents, and at the same time make it less desirable as a holiday destination, which in turn would see a downturn in trade and business. These developments go completely against the Norfolk Planning Policy Framework which states that 'local plans should seek to conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment and promote healthy communities..'
DS5	C22/1	Gurrney, Mr & Mrs Simon & Deborah. Hill, Mr Iain Bidwells (Agent)	LP487, LP490	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Whilst supportive of the principle of a residential led mixed use development in this location, we raise concerns regarding the deliverability of the proposed allocation. More specifically, whilst the policy makes it clear that any proposal must provide a means of access to the A149 by means of a roundabout, it is evident that, as drafted, the extent of the proposed allocation does not provide sufficient land to deliver the required infrastructure improvements. This is demonstrated by a recent letter from Norfolk County Council Highways in relation to planning application reference: 9/1/18/216, which

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
		(1217428 1217161)			proposes to develop the site in accordance with the general principles of draft Policy DS 5. The letter states that the County have fundamental concerns with the proposal and, as a result, has issued a holding objection. This is on the basis that, amongst other things, "the proposed footway widening at the east side of Norwich Road appears to require land that is outside the highway boundary and outside the land within the applicants control. Any off site works need to be deliverable within land which is either in control of the applicant or within the control of the highway authority." It is, therefore, evident that in order to ensure that the proposed allocation can be considered deliverable and developable in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and therefore allocated in the Local Plan, the extent of the site needs to be extended to incorporate additional land; land that is within my client's ownership.
DS5	C22/1	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1217309)	LP430	Object	1. Proposed use is described as "housing" yet the conclusion identifies it as preferred for sports pitches and facilities. There is no explanation or evidence for this.2. Site is "considered unsuitable for development" yet is identified as a Preferred Option. Inconsistent and therefore unjustifiable as a Preferred Option. 3. No evidence for the statement "development on this site shouldn't have a detrimental impact on the landscape and wider countryside", particularly as it requires a footbridge and roundabout, and is "visible from the south and immediate surrounding area. 4. The topography of the site is not significantly different from the topography of other sites proposed. 5. Inconsistency in the description that the site has "no contamination issues" yet the SA records it has "potential for remediation of contamination" 6. The conclusion suggests The site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal. This statement applies to many other Cromer sites, including those not identified as Preferred Options, for example: C11; C18; C19; C19/1; C34; C44. Furthermore, the summary assessment in the SA is inconsistent – see detailed comments on SA. 7. The conclusion suggests "This is considered to be one of the most sustainable and suitable of the Cromer alternatives". There is no evidence for this conclusion, particularly as it is visible; requires construction of a new footbridge and a new roundabout in order to be considered suitable; and the presence of large mature trees along the road from which access is proposed and has risk of flooding.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS5)
Summary of Objections	6	Concerns are expressed over this development; the potential impact on the natural environment, AONB, air quality, dark skies, noise and wildlife. Development would not improve quality of life, health and well-being of its residents and impact on trade and business, stating that it would go against the NPPF. Concerns over the increase of cars on the road network and pedestrian connectivity to the town centre. Flooding issues on the site and water shortages due to longer spells of dry weather from climate change. Issues with school, healthcare, water, gas, sewage, broadband capacity. Suggest that mini roundabouts should be provided at Christopher's Close and Station Road and new access road to both main arteries to the town not just Norwich Rd. Request a survey of water pressure, demand and infrastructure. One is supportive of the principle of residential in this location but raises concerns over the deliverability, the site does not provide sufficient land to deliver the required infrastructure and the extent of the site needs to be extended to include additional land. One questions why the preferred site includes sports pitches and facilities but the site has been assessed for housing. Assessment states that the site is considered unsuitable for development. The landowner for alternative site C25 wishes the site to be considered as part of site DS5. Access issues can be addressed. One proposes new alternative site, closer to town and would not use two main road arteries.
Summary of Support	0	None received

Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Feedback highlighted concerns on; the potential impact on the natural environment, AONB, air quality, dark skies, noise and wildlife and on the health and well-being of its residents and impact on trade and business. Flooding issues on the site and water shortages due to longer spells of dry weather from climate change. R**equest a survey of water pressure, demand and infrastructure**. Concerns over the increase of cars on the road network and pedestrian connectivity to the town centre. **Suggest that mini roundabouts should be provided at Christopher's Close and Station Road and new access road to both main arteries to the town not just Norwich Rd.** Issues with school, healthcare, water, gas, sewage, broadband capacity. Limited support for the principle of residential in this location but raises concerns over the deliverability, the site does not provide sufficient land to deliver the required infrastructure and the extent of the site needs to be extended to include additional land.
Council's Response		Noted. Consider comments in the development the policy approach. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints, the potential impact of development on landscape and views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size and whether the site preserves the separate identity of a settlement and the importance of natural and built features have been taken into account. The Council will take into account consultation feedback from bodies such as Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Natural England to inform decisions regarding the likely impact of developing a site for biodiversity and continue to work with site promoters to take into account biodiversity features. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development for local highways, water, and sewerage and energy networks. These issues have been taken into account in site assessment. The site is in Flood Zone 1 - low probability and Anglia water have indicated that off-site reinforcement may be required in relation to network capacity. The Council has engaged fully with the Environment Agency and other relevant key professional bodies/persons. The Council has engaged with Health and Education providers to establish the current position and capacity and to identify the strategic infrastructure requirements arising from planned growth. The proposed allocation is subject to a specific policy which identifies requirements that development proposals would need to address in order to secure planning permission. This includes a requirement to provide a footbridge or suitable alternative to provide pedestrian / cycle links to the town centre. The proposed allocation would need to comply with all relevant policies in the Local Plan in order to secure planning permission including but not limited to those on the natural environment, dark skies and air quality. Comments noted on deliverability and will be addressed in the next iterations of the plan.

Proposals for Fakenham

DS6: Land North of Rudham Stile Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS6	F01/B	N/A	N/A	N/A	None received.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS6)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary	No comments received	

DS7: Land at Junction of A148 & B1146

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS7	F03	N/A	N/A	N/A	None received.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS7)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary	No comments received	

DS8: Land South of Barons Close

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS8	F10	Castleton, Mr Norman (1218485)	LP807	Object	Object to the development plans for the area marked policy SS8. The development would be destructive to the green environmental corridors that exist and make this part and much of Norfolk unique. Housing on this scale and in this area will destroy the natural habitats of flora and fauna. It is far too close to the River Wensum Area of Conservation.
DS8	F10	Barker, Mr John (1218558)	LP437	Object	This site is not suitable. Barons Hall Access impossible. •This is a school drop off road and accessibility in early mornings, midday and afternoons is limited. There have been numerous occasions when dangerous situations have occurred with children due to the building of 10 houses at the top of the road, this would be a lot worse if 55 houses were built. •The positioning of the site will lose forever the character of the area and should be retained as a wild life habitat
DS8	F10	Benson, Mr Roger (1216144)	LP674	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Remove this area from the Local Plan. Adversely impact on the wildlife value of the Wensum Valley by reducing the area of semi-natural habitat (pasture) and altering other areas of existing quiet habitat (wet woodland and pasture) to open access with unspecified alterations to their nature and composition. The Wensum Valley is one of the most important wildlife corridors and areas of linked protected wildlife sites in the County and this underpins and supports the River Wensum's status as an internationally important wildlife area designated as an SAC. The area has been under pressure from development in the Fakenham area for some years and this would significantly impact on the connectivity and cohesiveness of the 'corridor' through the Town. Tourism to the area is now largely based on the value of the wildlife sites in and near to the Town and this would be adversely affected by such a development which would damage the setting and appearance of the valley from key public rights of way. The EA have raised concerns over the impact of contaminated surface water from this site entering the Wensum area and this will lead to further problems
DS8	F10	Heard, Mr Arthur (1217337)	LP349	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The land is not suitable for residential housing 1. several occasions the area has flooded therefore it would not be suitable for housing. 2. The red area shown to the adjoining residential properties is not correct as we have plans from the Land Registry proving this. 3. The smell from the local animal incinerator plant could be an environmental issue.
DS8	F10	Hill, Mrs Janet (1216125)	LP321	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** F10 unsuitable for housing. The Wensum Valley as a whole is one of the most important wildlife sites in the County and has the highest protection for the River Wensum - to European level. The value of the Wensum as a SAC is largely predicated on the value of the wide area of surrounding linked habitats along the valley, some of which are also protected and some of which are not. However, without the linking and supporting areas of natural habitat such as this site, the more highly designated sites would not be able to support the diversity of wildlife that they do, and it is the scale, integrity and diversity of semi-natural habitats along this long corridor of the river valley - with the river at its centre - that makes the Wensum Valley so valuable to wildlife. Developments such as F10 would further fragment and disrupt the value of the existing remaining habitats in the Valley where it passes through Fakenham. There have already been significant fragmenting developments which have seen damage to both the value of the landscape and to wildlife and this would further add to it. From the text, it would appear that the development option sees the provision of the 'green' land as a positive enhancement to the ecology and wildlife of the area, by providing this as some sort of public open space. In reality this would seem to suggest that further disturbance and damage to the wildlife interest of the valley would be caused at a point where there is already good public access (which I use a lot), and where the few remaining 'quiet' areas for

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					wildlife to thrive and commute without human and domestic pet disturbance, are few. Therefore, far from being an advantage, the change in use of this area would actually detract from the biodiversity value of the Valley. Many people come to Fakenham for the tourism interest of the wildlife sites of Pensthorpe and Sculthorpe Moor, but they also stay in the area and walk in the valley outside these sites. It is vital for the viability and health of the tourism industry to value what remains of the wilder natural areas of Fakenham and not to further build on them. Visitors say that they feel that the Wensum in the Fakenham area is not as lovely as it used to be largely because of new developments such as that at Kinnerton, if we continue to damage it further, they simply wont come any more.
DS8	F10	Knight, Mr Martin (1217977)	LP673	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** This development is seen as being unnecessary**.** Incredible, attractive, wildlife rich area existing so close to the town. The existence of conservation areas run by Pensthorpe Natural Park and the Hawk and Owl Trust to the west and to the east of the town provide a single, large linked habitat that is well placed to provide a valuable wildlife corridor as well as a valuable recreational resource. Lack of public access to some of these areas provide essential refuges for wildlife. This would be damaged if the development goes ahead. Have seen a wide range of wildlife occupying the area marked. Asked directions by three separate groups of tourists asking the way to the river. We are not against the development of Fakenham per se, for example, we understand the need for the northern development that is planned close to where we live. It is disheartening however, when we see so many people and organisations doing so much to protect this unique environment to realise that this area is under threat unnecessarily.
DS8	F10	Oglesby, Mrs Susan (1215855)	LP126	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The site shown does not belong to one landowner and includes land that belongs to my Mother. Request that the plan is amended to remove land owned by my mother. There will be no development on her land. I am amazed that you would even consider building on a flood plain. The proposed development will be even lower than the existing properties in this area, which are already at risk of flooding. The sandbags, which are to be seen outside even the northern end of the Kinnerton factory when we have heavy rain in the winter, should indicate the risk of the proposed housing area flooding. The concreting over of a flood plain area/meadow also puts at risk existing properties further along the river. There is no shortage of alternative already agreed development land in Fakenham. This is taking unnecessary risk.
DS8	F10	Pope, Mr & Mrs G (1218477)	LP787	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 1.The site is a flood plain to the river Wensum protecting existing property. 2. Barons Hall Lane is a Bridleway and not suitable for the heavy volume of traffic that this development would produce. 3. Heavy volumes of traffic in Barons Hall Lane during school start and finish times would present a serious hazard/ safety issue to children and parents. 4. The new properties already built in Barons Hall Lane when sold will present a serious safety risk as cars will be reversing into the flow of traffic both ways. 5. I am seriously concerned that the infrastructure will not be able to cope (Doctors Surgery, Schools, Sewerage and Utility Supplies) also with the increased road pollution. It was proposed that a development in the area of Rudham Stile Lane was built. This would have been a better development as there is the capacity for road improvements to provide access.
DS8	F10	Rumley, Mrs Barbara (1217787)	LP666	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Objecting to this site for the following reasons: The Wensum valley pasture meadows are a very special habitat and need to be nurtured - the riverside walks are really special and enjoyed by many. Creating housing here would undoubtedly impact this - and it would take many years to recreate such habitats, if indeed it could be done. It also makes a nonsense of all the efforts

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					to create conservation areas and reserves in the meadows east and west of the town. It seems a very short-sighted policy/plan when the plans exist for development to the north on sites which are not so environmentally sensitive.
DS8	F10	Wilkins, Mr Robert (1217860)	LP671	Object	Object to this proposal. The site is in a flood plain area and is adjacent to an AONB. Such a development will increase the danger of flooding of the adjacent land which will have an adverse impact on the flora and fauna of the adjacent areas. It will also interrupt the movement of fauna along the Wensum valley which is a recognized area of environmental scientific interest. It was understood that there would be no further extension of the Valley Way development. Bearing in mind that there are over 700 houses planned for a site off Rudham Stile Lane I question that Fakenham can manage to cope with the additional pressures that will be placed on schools, traffic, medical facilities etc. It is unlikely that much further employment will be available in Fakenham. Therefore people will be commuting to other towns which will not provide any economic benefit to the town.
DS8	F10	Wilson, Mr James (1218028)	LP676	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Delete from the preferred sites The development will damage the cohesiveness of the semi-natural land in the Wensum Valley and therefore have impacts on Protected Species and the special qualities of the River Wensum SAC/ nearby CWS and SSSIs and will therefore reduce the biodiversity value and habitat value of the Valley by reducing the areas that can be used by wildlife. This is contrary to Policy ENV 2 (so the site is actually contrary to other stated aims in the same plan) The site will have severely damaging effects on the local landscape character of the area by removing an attractive area of grazing within the Valley and introducing a hard built element which is alien to the semi-natural environment of this part of the valley floor. This will be particularly visible from the footpath along the northern side of the site and the riverside path along the Wensum. This damage cannot be mitigated by landscaping in this valley landscape context regardless of statements to the contrary in the Local Plan text as this will remove the spacious but semi-enclosed character of the remaining meadow in this location. The site cannot therefore be said to be 'sustainable' which is a principle guiding aim of all planning policy as underpinned by the NPPF document. For the above reasons the development will damage the tourism economy of the area by reducing the number of people who will want to visit and stay in Fakenham which is now becoming a centre for nature conservation tourism through the linked sites along the Wensum Valley including the Hawk and Owl Trust site at Sculthorpe and Pensthorpe Natural Park but also particularly the access to the valley from Public rights of way along and near the river in Fakenham. - Why damage one of the main jewels in the crown of Fakenham and damage sites further away as well? Overall there will be significant detrimental impacts to the Character and biodiversity of the area and that these impacts will have a bad effect on the way in which Fakenham is seen and used by tourists. There are much better and more sustainable locations for housing development elsewhere around the boundaries of Fakenham which will not have these damaging effects
DS8	F10	Spowage, Mr Richard (1217394)	LP424	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** • Increase run off into the adjacent floodplain • Could have an impact upon the Wensum Flood Plain – this can have an impact upon both farming and upon tourism activities • Highlights that the area is at risk of flooding adjacent to the development site factoring in 40% climate change. • Damage to this area could have detrimental effects to the local wildlife of the valley
DS8	F10	Mr Kevin Doy (1216261)	LP182	Object	Refuse development in this location and keep as natural habitat. We have been witnesses of the massive biodiversity and impact of rising water levels to this location for the last 33 years so speak from experience and have collected a wealth of photographic evidence to reinforce our opinions that this land is totally unsuitable for any form of

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					Residential / Commercial development Both Areas identified F10 are subject to flooding - 29/12/2017 Green area we have photographic evidence of entire area under approx. 600mm of water depth, Red Area shown in photographs with large size deposits of water that were then here for several weeks due to continuous downpours Current location F10 Red highlighted abundant with wildlife, historic hunting ground (documented) for Family of Barn Owls, Buzzard, Red Kite., Bats. Other visitors are Roe Deer, Frogs and Toads, Fox and Otter Run off water from Barons Close area is deposited into historic soakaway in middle of field identified in Red F10 The development is in direct contradiction of NNDC Local Validation Protected species Checklist Points 4, 5,8,10 and 11 and BS42020:2013 Any proposed development will damage the Cohesiveness of this semi-natural land in the Wensum Valley and therefore have a negative impact on the protected species and the unique special qualities of the River Wensum Special Area of conversation / nearby County Wildlife sites and SSSI's . It would be incredulous to suggest that the concreting over of this site would not severely diminish the Biodiversity value and habitat value of the valley that has been sympathetically maintained and allowed to develop by generations of landowners. The destruction of this jewel of Fakenham would be contrary to Policy ENV2 in the local plan. For these reasons , the site can never be 'Sustainable' which is a principle guiding aim of all planning policy as underpinned by the national Planning Policy Framework document Planning application on this site should be subject to increased public and Central Government Scrutiny due to possible conflict of interest that may have incidentally arisen due to conflict of interest and position of influence of landowning family with regards to planning and local government We have a catalogue of Chronological photographic evidence of this site to support our views which we will make available when requested
DS8	F10	Archson George (1210391)	LP043	Support	look forward to the housing development on F10 providing better access to the river. Despite there being a bridleway, this area is seldom seen by townsfolk and its development would improve the town's amenities - something important given the size of the Northern Developments.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS8)
Summary of Objections	12	The responses primarily focus on concerns over the environmental impact of development; the importance of the site for wildlife and biodiversity acting as an important environmental corridor and likely adverse effect on SAC, county wildlife site and SSSI adjacent to site. The lack of public access to this area provides habitat for wildlife. Concerns over impact on local landscape character, which is considered cannot be mitigated by landscaping. Access problems; Baron Hall Lane unsuitable to deal with heavy volumes of traffic, especially at school drop off and pick up times. Could be flooding problems and problems with contaminated surface water entering the Wensum Area. Concern over lack of employment opportunities and additional pressure on infrastructure and services.
Summary of Support	1	One supports this proposal, on the basis of providing better access to the river and improving the town's amenities.
Summary of General Comments	1	Comment received stating that the land is not in one ownership and includes land that is unavailable for development. Raises concern that proposed development would be lower than the existing properties and therefore would be at a risk of flooding. Developing on the flood plain puts existing properties further along river at risk. No shortage of alternative land available in Fakenham.
Overall Summary		The responses primarily focused on concerns over the environmental impact of development; the importance of the site for wildlife and biodiversity acting as an important environmental corridor and the potential adverse effect on SAC, county wildlife site and SSSI adjacent to site.

		The lack of public access to this area provides habitat for wildlife. Concerns over impact on local landscape character, which is considered cannot be mitigated by landscaping. Access problems; Baron Hall Lane unsuitable to deal with heavy volumes of traffic, especially at school drop off and pick up times. Could be flooding problems and problems with contaminated surface water entering the Wensum Area. Concern over lack of employment opportunities and additional pressure on infrastructure and services. One comments that the land is not in one ownership and includes land that is unavailable for development. One supports this proposal, providing better access to the river and improving the town's amenities.
Council's Response		Comments noted. Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints and designations, the potential impact of development on landscape and views have been taken into account. The Council will take into account consultation feedback from bodies such as Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Natural England to inform decisions regarding the likely impact of developing a site for biodiversity and continue to work with site promoters in the identification in relation to biodiversity. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact. The proposed allocation is subject to a specific policy which identifies requirements that development proposals would need to address in order to secure planning permission. This includes a requirement to consider the relationship and impact on the environmental designations particularly the SSSI, and require a landscaped buffer to the south of the site with increased public access. The location of residential development is outside any identified Flood Risk. The Council has engaged fully with the Environment Agency and other relevant key professional bodies/persons. It has used the most up-to-date flood risk evidence base in order to identify the likely flood risk of all sites and inform distribution. Development proposals will be subject to a satisfactory Flood Risk assessment demonstrating how flood risk from all sources of potential flooding to the development itself and from the site to the surrounding area, will be taken into account managed. The Council has liaised with the Local Highways Authority to identify the likely impacts of new development for the local and strategic road network in terms of highways safety, congestion and access arrangements. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact. Further work on deliverability will be undertaken in the next iterations of the plan.

Proposals for Holt

DS9: Land South of Beresford Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS9	H04	N/A	N/A	N/A	None received.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS9)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary	No comments received	

DS10: Land North of Valley Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS10	H17	Jones, Dr David (1210609)	LP074	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Oppose this proposal and favour an alternative site. H17 will have a significant impact on the local environment which is in 2 conservation areas. 27 dwellings represents fairly high density with associated noise levels, pollution and disruption to wildlife. The 40 to 50 vehicles of residents will in my view add considerable congestion to an already very busy stretch of Norwich Rd. The only possible access is only 20 metres from the traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing. Entering and leaving the development will be hazardous and lengthy when turning across traffic. Getting out of Valley Lane, for example can often take a number of minutes. Additional traffic so close to the primary school will expose the children on foot to more pollution and hazard. I am surprised this access is considered suitable for a development that size.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS10)
Summary of Objections	1	Concern raised over the environmental impact of development and the impact on the Conservation Areas. Concern with the potential density of the scheme, associated noise levels, pollution and disruption to wildlife. Access issues and safety concerns, more cars add to existing congestion.
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. Concern over the environmental impact of development and the impact on the Conservation Areas. Concern with the potential density of the scheme, the associated noise levels, pollution and disruption to wildlife. Also raises issues with access, safety and more cars add to existing congestion.
Council's Response		Noted. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints, the potential impact of development on landscape and views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size and the potential impact on heritage have been taken into account. The Council has liaised with the Local Highways Authority to identify the likely impacts of new development for the local and strategic road network in terms of highways safety, congestion and access arrangements. The proposed allocation would need to comply with all relevant policies in the Local Plan in order to secure planning permission including but not limited to those on pollution, wildlife and heritage.

DS11: Land at Heath Farm

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS11	H20	Adams, Mr (1215905)	LP592, LP595	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: If this area is to be developed it should be designated as employment land and the housing allocation moved to the proposed employment land at Heath Farm - H27/1. This area (H20) can be accessed almost directly off the A148 without the need to travel any significant distance though an area of housing. The impact of road noise on an employment area is of little significance. It could create a short and safe access to the bypass for the existing commercial units in the barns and ancillary building at Heath Farm and for the agricultural and supply vehicles serving the farm itself. . If the Council aims to provide housing with the best possible residential amenity then it should, where possible, avoid building housing close to busy main roads and also minimise commercial traffic flows through a residential area. - Designating H27/1 as residential and H20 as employment would - • reduce the number of commercial vehicle traveling through an existing residential area. • Provide new dwellings in an area where they would not be subject to significant road traffic noise from the a148. • provide new dwellings close to an area of public open space helping to promote a healthy lifestyle. • provide a small break between the two areas of housing giving the feel of two separate areas with their own identity making the overall site feel smaller and less out of proportion to the existing settlement. • provide safe and easy access for vehicles accessing the farm and associated industrial units again reducing commercial vehicle movements along the Hempstead Road without increasing commercial vehicle movements through a residential area and improving road safety on the A148 . - The size of the site is out of context to the settlement and is expanding too far into the countryside. The site size as proposed in H20/1 is more than enough. . See comments at 14 proposals for Holt explaining why it would be more suitable for use as employment land. - The size of the site is out of context to the settlement and is expanding too far into the countryside. . The site size as proposed in H20/1 is more than enough. . See comments at 14 proposals for Holt explaining why it would be more suitable for use as employment land.
DS11	H20	Adams, Mr (1218558)	LP629	General Comments	The site specific requirements attached to H20 require a site layout and landscaping scheme which considers the proximity of Listed Buildings to the north east of the site; Policy ENV 10 - Protection of Amenity should result in the development having greater respect for amenity of existing residents and residents of new development, with positive impacts upon quality of life and well-being. A site specific requirement should be attached requiring a site layout and landscaping scheme which preserves the residential amenity and privacy of the existing homes . This should include landscaping along the eastern boundary of the site which would also serve to provide a wildlife corridor from the piece of woodland along the side of the bypass to open countryside. The land between the two existing homes on the eastern edge providing an area of public open space either side of an access way leading to the public footpath. , The landscaping work should be carried out in advance of any development taking place giving it opportunity to mature and offer a place of relative safety for the wildlife inevitably disturbed during the development and to mitigate the inevitable disturbance to adjoining residence from building works. . If it is to be residential development then consideration should be given to the provision of allotments along the eastern edge with low rise elderly persons accommodation backing onto the allotments. This would help to blend the development into the open countryside

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS11)
Summary of Objections	1	The proposal received one objection, suggest it would be more suitable site for employment, as this would reduce commercial vehicles travelling through residential area and minimise impact on residential amenity. Would not have significant road traffic noise from A148, be located close to open space, provide small break between the areas of housing providing individual identities and feel smaller, provide safe and easy access for vehicles accessing the farm and improving safety on A148. DS11 is out of context of the settlement and expanding too far into the countryside.
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	1	A site specific requirement should be attached requiring a site layout and landscaping scheme which preserves the residential amenity and privacy of the existing homes, including landscaping along the eastern boundary provide a wildlife corridor, landscaping should be provided before development takes place. Consideration of the provision of allotments.
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. Concerns raised over the suitability of DS11 for residential as considered this would increase commercial vehicles travelling through the residential area impacting on residential amenity, close to road traffic noise, be out of context and expand too far into the countryside. S**uggest amending the requirements to ensure site layout preserves residential amenity and requires a landscaping scheme.** Suggest that this site would be more suitable for employment.
Council's Response		Disagree. Considered to be suitable location for residential. Background paper no6 published with this consultation provides full detail on the methodology used and the results of each site assessment. A separate SA has also been published. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints and designations, the potential impact of development on landscape and views, along with a site specific SA have all informed site selections. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development for local highways. Employment provision is provided for in the adjacent site, allocated in the current Core Strategy and proposed to be increased through policy DS12. The proposed allocation is subject to a specific policy which identifies requirements that development proposals would need to address in order to secure planning permission. This includes a requirement for a landscaping scheme and enhanced pedestrian access.

DS12: Land at Heath Farm (Employment)

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS12	H27/1	Adams, Mr (1215905)	LP592, LP595	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: OFFICERS SUMMARY** – If this area is to be developed it should be designated as employment land and the housing allocation moved to the proposed employment land at Heath Farm - H27/1. This area (H20) can be accessed almost directly off the A148 without the need to travel any significant distance though an area of housing. The impact of road noise on an employment area is of little significance. It could create a short and safe access to the bypass for the existing commercial units in the barns and ancillary building at Heath Farm and for the agricultural and supply vehicles serving the farm itself. . If the Council aims to provide housing with the best possible residential amenity then it should, where possible, avoid building housing close to busy main roads and also minimise commercial traffic flows through a residential area. - Designating H27/1 as residential and H20 as employment would - • reduce the number of commercial vehicle traveling through an existing residential area. • Provide new dwellings in an area where they would not be subject to significant road traffic noise from the a148. • provide new dwellings close to an area of public open space helping to promote a healthy lifestyle. • provide a small break between the two areas of housing giving the feel of two separate areas with their own identity making the overall site feel smaller and less out of proportion to the existing settlement. • provide safe and easy access for vehicles accessing the farm and associated industrial units again reducing commercial vehicle movements along the Hempstead Road without increasing commercial vehicle movements through a residential area and improving road safety on the A148 . - The size of the site is out of context to the settlement and is expanding too far into the countryside. The site size as proposed in H20/1 is more than enough. See comments at 14 proposals for Holt explaining why it would be more suitable for use as employment land. The size of the site is out of context to the settlement and is expanding too far into the countryside. The site size as proposed in H20/1 is more than enough. See comments at 14 proposals for Holt explaining why it would be more suitable for use as employment land.
DS12	H27/1	Adams (1215905)	LP599	Object	The size of the site is out of context to the settlement and is expanding too far into the countryside. . The site size as proposed in H20/1 is more than enough. . See comments at 14 proposals for Holt explaining why it would be more suitable for use as employment land. .

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS12)
Summary of Objections	2	Objections raise concerns over this proposal and suggest it would be more suitable for residential use; would reduce commercial vehicles travelling through residential area and minimise impact on residential amenity. Would not have significant road traffic noise from A148, be located close to open space, provide small break between the areas of housing providing individual identities and feel smaller, provide safe and easy access for vehicles accessing the farm and improving safety on A148.
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received

Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. No substantive issues raised. Concern that the proposal would be out of context with the settlement and expand too far into the countryside. Suggest that this site would be more suitable for residential use than site DS11. And would help to reduce commercial vehicles travelling through residential area and minimise impact on amenity, less noise from traffic, close to open space, provide small break between areas of housing providing individual identities, safe access for vehicles.
Council's Response		Disagree. Site is better linked to employment opportunities and a more suitable location for employment. The new access road from the A148 / Phase 1 development has been delivered to an enhanced specification to ensure appropriate access to the existing industrial estate and to alleviate heavy goods travel from Hempstead Road. Background paper no6 published with this consultation provides full detail on the methodology used and the results of each site assessment. A separate SA has also been published. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints and designations, the potential impact of development on landscape and views, along with a site specific SA have all informed site selections. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development for local highways.

Proposals for Hoveton

DS13: Land East of Tunstead Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS13	HV01/B	Armes, D (1210411)	LP046	Support	I understand that more housing is needed especially affordable housing as young people have to find somewhere to live, but think that instead of building new houses more money should be spent on refurbishing derelict buildings and building on abandoned industrial estates. I strongly disagree with building on agricultural land and woodlands. I think that building 150 houses on site HV01/B should be carefully considered. I believe that careful consideration and planning should be made to alleviate the increased demand on public services these new homes will inevitably generate. It is my firm belief that development should only be able to commence once provisions to increase capacities at local schools, GP surgeries, dentists etc have been firmly committed to. Development in Hoveton should in essence be conditional on securing these commitments to improve public infrastructure before construction work on the new houses can start.
DS13	HV01/B	Cook, Mr Geoff (1218558)	LP209	Object	~I am concerned by the size and density of the development of the preferred site and think that a number of smaller developments would be more in keeping with Hoveton as a large village. ~The plan seems to dismiss other sites in Hoveton because the preferred site meets the requirements, but there are no details of the assessment of the other sites. The preference would be for smaller developments e.g. 10x15 or 8x20 rather than 1x150. There is no Interim Sustainability Appraisal of other Hoveton sites for comparison purposes, but they would probably all be suitable for smaller developments. ~I am concerned that the proposed road to join Tunstead Road and Stalham Road will create a "ratrun" with increased traffic through the Brook Park development with consequential increase in pollution and risk to residents, particularly children. This is in addition to the 150-300 additional cars as a result of the development of the preferred site. ~I am concerned that the projections for traffic volumes over Wroxham Bridge have ignored the impact of the NDR. The pollution study was completed in 2017 before NDR was completed and ignore carbon monoxide. The pollution was above recommended levels for September 2017 but there are no figures for September 2018 and no mention of future projections. ~The impact on wildlife...the development clearly does not value the natural environment and does not mitigate against the impact of climate change ~It is recognised that Hoveton acts as an important centre for Broads-based tourism and tourism is hugely important to the economy...A large percentage of these trips will pass over Wroxham Bridge unless people get fed up with the traffic queues of at least 30 minutes at peak times in both directions and decide to take their tourism pounds elsewhere. ~A Care Home will increase traffic significantly because of visitors to residents, tradesmen, health / social care support. Parking for Care Home traffic needs to be taken into consideration. If the proposed care home is sheltered housing then this is likely to be superseded by mobile phone technology. ~Parts of Hoveton are considered at risk from river or tidal flooding and the proposed development site suffers from surface water accumulations after heavy rainfall. ~A reduction in agricultural land will make an impact on employment. The decline of arable land will not help feed people in the future and will result in importing more of our food with the consequential impact on climate change.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					~'Brownfield' sites should be developed first. ~The impact of a building site near to existing residents will affect their privacy levels and they cannot be kept free from excessive noise
DS13	HV01/B	Everett, Mrs Susan (1210447)	LP047	Object	Wroxham Bridge as many have eluded to is a pinch point for traffic. Ideally more traffic needs to be diverted into using the NDR so that only local traffic or tourists coming here use the local road. A weight restriction on Wroxham Bridge should be put in place to divert vehicles that make the Bridge single carriageway. This would assist the flow of traffic by not delaying vehicles waiting for large lorries etc to come over the bridge and stop the constant damage and repair required . Consideration for a no right turn from the Bridge into Church Road may help? In reality an additional river crossing or better road links to support all of the proposed building and secure business and prosperity for the future needs to be discussed now! With significant future building planned in North Norfolk and Broadland DC areas what are highways doing to address local concerns? Your consultation document does not address this matter and almost brushes it aside. Unlike expanding a school or doctors surgery the road system cannot be enlarged in the same way! Whilst I understand some planning is required the local infrastructure must be considered in its entirety, one cant simply just ignore the road networks as appears to have happened in your consultation document.
DS13	HV01/B	Hawes, Mr Peter (1210722)	LP079	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The proposed site will substantially increase the traffic in the village causing further congestion throughout the year but especially in the tourist season and greater traffic around Broadland high school and the expansion of the school will cause additional road congestion at school pick up times. Already a safety hazard, a through road will encourage drivers wishing to travel to Coltishall to use it as a rat run to avoid the doctors corner junction, creating further traffic past the school. The current hedge on Tunstead road currently provides a habitat for numerous birds and animals who will suffer if this habitat is removed. NNDC current planning guidelines state that trees and hedges should be protected and this historic hedge must fall in that category. The entrance would be less intrusive if it was placed to the north of the junction to Two Saints Close, provide a clear visibility in both directions along Tunstead Road. The assessment highlights the pressure placed upon the doctors surgery and that the NHS will expect mitigating solutions. Given that your guidelines also require accommodation for elderly people in developments of this size it seems a conflicting proposal as elderly people require more NHS capacity Anglian Water is already experiencing major problems with the capacity to provide new water and treat foul water discharge. The AWA will be unable to extract from aquifers to feed the village of Ludham and Js unable to deal with the normal processing of foul water in a small development near ST Johns church. This makes me question the validity of building further developments of this scale in Hoveton
DS13	HV01/B	Howe, Mrs Alex (1217494)	LP645	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** 1. Any new development needs to be sensitively and appropriately sited, which I feel does not apply to HV01/B. 2. New build should include consideration of the impact of climate change, to take into account the forecasts of increased temperatures, severe weather conditions and the need to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. (I see no reference to these issues in Persimmon Homes submission). 3. Existing air quality problem particularly in the specific area around Wroxham Bridge. All new developments will increase traffic levels further adding to this pollution. 4. Increased volume of traffic that all new developments north of the River Bure will bring. Wroxham Bridge is unable to deal effectively with present traffic levels, particularly in the summer months. 7. Persimmon should not be the chosen developer. I understand that the quality of some of the properties on Brook Park leaves a lot to be desired, and the company's response (or lack of it) to the problems brought to their attention (including the installation of the children's play

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					area) has been abysmal. 8. On-going problems with the foul water overflow and Anglian Water has yet to come up with any solution. Any further new housing will only exacerbate the problem until it is resolved. Hoveton & Wroxham Medical Centre is beyond capacity and struggles to provide the service that patients have a right to expect. This is not a criticism of the Centre but of the expectations placed upon it by developers who do not seem to take in the reality of this hard pressed service provision. 9. Access off Tunstead Road through to Stalham Road will be used as a rat-run. Exiting on to the busy Tunstead Road, and close to the high school would create a safety hazard; also around the Brook Park play area with children exposed to the hazards of irresponsible drivers. 10. The character of the village is rapidly changing and the sense of community is being weakened. If we are not careful Hoveton will become just another urban sprawl created by groups of people who do not live in the village but who have the power to create social and environmental upheavals! Remove Brook Park Phase 2 from the Local Plan and look at more integrated settlements in Hoveton. Smaller in size and with a better quality developer. 2. **Consider the smaller site along the Stalham Road** thus avoiding any 'crowding' of the high school. 3. Should Persimmon remain the chosen developer (and I understand why this might be so) then ensure that the company is required to comply with strict conditions, and that the building work is monitored throughout. 4. **Ensure that the Church Field and Tilia developments are included in the 150 dwellings sought for Hoveton.** 5. Ensure that climate change resilience, wildlife conservation and habitat protection, are written into any planning permissions.
DS13	HV01/B	Lampard, Nicola (1215757)	LP185	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Hoveton is only one area suffering the effects of housing developments around North Norfolk. At what point does this increase of building in a rural area become unsustainable? The local plan emphasises good connection to public transport, roads etc. There is no mention of Hoveton (& Coltishall) bridges. Hoveton bridge is built of over a 1619 narrow, hump back bridge. The traffic congestion is apparent throughout the year. Locals, and visitors alike suffer because of the often static, slow moving traffic through the centre of the village. POLLUTION - There may be public transport, but buses are caught up in the traffic and the railway is not electrified. People choose to use cars. Hoveton A1151 has the poorest air quality in Norfolk. With further development and associated increase of traffic, there is unlikely to be anything that developers could offer to mitigate this major problem. WATER & DRAINAGE - The water board has already stated that the area is under serious water stress. Norfolk is one of the driest counties in the UK. How will this precious resource be managed with the demands of a large increase in population, and the needs of businesses and agriculture? We know that the drainage in Hoveton is a serious problem. The proposed housing, next to St John's church is being held in abeyance, because of the local sewage network is inadequate. Anglian Water have admitted this is a major issue, and there are implications for further development that would require a new pipe line at considerable expense. Brook Park phase 1 has had on-going problems with drainage since 2015, and only now in 2019 the situation may have been resolved. How is it that Persimmons could possibly build another 150 houses to extend this problematic estate? LOCAL ECONOMY - The local plan is in danger of killing the golden goose. The Broads (considered a National Park) and its tourism is vital to the area. Visitors also place pressures on the area by sheer numbers, and of course the use of their cars. Bewilderwood, Hoveton St John attracted over 160,000 VISITORS IN CARS last year. This attraction alone has a serious impact. The proposed development of Brook Park 2 will use productive agricultural land. Our landscape is important to residents, businesses and visitors, both financially and aesthetically. Quality of life will diminish. SERVICES - The LP doesn't directly address the problems of our already over stretched medical services. Those of us that live in Hoveton, know the difficulty of obtaining appointments, The staff now use any room available, due to

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					shortage of consultation rooms. Concern over the capacity of schools in the village, and whether they will be able to cope with the growing numbers of pupils is being discussed. The children will not only come from the immediate villages, but the expanding numbers from the whole catchment area. Consideration should be given to a NHS dentist to be present in the village. The nearest NHS dentist is over that bridge! ROAD SYSTEM - The proposed road for Brook Park phase 2, is a classic case of "looks fine on paper," This road will be another rat run, causing further pollution to the residents. The connection between Stalham Road and into Tunstead Road, will increase considerably (April 2019 37000 cars used it). The junction at Tunstead Rd and Horning Rd West, is often congested with traffic backing up from the double roundabout from the main A1151. This is always a busy road junction, used by Broadland Academy a many businesses in the area including yacht builder, Oyster. Hoveton has reached that tipping point.
DS13	HV01/B	Lincoln, Ms Karen (1209571)	LP640	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There is no doubt that, should further development be needed in Hoveton, that this area is the best for that purpose, but very tight restrictions and control should be exercised to lessen the impact upon the community will need to be used. The linking of Tunstead road and Stalham road, by way of the new development and Brook park should not be an option. One of the only two public open spaces, in Hoveton, is on the Brook park estate, it is, at present, set in a quiet residential area with very little traffic and good air quality, this would change if the road was opened up to through traffic. The danger to children, who would be playing there, with open access from the open space to the road should be obvious, the fact that this action would see the estate cut in two, with a busy road is probably less. Most groups of houses have designated parking areas with a narrow entrance to access them. Getting in and out of those areas would be difficult if it were not for the fact that traffic is, at the moment, 'access only'. Problems at Brook Park with the landscaping and more concerning the drainage system on the estate is still ongoing and the play area, promised by the developers has still yet to open. Even when it is, it is not as was agreed on the S106 agreement.
DS13	HV01/B	Lowther, Mr Ian (1210039)	LP025	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The primary school (St. John's), was over subscribed this year, due to the recent expansion both Wroxham and Hoveton. Although I'm not aware of the High school's figures, I can only assume it faces similar issues. I'm not aware of any plans to expand capacity and can't see why 150 extra homes can be entertained without doing so. The traffic Along the A1151 through Hoveton and Wroxham has been worse than ever recently, with long tail backs of stationary vehicles in both directions becoming ever more commonplace, the addition of these extra homes will only compound the problem which creates pollution and effects the safety of children, attempting to cross the road from the new homes to the primary school. The plans for the new estate include linking Salhouse road through to Tunstead road. This will create a 'cut through' that I expect many frustrated commuters will use to avoid the bottleneck of the two mini roundabouts in town. As the ultimate bottleneck is the bridge and the ever increasing amount of road works that seem to be occurring recently, this won't alleviate the problem at all but expand it into the estate. I fear that the Brook Park estate will simply end up with the same stationary traffic/pollution problems that we currently have at peak times on the A1151 or heavy passing and potentially speeding traffic at quieter times, changing the estate from it's current family friendly condition to being unsafe for children. Additionally, residents here can expect several more years of construction traffic passing through that they have barely just finished from phase 1. It's also noteworthy that construction is still ongoing to complete the play park on the estate's green. (The late completion of this raises further questions of Persimmon Homes, the proposing house builder's competence.) This green, long overdue (4-5 years) and long awaited by residents could now become sited next to another busy commuter road instead of a quiet residential one.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS13	HV01/B	Miller, Mrs Pat (1210642)	LP121	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There has been some discussion in the village about having smaller developments 'dotted around' rather than one large site. I realise this is not a proposal within this Draft Plan but feel that it should not be considered for, at least, the following reasons: • Small developments with potentially different developers will not be able to deliver the same range of community benefits – an acceptable level of affordable housing, elderly care accommodation and infrastructure requirements. • Landowners offering parcels of land suitable for small developments could then go on to claim that the rest of the land was no longer economically viable as agricultural land and needed to be developed. Hoveton would then begin to 'sprawl out' in all directions and lose forever its already tenuous hold on being a beautiful village! Indeed, if great care is not taken, 'urban sprawl' could be the fate of many Broadland villages which would undermine the important economic benefits of tourism in the area. Taking all of this into consideration, the preferred proposal site does seem to offer the best option for Hoveton for the following reasons: • Its location limits the potential impact on the Norfolk Broads, River Bure and the landscape more generally. It 'sits well' within other residential developments in Hoveton. • The community benefits offered (affordable housing, elderly care accommodation and infrastructure requirements) take into account the needs of the village. However, it is essential that any developers are not able to reduce or remove these benefits, ignoring policies put in place to protect them, in their claims that they are 'not financially viable'. From previous experience (relating to the Church Fields development in Hoveton) this can, quite easily, be done.
DS13	HV01/B	Neary, Mrs Virginia (1215726)	LP119	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Withdraw proposal for new housing in Hoveton, keeping the land for continued agricultural use or creating allotments for local families. I believe a state of equilibrium is preferable to unfettered growth in order to provide a decent quality of life for local people. 1. Major traffic congestion & pollution issues along the main Norwich road, this has been an issue for many years & has been noted to have increased significantly in recent years. Concerned a road between the Stalham & Tunstead will inevitably lead to people using this as a 'rat run'. 2. There are limited employment opportunities in the local area, with much of it being seasonal, necessitating travel to the city & other areas for work, creating additional issues with congestion & pollution. 3. The 2 schools in the village are currently over subscribed & there is a large number of other local villages in their catchment area. 4. Public transport is inadequate- bus services have suffered recent cuts 5. The appropriation of valuable green belt land is something that can't be undone, with Brexit & an uncertain future we should be ensuring sufficient land is used for crops. 6. There is a rich range of wildlife in the area, & their habitats are becoming ever smaller. The hedge along the Tunstead Road is home to many nesting birds, there are hares on the fields as well as foxes, deer & buzzards. 7. As with local schools, the Hoveton & Wroxham medical centre is overburdened & it can take weeks to see a doctor, & longer if you want to see your own doctor , significant for people who want to see medical staff who know them & are familiar with their individual health issues.
DS13	HV01/B	osborne, Mrs margaret (1210388)	LP041	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Concerned that the road connection from the proposed development of HV01/B appears to be joining Tunstead Road close to the footpath across the existing development. On coming out of Two Saints Close, the traffic is often very fast and takes time to slow down to the 30mph limit as cars enter the village. Would it not be more sensible to have the new road come out opposite Two Saints Close to join a mini roundabout. This would have the added bonus of slowing the traffic down before it enters the village and create a safer environment for children coming out of Broadland High School.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS13	HV01/B	Smith, Mr Mark (1209582)	LP042	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** Less dwellings proposed for development HV01/B with a higher ratio of low cost affordable homes available. Do not allow new developments to be over populated. Brook Park in Hoveton is a good example but the preferred option in the village of HV01/B seems to have a higher density with less open space, a lot of dwellings for the size of the plot and judging by that smaller gaps between houses. This is not keeping with the character of Phase One. (Information based on previous development layout prepared by developer).
DS13	HV01/B	Smith, Mr Mark (1218514)	LP031	General Comments	Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament was agreed to be amended on 16th April 2014 and is now referred to as Directive 2014/52/EU. All member states were to comply by applying the legislation via its own national laws by 16th May 2017. Particular interest to all those that shall be affected by proposed developments is Article 3, items 1(a), 1(c), 1(e) and item 2. The impact of detriment to the current air quality and the affect on human health. Substantially the legislation restricts any development where the impact would decrease the quality of air where currently good quality or improved quality air is enjoyed. There is no lower limit of pollution to adhere to, basically alleviating the possibility of increasing the pollution to within higher acceptable/permitted levels to the detriment of an established settlement. There seems to be no substantial reports site specific on the impact to human health within the environment section of the draft document. (The document in its entirety is massive so if I have simply not found the information I seek, apologies). Further to air quality presenting a risk to health noise should be considered also. Such matters that should be considered during construction stage should conclude the least intrusive positioning of site facilities, the route to and from the site and the orientation that a development is constructed so to present the noise pollution and disturbance to established settlements for the least amount of time. Whether this is because noise can be monitored and averaged over time, I do not know. The longer term impact of noise may be presented for example by a current access road becoming a main thoroughfare between two main roads such is the case of the proposed HV10 site. Not only shall the noise be increased to the properties that line the road but to a lesser degree all residents of the established settlement. There is a high probability that the link road through this estate shall become a busy commuting route hence increasing the traffic noise (also reducing air quality and presenting safety issues to current road users, pedestrians, residents and children). Can only upload one file so cannot provide the researched evidence to support the affects of noise pollution but some symptoms are commonly reported to be sleep deprivation, stress, heart disease and hypertension. With reference to SA10 and the impact of development upon mental health and well being, should the impact upon a community regards its outlook be assessed? For example, residents outlook from windows changing from open fields with wildlife to bricks and mortar. There would be a definite impact but how has this been assessed and measured against what?
DS13	HV01/B	Smith, Mr Mark (1209582)	LP032	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Services in Hoveton are overstretched and may not necessarily be able to support an additional 150 dwellings. For example, an additional 150 dwellings will have an impact upon the quality of education. Additional pressure on the road network, increasing congestion. The bridge is not suitable for the proposed increase in traffic. The link road planned through partly established and part new settlement is a dangerous and detrimental gamble by the planners. The new link road will be used as a shortcut by residents and commuters. Maintain the established road into HV01 as an access only road but extend into Phase Two. A different approach by the planners allowing large scale development in isolated locations could easily have been sourced and strategically placed to suit travel and

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					commuting. Large scale developments attracts large developers willing to build facilities such as medical centres, schools, village halls. Bus operators are attracted to large scale development.
DS13	HV01/B	Smith, Mr Mark (1209582)	LP033	General Comments	SD5: The preferred option by the planners allow them to ensure planning consent is conditional. Shall be able to specify requirements that will be placed upon the applicant that needs to be evidenced by the applicant at planning stage. Construction stage of any development needs to be assessed and agreed by planners not developers. Established residents that will be neighbouring such development should be consulted and considered by the planners so as little detriment during the construction stage is endured. Such matters as safety, air pollution, noise pollution, access should all be considered and agreed with residents prior to consent being granted.
DS13	HV01/B	Smith, Mr Mark (1209582)	LP037	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** Object to Site HV01/B, extension of Brook Park, on the basis of Policy SD13; Pollution and Hazard Prevention/Minimisation. • The development is currently served by an access road directly linked to a roundabout on the Stalham Road. The road is a safe road that is mostly travelled by residents that understand the dangers of the road such as children playing alongside and crossing and drive accordingly. The road is not a busy road and offers very little safety concerns. • Hoveton is the first village of North Norfolk via the Stalham Road. A road bridge exists in-inbetween Wroxham and Hoveton and provides one of the most popular river crossings from North Norfolk to Norwich or vice versa. Road traffic is ever increasing and the frequency of long tailbacks through the village of Hoveton has in the last five years increased albeit mostly affecting traffic due South. The councils only measurement of road traffic emissions being over the national average during its most recent survey occurred in the village of Hoveton. The village is also popular with tourists and day trippers due to it's parking facilities and it's own retail outlets. Good for businesses and the council but not as good for residents due to pollution. • Tourism is increasing in North Norfolk and the route through Hoveton is popular. As part of the councils draft local plan many more housing developments are planned in North Norfolk in villages and towns North of Hoveton and North West. The route through Hoveton is currently a popular commuting route to and from Norwich for current residents in the villages and towns North and North West of Hoveton.. An extension of the current access road serving HV01 to become a link road between Tunstead and Stalham Roads will offer commuters from North Norfolk an attractive route to and from the Wroxham Road Travelling from the A149 through Tunstead and then through the Brook Park estate to the roundabout then through Hoveton. • What is the action plan of the council to prevent an increase in all pollutions? It is my view that an increase in all pollutions is inevitable due to the volume of traffic increasing through the estate due to a link road. Pollution will increase regardless even if the road was to remain an access only road simply due to more vehicles accessing their properties. The latter though being a more predictable and manageable increase that would give residents more confidence in any action plan. Given the predicted increase in volume that will travel the Stalham Road, tailbacks heading South shall become more frequent and longer. Hence, when on occasions the rear of the tailback can be joined at the doctors surgery, it shall possibly extend back northwards over the roundabout and prevent traffic leaving the new link road onto the roundabout causing tailbacks into the estate meaning a massive increase in static emissions, noise and in the darker months, light. • The link road does not equate to minimising hazards in relation to SD13. The current road is a lightly used safe access road. A new link road changes the implications to consider all the safety detriments of a main thoroughfare.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					Should the action plan include such measures as slowing the traffic down then the retention times will be greater hence more pollution. The change of use of the road will change the way inhabitants along the road can use the road and pathways. Currently safe for children to cycle up and down and play alongside, I would suggest that as time goes by and the road becomes busier, it would not be safe to chance allowing children the same freedom. I fail to understand how this could fit in with the councils preferred approach to SD13 by reducing or minimising hazards. • The above outlines a possible long term scenario that could impact obligations under SD13. The short term is even harder to satisfy due to the construction stage. This in my view is where in compliance with SD13 the entire development becomes unavailable. All the above detriments will be magnified almost beyond control during the construction stage. The preferred approach to the construction site will be via Stalham Road roundabout due to the restriction of the heavy duty traffic passing schools. This strategy in aid of safety I concur but the same risks if not greater exist when the same kind of traffic travels through the established development next to children playing and riding cycles and scooters and the like. Pollution will be magnified and uncontrolled and far more static on the site itself. The dust will be blown from the site to mix in with the magnified emissions and the access road will be, in the summer months a cause of uncontrolled dust anyway. This is all at the risk of health and safety of the current residents.
DS13	HV01/B	Smith, Mr Mark. (1209582)	LP040	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** • Access routes are dangerous for existing users. Construction traffic would travel past children either outside of the school or on the pathways while playing outside of their homes. • Ground Conditions: The completed phase one of Brook Park has experienced flooding issues due to very poor drainage through the ground. Attempts to rectify have yet been tested. • Pollution: Not only the construction traffic emissions to and from site but the working plant on site emissions will be detrimental to the air quality experienced by the neighbouring areas. Dust caused by the construction itself and the construction traffic to and from the site will contribute to poor quality air being experienced by residents of the neighbouring areas and in particular the residents of Phase One of Brook Park (ENV 10, 8.84). Noise pollution will be a problem experienced by neighbouring areas due to the construction itself and the heavy construction traffic passing established properties on their access to and from the site as will vibration (ENV 10, 8.83). • Design and layout of new development: The established properties on the western boundary of Phase One Brook Park has the rear of their properties facing west. The sun sets in the west giving light into private open space and habitable rooms. The layout and design of the proposed new development could impact occupiers through loss of light (ENV 10, 8.79). Careful planning would need to be done to ensure low rise development such as bungalows back onto the existing properties at the required distance away so not to cast a shadow and block sunlight to the existing properties hence not impacting occupiers. • Location of construction site compound and the orientation of build throughout development: A builders compound on the western boundary of Phase One Brook Park, bordering established properties whose rear gardens and rear

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					elevations of property face west would endure the utmost disruption and impact of the construction stage. Any stacking of mobile offices would certainly be invasive of privacy into private open spaced the very nature of a builder's compound would impact the same space due to noise and dust pollution (ENV 10, 8.76, 8.77, 8.78, 8.79, 8.83 and (8.84). Further to the location of the compound the orientation of build should be considered to be a major determining factor of how long existing residents of Phase One Brook Park, in particularly the properties that will border the new development, need to endure the construction and associated trades such as scaffold being constructed along the boundary fence line. These detriments in all the same ways the reasoning regards the compound does. • Having attended the NNDC physical consultation on 23/05/19 at the Broadland Youth and community Centre, the council officials made it quite clear that the link road planned to route through HV01/B has intention to be part of the contraflow system in and out of Hoveton. This changes the use of the current road from an access only to a main road. The council should use the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment accordingly to be truthful. The link road being planned to be for major use causes hazardous risks, pollution (air, light and noise), vibration and has the effect of impacting the experience of how both public and private amenity is utilised by existing occupiers, new occupiers and neighbouring areas. How the council can state in their assessment matrix that environmental impact of HV01/B with a major change of use of the road is neutral begs belief in how they arrived at that assessment. To increase traffic flow and possible congestion immediately increases emissions without even considering the dust, noise, artificial light and vibration. In effect, the assessment needs to be revisited and NNDC's own preferred policy need to be utilised properly to understand the true affect. Conditions affected in the policy are EV 10, 8.76, 8.77, 8.78, 8.82, 8.83 and 8.84. SD13, the council's own preferred policy is also very applicable not only to the complaint regards the development's use of road but all the factors raised. • The policy wording is 'To provide a policy to minimise and where possible reduce, all emissions and other forms of pollution including light and noise pollution and ensure no deterioration in water quality.'. Very relevant in my own opinion. The link road will also invite many more road users and impact the flow of traffic through Hoveton village centre, all trying to cross the bridge. An increase in traffic volume in the funnel of pollution. The one place throughout North Norfolk that registered a pollution measurement higher than the national average in the last available survey was measured outside of the Roy's toy shop in Hoveton. The greater traffic and congestion that will ultimately be experienced by users of public amenities in this area will be impacted by way of experiencing greater pollution more often rising above the national average. To think or rather assess that the volume of traffic travelling through Hoveton in relation to increased tourism in North Norfolk and an additional 2390 dwellings in villages or towns North and North West of Hoveton will not increase traffic volume and congestion in Hoveton at the notorious pinch point called Wroxham Bridge is unrealistic and it is an approach that causes detriment and possible harm to residents, workers, tourists, shoppers and general public at large.
DS13	HV01/B	Smith, Mr Mark. (1209582)	LP039	General Comments	Broadland Council will when considering their own Local Plan and the allocation of dwellings to Wroxham take into account the Hoveton plan. Would it not have been sensible for this to have happened the other way around. Most commuter traffic is to and from Norwich so to possibly reduce the number of properties allocated south of the

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					Wroxham bridge in view of the number of properties to be built North of does nothing to ease congestion around said bridge.
DS13	HV01/B	Taylor, Mrs M (1210707)	LP078	Object	If the proposed development goes ahead it will result in overlooking of properties at the north end of Tunstead Rd and loss of privacy. The field has already been developed and further extension of building to this site will lead to overdevelopment of the site and loss of character to the area. The existing new development has been designed to fit in with the local area with generous space around many of the properties. A further 150 homes here will result in a major housing development and overcrowding. The highway safety around this site is already very poor and further development will add to the regular abuse of speed limits on Tunstead Rd especially near the school. The Parish Council have evidence of the shocking abuse of speed limits on this road with some vehicles reaching motorway speeds. **If developed consider buffering the development with Tunstead Rd as well as the field at the north end. I would like you to consider the alternative sites particularly HV05 and HV08.** these sites are in close proximity to the primary school where young families would have the opportunity to walk their small children to school, creating early healthy habits for life. There is also existing easy access to the main road to Norwich by car or bus service. In the existing proposal there is mention of a bus service on Tunstead Rd but the only bus service I have seen is for the school. If the proposed site does go ahead (HV01/B) please can you consider buffering the development with Tunstead Rd as well as the field at the north end. in a previous proposal, a park was planned adjacent to the houses on Tunstead Rd and this might be worth considering again.
DS13	HV01/B	Turner, Mr Anthony (1209585)	LP001	Object	This proposal ignores the constraints imposed by Wroxham Bridge. This has long been a traffic pinch-point, and at peak periods the A1151 is congested all the way through Wroxham and part of the way through Hoveton. Given the available routes, environmental objections to a bypass would be very much stronger in today's social and political climate than they were 35 years ago when the original abortive bypass plan was first mooted. Therefore it does not make sense to add 150 new dwellings to Hoveton -- or indeed any at all. The same goes for the Bureside villages of Horning and Ludham, whose residents use Wroxham Bridge to access Norwich and points beyond. Logically, we cannot go on building out into the countryside for ever. We have to stop altogether some time, so why not now, before the landscape and character of the Broads are overwhelmed?
DS13	HV01/B	Walker, Mrs Kerry (1217345)	LP346	Support	~Brook Park – Preferred site can deliver the necessary type of housing stock to meet local needs and can also provide a good percentage of affordable homes. The site will also deliver an aged care development that is much needed given the aging population. ~Support for the approach of 1 site delivering 150 homes - rather than a number of individual sites as proposed by the PC. ~Growth in Hoveton should be limited to 150 in light of the constraints and planned growth in neighbouring authorities.
DS13	HV01/B	Weston, Mrs Sarah (1216006)	LP150, LP184	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Tunstead Road is already a safety hazard with severe congestion at school pick up and drop off times with parked cars and buses trying to get to school. There are also many heavy goods vehicles heading North throughout the year and seasonal agricultural use, all of which create a danger to school children and pedestrians alike. 150 more dwellings with a through road connection to Stalham Road will increase traffic further and will become a rat run for vehicles that wish to avoid the roundabouts at the junction of Horning Road West and Stalham Road. It will encourage traffic coming from the Coltishall direction to

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					come up Tunstead Road and through the new proposed road onto Stalham Road thus avoiding the village entirely. With all the development that is proposed north of Hoveton in various locations, all that same traffic has to funnel into one of two river crossings, namely Wroxham or Coltishall. The additional pressure of traffic on the Tunstead Road should not be permitted. The build up of traffic does not only affect the Norwich Road Wroxham and the Stalham Road Hoveton, it also causes further problems for the Horning Road and Horning Road West causing a standstill in Hoveton traffic during the summer months. With the addition of a further number of homes being built on Church Fields Hoveton, this all adds to the congestion bottle neck of The Bridge and also to a lesser extent the two mini roundabouts. Further planning of dwellings should be seriously considered south of Wroxham Bridge where there is direct access to both Norwich and the NDR. Access to the proposed new development appears to be sited nearly opposite to the entrance of Two Saints Close, with some comments suggesting that there may be a roundabout in the future. Would it not be more appropriate to site the entrance road further north of Two Saints Close which would give a clearer viewpoint of traffic travelling in both directions. It must also be pointed out that traffic is moving faster before entering the 30mph limit area. With the proposed development comes the additional impact on all our local services, with local schools in Hoveton and the Hoveton & Wroxham Medical Centre oversubscribed. The local wildlife also needs consideration, at present the current hedging on Tunstead Road that fronts the proposed development is home to many bird species and animals, these have already had their habitat squeezed by the development of Brook Park. We need to maintain green space in our environment. **Exit only onto Stalham Rd. Further public transport needs to be considered. Development should be located on Wroxham side of the river where access to the NDR and Norwich is more practical.**
DS13	HV01/B	Williams, Ms Katie (1209757)	LP009	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Broadly support this site. SCHOOLING / EARLY YEARS: Ensure sufficient primary and secondary school places are made available from the point at which residents start living in the new homes. There should be no staged introduction to school places - places should be made immediately available for new local residents so parents do not have to cope with the stress of transporting children to out of village schools whilst also having to manage their own commutes to work. Following the publication of data on primary school entrance places in NNDC, it should be noted that Hoveton St John Primary School filled all 30 of its available places in 2019 and had to refuse 6 applicants. Given that a new development of 25 houses is already in the process of being built in Church Fields (which, by conservative estimates, will inevitably be home to at least several primary aged children), this situation will only get worse. Expanding the primary school therefore seems not only a logical, but an entirely necessary, step to meet demand. It is also necessary to consider secondary school places at Broadland High School. At the moment that school only teaches up to 16 years of age, but given the new influx of children through Hoveton's expansion (as well as Wroxham's allocation of new houses which has to be simultaneously catered for), this cut off warrants serious consideration as otherwise any young person wishing to stay in full time education beyond 16 years will need to travel into Norwich. This is create additional stress on Wroxham Road as those children will either depend on family members driving them into the city or catching local transport. I also believe that given the growth of the village, greater provision needs to be made for young children aged 6 months to primary school age. In my opinion, the current size of the nursery linked to Hoveton St John is insufficient to meet demand. I personally have to drive my son to a nursery in Spixworth three days a week so I can access childcare that starts early enough and finishes late enough to allow me to work a normal working day.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					MEDICAL CENTRE: Similarly, capacity at the Hoveton & Wroxham needs to be increased to meet the growing demands placed on it. I am sure with careful planning this can be achieved as the facility certainly seems large enough from a lay person's perspective. ROAD ACCESS: Stalham / Norwich Road (especially over the bridge) is already arguably at capacity during the peak summer tourist months. Any road works that need to be carried out should only be allowed to take place during the late evenings and through the night as otherwise the disruption is colossal and in my view entirely unacceptable for existing residents who have had to queue in excess of 30/40 minutes to get over the bridge. The answer is not to push drivers to take the detour via Coltishall, as all that does is create problems for that village, but to get a handle on Hoveton & Wroxham's own traffic bottleneck. Ultimately a by pass would be the answer, but clearly that comes at huge expense. TRAINS: Given the number of new residents who will be joining Hoveton and Wroxham, I think a review of the frequency and carriage numbers of trains travelling towards Norwich is warranted, especially as some of the other towns requiring to take new homes are also on the same line. It is very likely that a significant proportion of the new residents will find employment in Norwich, so we should try and promote train use wherever possible to free up the roads. BIKE SCHEME: One viable way to get people to travel around the local area more, rather than depending on their cars so heavily, is to create a 'Boris Bike' type scheme with drop off hubs dotted around the wider area (including a large one at the station). This would obviously necessitate having to invest in good cycle paths, but I do think there would be a good deal of traction with tourists, plus it would be environmentally friendly. **Development in Hoveton should in essence be conditional on securing these commitments to improve public infrastructure before construction work on the new houses can start.**
DS13	HV01/B	Dixon, Cllr Nigel (1218612)	LP738	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: The originally proposed allocation of 100 - 150 is generally supported as a recognised start point, but somehow that's been changed to approx. 150 which is potentially very different and wouldn't be supported! In that regard this is an objection. However, using whichever figure, it must be seen and justified in the context of what BDC allocates to Wroxham because Hoveton and Wroxham are in effect one community of 2 large villages. It must take account of the traffic impact on the A1151, the impact on the existing poor air quality problem in the village centre and the NCC Market Towns Traffic Survey aiming to reduce traffic congestion and improve traffic capacity. It must also take account that Hoveton already has 2 recent major 'windfall' sites awaiting development: 22 units at Church Field and 28 units on the Tilia Tunstead Rd site. The traffic impact of these won't be known until they are built but it will be significant on current levels. If it's judged that 150 new homes is appropriate in Hoveton then it's my submission that the 50 already in the pipeline should be counted against that 150. The most recent indicative outline plan for the Hov 1 site includes a form of care home which would provide significant appropriate accommodation for the elderly and infirm and provide employment and capacity within the care sector. Hoveton has a need for this kind of accommodation and providing it's integrated well then it would be welcome and should further support the case for a 100 home allocation. Object - but the grounds for objection may be removed if the allocation took the above points into account and didn't exceed 100 new homes, in addition to a care home development. Choice of site - HV01/B is generally supported as the preferred site and seems to be the most logical although there are several aspects of the indicative layout that merit change; in particular, access to Tunstead Rd and the option for a mini-roundabout at the junction at Two Saints Close, routing and safety of the through road to Brook Park and the density and balance with green space for wildlife habitat and interconnection with adjacent habitats. The other major constraint is foul water network capacity and the impact of additional demand on the lower parts of the Hoveton network. This is the subject of a 'position statement' by AWA which

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					recognises the lower network constraints and the need for ongoing protection against network flooding; moreover, it requires future major development to be accompanied by a foul water drainage strategy which wouldn't impact on the lower network. While that's an engineering challenge, and not a reason to argue against this site, it's likely to affect the deliverability of the site. There is still doubt over whether strategically this site may be needed for education expansion of Broadland High School or a 'common campus through school' by relocating St Johns PS. Development of this site will effectively land lock BHS and restrict growth options in the long term. To date there's been no hard evidence that this site will not be needed for education use - this matter needs to be formally resolved before the site is allocated for residential use. Object - but the grounds for objection may be removed by ensuring schemes comply with the above proposed changes and requirements. Sustainability – Object - In general Hoveton scores well but in terms of the rural and Broads character of the village the HV01/B site needs to be designed so that it integrates well with the countryside and to ensure it doesn't urbanise this part of the village. Object - but the grounds for objection may be removed by ensuring the strategy changes at 2, 6, 7 & 8 above are adopted and included in the scheme to deliver the allocation. Habitats and Environmental Impact - Object - The pressure of spreading development into the countryside is intense and currently wildlife is simply displaced mostly by habitat loss. Conversely, the pressure of climate change and the need to protect ecosystems and wildlife habitat is also rising rapidly as we understand more about past development damage and our reliance on wildlife in all its forms to mitigate the impact of climate change. We are also learning about how habitat can be recreated and protected during the design and specification of major development. The development must be environmentally engineered so that it integrates the needs of wildlife in terms of habitat, food sources and safe connectivity of adjacent protected habitat areas; this includes restrictions and requirements around domestic areas to help support ecosystems at the expense of clinical and sterile manicured gardens and public area landscaping. Object - but the grounds for objections may be removed by ensuring the strategy changes at 6,7 & 8 above are adopted and include in this supplementary document.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS13)
Summary of Objections	13	The responses primarily focus on issues with existing infrastructure in Hoveton and concerns that development would result in increase in traffic through the settlements especially on Wroxham Bridge, Tunstead Road and Stalham Road would become a rat run. Issue exacerbated by an extension of the school and a new care home. Some comment on the size and potential density of the site having an impact on character of the village. Other concerns include: air quality issues, biodiversity impact, flooding risk, amenity impact on residents and the impact of the loss of agricultural land on employment and food supply in the future. Adding additional pressure on the doctors and schools and exacerbating issues with drainage and water stress. Current issues with the public transport available - buses caught in traffic, railway not electrified. Also concerns over the potential impact on the economy. Suggests that the hedge along Tunstead Road should be retained. And whether a number of smaller developments would be more in keeping with the village. One comments on the lack of detail available on the site assessment and sustainability appraisal of other sites. One proposes alternative sites HV05 and HV08, perceived to be closer to primary school and easier access to main road.
Summary of Support	5	A few respondents consider this the best option for further development in Hoveton. That elderly care accommodation is needed given the ageing population and extending the school is necessary. Support for the delivery of one site rather than a number of smaller sites. Need

		affordable housing. Development should only start once capacity at services is provided. Some concerns over access and increased traffic on surrounding streets (and Wroxham Bridge) especially during peak summer months. One suggests that there should not be a link between Tunstead Rd and Stalham Rd, as this could increase traffic and have an impact on the open space in Brook Park and cause safety concern for children. Suggestions that a bypass road would resolve traffic issues and improvements would be needed to the public transport. And to ensure sufficient school spaces are available and capacity at the medical centre is increased.
Summary of General Comments	6	Six general comments received. Seems the most logical site and there is a need for a care home. Concerns over access to the site and increased traffic especially over Wroxham Bridge and concerns that Tunstead Rd through to Stalham Rd will be used as rat-run. Existing issues at properties at Brook Park and on-going issues with foul water. AWA recognises the lower network constraints and the need for ongoing protection against network flooding. Future major development to be accompanied by a foul water drainage strategy. Other concerns; existing and likely air quality issues, potential noise pollution and amenity impact on existing properties. The potential impact on the character of village and sense of community, if not careful Hoveton will become an urban sprawl. Need to consider the potential impact of Wroxham Development. Medical centre beyond capacity. Support for this site over a number of smaller sites which wouldn't deliver the range of community benefits needed. This site sits within the residential area and therefore would limit the potential impact on the landscape, The Broads, and the River Bure. One suggests that development should be positioned to reduce potential noise pollution. Need to take into account other sites in the pipeline. To date there's been no hard evidence that this site will not be needed for education use - this matter needs to be formally resolved before the site is allocated for residential use. Development should be designed so that it integrates well with the countryside and to ensure it doesn't urbanise this part of the village. The development must be environmentally engineered so that it integrates the needs of wildlife in terms of habitat, food sources and safe connectivity of adjacent protected habitat areas; this includes restrictions and requirements around domestic areas to help support ecosystems at the expense of clinical and sterile manicured gardens and public area landscaping.
Overall Summary		A number of concerns raised, which focused mainly on the potential impact of development on this site on the existing road infrastructure in Hoveton; the increase in traffic on surrounding streets, especially on Wroxham bridge, between Tunstead Road and Stalham Road and through Brook Park. Concern that an extension of the school and a new care home on the site would exacerbate traffic problems especially at school pick up times. The size and potential density of development could impact on the character of the village. Other general concerns are: air quality issues, noise pollution, biodiversity impact, flooding risk, amenity impact on existing residents. The loss of agricultural land and the impact of this on employment and food supply in the future. Adding additional pressure to doctors, schools and exacerbating issues with drainage and water stress. Development should only start once capacity at services is provided. Public transport issues. Some suggest that a number of smaller developments would be more in keeping with the village and that a bypass would resolve traffic issues. Hedge along Tunstead Road should be retained. Questions the detail available of the site assessments and sustainability appraisal of alternative sites in Hoveton. Some consider this site as the best option for further growth in Hoveton, and prefer this to developing a number of smaller sites that would not provide the community benefits needed. Elderly care accommodation and the potential increase at the school would be welcomed. The site would have limited impact on the landscape and The Broads. Should consider the potential impact of development in Wroxham. Evidence that the expansion of education use is needed and should be resolved before being allocated. Development should be designed so it integrates with the countryside and ensure that it is environmentally engineered to integrate with the needs of wildlife.
+		Noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy. Sites have been assessed against a detailed set of criteria and have been subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal. The decision on whether a site should be proposed as a draft allocation is made having regard to all of the factors set out in para 11.10 of the emerging LP and detailed in Background Paper 6 - Development Site Selection methodology. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints, the potential impact of development on landscape and views and air quality issues have been taken into account. The Council has liaised with the Local Highways Authority to identify the likely impacts of new development for the local and strategic road network in terms of highways safety, congestion, access arrangements and cumulative growth where the Highways Authority is undertaking ongoing assessments through the market town initiatives. Off site Mitigation measures will be a requirement

		to offset any potential adverse impact. The Council continues to work with Anglian Water to identify and address network issues and establish a position statement. The Council has used current evidence base and engaged with relevant bodies including health and education bodies to identify where additional social infrastructure may be required as a result of new development . The Council has engaged fully with the Environment Agency and other relevant key professional bodies/persons. It has used the most up-to-date flood risk evidence base in order to identify the likely flood risk of sites, low probability. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems will be required. The proposed allocation is subject to a specific policy which identifies requirements that development proposals would need to address in order to secure planning permission. This includes a requirement for the retention of existing trees and hedgerows around the site. Wroxham is within Broadland District. Broadland District Council, together with Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council, is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan for the Greater Norwich area but is yet to make decisions about how much development might be considered in Wroxham. The Council co operate on cross boundary issues through the Duty to Co operate and Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework and any cross boundary issues in relation to the Greater Norwich Local Plan / Braods Authority in relation to Wroxham will be taken into account. The Council will take into account consultation feedback from bodies such as Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Natural England to inform decisions regarding the likely impact of developing a site for biodiversity and continue to work with site promoters to take into account biodiversity features. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact.

Proposals for North Walsham

DS14: Land at Norwich Road & Nursery Drive

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS14	NW01/B	Clark, Mr Ian (1210036)	LP023	General Comments	look at the Cromer rd...Aylsham rd...station rd...a new fuel outlet....and as mentioned..drainage..the towns system is old...and where is the main drainage to this large development going?..reference to the governments papers printed on the initial appeal that refused the greens rd plan…
DS14	NW01/B	Correa-Hunt, Mr David (1218558)	LP783	Support	~The Town of North Walsham has a favourable site on somewhat elevated arable land only a few miles inland from the popular North Norfolk coast sixteen miles north of the County Town, Norwich. ~Recent decades have seen substantial growth of Residential development surrounding the town, which is now the largest urban area in North Norfolk, and growing. ~ the original streets are narrow and contorted and accordingly basically unsuitable for today's motor traffic. Provision for pedestrians (and cyclists) is deplorably inadequate and in places totally lacking, which is obviously a public danger. The so-called "Bypass", the outcome of a past decision to reroute the A149 (Yarmouth-Cromer) Road along the alignment of a former railway, is not in fact a bypass at all. The result is a busy highway that virtually bisects the town. ~The Railway Station is unfortunately on the other side of the A149 road, from the Town Centre. There is absolutely no provision for bus stops at the station. Moreover the location of the station is rendered inaccessible to the double-decker bus services owing to the low rail bridge spanning the Norwich Road. The railway line northwards from Wroxham Station is single track and non-electrified. It serves the largest urban area in North Norfolk, which is set to continue growing. Clearly a twin-track electrified line from Norwich would be an enormous advantage to North Walsham. ~It would appear to be desirable for the A149 to be rerouted (once again) to constitute an actual bypass passing to the west of the Urban area. It could then ring and define those areas that it is now planned to develop for yet further residential expansion. The periodic traffic congestion occurring in the town at present has evidently been exacerbated by extensive growth of residential areas surrounding the town. ~Conservation and Re-Vitalisation of the C.B.D The Central Business District/ Town Centre needs special consideration: it should become a Conservation- Redevelopment Zone (in planning law) comprising: Market Place / Market Street; King's Arms Street (part); The Precinct/ Church Yard; Church Road etc. [also possibly; Aylsham Road (part); Cromer Road (part); Mundesley Road (part); and Vicarage Street]. Additionally, through traffic flow must be eliminated from that part of Yarmouth Road separating Market Place and Roy's store, from the Post Office and Lidl's supermarket. ~In the 19th century there has been an unfortunate encroachment into the S.W. part of Market Place; visually it appears to crush the unique (pavilion-like) 17th century Market Cross (iconic feature of the old town) into a corner. Also it also completely masks the Kings Arms Inn. Accordingly consideration should be made to removing this encroachment. (But 18th century "Waterloo House" should be retained). The suggested removal would open up a vista from Market Place into the Square formed by Paston College Buildings. Conservation of the Market Place would entail its permanent "PEDESTRIANISATION". To implement this it would be necessary to form a traffic circulation route surrounding the CBD with provision for short-term car parking and convenient access to the Market Place for pedestrians and cyclists.

					~A basic amenity must be the provision of access and space to accommodate rail / bus interchange at the railway station. The constructive approach would involve much creative and discerning "town design" to conserve the attractive old town and to adapt it to the needs of the 21st Century without destroying its historic character. ~The ancient Market towns of North Norfolk, such as Aylsham and North Walsham are being subjected to official pressure to expand by the government's Housing Policy. It is perhaps regrettable that the possibility of the creation of an "Eco-Town" on the site of the former Coltishall Air Base, is not to be implemented. Such development could have saved the old towns from pressure to expand, which could, unless handled with great skill, lead to the ruin of their historic character. ~Natural features of the landscape, such as the shallow valley of the Ant River, should be determining factors in this gentle landscape. All development must be designed with the utmost sensitivity to the environment and with cognisance of the fact that the productive agricultural land that we have inherited is irreplaceable. ~ If future plans for Paston College (as mooted) include desired move to an out-of-town site, this could offer the town a unique opportunity for the conversion of the fine (listed) existing College Buildings to form a worthy Civic Centre / Town Square (adjacent to Market Place) for the town, to augment its stature.
DS14	NW01/B	Cossey, Ms Donna (1218402)	LP729	Object	~I wish to state my concerns for further residential homes in North Walsham. Problems already in town without further houses. ~North Walsham Infant and Junior School already teach some lessons in corridors as not enough room. Sometimes in the school hall / dinner hall there is not enough tables and benches so children have to eat on the floor. ~North Walsham dentists.... family members have to travel to Hemsby to see a dentist. Young children, well lots of residents are without dentist in North Walsham. North Walsham Doctors sometimes 2 or 3 week wait to see a Doctor. ~North Walsham town center is a standstill from 2.40 until 3.40 around school pick up time. No one moves just sit in car and move slowly.
DS14	NW01/B	Smith, Mr Matthew (1209593)	LP002	Support	I support the need to grow and develop and believe that a Local Plan in the best way forward. What needs to happen is Section 106 funding must come to North Walsham (and other NNDC towns) first and work must be undertaken to improve infrastructure before homes are signed off/sold. In particular school places and access to quality play park provision are vital for the youngsters in the town. Local charities such as North Walsham Play are best placed to support with this going forward. Please do give this suitable consideration.
DS14	NW01/B	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	We share the concerns which North Walsham Town Council has expressed about this policy. While we agree that there is a requirement for an independent Development Brief to guide any future development of this site, we too think that the policy is insufficiently precise in its treatment of utility provision. As a part of this Development Brief, we think that there must be a requirement to demonstrate sufficient capacity in electricity and telecommunications to meet the needs of any proposed development. We note too that there is no explicit reference to the North Norfolk Design Guide in Policy DS 14. We would hope to see additional wording within this policy in order to make specific North Walsham's requirement for a well designed development with proper provision of essential utilities.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS14)
Summary of Objections	1	The proposal received one objection. Existing issues with congestion. Concern about capacity at doctors and dentist.
Summary of Support	2	Two support this site, recognising North Walsham as the largest urban area in North Norfolk and the need for it to grow. However comment on concerns with the existing road infrastructure, with the town suffering from traffic congestion exacerbated by residential growth in the town and the lack of pedestrian and cycle routes. Suggest that it would be desirable to reroute the A149 and to improve the railway station. Also for the town centre to become a Conservation Redevelopment Zone and be pedestrianised. Development should be designed to be sensitive to the environment and Section 106 funding must come to North Walsham (and other NNDC towns) first and work must be undertaken to improve infrastructure before homes are signed off/sold.
Summary of General Comments	2	Two comments received. Concerns over the impact of the proposal on the existing road system and on drainage . Agree with the requirement for a Development Brief but think policy is insufficiently precise in its treatment of utility provision. Must be a requirement to demonstrate sufficient capacity in electricity and telecommunications to meet the needs of any proposed development. Would like additional wording to make specific North Walsham's requirement for a well designed development with proper provision of essential utilities.
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. Overall support for this site, recognising North Walsham as the largest urban area in North Norfolk and the need for it to grow. However there are concerns with the existing road infrastructure, traffic congestion, lack of pedestrian and cycle routes, capacity at doctors and dentists, electricity and telecommunications and issues with drainage. Suggest that it would be desirable to reroute the A149, to improve the railway station and for the town centre to become a Conservation Redevelopment Zone and be pedestrianised. Development should be designed to be sensitive to the environment and for Section 106 funding to come to North Walsham (and other NNDC towns) first and work undertaken to improve infrastructure before homes are signed off/sold. **Suggest additional wording** requiring a well designed development with proper provision of essential utilities.
Council's Response		Support noted. Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. The Council has liaised with the Local Highways Authority to identify the likely impacts of new development for the local and strategic road network in terms of highways safety, congestion and access arrangements. The Council has engaged with infrastructure providers to establish the current position and capacity and to identify the strategic infrastructure requirements arising from planned growth and to identify potential funding and delivery mechanisms. These issues have been taken into account and will continue to be taken into account through iterative dialogue in the finalisation of the Local Plan. The Council has committed to the development of a development brief in partnership and will be subject to further public consultation and this will include an overall design framework building on the principles of the District's most up to date Design Guide.

DS15: North Walsham Western Extension

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS15	NW62	Addison Elaine (1210267)	LP075	Object	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Whilst I welcome the adoption of a local plan, subsequent to the recently declared 'Climate Emergency' by NNDC, I expected to see more environmentally sound policies and obligations placed on developers for carbon-neutral developments. There is a complete lack of community-led planning in North Walsham, a total lack of infrastructure incorporated into the North Walsham Western extension, and commercial development has also been dismissed for the lifetime of this local plan by not incorporating the bypass road extension all of the way to the industrial estate in North Walsham. This plan should be reviewed, and re-drafted, as in its current form is not considered to be fit for the purpose it sets out to achieve. There are significant risks to delivering its objectives and targets, especially in line with the Climate Emergency declaration. It should therefore be re drafted and be then subject to a further round of public consultation. Commercial strategy - bypass / link road must join all the way to the industrial estate - this is essential in order to develop North Walsham, and it will allow new residents to work locally. • cycleways to support new housing • commitment to carbon offsetting all of NNDC services • commitment to carbon calculations in local plan • commitment to zero carbon by 2030, which is within the timeframe of this local plan • obligation for developers to use renewable technology • obligation for developers to use rainwater harvesting • obligation for developers to install electric car charging points on new homes • obligation for developers to develop passivhaus / carbon neutral homes • park & ride Legally binding obligation to build social housing, not just so-called affordable housing. Any affordable housing agreed at this stage, will be diluted once the plan is agreed and the developers start squirming out of their projections, and we already have too many residents on housing waiting lists who cannot afford this so-called affordable housing. Infrastructure needs to be embedded within the community. This means schools & health centre within the western extension, so that our over-burdened roads are not broad to a standstill with an extra 4,000 cars trying to get to schools or the doctor. Convenient shops in the western extension, to help develop this as a community, rather than a dormitory area. Review of how North Norfolk can use brownfield sites first, rather than building on green field sites which will weaken our food security forever.
DS15	NW62	Bell, Ms Jane (1218558)	LP799	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Neutral; A new primary school would be a splendid opportunity to design green, sustainable buildings, surrounded by every chance for children to learn about and to cherish the natural world; to learn about ecological relationships - how all life 'fits together'. Darwin's 'economy of nature' can be taught at any level and the need to learn about it is more urgent than ever.
DS15	NW62	Binks, Mrs Susan (1217821)	LP667	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Object to this proposal. There is a wild field behind Skeyton View which is due to be built on which has beautiful old trees and hedgerows & is home to many many species of wildlife. Many different birds,insects,hedgehogs,squirrels,butterflies,bees both wild and those in hives and I'm sure many many more. The destruction of this habitat would be criminal.
DS15	NW62	Bluss, Mr Andrew (1210045)	LP027	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Given that the average household has one car that is potentially an extra 1500 vehicles on the road adding to an already polluted and congested town. The town's carbon footprint is not going to be helped by the significant increase of vehicles which will lead to slower

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					journey times and more CO2 being pumped into the atmosphere. Do I need to mention schools, doctors, refuse collection, policing etc to cope with the added population? Will there be an increase in the number of buses and/or bus routes to allow commuting? The proposed western extension swallows up a number of public footpaths and the Weavers Way. It is also the site of the 1381 Battle of North Walsham. A very significant episode in our local and social history! Whilst the precise location has not been determined, using the existing markers around the town as a relatively accurate "boundary" then your plans would totally eradicate this site completely. Lastly, the "Link Road" between Norwich Road and Cromer Road. A possible route has been identified for this. Starting just south of the town boundary, cutting across pristine farmland, several public footpaths, across Skeyton Road and joining Cromer Road by Link Road. The pipedream is to push this through to the industrial estates. My understanding is that a feasibility study was carried out a number of years ago on whether the rail bridge on Link Road could take HGV's. The reports findings was that it could. However, lorries have got much bigger in that time and it is difficult to imagine the bridge being able to cope with the amount of sustained traffic (and the additional gross vehicular weight) it would be required to carry without huge cost to make it viable. We have been told that the developers would foot the cost of the link road? How? The average cost of a home in North Walsham is significantly less than those of more "fashionable" towns so the profit margin is going to be equally reduced per unit. So will the percentage of so-called "affordable" homes be reduced to make up the difference? I recognise the need to remove HGV's from the local streets. So I am not dismissing the proposal out of hand but have ALL the alternatives been looked at? For example, why not impose a weight limit of 7.5 tonnes on Aylsham Road at the junction of Greens Road? Prohibited traffic entering North Walsham would be forced to use Greens Road. Place a set of traffic lights with pedestrian usage at the junction of Cromer Road to control access/egress. The speed limit of 30 on Cromer Road could also be moved back to the town boundary as an additional safety measure. I know it sounds simplistic but has lowering the road surface under the railway bridge on Norwich Road been considered? – could solve all the problems in the long term for an initial amount of pain? Have all alternatives been considered to accommodate HGVs rather than a link road. **The land between Link Road and Waitrose, could site a significant number of required homes of the proposed plan.** Why is this not being considered as the preferred option? The answer, invariably, is twofold. Firstly acquiring the land from the owners and the cost of clearing. My response to that is, what possible reason could there be for the owners to allow land to sit unused for years? The rusting structures that blight Cromer Road are testimony to this. Why not compulsorily purchase the land? Why not change the permitted use from commercial to residential? What price the cost of clearing industrial land compared to the destruction of the natural environment under current proposals? Developments on Norwich Road had to do it so it would not be setting a precedent.
DS15	NW62	Burns, Mr David (1216064)	LP156	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Before any development is considered NW requires a full plan and resourcing of local infrastructure and capacity, particularly rail route to Norwich, associated parking, school capacity, road flows, etc. A full investment plan in the required infrastructure before development as the town needs these today, as any extra houses will be a community burden and unsustainable with existing services

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS15	NW62	Clark, Mr Ian (1210036)	LP023	General Comments	look at the Cromer rd...Aylsham rd...station rd...a new fuel outlet....and as mentioned..drainage..the towns system is old...and where is the main drainage to this large development going?..reference to the governments papers printed on the initial appeal that refused the greens rd plan…
DS15	NW62	Correa-Hunt, Mr David (1218473)	LP783	Support	~The Town of North Walsham has a favourable site on somewhat elevated arable land only a few miles inland from the popular North Norfolk coast sixteen miles north of the County Town, Norwich. ~Recent decades have seen substantial growth of Residential development surrounding the town, which is now the largest urban area in North Norfolk, and growing. ~ the original streets are narrow and contorted and accordingly basically unsuitable for today's motor traffic. Provision for pedestrians (and cyclists) is deplorably inadequate and in places totally lacking, which is obviously a public danger. The so-called "Bypass", the outcome of a past decision to reroute the A149 (Yarmouth-Cromer) Road along the alignment of a former railway, is not in fact a bypass at all. The result is a busy highway that virtually bisects the town. ~The Railway Station is unfortunately on the other side of the A149 road, from the Town Centre. There is absolutely no provision for bus stops at the station. Moreover the location of the station is rendered inaccessible to the double-decker bus services owing to the low rail bridge spanning the Norwich Road. The railway line northwards from Wroxham Station is single track and non-electrified. It serves the largest urban area in North Norfolk, which is set to continue growing. Clearly a twin-track electrified line from Norwich would be an enormous advantage to North Walsham. ~It would appear to be desirable for the A149 to be rerouted (once again) to constitute an actual bypass passing to the west of the Urban area. It could then ring and define those areas that it is now planned to develop for yet further residential expansion. The periodic traffic congestion occurring in the town at present has evidently been exacerbated by extensive growth of residential areas surrounding the town. ~Conservation and Re-Vitalisation of the C.B.D The Central Business District/ Town Centre needs special consideration: it should become a Conservation- Redevelopment Zone (in planning law) comprising: Market Place / Market Street; King's Arms Street (part); The Precinct/ Church Yard; Church Road etc. [also possibly; Aylsham Road (part); Cromer Road (part); Mundesley Road (part); and Vicarage Street]. Additionally, through traffic flow must be eliminated from that part of Yarmouth Road separating Market Place and Roy's store, from the Post Office and Lidl's supermarket. ~In the 19th century there has been an unfortunate encroachment into the S.W. part of Market Place; visually it appears to crush the unique (pavilion-like) 17th century Market Cross (iconic feature of the old town) into a corner. Also it also completely masks the Kings Arms Inn. Accordingly consideration should be made to removing this encroachment. (But 18th century "Waterloo House" should be retained). The suggested removal would open up a vista from Market Place into the Square formed by Paston College Buildings. Conservation of the Market Place would entail its permanent "PEDESTRIANISATION". To implement this it would be necessary to form a traffic circulation route surrounding the CBD with provision for short-term car parking and convenient access to the Market Place for pedestrians and cyclists. ~A basic amenity must be the provision of access and space to accommodate rail / bus interchange at the railway

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					station. The constructive approach would involve much creative and discerning “town design” to conserve the attractive old town and to adapt it to the needs of the 21st Century without destroying its historic character. ~The ancient Market towns of North Norfolk, such as Aylsham and North Walsham are being subjected to official pressure to expand by the government’s Housing Policy. It is perhaps regrettable that the possibility of the creation of an “Eco-Town” on the site of the former Coltishall Air Base, is not to be implemented. Such development could have saved the old towns from pressure to expand, which could, unless handled with great skill, lead to the ruin of their historic character. ~Natural features of the landscape, such as the shallow valley of the Ant River, should be determining factors in this gentle landscape. All development must be designed with the utmost sensitivity to the environment and with cognisance of the fact that the productive agricultural land that we have inherited is irreplaceable. ~ If future plans for Paston College (as mooted) include desired move to an out-of-town site, this could offer the town a unique opportunity for the conversion of the fine (listed) existing College Buildings to form a worthy Civic Centre / Town Square (adjacent to Market Place) for the town, to augment its stature.
DS15	NW62	Cossey, Ms Donna (1218402)	LP729	Object	~I wish to state my concerns for further residential homes in North Walsham. Problems already in town without further houses. ~North Walsham Infant and Junior School already teach some lessons in corridors as not enough room. Sometimes in the school hall / dinner hall there is not enough tables and benches so children have to eat on the floor. ~North Walsham dentists.... family members have to travel to Hemsby to see a dentist. Young children, well lots of residents are without dentist in North Walsham. North Walsham Doctors sometimes 2 or 3 week wait to see a Doctor. ~North Walsham town centre is a standstill from 2.40 until 3.40 around school pick up time. No one moves just sit in car and move slowly.
DS15	NW62	Harrison, Dr Geoffrey (1215953)	LP146	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** In favour of link road between Norwich Rd and Cromer Road, would need to be suitable for HGVs, and farm traffic that currently have to pass through the existing western residential area (principally Station Road). The "Link Road" "APPEARS" to be simply another small road through a very densely populated residential area, which would not be suitable or adequate for the volume of, or the type of traffic that it would be used by; would present constant danger for new residents. This traffic is already life threatening for residents of the existing Western section of North Walsham e.g. Station Rd Skeyton New Road and the parallel section of Aylsham Rd where a 20 MPH speed limit is urgently required. How many child fatalities are required for action to be taken? The BYPASS needs to extend past the Lyngate Industrial estate off the Mundesley Road to join the B1145 an increase in population by 5000 would require a 40% increase in all public amenities , and the appalling road between Aylsham & North Walsham would need to be fixed as it would suffer considerably more traffic.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS15	NW62	Hayes, Mrs Judith (1216770)	LP765	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** There has been a great deal of houses and building work around Norwich Road, the road can hardly cope with the amount of traffic going in and out of North Walsham. The traffic lights by the station cannot cope and it takes a very long time to get to and from the town at peak times. This surely will get worse once all the current houses are finished and the new ones built. A link Road will only stop a certain amount of traffic and probably push more vehicles along Norwich Road. It needs to go over the railway line to join up with the main road. The land currently growing crops etc., this type of agricultural land will ever be replaced and the amount of crops etc., will be lost forever. It seems a shame to saturate North Walsham with so many houses and building work expanding the town outwards. Sadly the shops in the town will not keep shoppers in North Walsham as there as so many items that cannot be found or purchased locally.
DS15	NW62	Heal, Mrs Jeanne (1216562)	LP199	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Object to the proposals for North Walsham: • There is no plan to address the recently declared climate emergency. Creating a commuter town rather than local employment and commerce will increase rather than reduce the carbon footprint. A commitment to ensure that there is social housing provided. The proposed development should only be started after a link road from the Cromer Road to the industrial estate is provided. There is no social housing. The increase in elderly and infirm means there is a need to house workers who will provide care. Care workers are generally low paid, unable to afford 'affordable' housing, but needing low rent or shared ownership, i.e. social housing. There is already a shortage of care workers in the district. The congestion on the roads in the town already make NW an unattractive place to visit. It is vital that the link road from the Cromer Road to the existing industrial estate via Link Road is put in place before there is any development. This will need public investment. As NW is the largest town in the District, raising a substantial amount in Council tax, it deserves to see a return in public investment in the town. If the local authority invested per head of population in North Walsham at the same level as they have for industry at Egmere, Itteringham Community shop or Cromer indoor tennis facilities, this would cover the link road. • The link road is viable, plans were in place when I was a member of the authority over 30 years ago, it is shameful that this vital infrastructure has been neglected resulting in the loss of industry, employment and unacceptable risks for pedestrians and cyclists on Aylsham Road. • The link road will allow the industrial estate to expand creating local employment. • Commuters will not shop locally, the plan needs to encourage people to live, work, and shop locally. Whilst acknowledging that the plan is to address housing need, housing cannot be considered in isolation. We need to build communities not just houses.
DS15	NW62	Jones, Mr Tony (1217025)	LP290	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** NW62 represents a significant expansion of the town. Notwithstanding the rail service to North Walsham, transport links remain poor. It is inevitable that a large proportion of new inhabitants of the town will work elsewhere, it's therefore imperative that NNDC works with Norfolk County Council to improve public transport links so that the expanded population can make sustainable transport choices. Larger trains are delivering increased capacity now, but the current hourly train frequency ensures that travelling to Norwich by rail is less attractive than it could be. A half hourly frequency would enable more flexible travelling, and will be crucial to providing an attractive service for regular travellers. The current hourly service is unattractive now, and will be unfit for purpose if/when the western extension is built out. My focus here is rail, but quality walking cycling links in the town will be necessary to support growth. NNDC should ensure that design of new

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					developments is masterplanned to support residents making environmentally sustainable transport choices. This is too important to be left to the developers alone. There is an opportunity here to deliver imaginative, high quality development which is not focussed solely around the car.
DS15	NW62	Macey, Mr Henry (1216502)	LP196	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: I agree in principle but the scale of proposed development is far too large. Dependent on good infrastructure. The new road would clearly be paid for by the developers and needs to be in place first which it can't! Re: 16.5 Vulnerability of the town centre is serious. Parking must be addressed - not just quantity but layout (presently badly designed). What happened to the proposed enlargement of the station car-park. Potential congestion must be addressed; new residents will not walk into town so must park. Sort the Grammar School roundabout/King's Arms St junction where NCC caused congestion by taking out a lane; this gets worse.
DS15	NW62	Mann, Mr Bernard (1218500)	LP808	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Horror and Outrage that you can even think of allowing such a large scale proposal as this without any thought as to how the village of Coltishall is going to cope the extra burden of at least 2000 extra car journeys per day. Everybody living on the North Walsham and adjoining roads already state that the situation is already a nightmare and that High Street was NEVER intended to take such volumes of traffic. Since the NDR has been in operation the volume of traffic through Coltishall has Significantly increased due to the fact that people living the coastal side of Wroxham find it easier to travel through Coltishall rather than queue for over a mile to get through the village when leaving Norwich. Before any future developments are even considered Thought & Action must be given to a relief road or Bypass. Has any thought been given to the amount of extra pollution that will be generated in our village? YOU have a duty to ensure that our future inhabitants are not choked to death by traffic that should not be going through the village. Get your priorities right, put the correct infrastructure in place Before any more developments are allowed. Why does it take the general public to see the forthcoming problems before the people in "power" can see them or are their eyes and ears closed ? I am fed up seeing and listening to people saying " We must learn from this" after a mistake has been made and highlighted
DS15	NW62	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	It is our view that the level of development which is proposed for North Walsham would impose very considerable strain upon our town. In order to sustain such a level of development we have needs which must be addressed by the Plan. This submission seeks to specify those needs. Throughout this submission we have made comments which have relevance to Policy DS 15. We believe that any extension to our town should be a model of green development, designed in accordance with the North Norfolk Design Guide and an enhancement to the well being and prosperity of North Walsham as a whole. What Changes Are You Seeking? 1. We are seeking a western extension link road which joins the Norwich Road to North Norfolk District Council's industrial estate. We consider that a road which merely links the Norwich Road to the Cromer Road will be inadequate both to the needs of our residents and to the needs of businesses on the industrial estate. 2. We are seeking - as we have noted elsewhere - an increase in the percentage of social rented housing to be made available on this and other residential sites allocated in North Walsham. 3. We note that while Policy DS 15 makes reference to the need for the 'mitigation' of highways impact, there is no mention of a

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					comprehensive traffic impact study for the town as a whole. We are seeking such a study. 4. As we have argued elsewhere, if the proposed development is to enhance the health and well being of the town then there must be imaginative provision for a green infrastructure which links the development to nearby countryside and to the town centre. 5. We are seeking a thorough study of the impact of this development upon the health of both the new and the existing residents of North Walsham and a complete understanding of how their identified needs would be met. We would expect this to include additional medical and community facilities. 6. As we have argued in relation to Policy DS 14, we would expect to see evidence of sufficient capacity in electricity and telecommunications to support the needs of the residents of the proposed site. 7. We are seeking the provision of a new Primary School for North Walsham, accessible from the western extension link road and green infrastructure routes. Have the chance to create a model of green development in North Walsham, a well designed, pleasing and energy efficient community, well integrated into our town. Would be an enhancement of our prosperity and attraction. But our abiding concern is that without the infrastructure to which we have alluded these things will never be achieved.
DS15	NW62	Morey, Mr Philip (1210409)	LP045	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I understand That only a large scale development will enable developers to provide infrastructure but how often have they promised doctors' surgeries, schools, community halls etc only to renege on their commitments claiming financial restrictions as has happened on the Norwich Road site where affordable homes have been scrapped? Why is it not possible for the larger brownfield sites to be developed (thus removing local eyesores) and the developers pay a premium to the council so that the council can invest in improving infrastructures? That way much of the land west of North Walsham will not be needed for housing and the council can be held responsible for infrastructure improvements rather than an unaccountable private developer. As for the traffic problems, I am sure every local resident has been snarled up, sometimes for lengthy periods, as buses outside the post office create chaos and huge tailbacks through the town centre. This can only get worse with more houses and is an issue that needs to be tackled before any more homes are built, no matter where. And already considerable problem of trying to get a doctor's appointment.
DS15	NW62	Mortimer (1210197)	LP076	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: Surely NO building should happen on open fields until ALL brownfield sites and empty spaces above shops and offices have been used? This type of proposal seems short-sighted and environmentally bad. It should not be the job of North Walsham (or Norfolk as a whole) to be providing homes that are affordable only to those moving here from the South East. This could allow young people onto the property ladder, and allow older people somewhere to down-size to when they were ready.
DS15	NW62	Philcox, Miss Charlotte (1210047)	LP026	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Large developments of the kind proposed are often overcrowded, designed around car use, lacking in infrastructure and with a stark absence of genuinely affordable homes. How will such a large site be integrated into the town? Where will people work, go to school, socialise, etc? It sounds like another dormitory development for people working in Norwich/outside the area, or retiring here from outside the region. I fully support those many local residents in the town whose homes will look out onto this proposed development, and be severely impacted by it. If it is to go ahead, I would therefore suggest as a minimum the inclusion of 'buffer' strips between existing homes and new properties, consisting of carefully planned

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					areas of trees (which should not be placed so as to shade existing gardens/homes) and open grassland to provide habitat/green areas which would improve the landscape, give screening, and also help to compensate for polluted air from the new link road. On a positive note, the development itself could be a flagship for sustainability and include good sized areas of trees, green space, wildlife corridors and public gardens. Properties should not be allowed to be purchased as second homes. Far more should be done to lessen the environmental impact of the proposed developments. Rather than a faceless sprawl of uniform properties built by 1-3 companies as mentioned within the proposal (we can guess which these will be), of which there are so many already, it should be an opportunity to build new properties which are integrated with the landscape, low on energy consumption and waste, and are built from environmentally friendly materials, and for ecological sustainability. Planting of trees, provision of cycle lanes, facilities for electric cars, footpaths and green open spaces should be given a priority. If it is to happen, this development could be a flagship for our region, a positive element benefitting the town and encouraging visitors.
DS15	NW62	Rayner, Mr Andrew (1217466)	LP635	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Scale of development:-The western extension would add a major increase to the size of the town and population. It results in the loss of substantial areas of greenspace, farmland and natural habitat for wildlife and quiet areas for walking etc. The overall density of the western edge would be massively increased to the detriment of existing residents who enjoy a semi rural environment. There is also the issue of the impact of such a large development on outlying roads and towns. for example, the resulting vehicular movements to the coast and towards Norwich. For example Coltishall and Wroxham bridges will be impacted upon. I fear the development on such a scale will be largely controlled by developers who have shown time and time again that they have no interest in the area other than profit and will do all they can to renege on any social contribution negotiated. Link Road: I note the link Road is proposed in order to address heavy lorry access through the Town. However it seems that it will simply move the problem to those existing residents in the area of the extension zone and the new housing developments. Presumably any new residential roads will filter of the new link road. There should be no motorised vehicle access from the new development, nor a spur off the link road, onto Skeyton Road. Otherwise this would result in a totally unacceptable level of harm to the amenity and quiet enjoyment existing residents. In addition the traffic problems experienced in the Station Road area will not be addressed due to increased vehicle movement from the new developments. Climate issue:-Given the worldwide concern over the impact of human activity on the planet are such road developments sustainable? Instead should we not be looking at reducing the size of vehicles of local roads so they can pass under existing bridges. Vehicle weights should be decreased to prevent damage to existing unsuitable narrow roads. Use of cars should be discouraged but given the distance from the development into town it can be anticipated that car use will take precedence over walking and cycling.
DS15	NW62	Rose, Mr Alan (1217227)	LP577 LP821	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Housing development in North Walsham could mean a new link road running between the Norwich and Cromer Roads, hopefully then extended on into the industrial estate, which will cut traffic in the town and move tall lorries away from the bridges, alleviating the problems on Aylsham Road and the regular strikes on the Cromer Road bridge. The bypass will facilitate significant

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					benefits both real and potential. It would also need new schools and GP services and maybe even an upgrade for the Cottage Hospital. There would be more people using the train and new jobs and businesses might come into the town. We need to make sure we have the infrastructure and services to be able to cope with an increase in housing and population. Town infrastructure The increase in housing and businesses facilitated by the plan will need key infrastructure improving within the town. 1. Schools - additional primary and secondary education places will need to be identified through expansion of existing schools or building of additional ones. 2. Sewage/drains - The town has always had issues with drainage that in extreme weather has caused significant flooding. Expansion will need to include plans for this and development before building new houses. 3. Medical - Doctors surgeries are already at breaking point so additional services potentially on the site of the Memorial hospital are required, again before the building of the houses
DS15	NW62	Scott, Mr Lawrence ()	LP020	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Agree that North Walsham needs this expansion and note you have put in the supporting infrastructure. The new link road, extra primary school. The new link road will be built to gain access to the proposed building areas. I am still concerned that the high sider route is still going through the centre of North Walsham.I understand that the bridge over the railway is suitable to carry LGV's. In my opinion this will not need widening, but instead use smart lights to control traffic. Bradfield Road and Lyngate Road will need widening and junction improvements. The benefits of this will be to pull the high sider LGV from the centre of town. This making it safer for pedestrians and buildings (Reduced vibration) all round. This will allow LGV's direct access to Folgate Road industry park.
DS15	NW62	Smith, Mr Matthew (1209593)	LP002	Support	I support the need to grow and develop and believe that a Local Plan in the best way forward. What needs to happen is Section 106 funding must come to North Walsham (and other NNDC towns) first and work must be undertaken to improve infrastructure before homes are signed off/sold. In particular school places and access to quality play park provision are vital for the youngsters in the town. Local charities such as North Walsham Play are best placed to support with this going forward. Please do give this suitable consideration.
DS15	NW62	Tuff, Mr Roy (1215889)	LP731	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** In response to the vision set out in paragraph 5.17 - Sadly, we are three years into the Plan and are going backwards – there are no NHS Dental Spaces available, even on the Waiting List – one friend who has moved from Cromer needed to stay with her Dentist in Cromer as she couldn't switch. Doctors are problematic – the standard Waiting Time is now three weeks. Primary Schools are splitting Siblings – one at Manor Road, the other at Millfield – there are also splitting friends who were together at Infant School. There is increasingly heavy Traffic through the Town, and it is grid-locked at certain times of the day. The general consensus at a meeting held by the Town Council is that there should be no further development until the Infrastructure is sorted – I fully concur with this. I would welcome more Housing once the appropriate Infrastructure is available. It would be good to have sufficient Social Housing for those on the Waiting List, and Affordable Housing for Young People. I would also wish that the Western Link Road to extend over the Railway Line to eventually allow access to the Industrial Estate. It would also be useful to see the 20 mph area on Aylsham Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					extended further out of Town. Final comment – there is mention of our Ageing Population and also the Economic Contribution of Younger People – we should also remember the Volunteering Contribution made by many of our Retirees.
DS15	NW62	Ward, Mr Nigel (1210625)	LP072	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** A travesty if land owners are allowed to sell there prime agriculture land for building 2000 plus homes. Agricultural Land should be protected at all costs along with our wildlife and their habitation. Large developments have had direct negative impact for North Walsham residents such as major tail backs of traffic in the town centre grid locked during school runs twice daily. The pollution is awful and 4000 more cars from the proposed development is a danger to our children along with the added risks of the extra traffic I though there was a climate environmental emergency so NNDC has said. No funding or costings to light Taking a chunk out of weavers way to put a link rd shame on NNDC as our children use Weavers Way. No Council Houses and we know as previous developments in the town that developers promise the earth and have never delivered as NNDC cannot force Developers to do what they have said they will do. No infrastructure No Morals and it appears our opinions are just a formality as from my recent visit to an event Road Show in North Walsham Hosted by NNDC its going through. I can say not if the people of North Walsham have anything to say about it we will jut vote the council out at the next election. As I own a small business its common sense to put and build the infrastructure in first before any houses are built but it seems NNDC does not understand business models!!! Sort the disaster of Coltishall out first before any further developments Coltishall bridge cannot take any more Buses, HGVs, vans, and cars as its always tailed back as only 1 lorry and nothing else can get over the bridge Do Not build on either side of Weavers Way it will destroy our Countryside. Build on carters fields that way a much smaller development that can access the main North Walsham to Norwich rd with out a link going through Countryside. TWO of the largest hauliers in North Walsham would not use any link rd as it would take them 2 miles longer to get to Yarmouth Rd and would be pushing HGV's through the new Link Rd down Mundesley Rd Use Brown field sites
DS15	NW62	Willer, Mrs Jill (1210911)	LP099	Object	I have seen many changes and developments in and around the town. I truly believe that the town has almost reached it's capacity and any new builds should be limited to brown field sites. The number of new builds suggested needs to be scaled down. 2000 plus is unrealistic. We have just had new house builds on the Norwich Road, putting an extra strain on our doctors surgeries, dentists, drainage, water supply and the national grid. How would they cope with the population of another 2000 dwellings? The NHS dentists in the town are no longer taking on new clients, we cannot obtain new doctors due to the work overload and stress of it all! A population increase means more cars commuting to schools. There is suggestion of a new primary school but what of the strain on the high school and college? The town network cannot cope with all the extra traffic. To suggest an increase to the industrial estate with extra units as a solution to the lack of jobs in the town is ridiculous. The days of high employment in the town are long gone with the major employers of the 1970's and 1980's. We will have more houses than ever but less jobs than past times. One of the reasons for Crane Fruehauf closure was because of the poor road network to North Walsham and this has not improved since the closure, 20 years ago. Why not build between Norwich City limits and the NDR first. People need work and the vast majority of jobs are in Norwich. People already commuting between North Walsham and Norwich do not have a good road network (B road). It is immensely busy. More cars would put a strain on this.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					What about the nature habitat. There are 17 species of bees regionally extinct, 25 types threatened and 31 conservation concern. We will not be able to survive in the future without them and nature. This proposal would see North Walsham expanding out of control over beautiful countryside. With the running out of oil for artificial fertilizers, our future generation will need the land to go back to organic growing in order to feed the population, instead of intense farming. They will need the green belt land that this proposed plan will take. Why should people who have already made there homes in North Walsham, especially on the west side, have to put up with all this disturbance and destruction over many years.
DS15	NW62	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP204	Object	Massive and disproportionate over-development of North Walsham. Targeting North Walsham to take so much of the bulk of the housing target, together with a disproportionately high density of growth villages in the surrounding part of the district, represents a poor attempt at forward planning, likely to have an unfairly detrimental impact on the geography of that part of the district, and quality of life of existing residents. A more modest growth allocation for North Walsham, over the plan period, with a greater emphasis on previously developed land, as priority over the greenfield development of surrounding farmland/countryside.
DS15	NW62	Woodhouse, Ms Jan (1210825)	LP091	General Comments	Attention needed to pedestrian access/facilities in order to link new development and existing houses in Greens Road area with the town centre.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS15)
Summary of Objections	10	A number of objections raise concern over the potential impact on the environment; the loss of a large area of greenspace / agricultural land, adverse landscape impact, impact on public footpaths including Weavers Way and wildlife and biodiversity impact. There needs to be an approach to local planning that addresses the Climate Emergency. Suggest that the scheme should include cycleways, a commitment to carbon offsetting, use of renewable technology, rainwater harvesting, electric car charging points, passivhaus/ carbon neutral homes. Need for social housing. One comments that this would create a commuter town rather than local employment and will increase rather than reduce the carbon footprint. Potential impact on the site of the 1381 Battle of North Walsham, significant in local and social history. Many raise concern over the infrastructure; existing issues with traffic, pollution, safety concerns on Aylsham road. Vital infrastructure has been neglected resulting in the loss of industry in the town. How Coltishall is going to deal with the extra cars. Some acknowledge that there is a need for a link road, to remove HGV's from local streets but consider it necessary to extend it to the industrial estate and to ensure that it is in place before development commences. How will it be funded and will it actually be used, problems along Station Rd and Mundesley Rd might not be addressed. No access should be available from development onto Skeyton Road. Concern that development could result in the loss of amenity for local residents. Concern about capacity of healthcare, schools, refuse collection, drainage, water supply, national grid, policing, buses etc. Need Social housing in North Walsham. Suggestions that other locations such as on the outskirts of Norwich would be favourable over this site and consider the town has reached capacity. One proposes a new alternative site, perceived to more suitable, having less impact on the natural environment and suggests that it should be compulsory purchased.

Summary of Support	5	Agrees that North Walsham needs an expansion and supports the link road between Norwich Rd and Cromer Rd but would need to extend onto the industrial estate. Otherwise high vehicles will still go through town centre. Existing road infrastructure is unsuitable and there are a lack of of pedestrian and cycle routes. Would require an increase in public amenities, access to quality play park provision is vital . Section 106 funding must come to North Walsham before houses are signed off. B1145 improvements required. Questions the suitability of the link road and suggests that rerouting the A149 would be desirable. Concerns over traffic. Improvements needed to the railway station and suggestions that the town centre should become a Conservation Redevelopment Zone and be pedestrianised.
Summary of General Comments	12	Agree in principal. This provides an opportunity to build green and sustainable buildings and be a flagship site for sustainability. No development should be built until infrastructure is in place. The new link road will provide opportunities for industry and businesses and opens town to growth and address current traffic issues. However others feel that the road will only stop certain amount of traffic and push more vehicles along Norwich Rd. Need to ensure the road extends over the railway line to allow access to the industrial estate and need to improve public transport links and pedestrian links. There is a lack of employment opportunities. Concerns over parking and the impact on the town centre and impact on amenity of existing residents. Will result in the loss of agricultural land. Need to provide buffers and open grassland. Some concerns over additional pressure on school, healthcare capacity and drainage. Suggestions that other sites should be prioritised first, including brownfield sites, and as part of existing development. Seek an increase in percentage of social rented housing on this site. Seeking a comprehensive traffic impact study for the town as a whole. Must provide GI. Seeking a study of the impact of the development upon health on residents and how there need will be met. Evidence that there is sufficient capacity in electricity and telecommunications.
Overall Summary		Some support for the expansion of North Walsham acknowledging the need for a link road (extending to the industrial estate) but questions how it will be funded, if it will actually be used and if it will resolve current issues on Station Rd and Mundesley Rd. Concern that North Walsham lacks the infrastructure necessary to accommodate growth. Existing traffic issues in the town and a lack of pedestrian and cycle routes. Concerns over parking, the impact on the town centre and impact on amenity of existing residents. Lack of employment opportunities. Concerns over the potential impact on the environment; loss of a large area of greenspace / agricultural land, adverse landscape impact, impact on wildlife and biodiversity and Weavers Way, impact on the site of the 1381 Battle of North Walsham. There needs to be an approach to local planning that addresses the Climate Emergency and a number of suggestions made to offset carbon in the development. Concern about capacity of healthcare, schools, refuse collection, drainage, water supply, national grid, policing, buses etc. **Need for social housing. Would require an increase in public amenities, access to quality play park provision is vital. Section 106 funding must come to North Walsham before houses are signed off. B1145 improvements required and no access should be available from development onto Skeyton Road. Need to provide buffers and open grassland.** Suggestions that other sites should be prioritised first, including brownfield sites, and as part of existing development. **Improvements needed to the railway station and suggestions that the town centre should become a Conservation Redevelopment Zone and be pedestrianised.** S**eek a comprehensive traffic impact study for the town as a whole, a study of the impact of the development upon health on residents and how there need will be met and evidence that there is sufficient capacity in electricity and telecommunications.**
Council's Response		Comments noted. Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. The Council is taking the Strategic Urban extension forward through a collaborative approach, recognises the need for a co-ordinated infrastructure delivery including the importance of improving access to the industrial site and has set up a delivery group to manage the delivery and supporting evidence through the production of a comprehensive Development Brief to inform the delivery of this strategically important growth which reports to the Local Plan Working Party . The Council has used current evidence base and engaged with relevant bodies including Highways and infrastructure providers to establish the current position and capacity and to identify the strategic infrastructure requirements arising from planned growth and to identify potential funding and delivery mechanisms. These issues have been taken into account and will continue to be taken into account through iterative dialogue in the finalisation of the Local Plan. The Current position is detailed in background paper 4, Infrastructure Position Statement. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will accompany the final Plan. Evidence with regards to capacity of electricity in the town has been commissioned. The Council has committed to the development of a development brief in partnership and will be subject to wider engagement and will include the requirement to accord to the Health protocol and for a 'Health Impact Assessment' of the healthcare impacts arising from the proposed development and a strategy to deliver

		the essential highway infrastructure and mitigation arising from the proposed development. Heritage considerations including the potential impact of development on archaeological sites have been taken into account and helps inform the extent of the site, including consideration by Historic Environment. The Council will take into account consultation feedback from bodies such as Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Natural England to inform decisions regarding the likely impact of developing a site for biodiversity and geodiversity and continue to work with site promoters to take into account biodiversity and geodiversity features. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact. Landscape and settlement considerations including the potential impact of development on landscape and views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size and whether the site preserves the separate identity of a settlement and the importance of natural and built features have been taken into account.

DS16: Land at Cornish Way

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS16	E10	Mooney, Mr Raymond (1210675)	LP080, LP113	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Having this will lead to the creation of a developer lead satellite commuter dormitory estate. The lack of increased infrastructure because the local economy would not be local there would be a vacuum to encourage the development of a vibrant, sustainable local new community. 1. The wording (including possible provision for a connection to a future access road from the south west (Bradfield Road)) is quite simply unacceptable. This should be done before anything else in order that the supply chain businesses that will service the Vatten Field wind farm would find North Walsham a viable location to locate to. This would bring high skilled, well paid jobs in green energy technologies to North Walsham with training opportunities for our youth and increased economic activity with in North Walsham. It would increase local employment, make living and working in North Walsham sustainable and reduce the amount of commuting there by reducing pollution from car journeys .Before development commences, funds from all available sources must be sort, in order that this vital part of infrastructure is in place before any further development commences. Amend policy DS16 part 1 by removing the word 'possible'
DS16	E10	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218558)	LP802	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** We believe that the allocation of further employment land would be of advantage to North Walsham. We have suffered from a lack of contemporary office space in North Walsham as well as an inadequate road infrastructure. It is important that in allocating this site these things are taken into account. We would expect to see provision for a road a western extension link road serving this and other sites as we have stated at more than one point in this submission. We note that reference is made to the possible provision of such a road but we would maintain that without such a road this allocation will not attract businesses to the site.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS16)
Summary of Objections	1	The proposal received one objection. Concerns that North Walsham lack the infrastructure necessary to accommodate growth and improvements, including a road connecting to Bradfield Road, should be provided before development starts. This would help to encourage businesses, such as those serving the wind farms, to locate in North Walsham. Bringing high skilled, well paid jobs to North Walsham and improving the economy. Concern that this could turn into a dormitory commuter estate. By encouraging the development of a vibrant, sustainable local new community would help to reduce commuting and car journeys.
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment received, support further employment land in North Walsham, have suffered from a lack of contemporary office space as well as in an inadequate road infrastructure. Expect to see a road linking to the Western extension, to attract businesses.
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. No substantive issues raised. Support for further employment land in North Walsham, concern that North Walsham lacks the infrastructure necessary to accommodate growth and improvements, including a road connecting to Bradfield Road, should be provided before development starts. This would help to encourage businesses, such as those serving the wind farms, to locate in North

		Walsham. Bringing high skilled, well paid jobs to North Walsham and improving the economy. Concern that this could turn into a dormitory commuter estate. By encouraging the development of a vibrant, sustainable local new community would help to reduce commuting and car journeys. Lack of contemporary office space available.
Council's Response		Noted. Support welcomed for further employment Land. There is a need to ensure communities remain sustainable and viable for future prosperity. The Council is taking the Strategic Urban extension forward through a collaborative approach, recognises the need for a co-ordinated infrastructure delivery including the importance of improving access to the industrial site and has set up a delivery group to manage the delivery and supporting evidence for the delivery of this strategically important growth.

Proposals for Sheringham

DS17: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS17	SH04	N/A	N/A	N/A	None received.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS17)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary	No comments received	

DS18: Former Allotments, Weybourne Road, Adjacent to Splash

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS18	SH07	Hay-Smith, Mr Clive Alflatt, Mr James (Agent) (1217382 1217379)	LP536	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Support DS 18. The site is entirely deliverable (in line with the NPPF), and capable of making a significant contribution towards satisfying the Council's housing needs during the plan period to 2036. This rep demonstrates suitability, achievability, viability, and availability for allocation. The site should be considered in the broadest sense of residential development; including the flexibility for potential future uses of extra care facilities on the site. To provide sufficient flexibility in the policy approach which could help towards meeting the unmet demand for extra care bed spaces in the District. The site is entirely suitable for development, and there are no site-specific constraints which cannot be appropriately mitigated (such as the landscape and visual impact). The site is located within the Settlement Boundary of Sheringham. The site is suitable and can be delivered in accordance with the proposed policy requirements of points 1 – 5 within DS18. Landscape and Visual Impact point 1 of DS18 stipulates the need to provide 'careful attention to site layout, building heights and materials in order to minimise the visual impact of development'. Further to this, point 2 seeks the provision of landscaping along the Weybourne Road site frontage. Sheils Flynn have prepared a Landscape and Visual Appraisal of the site. This Appraisal considers the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) for the site, based on the potential of 2 storey residential development on the site. From the visual receptor of motorists travelling towards the site along the A149, it is concluded that there is good scope to mitigate changes in views along the road. From the summit of Franklin Hill, a popular viewpoint for walkers, it is recognised that views of the site are almost entirely screened by existing trees. It confirmed that development would not be visible from Sheringham Park, with no impacts on the landscape setting of Sheringham Park. Turning to Landscape Value, whilst it is recognised that the site forms part of a valued part of the landscape setting to Sheringham, it also outlines how the condition and character of the site's immediate character is relatively degraded. The Appraisal confirms that the creation of a high-quality development that is structured to retain and strengthen key aspects of the landscape character will reinforce local identity and sense of place. It is important to acknowledge PF/18/1435 on the adjacent Splash Leisure Centre site, which is currently under construction. When considering the landscape and visual impact of any development on this site, this needs to be set within the context of the contribution adjacent developments make to the landscape character and visual impact of the locality. Utilities Points 3 and 4 of the proposed wording of Policy DS 18 outlines that any proposal may need to provide enhancements to the foul sewerage network, and that off-site mains reinforcements are required. As part of any application for the site, a Utilities Report will be provided, which will assess the capacity of required utilities to serve the site. Enhancements to both the foul sewerage network, and off-site mains reinforcement will be provided as part of developing the site, where this is required. Surface Water Runoff Under the proposed wording of Policy DS 18, point 5 states that development needs to provide 'appropriate measures for dealing with surface water runoff'. Infiltration tests conducted on site demonstrate that the ground conditions (i.e. sands and gravels) are suitable for infiltration systems, but additional infiltration tests would be required to test for sufficiently permeable soils. Accordingly, this recognises the suitability of the site to provide appropriate measures for dealing with surface water runoff. Layout in Relation to Pumping Station Point 6 of the proposed policy wording for Policy DS 18 stipulates that any development proposal should be set back from the north-eastern boundary, to avoid encroachment to the pumping station. Initial preliminary site layout sketches have confirmed that it is fully achievable to design development on the site in a manner which ensures that it does not encroach on the pumping station. Deliverability Through ongoing marketing of the site, a range of interest has been received from a variety of developers. Accordingly, this demonstrates that there

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					is market demand and interest in the site; thus suggesting that there is a realistic prospect that the site will be delivered within the first five years of the plan period, in accordance with the NPPF. Achievable Based on the suitability assessment above, there are no site-specific constraints which could preclude the delivery of residential development on the identified Policy DS 18 proposed allocation site. Therefore, residential development on the site is deemed to be entirely achievable. Viable Development of the site for residential purposes is considered viable, taking into consideration the various policy requirements in relation to matters such as affordable housing provision. Further evidence on viability can be provided, should this be deemed necessary at the application stage. Summary Sheringham is a highly sustainable location for growth, benefitting from a range of services and amenities. Furthermore, the sustainability of Sheringham is enhanced through the availability of sustainable transport methods, including the train line, which provides a direct rail connection to Norwich, West Runton, Cromer, North Walsham, Hoveton, Wroxham and Salhouse. As has been demonstrated, the site is suitable, available, achievable and viable, and is deliverable within the first five years of the plan period. There are no constraints which would affect the suitability of the site for residential development. Accordingly, the above text demonstrates that this specific site is a suitable location for further development, and Mr Clive Hay-Smith supports North Norfolk District Council's proposals to allocate the site under Policy DS 18 for residential development. Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged from the Council's own technical evidence which is informing its plan making process, that the land at Weybourne Road, Sheringham is suitable, available and deliverable for residential or employment development. Alternatively, a combination of the two, as a mixed use development.to provide sufficient flexibility and make the most efficient use of land, as required by the NPPF, the wording of Policy DS 18 should be changed so not to impose an artificial maximum, for 'at least 45 dwellings…'. Therefore, it is proposed that the first paragraph of Policy DS 18 is amended to include the following: **"Land amounting to approximately 1.7 hectares is proposed to be allocated for development comprising of at least 45 dwellings (inclusive of affordable homes and self-build plots, public open space, associated on and off-site infrastructure, and potential extra care facility)."**

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS18)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	1	Support received from the Landowner who confirms that the site is suitable and there are no site-specific constraints which cannot be appropriately mitigated. A landscape and Visual Appraisal has been prepared. And a utilities report will be provided as part of any application. Enhancements to both the foul sewerage network, and off-site mains reinforcement will be provided as part of developing the site, where this is required. Infiltration tests conducted on site demonstrate that the ground conditions (i.e. sands and gravels) are suitable for infiltration systems, but additional infiltration tests would be required to test for sufficiently permeable soils. The site layout can be designed to ensure development does not encroach on the pumping station. The site is deliverable, capable of making a contribution towards satisfying the Council's housing needs during the plan period to 2036. But suggests that there should be flexibility for potential future uses of extra care facilities on the site, to help towards meeting the unmet demand for extra care bed spaces.

Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. No substantive issues raised. Support received from the Landowner who confirms that the site is suitable and there are no site-specific constraints which cannot be appropriately mitigated. A landscape and Visual Appraisal has been prepared. And a utilities report will be provided as part of any application. Enhancements to both the foul sewerage network, and off-site mains reinforcement will be provided as part of developing the site, where this is required. Infiltration tests conducted on site demonstrate that the ground conditions (i.e. sands and gravels) are suitable for infiltration systems, but additional infiltration tests would be required to test for sufficiently permeable soils. The site layout can be designed to ensure development does not encroach on the pumping station. The site is deliverable, capable of making a contribution towards satisfying the Council's housing needs during the plan period to 2036. But suggests that there should be flexibility for potential future uses of extra care facilities on the site, to help towards meeting the unmet demand for extra care bed spaces.
Council's Response		Support welcomed. Further information on drainage, sewage, surface water and 'landscape and Visual Appraisal' submitted is welcomed and will be used to help finalise and support the policy approach. Welcome clarification on availability.

DS19: Land South of Butts Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS19	SH18/1B	N/A	N/A	N/A	None received.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS19)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary	No comments received	

Proposals for Stalham

DS20: Land Adjacent Ingham Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS20	ST19/A	Elliot, Mrs Rachel (1210046)	LP024	Object	Stalham has 2 doctors surgeries, both of which seem to be full to capacity and the booking of appointments is near on impossible, how can further development be considered until the issue of services such as doctors be addressed. Please liaise with Norman Lamb as he is currently looking into this issue.
DS20	ST19/A	Stanton, Mr Garry (1218558)	LP017	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** • Should not be building in the countryside and should protect Grade 1 agricultural land. • Ingham Road runs adjacent to Stalham High School is already congested at certain times of the day and this will add to accidents between vehicles and school children. • Nearest NHS dentist is 10 miles away • Lack of employment opportunities – people will travel to Norwich • An additional 70 properties in this area would also add to already stretched resources such as schools, healthcare, water resources and additional loading on the sewage treatment works. • What is meant by 'affordable homes' • This will add to Norwich commuter belt, inflating prices and squeezing families out of the area.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS20)
Summary of Objections	2	Two objections received. Concern about capacity of healthcare, schools, water resources and sewage treatment works. Grade 1 agricultural land and countryside should be protected and shouldn't be built on. Concern over increased traffic and safety concerns. Lack of employment opportunities. This will add to Norwich commuter belt, inflating prices and squeezing families out of the area. Seeks clarification on what is meant by 'affordable homes'.
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Limited responses received. Concern about capacity of healthcare, schools, water resources and sewage treatment works and the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and countryside. Consider that this should be protected and not built on. Concern over increased traffic and associated safety concerns. Lack of employment opportunities. This will add to Norwich commuter belt, inflating prices and squeezing families out of the area. **Seeks clarification on what is meant by 'affordable homes'.**
Council's Response		Noted. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development for Children's services, health, local highways, water, and sewerage and energy networks. These issues along with wider constraints have been taken into account in site assessment. Affordable housing is a general term which is used to describe a range of housing types such as affordable rent, shared ownership, shared equity and low cost home ownership properties where the purchase price of homes is discounted below open market values. Occupation is limited to those that are in housing need. Affordable housing is defined by central government. The full definition can be found in the National Planning Policy Framework.

DS21: Land North of Yarmouth Road, East of Broadbeach Gardens

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS21	ST23/2	Noble, Dr Michael (1210275)	LP123	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Previously, part of area ST23/2 had planning permission for industrial units. I was told at the recent event at Stalham Town Hall that this has been changed so that it can now be used for residential development instead. This is contrary to the aims of the Local Plan which seeks to increase local employment opportunities. This promise should be kept. Please consult with local service providers such as surgeries and schools to gain a realistic view of the impact of further increasing the local population. Please consider how this land can be better utilised to add to services for existing residents, such as local employment opportunities and green spaces for the benefit of the whole community.
DS21	ST23/2	Elliot, Mrs Rachel (1218558)	LP024	Object	Stalham has 2 doctors surgeries, both of which seem to be full to capacity and the booking of appointments is near on impossible, how can further development be considered until the issue of services such as doctors be addressed. A review of the usage of the doctors surgeries and plans put in place to review their capacity and parking spaces at the surgeries.
DS21	ST23/2	Stanton, Mr Garry (1209669)	LP018	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** • Should not be building in the countryside and should protect Grade 1 agricultural land. • Yarmouth Road is already congested at certain times of the day and this will add to accidents between vehicles and school children. • Nearest NHS dentist is 10 miles away • Lack of employment opportunities – people will travel to Norwich • An additional 70 properties in this area would also add to already stretched resources such as schools, healthcare, water resources and additional loading on the sewage treatment works. • What is meant by 'affordable homes' • This will add to Norwich commuter belt, inflating prices and squeezing families out of the area.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS21)
Summary of Objections	3	Three objections received. Members of the public express concern over the impact on the capacity of healthcare, schools, water resources and sewage treatment works. Loss of valuable agricultural land that should not be developed. Could create extra traffic and safety concerns. Lack of employment opportunities. Part of site has planning permission for employment which should be provided. Add to Norwich commuter belt, inflating prices and squeezing families out of the area.
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Limited responses received. Members of the public expressed concerns over the potential impact of development on this site on the capacity of healthcare, schools, water resources and sewage treatment works. Loss of valuable agricultural land that should not be developed. Could

		create extra traffic and safety concerns. Lack of employment opportunities. Part of site has planning permission for employment which should be provided. Add to Norwich commuter belt, inflating prices and squeezing families out of the area.
Council's Response		Noted. Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development for Children's services, health, local highways, water, and sewerage. These issues along with wider constraints have been taken into account in site assessment. The Council considers it important to retain some of the land for solely employment use and therefore the site is proposed for a mixed use scheme including residential, employment land and community/ commercial land. Part of the site consists of Grade 1 agricultural land, however the allocation would have minimal impact on the overall supply in the town.

Proposals for Wells-next-the-Sea

DS22: Land at Market Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS22	W01/1	Price, Ms Amanda (1210607)	LP071	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Market Lane is OK - but the whole affordable housing issue still applies
DS22	W01/1	Edwards, Mr John (1218558)	LP318, LP322	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** The Norfolk Coast AONB was designated in 1968 and includes the North Norfolk Heritage Coast, a continuous coastal strip from Holme-next-the-Sea to Weybourne. This coast is characterised by a wide variety of significant coastal deposition features, including salt and drained marshes and sand dunes. It is a coastline punctuated by small, ancient, compact and relatively quiet settlements with Wells at its centre, and has seen significant growth of active outdoor pursuits, side by side with peaceful tourism. A major feature running through the Heritage Coast is the Norfolk Coastal Path from which there are extensive and uninterrupted views of 'where the sky meets the sea' to the north and where the sky to the south meets the gentle landscape of the chalk land rising away from the coast. The statutory purposes of the AONB designation are to conserve and enhance the natural beauty while allowing for the sustainable development of the communities and economic activity in ways that enhance the character of the area. This is reinforced by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 which places a duty on public bodies to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty; in this connection, the key to development in an AONB is that it must enhance the area. In addition, two non-statutory purposes recognise: • The needs of agriculture and other rural industries, and of the economic and social needs of local communities by promoting sustainable forms of development that in themselves conserve and enhance the area's natural beauty, and • The need for recreation in so far as this is consistent with conserving and enhancing the area's natural beauty. Insufficient weight has been given to the above in proposing to extend a settlement in a linear fashion along the coastline. Such linear development would compromise the essential and ancient relationship between the valuable coastal marsh environment and its heritage settlements established originally as compact and nucleated settlements around navigable inlets providing accessible waterfronts. It would additionally bring housing and its intrusions into proximity with valuable and protected bird habitats and territory and might, therefore, have a detrimental effect on their sustainability.
DS22	W01/1	Cracknell, Mrs Lorraine (1217377)	LP420	Object	Much further consideration needs to be made before considering the Mill Rd site as suitable ~The other site above Staithe Place off Market Lane seems to serve the purpose well for social/affordable housing. ~If this was a kept as a green field and the other site you have proposed as the new green area was used for affordable/ social housing opposite existing housing with exit onto Holkham/ Freeman St ~Is it not possible to look at smaller plots to meet the needs rather than one big site which has far more detrimental impact on Wells.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS22	W01/1	Griffiths, Dr David (1210766)	LP081	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** Concerns regarding any significant new housing development at Wells-next-the-sea because of pressure on the existing infrastructure - especially roads and parking - and question whether the town has sufficient amenities to support. However, I do understand the basic requirements of the local plan and need for housing - and affordable housing in particular. I can see that the planning team have done a thorough evaluation and, given the various constraints and challenges, and on the assumption that any approved development is sensitive to the local environment and all basic infrastructure is part of any development, i agree that this site (W01/1) and the other preferred site, W07/1 are the most suitable for limited development that would have least adverse impact on the town, those living here and those visiting.
DS22	W01/1	Gates, Michael (1210794)	LP158	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION** Affordable housing is needed in Wells. Very disappointing that the exception site has changed into development land.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS22)
Summary of Objections	3	Three objections received. Majority consider this to be a suitable site but affordable housing issue still applies. Concerns over the potential impact of development on the AONB, key to the future growth of the local economy. Linear development could comprise the valuable marsh environment and heritage of this settlement. Also potential impact on protected birds.
Summary of Support	2	Two comments of support, understands the need for housing especially affordable housing. Consider that this site would have the least adverse impact on the town. Raises concerns over significant housing developments due to the pressure on existing infrastructure and if there is sufficient amenities. Development should be sensitive to local environment and provide basic infrastructure. Disappointed that site would no longer be for solely affordable housing.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Limited responses received. Majority consider this to be a suitable site for housing but expressed a preference for affordable housing . Some concerns over the potential impact of development on the AONB, key to the future growth of the local economy. Linear development could comprise the valuable marsh environment and heritage of this settlement. Potential impact on protected birds. **Development should be sensitive to local environment and provide basic infrastructure.**
Council's Response		Noted: Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. Addressing ALL housing needs, including both market and affordable is an important consideration in meeting all identified housing needs across the district (both Local and District wide) and contributing to a balanced and sustainable community. The location of development in Wells has been informed by proximity to the designated sites on the marshes to the north of the town, the high quality of the landscape around the town and the potential impact on the AONB. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints and designations, the potential impact of development on landscape and views, along with a site specific SA have all informed site selections. Background paper no6 published with this consultation provides full detail on the methodology used and the results of each site assessment. The proposed allocation is subject to a specific policy which identifies requirements that development proposals would need to address in order to secure planning permission. This includes a requirement for the retention and enhancement of mature hedgerows and trees around the site. The Council will take into account consultation feedback from bodies such as Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Natural England to inform decisions regarding the likely impact of developing a site for

		biodiversity and geodiversity and continue to work with site promoters to take into account biodiversity and geodiversity features. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact. The Parish Council is also developing its own neighbourhood plan and is currently understood to be assessing the level of additional local need to inform its own NP policies on additional growth to address local needs.

DS23: Land Adjacent Holkham Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS23	W07/1	Griffiths, Dr David (1210766)	LP082	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I am not seeking changes - simply to add my (conditional) support. Concerns regarding any significant new housing development at Wells-next-the-sea because of pressure on the existing infrastructure - especially roads and parking - and question whether the town has sufficient amenities to support. However, I do understand the basic requirements of the local plan and need for housing - and affordable housing in particular. I can see that the planning team have done a thorough evaluation and, given the various constraints and challenges, and on the assumption that any approved development is sensitive to the local environment and all basic infrastructure is part of any development, i agree that this site (W01/1) and the other preferred site, W07/1 are the most suitable for limited development that would have least adverse impact on the town, those living here and those visiting.
DS23	W07/1	Cracknell, Mrs Lorraine (1218558)	LP420	Object	~The proposed site marked in red off Mill Rd is totally unsuitable when the points raised in your own documents are taken into consideration. This site seems to contradict every point you have stated. ~The document states that 80 new homes are needed In Wells but only 28 of these would be affordable homes. It is social and affordable that is required due to the massive increase in recent years in the sale of property for second home use. ~The Mill Rd site is an open green area as stated by you in a designated area of outstanding natural beauty and is presently used as a caravan club site and horse holiday liveries to support the last remaining farm in Wells. This business helps support the town with holiday trade. Whilst tourists are staying there they not taking up much needed car parking in town as obviously their vehicles are on the site. ~This site in particular would have a huge impact to the green open spaces that you state you wish to keep as it can be seen all the way from the beach and would be detrimental to that view. ~The flow of traffic along Mill Rd is horrendous already in the summer and this would only exasperate the problem so I fail to see why highways favour this above other sites. ~With building there on the green area and on Market Lane would this not meet the 28 homes required? The other 52 homes that are said to be needed are only going to be sold as second homes as seen in the Staithe Place development. ~Is it not possible to look at smaller plots to meet the needs rather than one big site which has far more detrimental impact on Wells Much further consideration needs to be made before considering the Mill Rd site as suitable~**The other site above Staithe Place off Market Lane seems to serve the purpose well for social/affordable housing.** ~If this was a kept as a green field and the other site you have proposed as the new green area was used for affordable/ social housing opposite existing housing with exit onto Holkham/ Freeman St ~Is it not possible to look at smaller plots to meet the needs rather than one big site which has far more detrimental impact on Wells

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS23	W07/1	Wright, Miss Christie (1217325)	LP330	Object	This site should be removed - Concerns over: ~the economic impact of the development on the existing farm use and the impact on the town. ~access and impact on highways. ~visual impact and views ~potential for the homes to become 2nd homes ~capacity of local services
DS23	W07/1	Benson, Mr Roger Hill, Mrs Janet Wilson, Mr James (1216144 1216125 1218028)	LP169 LP163 LP675	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Delete this site from the list and use another area where social housing which is needed for Wells (good affordable rented accommodation) can be provided. Not a sustainable location. The development will damage the views of the town and countryside from the coast in one of the most important parts and well loved views in North Norfolk. Not appropriate for the AONB. Will be traffic problems caused by the additional traffic on Holkham Road and will impact on the European Protected wildlife sites by introducing more pressure from new residents which will not be addressed by a small area of open space. Will be entirely visible from and dominate a large stretch of the AONB which are given special mention in the NPPF - proposals which will significantly harm the special qualities of these areas should be rejected. Certainly this development will have significant, large scale and highly visually damaging impacts on the AONB. **Quotes** Para 172 of the NPPF. Additional pressure on the already overcrowded and increasingly damaged SPA, SSSIs, SAC and European Marine Site which are the highest nature conservation designations available, will be significant and will not be mitigated by the area of open space provided. Contrary to national and local planning policy. Impact on nocturnal 'dark skies' views in the area will be significant and damaging - this coastal strip is one of the few areas where the Northern Lights are visible in lowland Britain -and other wonderful night-time sky elements. Additional traffic generated on Holkham Road will be significant and damaging The Character of the Town - and particularly its western fringe and the adjacent coastal countryside will be significantly altered and damaged which will be contrary to the Policy ENV 2 in the Local Plan. Past experience has produced generic, ugly, uncharacteristic and unaffordable housing that has mostly gone to supply an insatiable 'second home' market which is unsustainable and unjustifiable in community development, local amenity value and economic development. Would require a massive amount of landscaping on the northern and western sides to buffer and screen the development from adjacent open views and landscapes - at least a 50m wide tree planting belt would be necessary as a minimum. Not be able to profit from a view over the coast / countryside, and no attempt to orientate or sell it on that basis should be made. If development were to be located on this site - Housing must be low level types not exceeding 1.5 stories in height to reduce the visual impacts. The ugly 2 - 3 story developments which have been proposed elsewhere in the area are not appropriate
DS23	W07/1	Price, Ms Amanda (1210607)	LP071	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Reconsideration of the amount of extra housing at wells Site is not big enough for 60 houses, and I would need to be very convinced about the pricing of these not to think they will all go into posh second home ownership and part-time occupancy with second lets (often not declared....) So this site needs further consideration, the alternatives are no better. Local proposals for allotment use as an alternative are unacceptable.
DS23	W07/1	Walsingham, Mrs Heather (1218475)	LP785	Object	The proposed plan W07/1 is on our right of way, please see the attached document clearly showing the right of way on picture 1, and our deeds clearly stating we have right of way with or without motor vehicle, (see hand registry document).

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS23	W07/1	Edwards, Mr John (1216139)	LP318, LP322	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** Policy DS 23 be deleted and replaced by alternative sites. The Norfolk Coast AONB was designated in 1968 and includes the North Norfolk Heritage Coast, a continuous coastal strip from Holme-next-the-Sea to Weybourne. This coast is characterised by a wide variety of significant coastal deposition features, including salt and drained marshes and sand dunes. It is a coastline punctuated by small, ancient, compact and relatively quiet settlements with Wells at its centre, and has seen significant growth of active outdoor pursuits, side by side with peaceful tourism. A major feature running through the Heritage Coast is the Norfolk Coastal Path from which there are extensive and uninterrupted views of 'where the sky meets the sea' to the north and where the sky to the south meets the gentle landscape of the chalk land rising away from the coast. The statutory purposes of the AONB designation are to conserve and enhance the natural beauty while allowing for the sustainable development of the communities and economic activity in ways that enhance the character of the area. This is reinforced by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 which places a duty on public bodies to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty; in this connection, the key to development in an AONB is that it must enhance the area. In addition, two non-statutory purposes recognise: • The needs of agriculture and other rural industries, and of the economic and social needs of local communities by promoting sustainable forms of development that in themselves conserve and enhance the area's natural beauty, and • The need for recreation in so far as this is consistent with conserving and enhancing the area's natural beauty. Insufficient weight has been given to the above in proposing to extend a settlement in a linear fashion along the coastline. Such linear development would compromise the essential and ancient relationship between the valuable coastal marsh environment and its heritage settlements established originally as compact and nucleated settlements around navigable inlets providing accessible waterfronts. It would additionally bring housing and its intrusions into proximity with valuable and protected bird habitats and territory and might, therefore, have a detrimental effect on their sustainability.
DS23	W07/1	Edwards, Mr John (1216139)	LP319, LP322	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** Policy DS 23 be deleted and replaced by alternative sites. 1. A significantly prominent site, intrusively visible from the main features of the AONB, including the Norfolk Coastal Path; it is an integral part of the open landscape formed by the drained marshes and the rising coastal chalk ridge and represents a significant westward extension of the Wells townscape into the attractive rural landscape leading to Holkham and its parkland. It conflicts with Policies ENV 1 and ENV 2. 2. Existing development has provided a clear hard border to the Town, which has been maintained from the early part of last century, 3. The current ribbon of housing alongside the A149 dates from the 1930s and well before the designation of the AONB. The 19 houses are set at some distance back from the highly visible coastal chalk ridge and now blend in as a result of hedgerow and tree growth having reached maturity. This blending is seen from all coastal viewpoints; in fact the need to blend housing into the landscape was a material consideration in the determination of recent planning applications extending this Mill Road ribbon development. While noting that an intrusion exists, this is not a justification for making the position worse by consolidating it further with a major development which would be

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					visually and starkly intrusive and practically impossible to blend in, especially at the density proposed. The light pollution would have a major adverse impact on the highly valued dark coastal skies at night, 4. The loss of the field would have a detrimental impact on the viability of Mill Farm and would be contrary to the purposes of the AONB, 5. In moving westwards from the hard boundary formed by Westfield Avenue, the new boundary is arbitrary and apparently defined solely by the housing target. In reality, if the existing hard boundary is breached, there would be little justification for resisting further development as far as the former railway embankment, as the first clearly defined boundary, 6. The single vehicular access from Mill Road would exacerbate, in summer, the traffic problems on the heavily used and often congested A149 Coast Road, 7. In the event the development proceeds, full regard should be had to the loss of privacy incurred by the existing adjoining housing. Alternative Sites In resisting the development of WO 7 and given the housing target for Wells [accepted in this submission], it is necessary to identify alternative housing provision. The following are material considerations: 1. Any housing development, with the exception of infill, brownfield and small scale special housing, should be behind the coastal ridge visible from the areas that justify the AONB, e.g. the marshes and dunes, 2. Developments should mostly be small to facilitate the provision of housing for rent and affordable permanent residency; this should be provided by appropriate bodies, including the community led housing association, 3. Development should form a coherent extension to the existing settlement and be sensitive to the existing townscape. As a consequence, it is suggested that there should be further investigation into: 1. The impact on the housing target of current infill and brownfield development opportunities, **Policy DS 23 be deleted and replaced by alternative sites, particularly suitable for the provision of affordable housing as per Policy SD 2, and mainly for rent, for those working in Wells and district, and those seeking continued permanent residency.** **The definition of OSP147, off Two Furlong Hill and Mill Road, as a single homogenous entity is inappropriate, as it is two distinct areas of Allotments and Paddocks. Development off two Furlong Hill would form a coherent contribution to the townscape.**
DS23	W07/1	Fullwood, Mr Tony (1217463)	LP587	Object	Para 19.20 already acknowledges that the site is within the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is reasonably prominent in the local landscape - particularly when viewed from the lower ground to the south and the site can be seen from the Beach Road causeway. However, the density of development proposed will not allow for sufficient landscaping to carefully integrate proposals within this sensitive environment. Nor do the policy criteria sufficiently emphasise the impact on this landscape of national importance. It cannot be right that the principle of access is not yet resolved and this issue should be rectified before the publication of the Reg 19 Local Plan. It would appear that the greatest conflict in relation to vehicular access would arise if the access were located on Freeman Street/ Holkham Road given other car parking and constraints along this road. Reduce capacity of Policy DS 23 Land Adjacent Holkham Road from 60 dwellings to 40 dwellings in order to allow sufficient landscaping within this sensitive location. Add 'landscaping' to criterion 1. Specify satisfactory vehicular access to the site within criterion 3. Amend criterion 5 to: retention and enhancement of mature hedgerows and trees around the site including provision of generous landscaping within the site and landscaping along the northern boundary of the housing; **The brownfield site of the long-vacant former Ark Royal Public House, Freeman Street, Wells represents an amazing opportunity for**

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					development to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area and this approach to the town, whilst providing additional facilities - including housing. It is important that the Local Plan focuses on brownfield opportunities in sustainable locations and this site should be investigated for allocation inn the Local Plan.
DS23	W07/1	Wells, MS Judith (1217777)	LP665	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The area now proposed for housing at W07/1 is a relatively small site and I wonder how it could support sixty dwellings? The plan leaves half the existing area of horse paddocks. I do not know whether this reduced space is sufficient for Mill Farm to continue its business with visitors and their horses, or if the owner wishes to, but I am concerned that once part of the land has been built on, it would create a momentum to develop the remaining portion. (I note this appears to be the case with the recent development at Market Lane, W01/1.) As a resident of Bases Lane I am particularly aware of the narrowness of that road and Westfield Avenue. Both already suffer from a high level of on street parking and can only support one vehicle passing at a time. If even a part of the additional traffic that would be generated by 60 dwellings were routed onto either of these roads, I would have significant concerns for safety. For the most part Bases Lane has no pavement so pedestrians (often children and the elderly) have to avoid moving cars while walking past parked vehicles. As most households now have two cars, I believe the substantial additional traffic the new homes would bring must present an unacceptable risk to pedestrians. The narrowness of the entrance to Bases Lane from Park Road also regularly creates a situation where drivers who are seeking to enter Bases Lane must reverse into Park Road. They are forced to give way to eastbound vehicles that are seeking to exit Bases Lane past parked vehicles and thus occupy the whole of the available road space. This manoeuvre is potentially dangerous, particularly as the junction is on a 90 degree bend and the volume of tourist traffic around this bend can be substantial. Even a small amount of additional traffic along Bases Lane would worsen this situation. Despite what I imagine would be additional cost, **it would be safer to route vehicular traffic generated by the new development onto either Mill Road or Holkham Road which are straight two-lane roads.**

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS23)
Summary of Objections	8	Eight objections received. A number of concerns raised, mainly the potential impact on the environment and the AONB (alignment with paragraph 172 of NPPF). Concerns that development would be prominent, have detrimental impact on views, the countryside and coastal paths and could impact on character of the town. Insufficient space for landscaping. Potential adverse impact on designated sites from new residents, unable to be mitigated by open space. Western boundary is arbitrary and hard to resist further development. Damage dark skies and impact on wildlife. Other concerns; impact on the capacity of local services, the amenity of existing residents, the loss of a beneficial use and access concerns. Traffic impact, especially in summer. Suggest that a safer access route could be onto Mill Rd or Holkham Rd. Part of the land is in different ownership with the right of way. Affordable homes should be for local people and market housing should not be available for second homes. Concerns over the design of the development. **Suggestions that a number of smaller sites would be more beneficial or this site should be for 40 dwellings rather than 60. Development should form a coherent extension to the existing settlement and be sensitive to the existing townscape. Would require large amount of landscaping and restrict housing to maximum height of 1.5 stories. Add 'landscaping' to criterion 1. Specify satisfactory vehicular access to the site within criterion 3. Amend criterion 5 to: retention and enhancement of mature hedgerows and trees around the site including provision of generous landscaping within the site and landscaping along the northern boundary of the housing.**

Summary of Support	2	Two comments of support received. Understands the need for housing especially affordable housing. Consider that this site would have the least adverse impact on the town. Raises concerns over significant housing developments due to the pressure on existing infrastructure and suitability of the access road and the likelihood of the remaining section of the site being built once site is developed. Also whether there are sufficient amenities. Suggests that a safer access route would be onto Mill Rd or Holkham Rd. Development should be sensitive to local environment and provide basic infrastructure.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		A number of concerns raised, mainly the potential impact on the environment and the AONB (alignment with paragraph 172 of NPPF). Concerns that development would be prominent, have detrimental impact on views, the countryside and coastal paths and could impact on character of the town. Insufficient space for landscaping. Potential adverse impact on designated sites from new residents, unable to be mitigated by open space. Western boundary is arbitrary and hard to resist further development. Damage dark skies and impact on wildlife. Other concerns; impact on the capacity of local services, the amenity of existing residents, the loss of a beneficial use and access concerns. Traffic impact, especially in summer. Suggest that a safer access route could be onto Mill Rd or Holkham Rd. Part of the land is in different ownership with the right of way. Affordable homes should be for local people and market housing should not be available for second homes. Concerns over the design of the development. **Suggestions that a number of smaller sites would be more beneficial or this site should be for 40 dwellings rather than 60. Development should form a coherent extension to the existing settlement and be sensitive to the existing townscape. Would require large amount of landscaping and restrict housing to maximum height of 1.5 stories. Add 'landscaping' to criterion 1. Specify satisfactory vehicular access to the site within criterion 3. Amend criterion 5 to: retention and enhancement of mature hedgerows and trees around the site including provision of generous landscaping within the site and landscaping along the northern boundary of the housing.**
Council's Response		Noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy. The Local Plan is informed by a sustainability appraisal which reviews the key environmental, social and economic considerations that affect the District. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints and designations, the potential impact of development on landscape, views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size and whether the site preserves the separate identity of a settlement and the importance of natural and built features have been taken into account. Background paper no6 published with this consultation provides full detail on the methodology used and the results of each site assessment. A density of approximately 30 dwellings per hectare has been applied but it is considered that sites may not be suitable eg due to local character considerations, we have adjusted our assessment accordingly and this allows space for landscaping. The location of development in Wells has been informed by proximity to the designated sites on the marshes to the north of the town, the high quality of the landscape around the town and the potential impact on the AONB. The proposed allocation is subject to a specific policy which identifies requirements that development proposals would need to address in order to secure planning permission. This includes a requirement for the careful attention to site layout, building heights and materials in order to minimise the visual impact of development. And the retention and enhancement of mature hedgerows and trees around the site including provision of landscaping along the northern boundary of the housing. Development proposals would need to comply with a number of policies (including those relating to affordable housing, open space, providing supporting infrastructure and design) elsewhere in the plan. Dark skies will be considered in line with Policy SD13 Pollution & Hazard Prevention & Minimisation, comments will be considered in the finalisation of this policy. The Council will take into account consultation feedback from bodies such as Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Natural England to inform decisions regarding the likely impact of developing a site for biodiversity and continue to work with site promoters to take into account biodiversity features. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact. The draft Plan has been subject to an Interim Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) with the purpose to assess the potential impacts on Natura 2000 or European Sites and if necessary specify any mitigation measures. The results can be found within the published HRA. A further Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) is currently being commissioned collectively by the Norfolk Authorities and Natural England. Both of these studies will inform the next stages of plan making. The

		Council has engaged with the County Highways Authority to ensure that highways impacts are manageable in terms of site access, road network considerations including suitability in relation to scale and potential cumulative impacts and potential mitigation measures. The Parish council is also developing its own neighbourhood plan and is currently understood to be assessing the level of additional local need to inform its own NP policies on additional growth to address local needs.

Proposals for Blakeney

DS24: Land East of Langham Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS24	BLA04/A	Albany, Mr Clive, Albany, Mrs Anne (1210593, 1216374)	LP176, LP177, LP178, LP191	Object Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Removal of BLA04/A as the preferred location for housing allocation in Blakeney. It is clear from site visits that allocation BLA04/A is not 'reasonably well enclosed' in the landscape (as referenced in the reasons for selection), but very prominent. - Views across the arable field from Langham Road to the east are very open due to the intermittent fragmented hedge on the east side of the road. In contrast, views to the west are less open due to a continuous hedgerow that provides a degrees of screening of recent development at Avocet View and further development opportunities to the west of Langham Road. The existing settlement edge is defined by a line of pines and other trees to the south of properties on Kingsway and deciduous woodland further to the east. These have taken c. 50 years to mature and provide the current screening benefits. These trees filter views of the properties on Kingsway, softening the urban edge of Blakeney. Development of land within BLA04/A would be highly conspicuous, introducing a hard edge to the settlement that would take a number of decades to soften with appropriate planting. This would have adverse landscape and visual effects from one of the main roads accessing Blakeney and footpaths to the south. Whilst the line of pines and other trees soften the urban edge of Blakeney, when viewed from the south, they would not screen views of development in BLA04/A from properties on Kingsway. - The development of allocation BLA04/A would have adverse effects on the setting of St Nicholas Church, which is currently seen above a wooded foreground and fields. - The Blakeney Draft Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan (August 2018) Section 8.3.6 sets out the need to appreciate heritage assets individually or collectively from key viewpoints that contribute to their special interest. - The footpath that links Langham Road to Saxlingham Road, and ultimately St Nicholas Church and Blakeney Primary School is a well-used route by dog walkers, local residents, ramblers and school children. The transient use of the path limits the effects on privacy compared to the more permanent intrusion of residential property. As such, the selection of the preferred site allocation should be reconsidered in favour of sites that are less conspicuous in the landscape, would have less of an impact on residential amenity, public footpaths and the setting of St Nicholas church. (See accompanying document). The existing Avocet Way development was included in the previous Local Plan, but no consideration was given to the future need for expansion or integrating the site with the wider community of Blakeney. The current plan review is an opportunity to take a long term strategic approach to development within the village and to integrate future proposals more fully with the existing settlement. **Development within BLA01 & BLA09 would be a natural extension to the recent Avocet View** development and would allow for future natural expansion, if developments are design to facilitate this. Axis has been in contact with the landowner and their agent and they have confirmed that the land is still available for development within the plan period and that they will be making representations accordingly. Potential development of BLA01 & BLA09 could be delivered over a number of phases, as required by the needs of future plan reviews. In addition, there is sufficient land available to accommodate Public Open Space (to enhance the overall provision in Blakeney) and to provide a suitable buffer to the SSSI, that could be used for habitat creation/enhancement. Furthermore, there is scope to provide footpath and cycle way links to Langham Road, Morston Road and Oddfellows Field to help integrate the future development with the existing settlement.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS24	BLA04/A	Faulkner, Mr Anthony (1218558)	LP215	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.** There is no need for more market housing in Blakeney which will not contribute to the national need for permanent housing as it is likely to become second or holiday homes. What is needed is more affordable housing, preferable rented, which is best provided on exceptions policy land where its use is protected for all time. To omit the proposal for BLA04/A and look instead for a site, or sites, suitable for a small development of perhaps 6 to 10 houses on exception policy land. **A suitable site may be as an extension of Oddfellows on part of BLA01, or BLA05** for its proximity to the school.
DS24	BLA04/A	Foreman, Mr David. Foreman, Mrs V. Flude Mrs & Mr, (1209776, 1215854, 1218471)	LP010, LP777, LP781, LP231	Object Object Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION.**1. New development should not take place on green field sites, with global warming and uncurbed population increases, agricultural land will be needed in the future for food production and the building of new homes will put a further strain on water supplies. 2. In your recent Glaven Valley Conservation review document it referred to "the important views of the Conservation Area across the field (BLA04+A) to the east of Langham Road" and showed a photograph thereof. The development of this area would destroy this important view. 3. The field (BLA04/A) to the east of Langham Road is a wildlife corridor for many birds and animals and a hunting ground for protected species such as Marsh Harrier, Red Kite, Buzzard, Sparrow hawk, Kestrel, Barn Owl and Tawny Owl, the Owls both breed in the immediate vicinity. 4. Further development should be within the existing built-up area of the village, particularly where sites are being redeveloped, over 50 new homes have been created this way over the last 20 years, without using green field sites. 5. If the only site for future housing has to be a green field site adjacent to Langham Road, then a continuation of the development on the western side of Langham Road (BLA09) would be less obtrusive and have less landscape impact when entering the Village than that on the eastern side. It would also have less impact, with it affecting a much smaller number of existing properties, as compared to development to the east of Langham Road (BLA04/A) which would affect many more properties. The proposed development land is at a much higher level than some of the existing bungalows in Kingsway and therefore would seriously impinge on them. 6. Should any future development take place the cost of the enhancement that would be required to the footpaths and sewage network, bearing in mind the recent problems with sewage that have been experienced within the village, should be born entirely by the developer and not by District Council/Parish Council/Residents. 7. The land east of Langham Road (BLA04/A) is just as much in the countryside as alternative sites in Saxlingham Road, Morston Road and west of Langham Road, that you quote as having an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. 8. The site BLA04 is considerably higher than Kingsway. Any development of this land would have an overbearing impact on the adjoining properties. All of these properties are bungalows, they were built with their living accommodation to the rear to take advantage of the open countryside views and the natural light from the south. As a result of the orientation of our homes, during the winter months, we enjoy a degree of passive heat from the low winter sun. This is a valuable amenity, reducing our fuel bills and hence our carbon footprint. The loss of light and privacy would be unacceptable. There would also be the introduction of light and noise pollution associated with a large residential development. This would be in contravention of ENV1O of the draft local plan which is designed to protect the amenities of existing residential properties. 9. The other major environmental impact would be the loss of the view as you approach Blakeney from Langham.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					The view to the east across open fields towards the church would disappear. The loss of this view would certainly have a detrimental impact on Blakeney and should be preserved at all costs. **The alternative sites BLA01 & BLA09 being proposed by the residents of Kingsway provide a much better overall long-term solution.** They are large enough to accommodate the number of houses required for this phase and future phases. The development would have less visual impact when approaching from Langham as the land falls away to the north. There is also an large mature hedgerow which helps screen the site from the Langham Road. There is also the possibility of a road through to the Morston Road, which even if it has to be access only, it would elevate some of the additional traffic congestion on the Langham Road. The possibility of a pedestrian access via Haywoods Close would integrate the new development into the existing landscape. It would allow safe access to the daycare facilities at Thistleton Court and the doctors surgery for the elderly. Children attending the village school could walk safely through Queens Close and across the playing fields to school, without having to walk down the busy Langham Road. As Blakeney has been designated as a growth village the land BLA01/BLA09 would appear to provide a long-term solution to Blakeney's housing needs without causing any unnecessary environmental impact. As Blakeney is now classed as a Large Growth Village, is it not better to think about possible future needs for development, rather than just serving the immediate short term needs of the village. As the land at BLAO1 and BLAO9 is now available, the proposal put forward by Mr Clive Albany, serves the immediate needs of the village while allowing for future requirements with continuity of development. 10. With the huge number of new homes being built in Holt, this should provide sufficient homes for the surrounding area including the Glaven Valley villages, for at least the next 20 years, particularly as there is very little employment in the area.
DS24	BLA04/A	Cooper, Mrs Alison (1216386)	LP189	Object	Abandonment of proposals to designate area BLA04/A on the edge of Blakeney for building. ~I agree with all the points made by Mr. D Forman (1209776) and what follows adds to his comments. ~The plan itself already lists several objections to the choice of this site for building (visual intrusion, good agricultural land, AONB etc.). The argument seems to be that it is the least bad option **~BLA01 which already has buildings on three sides is more appropriate as it is virtually infill.** ~the Plan's arguments appears to be that there is a footpath from BLA04/A towards the school. However the new build housing would not remove the existing difficult part of this route (a narrow path between woods and high fences) ~Not only is BL04/A an important natural habitat but walkers from or to the Langham Road will lose a pleasant footpath along the side of a field edged with trees full of wild life ~BL04/A occupies rising ground, The nearest properties (on Kingsway) are bungalows so that visual impact on the existing landscape is minimized to preserve the view along Langham Road towards the marshes and the sea. But I presume that any new builds will be at least 2 floors high and therefore overlook the bungalows and have a serious visual impact on the whole area.
DS24	BLA04/A	Cox, Mr & Ms Peter & Valerie (1218466)	LP766	General Comments	~the village struggles with school and doctors are overstretched now, it is very difficult to get appointment also where will people work? ~How will we support more houses? ~The first plan will need to have a road coming out of estate onto Langham road, this is a small busy road unsuitable for more cars coming onto it, if however the estate has to be thereabouts the other side of road (BLA09) already has

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					an access road, so why yet another access road? The outstanding view coming into village via Langham Road is something that the many visitors see first. ~The area suggested off Morston Road **(BLA01) or BLA08 would be safer** as Larger Road (A road) this will also not be so destructive re views as you come into Blakeney. The outstanding view coming into village via Langham Road is something that the many visitors see first.
DS24	BLA04/A	Cox, Mr Peter (1215783)	LP122	Object	~when we wanted to remove some trees from the back of our garden we were told we could not as it would spoil the view coming into Blakeney down the hill ~we were told at the time that the field behind us (plan BLA04/A) would never be altered due to the AONB of the area and Blakeney conservation Plan 2018 ~However the **Oddfellows land going onto The Morston Road must be the must suitable** of all due to Road Access.
DS24	BLA04/A	Broch, Mr Daniel Sworders Grimes, Mr Kelvin (Agent) (1217619 1217618)	LP660	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Development in AONB undermines both national planning policy and emerging local policy in Policy ENV 1. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF states that, (in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty): 'Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.' The Plan's Policy ENV 1 reflects the national policy position. Thirty new homes must surely constitute major development in the AONB. However, Policy DS 24 does not set out any exceptional circumstances as to why this site should be developed, nor is any attempt made to demonstrate that development of this site would be in the public interest. This site should be removed. New homes could be met through the provision of a number of smaller sites, none of which would constitute major development. Proposed site could contribute five of the units required, in a highly sustainable location with minimal impact on the AONB due to the high quality of the proposed homes, which would be designed to respect and enhance the landscape and environmental setting.
DS24	BLA04/A	Bryant, Mr John (1216275)	LP183	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** A change of the preferred site from BLA04/A to BLA01. Next to the public footpath (Langham rd to the Saxlingham rd and church) are 4 magnificent scots pine trees. There used to be 5. Was told by NNDC that these trees formed a very important feature. Views across the field to more open farmland, church and these trees. They could not be removed under any circumstances I was told. Neighbour had similar conversation with NNDC. Yet the preference for bla04/a states that this site has a less sensitive landscape than other sites in the village. This appears contradictory to what myself and my neighbour were told. Whilst the site would be landscaped, the views which NNDC told were sacrosanct would now be sacrificed to the building of houses. Accept that Blakeney provides more houses. Why is this site preferred when there are seemingly obvious alternatives. Accept that Blakeney provides more houses. Why is this site preferred when there are seemingly obvious alternatives. **If Avocet view was felt desirable then it is on that side of the Langham road that development should continue** rather than break into greenfield site such as bla04/a. **bla01 and bla09** are 1. A continuation of an existing development as opposed to a totally new development on a greenfield site 2. Development of those sites would not only meet the building requirements in the short term, but give potential for further future housing should it ever be required. 3. The sites are more enclosed from a landscape perspective and the views beyond them are to other houses. 4. It would leave the site bla04/a and its neighbouring fields as it is on entering Blakeney with its views of the church, scots pines, etc. This would be more desirable and in accord with my

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					understanding of what I was told when the question of the trees was raised as above. I would respectfully ask you therefore to reconsider your existing preferred site in favour of the site(s) mentioned above.
DS24	BLA04/A	Bryant, Mrs Lynda (1216266)	LP181	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** A change of the preferred site from BLA04/A to BLA01.Amazed that bla04/a was the preferred option! Common sense says to me that surely extra houses should be built where extra houses have already been built. Why would you propose a green field site in preference to a site(s) that is already adjoining the existing new development? Become used to the new houses to the left,bla01 would be beyond this and therefore not visible from the Langham road. BLA04/a would ruin the view to the right of the road with its views across open farmland to the church and bordered by scots pines. Avocet view is a very attractive development, it has moved the village boundary in a southerly direction. **Expected further development to be in that vicinity; bla01 and bla09,** I.E. Extending an existing development. Bla09 could be used in future if more development required. If these sites were preferred options; the expansion of the village would already have been facilitated.
DS24	BLA04/A	Hill, Mrs Janet (1216125)	LP165	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** A reduction in housing numbers and a limitation to types that will provide affordable housing only for the village to supply local housing need and therefore be sustainable. Adverse impact on the entrance to the village as seen from Langham Road and on the North Norfolk Coast European Marine Site, Special Area of Conservation and Special Protection area from additional residents using and accessing the coast which is not offset by provision of alternative sustainable features such as open space. IF the development were to proceed it would need appropriate and adequate screening on the southern and eastern sides which will require substantial 30m wide (minimum) tree belts to screen the development and the retention of the western boundary field hedge to retain this characteristic rural lane If development were to proceed it should not have street or other outside lighting Similarly if the development were to proceed it should be low level housing (not beyond 1.5 story height) to minimise impacts
DS24	BLA04/A	Kewell, Mrs Helen Roden, Mrs Sarah, Albany, Mr Clive (Agent) (1216776 1216777 (1216772))	LP233 LP232	Object Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: The removal of BLA04/A as the Preferred Site and the promotion of BLA01. Objecting to BLA04/A for the following reasons a) Preference for BLA04/A is based upon NNDC assessment that the site has a less sensitive landscape setting than other sites in the village. This is contradictory as the Local Plan states that "BLA04 mirrors the recent Avocet View development and has a less sensitive landscape setting than other sites in the village". b) In the draft Blakeney Conservation Appraisal Report of August 2018 under Section 8.3.5, it states that "Views of Blakeney from Wiveton and Cley and from the surrounding landscape to the south and south west will be preserved" .Page 134 shows such views from the Langham Road when approaching Blakeney from the south i.e. just where BLA04/A is planned to be built upon. In addition, on P88 the report states "New developments will not negatively impact on views within or towards the Conservation Area" i.e. across the field of BLA04/A.Thus construction of 30 houses on BLA04/A will affect such views and make a mockery of this important Conservation Report. c) A line of Scots pine and other mature trees have softened the urban edge of Blakeney over the 50 years since the Kingsway houses were built. At least two properties backing onto FP6 have been denied permission by NNDC to reduce or remove such trees (although they are not subject to a tree preservation order) with the reason given that such action will affect the importance that they give to the visual impact when entering the village from the south along the Langham Road. Housing development on BLA04/A will completely hide this view. d) **Housing development should be restricted to building off the existing Avocet View (Harbour Way) estate** by providing a two-way access road along the southern side of Avocet View

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					development into **BLA01** which sits better into the landscape. The Local Plan accepts that access is practically possible. BLA01 and BLA09 land owners have confirmed to NNDC that the land is immediately available as building land. e) Should BLA04/04 be approved, then there is a high probability that the rest if the field BLA04 will be built upon at some future date. The then enlarged housing estate will have a massive environmental and conservation impact on Blakeney which is supposed to be in a conservation area and AONB.
DS24	BLA04/A	Myers, Mr John (1217478)	LP636	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: BLA01 and BLA09, would not enhance the overall layout of Blakeney Village and would offer more difficult access to local amenities and roads.** Continuing with existing boundary line of Avocet View across the Langham road, would appear to be the most sensible solution. There is already a higher concentration of houses on the western side of the Langham Road. Affordable housing in Blakeney would be well suited to the BLA04/A site, as this already offers access, via the existing footpath to the primary school, the Pastures, recreation ground, village hall and shop amenities as well as medical facilities. A smooth line of demarcation with the existing Avocet View development with the planned boundary of BLA04/A across the Langham Road would balance the size of the village. This line would be confined within the 30mph speed limits. The Langham Road short stretch access that has to be provided does not represent much of a difficulty, as compared to any road access on the Morston Road.
DS24	BLA04/A	Watson-Farrar, Mrs Penelope (1217361)	LP343	Object	New development should not take place on green field sites as has happened with the site on the other side of the Langham Road, a ludicrously expensive and inappropriate development for an important village, one that has not been popular with either its residents or others in the village, and which has not 'softened in character' despite expensive landscaping. The approach to Blakeney along the Langham Road will be despoiled forever if yet another ill-conceived housing estate of 30 homes is allowed to be built on agricultural land crucially important to maintain Blakeney's unique character. I quote from 20.2 of your document: "The areas that are undeveloped provide important green spaces and recreational areas that are an essential part of the character of the village and are proposed to be retained." Agricultural land is an essential part of that essential character of our village. Blakeney needs space to breathe. Blakeney needs distant views. Blakeney needs to be protected from the NNDC plan in its entirety. Before Blakeney loses its entire unique character, and all the reasons why it has been preserved and marked out as a very special place both in the last century as well as this one, there must be surely be a body of sensible, strong and courageous people on planning committees who are prepared to commit to preserving Blakeney's unique future place in the United Kingdom and who will say, "Enough is enough. "Blakeney is distinctive, individual, and very, very special. It must now be exempt from further suburbanisation and saved from total ruin. There are just some extremely special places in North Norfolk that need saving from being overdeveloped. I do not object to the social housing part of the Plan, and in fact support it wholeheartedly but we do not need any more million pound houses in Blakeney.
DS24	BLA04/A	Sadler, Mrs Katherine (1216707)	LP245	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Objections to use of site BLA04/A . (1)It is uphill of the present dwellings, on a protected approach to the village. -- a. The draft Blakeney Conservation Area Appraisal (Aug 2018) states in section 8.3.5 “Views of Blakeney […] from the surrounding landscape to the south and south west will be preserved”. This clearly encompasses the approach from Langham in the south (but not from Morston in the West). It also pledges “New developments will not negatively impact on views within or towards the Conservation Area.” Building uphill from Kingsway will do just this. It will interrupt the attractive approach to the village and impede the view of its famous church. -- b. The mature trees separating Kingsway from the field provide a

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					pleasant screen. Building a housing estate in front would replace this with houses, fencing and immature trees at best. Not the rural approach the village presently enjoys. Kingsway resident Peter Cox (1215783): "when we wanted to remove some trees from the back of our garden we were told we could not as it would spoil the view coming into Blakeney down the hill, we were told at the time that the field behind us […] would never be altered due to the AONB of the area and Blakeney conservation Plan 2018". -- c. Any new housing built on BLA04/A will overlook the bungalows on Kingsway due to their elevated position, creating overbearing impact and visual dominance. -- d. Point 20.11 of the plan notes that Anglian water has identified issues with sewerage and water supply. Such issues would surely be magnified if the building were to be uphill of Kingsway, and may also impact the buildings downhill, ie in Kingsway and the village hall. . (2). The footpath at the back of Kingsway, FP6, is a pleasant countryside walk through fields and woodland, with low environmental impact as the pathway is not paved or tarmac. Wildlife such as pheasants can often be seen from the path. -- a. The rural nature of the footpath will be ruined by a housing estate. -- b. If the path were to be upgraded (widened with paving or tarmac) to either an access road or to provide pedestrian access to Saxlingham Road, the woodland and all the houses on Kingsway and The Butts would be adversely affected. -- c. Moreover, The Butts appears to be an unadopted lane. This could throw a question mark over its maintenance, which would be a concern with increased use of the path. . (3). The field above Kingsway, site BLA04/A, is a good sized, quality arable field. The field is used for growing food. We should keep using it for growing food. -- a. The aerial view shows it is also an excellent shape, largely rectangular. Nibbling away at it by building a wedge shaped housing estate will make the field a strange shape which will introduce corners and thus impact its usability by agricultural machinery. -- b. It is also home and hunting ground to many animals and birds, including protected species such as marsh harriers and owls which breed nearby. Their habitat and feeding ground should not be eroded. . (4). New houses will require street lights and more light pollution encroaching into the countryside. **Instead of BLA04/A, I would support the use of site BLA01,** with access from the Langham Road. Here are my reasons. . (1). Site BLA01 nestles lower down the hill and building on it would have less visual impact on the approach to the village, as it would be obscured by the present housing, hedging along Langham Road and vegetation alongside the neighbouring downland. . (2). The shape and location of the field BLA01 within the present boundary of the village makes it more like "in-fill" which is surely preferable to encroaching on the open countryside. . (3). The site backs on to the Queens Close development and could provide a handy pedestrian cut through (eg via Haywards Close) to the daycare facilities and doctors surgery in Queens Close and from there to the rest of the village, minimising the need to walk down the upper part of busy Langham Road with its narrow pavement. . (4). I have heard that the land owner of BLA01/BLA09 is the same as owned the land for Avocet View development and is willing to sell more for a mixed social housing development. . (5). If access to BLA01 from Morston Road is problematic, an Avocet View boundary road could be opened off Langham Road. The existing mature hedges screening Langham Road need not be impacted as the road could be located where the hedge was already removed to build Avocet View. The strip of land required for this road is on the edge of BLA09 which I have heard is owned by the same owners as BLA01. . (6). There would be room for future development should it be needed, whereas building more houses on BLA04 would further detriment the agricultural use of the land and the visual impact on the approach to the village.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS24	BLA04/A	Terry Stanford, Mr Terry (1217362)	LP344	Object	1: The proposed site would be the first view of Blakeney anyone arriving via the B1156 would see. The field above Kingsway, site 1: The proposed site would be the first view of Blakeney anyone arriving via the B1156 would see. The field above Kingsway, site BLA04/A, is uphill of the present dwellings, and is on a protected approach to the village This view of the still pretty village would be forever lost. 2: This site (BLA04/A) is just as much in the countryside as alternative sites in Saxlingham Road, Morston Road and west of Langham Road, that you quote as having an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. 3: How many of the proposed housing will again go to second homes? A recurring theme in Blakeney. 4: There is little work in Blakeney and presumably any full time residents of a new development will need to work outside the village. Potentially putting 60 extra cars (2 per family) onto already congested rural roads. 3: How many of the proposed housing will again go to second homes? A recurring theme in Blakeney. T**he alternative sites give better and safer access to the local school, surgery and shops.** 6: The field to the west of Langham Road (BLA09) could join with the existing development of Avocet View and have vehicular access to Queens Close where the start of an access road already exists This would channel traffic onto Langham Road at a much safer point. , is uphill of the present dwellings, and is on a protected approach to the village This view of the still pretty village would be forever lost. 2: This site (BLA04/A) is just as much in the countryside as alternative sites in Saxlingham Road, Morston Road and west of Langham Road, that you quote as having an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
DS24	BLA04/A	Broch, Mr Daniel Sworders Grimes, Mr Kelvin (Agent) (1217619 1217618)	LP658	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The site is deliverable and available. It could make a small but important contribution to housing delivery, on **a site which could accommodate up to five dwellings** within walking distance of the village centre, and as such should be considered further for allocation in the draft Local Plan. My client's site lies within the AONB. The development will be designed to minimise the visual impact, and to respect and enhance the setting of the environment and the landscape. The scale and character of the properties will reflect their setting, and the associate landscaping will ensure that they integrate into the environment. Consider the HELAA assessment of transport is inaccurate and future highways work would demonstrate that any such constraints can be mitigated.
DS24	BLA04/A	Hadley, Mr Anthony (1217477)	LP637	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: BLA01 & BLA09 road access via Morston Road (BLA01) will be a major safety issue and geographically is further away from local amenities in Blakeney village. There is also a higher concentration of existing houses on the western side of the Langham Road so any future housing development will only add to this situation. BLA04/A will provide safe and easy access not only to the local School but also to the Recreation Ground, Village Hall and local shop with no crossing

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS24)
Summary of Objections	18	Objections to development on basis of the environmental impact; no development on greenfield sites as agricultural land will be needed in the future due to global warming and population increase. Other concerns; impact on the approach into Blakeney, views of the church and Conservation Area, which is in conflict with the Conservation Area appraisal that states that these views of Blakeney will be preserved. Lying on higher ground development would be visible, prominent and have a detrimental impact on the distinctive character of the area. Not considered to be enclosed in the landscape. And impact on the amenity of existing properties views and be overbearing. Impact on wildlife including protected species, and on European Marine Site, SAC, SPA from additional residents using the coast that will not be offset by provision of open

		space. Constitute major development in the AONB, undermining national policy and doesn't set out exceptional circumstances or demonstrate this would be in the public interest. Would have the same impact as other sites within the AONB that are considered as having an adverse impact on the AONB in site assessment. Development would cause light and noise pollution impacting on the Dark Skies. Impact on the existing natural footpath adjacent to the site and the existing trees, sections of the footpath would need improving. Nearby residents told they cannot remove their boundary trees as they provide an important feature which is contradictory to this policy which states that this site is less sensitive landscape than others. Concerns that development would extra pressure on the roads, water supply, and sewage capacity. Suggests that further development should be located within existing built up areas or provided on a number of smaller sites which would have less impact. If developed then ensure that adequate screening is provided, no street or outside lighting and houses are lower than 1.5 storey in height. Market housing will merely increase second home ownership, any development should be 100% affordable. A number are proposing alternative sites and consider BLA01 and BLA09 as more suitable sites than the preferred site, perceived that the alternatives would have less impact on the landscape, less detrimental visual impact and less impact on existing residents. A number objecting neighbour onto the preferred site. Consider that BLA01 would provide better/safer access to facilities. Questions whether the most suitable site has been chosen, whether this is demonstrated in the SA and if the statutory consultees including Natural England and Historic England agree. An alternative new site has been proposed, the landowner confirms that the site is deliverable and available and could make important contribution to housing delivery. The proposal would be designed to minimise the visual impact and enhance the setting of landscape. Housing design will reflect their setting and landscaping will integrate site into environment.
Summary of Support	2	Would be well suited to affordable housing, the site offers access, via the existing footpath to the primary school, the Pastures, recreation ground, village hall and shop amenities as well as medical facilities. A smooth line of demarcation with the existing Avocet View development with the planned boundary of BLA04/A across the Langham Road would balance the size of the village and would be confined within the 30mph speed limit. Access onto Langham Road doesn't cause much difficulty compared to Morston Road. One supports DS24 rather than the alternative sites BLA01 and BLA09, considers them to be unsuitable due to road access and being located further from facilities in Blakeney village.
Summary of General Comments	1	One general comment received. Concerns over school and doctor's capacity and employment opportunities. Langham road unsuitable for more cars. Development would impact on views coming into the village and Outstanding view coming into village via Langham Road.
Overall Summary		A number of concerns raised, with many comments raising generalised objections around the potential impact on the environment and the AONB. Concerns that development would be prominent, have detrimental impact on views and on the approach into Blakeney and the character of the town and Conservation Areas. In conflict with Conservation Area appraisal. Damage dark skies from light and noise pollution and impact on wildlife. Potential adverse impact on designated sites from new residents, unable to be mitigated by open space. Constitute major development in the AONB, undermining national policy. Considered to have similar impact on the AONB as other non-preferred sites. Other concerns; pressure on the schools, doctors, roads, water supply, and sewage capacity. Limited employment opportunities. Concerns over the impact on the adjacent footpath and loss of greenspace / agricultural land which will be needed in the future. Concerns with the site access, consider Langham Road to be unsuitable for more cars. Suggest that development should be within the existing built up area or on a number of smaller sites. If developed adequate screening should be provided, no street or outside lighting, houses should be lower than 1.5 storey in height. Should be for affordable homes for local people, not available for second homes. Comment of support states that the site offers access to primary school and other services within village.
Council's Response		Noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy. Sites have been assessed against a detailed set of criteria and have been subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal. The decision on whether a site should be proposed as a draft allocation is made having regard to all of the factors set out in para 11.10 of the emerging LP and detailed in Background Paper 6 - Development Site Selection methodology. Background paper no6 published with this consultation provides full detail on the methodology used and the results of each site assessment and in relation

		to the overall housing requirements identified in policy HOU1. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints and designations, the potential impact of development on landscape, views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size and whether the site preserves the separate identity of a settlement and the importance of natural and built features have been taken into account. The location of development has been informed by proximity to the designated sites and the limitations on the wider views over the marshes, the high quality of the landscape around the town and the potential impact on the AONB. The proposed allocation is subject to a specific policy which identifies requirements that development proposals would need to address in order to secure planning permission. This includes a requirement for the careful attention to site layout, building heights and materials in order to minimise the visual impact of development. Prior approval of a scheme of mitigation to minimise potential impacts on the Wiveton Downs SSSI and the North Norfolk Coast SPA/SAC/Ramsar. The allocation seeks the provision of landscaping along the Northern boundary including the improvement and integration of the existing footpath into a green corridor. National policy dictates that whether a proposal is major development in the AONB is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting. The draft Plan has been subject to an Interim Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) with the purpose to assess the potential impacts on Natura 2000 or European Sites and if necessary specify any mitigation measures. The results can be found within the published HRA. A further Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) is currently being commissioned collectively by the Norfolk Authorities and Natural England and will help inform the final position towards recreational impacts on sensitive European sites. The Council will take into account consultation feedback from bodies such as Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Natural England to inform decisions regarding the likely impact of developing a site for biodiversity and continue to work with site promoters to take into account biodiversity features. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact. Development proposals would need to comply with a number of policies (including those relating to affordable housing, open space, providing supporting infrastructure and design) elsewhere in the plan. Dark skies and Light and Noise Pollution will be considered in line with Policy SD13 Pollution & Hazard Prevention & Minimisation, comments will be considered in the finalisation of this policy. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development for local highways, water, and sewerage, healthcare and education. The Parish council is also developing its own neighbourhood plan which offers the community the opportunity to add a layer of local distinction to development in order to address evidenced local needs and ensure any development respects community aspirations on local character.

Proposals for Briston

DS25: Land East of Astley Primary School

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS25	BRI01	Daniels, Mr (1217050)	LP270	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The proposed allocations will effectively lead to the coalescence of Briston and Melton Constable and there are concerns that the lack of defensible boundaries will result in development being difficult to control. The commentary of the plan pre-supposes that further development will result in this coalescence being reinforced. The provision of two accesses in close proximity to the school is likely to increase conflict with the operation of the school, particularly with drivers heading east. The allocated sites are also subject to a number of constraints and an assessment needs to be undertaken to ensure that they will actually be able to deliver the requisite level of affordable housing and associated community benefits and that these benefits will not be eroded by viability arguments. A proper assessment needs to be undertaken of all the sites submitted in Briston and with the detailed evidence being provided as to why alternative sites have been rejected. The rejection of sites appears to have been predicated on the basis that the two sites proposed for allocation will meet the needs of Briston and therefore no other sites should be considered. This appears to demonstrate a bias and pre-judgement of other sites. As stated in representations in relation to paragraph 11.10 there are also questions as to the deliverability of a site which has been allocated in excess of 8 years.
DS25	BRI01	Waddingham, R.N. and Family Agent - Hill Iain (Bidwells) (1218558)	LP608	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: The site is considered to be entirely deliverable, and the owners supports Council's proposals to allocate the site under Policy DS 25 for residential development The following Representation demonstrates the site's suitability, achievability, viability, and availability for allocation. The site is located within Briston. The following commentary demonstrates the site's suitability and that it can, subject to minor alterations, be delivered in accordance with the proposed policy requirements of Policy DS 25. -Landscaping and Site Setting Within Point 1 of the proposed wording of Policy DS 25 -Point 2 of the proposed wording of Policy DS 25 requires the provision of a car parking area for the adjacent school (for pick up and drop off). However, given that both Policy DS 25 and DS 26 have the requirement for a car parking area for the adjacent Astley School, the provision of car parking for the school on both sites may significantly exceed demand. Therefore, Point 2 should be amended to require the provision of a car park, subject to it being demonstrated that there is an unmet need. Accordingly, Point 2 should be amended to reflect: **'2. provision of a car parking area for the school (pick up and drop off), subject to an identified need'** -Pedestrian and Cycle Access. The site is bound to the north by a joint pedestrian footpath and cycleway, and to the east by a pedestrian footpath. Point 3 of the proposed wording of Policy DS 25 requires the provision of pedestrian and cycle access through the site. Both pedestrian and cycle access through the site can be incorporated into the design of development on the site. -Retention and Enhancement of Mature Hedge and Pond Point 3 of the proposed wording of Policy DS 25 seeks the retention and enhancement of the mature hedge and pond. The requirements of the policy are, where practical and feasible, supported. In addition, it is suggested that the **supporting text to the policy states that the feasibility of using the pond for educational purposes linked to the school should be explored.** -Water Main As outlined within Point 5 of the proposed wording of Policy DS 25, a water main crosses the site and enhancements to the foul sewerage network capacity will be required. It is noted that a water main crosses the site;

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					this could either be diverted as part of the development or the development could be designed in a manner to not impact upon the existing water main. The wording of Point 5 should be amended to reflect that the foul sewerage network capacity upgrade requirements can be provided as part of development on the site, subject to confirmation of requirement from the relevant statutory provider. And to state that **'a water main crosses the site and enhancement to the foul sewerage network capacity will be required, where an appropriate need is demonstrated'** -a range of interest has been received from a variety of developers. Further details on market interest can be provided on a strictly private and confidential basis. Accordingly, this demonstrates that there is market demand and interest in the site; thus, suggesting that there is a realistic prospect that the site will be delivered within the first five years of the plan period, in accordance with the NPPF. -it is envisaged that the development would provide 30 dwellings per annum, ensuring completion in 2022; -Based on the suitability assessment above, there are no site-specific constraints which could preclude the delivery of residential development on the site. Therefore, residential development on the site is deemed to be entirely achievable. Viable Development of the site for residential purposes is considered viable, taking into consideration the various requirements identified in Policy DS 25 . Further evidence on viability can be provided on a strictly private and confidential basis, should this be deemed necessary.
DS25	BRI01	Irwin, Mrs Joan (1209713)	LP006	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** We have a portion of land (approx. 5 acres) to the north side of Fakenham Road, which is accessible from the main road which could be considered for residential development in the future.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS25)
Summary of Objections	1	One objection received. Concern that development will lead to coalescence of Briston and Melton Constable, and future development will be difficult to control. Concern with proximity of access to the school. Assessment needed to ensure site can deliver required level of affordable housing and associated community benefits. Concerns over the assessments of alternative sites, seems that sites have been rejected on the basis that the two sites proposed meet the needs of Briston, seems to be bias and pre-judgement. Questions the deliverability of a site which has been allocated in excess of eight years.
Summary of Support	1	Support received from the landowner who confirms that the site is available, suitable and achievable. Envisaged that development could provide 30 dwellings per annum, ensuring completion in 2022. Suggest amendment to requirement 2 'provision of a car parking area for the school (pick up and drop off), subject to an identified need'. And to requirement 5 to reflect that the foul sewerage network capacity upgrade requirements can be provided as part of development on the site, subject to confirmation of requirement from the relevant statutory provider.
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment is proposing a new site for development.
Overall Summary		Limited response received. No substantive issues raised . Concern that development will lead to coalescence of Briston and Melton Constable, and future development will be difficult to control. Concern with proximity of the potential site access to the school. Assessment needed to ensure site can deliver required level of affordable housing and associated community benefits. Concerns that the site assessments are bias and

		pre-judged. Questions the deliverability of BRI02 that has been allocated in excess of 8 years. Support received from the landowner who confirms that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
Council's Response		Noted. Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. The Council has liaised with the Local Highways Authority to identify the likely impacts of new development for the local and strategic road network in terms of highways safety and access arrangements. The Council have undertaken a proportionate assessment of plan viability which takes into account relevant policies, local and national standards and feedback from local developers and site promoters. The approach is intended to provide added certainty around viability and delivery, by setting clear affordable housing requirements. The Authority wishes to ensure, as far as it is able to do so, that the required growth, and in particular the affordable homes that are required, are actually provided. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints, the potential impact of development on landscape and views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size and whether the site preserves the separate identity of a settlement and the importance of natural and built features have been taken into account. A detailed site assessment process of each of the options has been completed. Sites have been assessed against a detailed set of criteria and have been subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal. Full details of the methodology used can be found in Background Paper 6 - Site Selection Methodology and results. Comments noted on deliverability and will be addressed in the next iterations of the plan. Welcome clarification on availability.

DS26: Land West of Astley Primary School

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS26	BRI02	Daniels, Mr, Mr Jon Jennings, Cheffins Planning (Agent) (1217050 1217047)	LP270	Object	The proposed allocations will effectively lead to the coalescence of Briston and Melton Constable and there are concerns that the lack of defensible boundaries will result in development being difficult to control. The commentary of the plan pre-supposes that further development will result in this coalescence being reinforced. The provision of two accesses in close proximity to the school is likely to increase conflict with the operation of the school, particularly with drivers heading east. The allocated sites are also subject to a number of constraints and an assessment needs to be undertaken to ensure that they will actually be able to deliver the requisite level of affordable housing and associated community benefits and that these benefits will not be eroded by viability arguments. A proper assessment needs to be undertaken of all the sites submitted in Briston and with the detailed evidence being provided as to why alternative sites have been rejected. The rejection of sites appears to have been predicated on the basis that the two sites proposed for allocation will meet the needs of Briston and therefore no other sites should be considered. This appears to demonstrate a bias and pre-judgement of other sites. As stated in representations in relation to paragraph 11.10 there are also questions as to the deliverability of a site which has been allocated in excess of 8 years.
DS26	BRI02	Waddingham, R.N. and Family, Hill, Mr Iain, Bidwells (Agent) (1218558)	LP596	Support	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: The site is considered to be entirely deliverable, and the owners support the Council's proposals to allocate the site under Policy DS 26 for residential development The following Representation demonstrates the site's suitability, achievability, viability, and availability for allocation. The site is located within Briston. The following commentary demonstrates the site's suitability and that it can, subject to minor alterations, be delivered in accordance with the proposed policy requirements of Policy DS 26. -Landscaping and Site Setting Within Point 1 of the proposed wording of Policy DS 26 -Point 2 of the proposed wording of Policy DS 26 restricts vehicular access to one point from Fakenham Road. One point of access may prejudice the quantum of development which could be achieved to the south (as outlined within Point 4 of Policy DS 26). Accordingly, in order to provide sufficient flexibility, the access strategy should be devised through appropriate supporting technical work, provided by a Highways Consultant, in line with Norfolk County Council Highways advice, which will inform the quantum and location of vehicular access points. Whilst every effort can be made to explore the possibility of achieving access to the site from the west, this land falls outside of the land owned and controlled by R.N. Waddingham and Family. Requested that second part of point 2 is deleted. Point 3 requires the provision of a car parking area for the adjacent school (for pick up and drop off). However, given that both Policy DS 25 and DS 26 have the requirement for a car parking area for the adjacent Astley School, the provision of car parking for the school on both sites may significantly exceed demand. Therefore, Point 3 should be amended to require the provision of a car park, subject to it being demonstrated that there is an unmet need. Accordingly, Point 3 should be amended to reflect: '3. provision of a car parking area for the school (pick up and drop off), subject to an identified need' BRI02 was submitted as a larger site through the Call for Sites, the southern element has not been identified as a preferred allocation. It is suitable, available, achievable and viable and deliverable. Support point 4 – development on the site can be designed to ensure that development to south and west could come forward in the future. -Pedestrian and Cycle Access and green links can be incorporated.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					Amend Point 6 to reflect that Foul Sewerage Network Capacity upgrade requirements can be provided as part of the development on the site. Amend to: '6. Enhancement to the foul sewerage network capacity, where demonstrated by an identified need'. -a range of interest has been received from a variety of developers. Further details on market interest can be provided on a strictly private and confidential basis. Accordingly, this demonstrates that there is market demand and interest in the site; thus, suggesting that there is a realistic prospect that the site will be delivered within the first five years of the plan period, in accordance with the NPPF. -it is envisaged that the development would provide 30 dwellings per annum, ensuring completion in 2022; -Based on the suitability assessment above, there are no site-specific constraints which could preclude the delivery of residential development on the site. Therefore, residential development on the site is deemed to be entirely achievable. Viable Development of the site for residential purposes is considered viable, taking into consideration the various requirements identified in Policy DS25. Further evidence on viability can be provided on a strictly private and confidential basis, should this be deemed necessary. Policy DS 26 Land West of Astley Primary School Land amounting to approximately 2 hectares is proposed to be allocated for residential development for approximately 40 dwellings. Development proposals would need to comply with policies including those relating to affordable housing, open space, supporting infrastructure, elsewhere in this plan and the following site specific requirements: 1. consideration of the landscaping and setting on the Fakenham Road; 2. restriction of vehicular access to one point from Fakenham Road, unless it can be demonstrated through supporting technical work that alternatives are feasible; should be restricted to a single access point and alternative access arrangements via the adjacent estate roads should be explored; 3. provision of a car parking area for the school (pick up and drop off), subject to an identified need; 4. development layout that does not prejudice the potential development/redevelopment of land to the south and west; 5. provision of landscaping, pedestrian and cycle access, and green wildlife links through the site; and 6. enhancement to the foul sewerage network capacity will be required, where demonstrated by an identified need.
DS26	BRI02	Irwin, Mrs Joan (1209713)	LP006	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** We have a portion of land (approx. 5 acres) to the north side of Fakenham Road, which is accessible from the main road which could be considered for residential development in the future.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS26)
Summary of Objections	1	One objection received. Concern that development will lead to coalescence of Briston and Melton Constable, and future development will be difficult to control. Concern with proximity of access to the school. Assessment needed to ensure site can deliver required level of affordable housing and associated community benefits. Concerns over the assessments of alternative sites, seems that sites have been rejected on the basis that the two sites proposed meet the needs of Briston, seems to be bias and pre-judgement. Questions the deliverability of a site which has been allocated in excess of eight years.
Summary of Support	1	Support received from the landowner who confirms that the site is available, suitable and achievable. Envisaged that development could provide 30 dwellings per annum, ensuring completion in 2022. However requirement 2 restricting the site to a single access point may prejudice the quantum of development in the future. The land to the west falls outside of the land owned by R.N Waddingham. Suggest amendment to

		requirement 3 ‘provision of a car parking area for the school (pick up and drop off), subject to an identified need’. And to requirement 6 to reflect that the foul sewerage network capacity upgrade requirements can be provided as part of development on the site. Suggest wording change; 'Enhancement to the foul sewerage network capacity, where demonstrated by an identified need’.
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment is proposing a new site for development.
Overall Summary		Limited response received. No substantive issues raised. Concern that development will lead to coalescence of Briston and Melton Constable, and future development will be difficult to control. Concern with the potential site access to the school. Assessment needed to ensure site can deliver required level of affordable housing and associated community benefits. Support received from the landowner who confirms that the site is available, suitable and achievable. Concerns that the site assessments are bias and pre-judged. Questions the deliverability of BRI02 that has been allocated in excess of 8 years. Support received from the landowner who confirms that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
Council's Response		Noted. The Council has liaised with the Local Highways Authority to identify the likely impacts of new development for the local and strategic road network in terms of highways safety and access arrangements. Welcome clarification on availability. The Council have undertaken a proportionate assessment of plan viability which takes into account relevant policies, local and national standards and feedback from local developers and site promoters. The approach is intended to provide added certainty around viability and delivery, by setting clear affordable housing requirements. The Authority wishes to ensure, as far as it is able to do so, that the required growth, and in particular the affordable homes that are required, are actually provided. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints, the potential impact of development on landscape and views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size and whether the site preserves the separate identity of a settlement and the importance of natural and built features have been taken into account. A detailed site assessment process of each of the options has been completed. Sites have been assessed against a detailed set of criteria and have been subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal. Full details of the methodology used can be found in Background Paper 6 - Site Selection Methodology and results. Comments noted on deliverability and will be addressed in the next iterations of the plan.

Proposals for Ludham

DS27: Land South of School Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS27	LUD01/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	None received.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS27)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary	No comments received	

DS28: Land at Eastern End of Grange Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS28	LUD06/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	None received.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS28)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary	No comments received	

Proposals for Mundesley

DS29: Land off Cromer Road & Church Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS29	MUN03/A	Camus, Mrs Elizabeth (1216244)	LP186	Object	Reduce the number of houses that you are proposing to build but if needed then build in small groups around the village. I have lived in Mundesley for several years, and have seen the village grow with the addition of other large estates, -I have also seen the amount of time I have to wait for a doctors appointment considerably increase, surely allowing another fifty houses to be built as one large estate will add a lot more pressure to those waiting lists. -The site of these houses will also add to the ever increasing amount of traffic that uses Cromer Road. -as a non driver that uses the buses, many services are being reduced, and more houses means more pressure on public transport. -What about the local school, or are you assuming that these new houses will as many are in the village, be second homes, therefore not adding to the school numbers. -more second homes do not bring value to the village as they are only used a few times a year and the people I know who have these homes rarely shop in the village. -there will be eight affordable properties from the fifty, I doubt any of the younger locals could afford to buy one even if they got the chance, there is not enough work in this area to support another fifty houses being built and locals being able to purchase them. to reduce the number of houses that you are proposing to build, but if you must build them please use your common sense and build them in smaller groups around the village in more discreet sites which will not offend the people who already live here or the people who visit.
DS29	MUN03/A	Barnes, Ms Jane (1218558)	LP084 LP085	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Wholly unsuitable. On the highest point of the village and is very close to the Church; as with the four already designated it will ruin the landscape from every angle and approach into the village. On this highest point it is possible to see four different churches in the surrounding countryside, this view will be lost, and more importantly the view of the beautiful church and the landmark Trafalgar Court will be blighted by a mass of red roofed houses dominating the skyline. Site runs parallel to the coastal erosion zone, and is also the narrowest and most dangerous section of Cromer Rd, so perhaps this is why this particular site was rejected before on the previous core strategy plan! Turning the adjoining site into a public green space is ridiculous, as we already have a very large green space with a children's play area within a few minutes walk of this field. Building this large amount of houses on one relatively small site will also have a significant effect on the tourism trade and this is very important to our village, we do NOT want to become a sprawling "town" of built up estates which unfortunately has already had a detrimental effect on the landscape as you drive into Mundesley on the Cromer Rd. Mundesley needs fifty more houses, **a better plan/ more beneficial for the village is to build on smaller sites spread around the village. Alternative sites; MUN08, MUN 09 and MUN11 could each take smaller number of houses but would not change the landscape and not have the detrimental visual impact that using MUN03 would have.** The photo attached shows the visual impact of the house already being built on the MUN03 site, and this house is not even on the highest part of the field, imagine fifty more and how that landscape would then look.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS29	MUN03/A	Brightman, Mrs Catherine (1215720)	LP117	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Added overload on the doctors and school, the position of the site, and because of the extra volume of traffic on Cromer Road, Cause even more safety problems on Cromer Road. Opposite a blind bend and on a very narrow section of Cromer Road, parallel with the coastal erosion zone, so why pick this site over any of the others? On a very high point in the village and will be seen from every access point into the village, the church will be obliterated from view, and once the site is developed it will stick out like a sore thumb! How are the doctors and schools going to cope with extra people, why do we need a green space, when it is already a green space with alpacas on that everyone loves. Only a few minutes walk from Gold Park where everyone can enjoy a green space, a MUGA, a skate park and a lovely chiders play area. This is not the right site, and any development of fifty houses should be dispersed around the village so that this village does not look like an urbanisation.
DS29	MUN03/A	James, Mrs Rosemary (1215666)	LP114	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** I can bare witness to how dangerous Cromer road is, a hidden bend right opposite the site and the speeding aspect is outrageous, this area of Mundesley does not need any further building as it is heavily built up with the Norfolk Homes site. We do not need more pressure put on our service facilities such as the doctors surgery or the schools, have to wait three weeks for a doctors appointment now, certainly if these fifty houses are built as one development rather than being spread over the twenty years as stated in your plan, this will add considerable pressure to an already overwhelmed system. The site is on very high ground and the four roll back houses that are currently being built look totally out of place now. Photo attached from the church entrance towards proposed site, which sits much higher than the Church, become a very big blot on the landscape.
DS29	MUN03/A	James, Mrs Rosemary (1215666)	LP114	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** The site needs to be in a visually less overbearing place such as MUN09 or split into several smaller developments which would be much more appealing to the local residents.
DS29	MUN03/A	Louise, Ms Sandra (1215668)	LP115	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: I do not think building fifty houses with only eight as "affordable homes" will enhance this village in any way. I live in a street where at least half of the houses are second homes, they visit infrequently and the houses stand empty for most of the year. I suggest that another fifty houses will be much the same, the affordables will not be affordable, and the larger houses will all be sold to the second home brigade as the prices will be too expensive for the average local family. Perhaps if they were all built as affordable/social housing specifically for people that live within the village postcode, things might be different, but I doubt this will be the case! Build more affordable housing for our younger families, don't build them on this site as it is too close to Cromer Road, and preferably don't build them at all!
DS29	MUN03/A	Wheldon, Ms Ginny Wibberley, Mr Chris (1216703 1216702)	LP214 LP301	Object Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** In addition the entrance for the proposed site is from Cromer Road on a blind bend which is already dangerous with speeding motorists coming round the corner on the wrong side of the road. To add more traffic to this narrow part of the road will cause accidents, either involving pedestrians or vehicles. Parking outside Tesco's store just up Cromer Road from the site is also extremely dangerous and adding more traffic/more customers will only make this far worse.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS29	MUN03/A	Revell, Mrs Denise (1210223)	LP034	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** It's In the wrong place and does not support the needs of the village. MUN03 borders on the busiest route into the village, Cromer Road also the most developed area of the village and if you follow it through to the other end of the village it is the only place without significant development and this site is prominent on the landscape. Access onto this site via Cromer Road is on a blind bend, the road is narrow and the only existing footpath would have to cross the access road causing a safety hazard for pedestrians. During the holiday season this road, being the only road along the coast is extremely busy, accessing the road from this point is already treacherous. In addition to this there are already problems in the area due to no available footpaths to access Warren Drive via Church Lane so that parents can get their children safely to school. The proposed additional green space in this area is would be surplus to requirements as there is adequate green space and play provision at Gold Park. Proposed green space would be in a dangerous position for open space as it is on a busy bend in the road. It is also the highest point of the village so any new estate built on will be seen from all aspects therefore blocking the view of the Church and other important landmarks for the villagers and visitors. Previous planning permission for this site was refused several years ago so should be again now. Previous building on the Cromer end of the village, formally the RAF camp, is not the most attractive entrance to the village and a further 50 houses of this type at this point on Cromer Road will only make a further blot on the landscape. They could be built in smaller clusters spread around the village and this will not have a negative impact on the village. **The area MUN11 At the edge of the village on Cromer Road would make a more suitable site for development.** The road is straight allowing visibility for vehicles entering and leaving the site and there is already existing access to the site from Collingwood Drive. The existing services, water, drainage, electricity supply and telephone etc could easily accommodate additional houses. The site is not prominent on the landscape and a housing development on this site would easily blend in. There are no flooding or contamination issues, and the area is supported by public transport. This site does not get used as open space as it was originally proposed to be because there is nothing to attract people to use it and it is at the wrong side of the existing development and with the already open space and play area within two minutes walk this area would make it a prime area for development.
DS29	MUN03/A	Reynolds, Mrs Bev (1210091)	LP044	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: See Rep LP034 plus additional points: Mundesley relies heavily on the revenue provided by visitor, who come for the Blue flag beach, the charm and the fact that it remains relatively unchanged. We do not want to become a concrete urbanised settlement which deters visitors from coming, and who regularly visit the village because of its quintessential seaside charm. I appreciate that we must build new houses, especially affordable ones but: The site will be seen from some miles away. MUN03 was previously turned down in favour of the Water Lane development for just that reason. The infrastructure of the village, i.e. Doctors, the School etc will be seriously under pressure Why would we want to jeopardise this in any way by building a "blot on the landscape' on the busiest main route into Mundesley. Previous allocation is extremely large, and Cromer Rd is very built up, so adding another estate on the coast road is going to make this end of the village an even bigger urban jungle. The section of Cromer Road where the proposed estate is to be built is in the coastal erosion zone, so is this considered insignificant when choosing sites to build new houses? The volume of traffic increases every day, let alone the continued anger of residents over the speeding! This area including, parcel 3, is best left as a natural habitat as it has always been, changing it by building pathways and cycle routes through it will upset the biodiversity of the area, and who would be responsible for the

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					maintenance of this green area? 5**0 houses should be built in smaller development clusters in various areas spread around the village, specifically in two of your alternatives, MUN11, and MUN09.** MUN11 is situated on a wider more accessible length of Cromer Rd, it would not be in prominent sight and would blend in with the other houses in the vicinity, and there is already an access point from Collingwood Drive. It is a 3 acre site, all services would be easily accessible, and it has direct public transport links. It is not used as a public green space area, as within two minutes walk there is already a children's play area and a maintained open green space. This is a prime site for future development. MUN09 is an area that sits just behind a new development of bungalows, so any argument that Highways access is unsuitable, or it is too far from key services is not valid, as an existing new build of 10 bungalows was built only a couple of years ago. It is also very close to the school allowing parents to walk their children to school, and the area is supported by public transport. Surely building these smaller developments would provide opportunities for our local builders giving more employment opportunities for local people.
DS29	MUN03/A	Roberson, Mr Paul (1216428)	LP193	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION**: MUN03 is not suitable, it would completely spoil That part of Mundesley, the church opposite gives that area a lovely un spoilt feel. It is home to a considerable amount of wildlife. Cromer road has become congested around the Tesco's, there have been accidents there and several near misses, having an entrance onto the proposed site from Cromer Road or Church Road would be an issue, neither of the roads are suitable to have extra traffic entering on to them. it would also be a shame to loose the field that is home to the Alpacas, these have become a tourist attraction, I have been asked on several occasions by holiday makers where they can find them. Concerns as to how the doctors would cope, I am constantly being told of patients having to wait for several weeks to see a doctor, 50 more homes will not help this situation.
DS29	MUN03/A	Kelly, Mr Sean (1216516)	LP198	Object	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** What evidence do you have of any "identified" need for this scale of development in Mundesley? You have arbitrarily allocated this number to Mundesley in order to meet the government target for the number of houses to be built in North Norfolk. You have then, simply to reduce the work load arising from the development of a new Local Plan identified an area of land of sufficient size to deliver the allocation in a single parcel. There is a ready supply of properties of all types for sale in Mundesley particularly at the starter home end of the market which would be attractive to local residents. There is no requirement for anywhere near this number of additional homes in Mundesley and, as evidenced by the recent development on the north side of this site it is highly likely that proposals will be to build as many expensive high end homes as possible. The scale of the development is not appropriate for the site as because of the topography of the and it will completely dominate the surrounding area. Any development of the southern area of plot 1 in particular will be several feet above the level of surrounding properties in Church Road, Church Lane and the north end of Manor Road. Any development in this area will completely obscure the horizon for all properties in that area. Because of the elevated position of the site any large scale development will be visible for miles around. The site is surrounded on three sides by the conservation areas of Mundesley a development on this scale, especially at the southern end of the plot will impact negatively on those conservation areas by completely altering the character of the immediate surrounding area from open farmland to dense urban development. There will be no point in having a conservation area. There are no employment sites nearby so a development on this scale will result in a significant increase in commuter traffic as. This is also true for travel to secondary and tertiary education as well as healthcare facilities and all retail activity except for immediate local store type shopping. Replace the

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
					large scale development in the proposed plan with a significantly smaller development on this site and identify other smaller scale sites in the surrounding area. Restrict development on this site to the north west of the site so it will not dominate the existing homes that surround the current proposal and will be less prominent in the landscape. Any public open space should be formed in the area adjacent to Church Road and Lane to reduce the overbearing nature of the current proposal on the surrounding properties.
DS29	MUN03/A	Bates, Mr & Mrs Clive & Eileen (1215840)	LP124 LP703	General Comments	**OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION:** Developments have to be done with respect and fitting in with the local environment. Development of Cromer Road gives me concern. Need to make available affordable homes so young people can live in the village and bring up their families, do we need more expensive properties so a % of them just become second homes as has occurred on another large development in the village. The Impact on the local infrastructure, roads actual accessing the development the junction joining Cromer road will need substantial work to make it safe. The strain on local services; the school is there enough provision to accommodate more children [if these homes are not taken up as second homes] the same applies to the doctors. Local buses have been reduced leading to more local traffic on our roads. Water erosion- rain water percolates through the field reaching the water table, the rain water off the roofs, garages and driveways into soak a ways more quickly finding its way into the water table. [even on the hottest summer days there is evidence of water seeping through the cliffs adding to erosion] would the village centre find itself more exposed to flooding as one of the lowest points in the area? The impact on local wildlife, although the train embankment is proposed to be kept as a through way for wildlife there is also the massive affect to open farmland birds and animals, [they are having a hard time nationally with depletion of habitat and pesticides and global warming] no objection to sympathetic well thought out small developments which enhances the village taking into consideration the villagers wishes and fears especially those villagers who will be affected by the development.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS29)
Summary of Objections	12	The responses primarily focus on concerns over the impact of development on the existing infrastructure and the landscape; located on the highest point of the village, development could be prominent and be detrimental and could result in the loss of views of church and other landmarks. Thereby impacting on tourism. Could also impact on biodiversity on the site, considered best to leave as a natural habitat. Open Space surplus to requirement. Infrastructure is under pressure development could result in more traffic along Cromer Road. Concerns about the safety of the access, located on a dangerous busy bend and the safety of the pedestrian footpaths. No footpath to access school. Further pressure on doctors, schools and public transport. Site adjacent to Coastal Erosion Zone. Need more affordable housing. Market housing will merely increase second home ownership. Not enough work opportunities. Development should be dispersed around the village, more preferential sites within village. A number are proposing alternative sites and consider MUN08, MUN09 and MUN11 as more suitable sites than the preferred site, perceived that the alternatives would have less impact on the landscape and less detrimental visual impact. MUN09 is located behind existing housing, with suitable access and close to key services and school. Suggest that MUN11 would have suitable access and has existing services available. Suggest that building a number of smaller sites would be more appropriate for the village than one large site.

Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment received. Concerns of the impact on local infrastructure especially safety of Cromer Road. Will cause a strain on services including schools, doctors. Reduction of local buses causing more traffic. Potential for more flooding from water erosion. Impact on wildlife. No objection to smaller developments which enhance the village. Need more affordable housing, rather than second homes. Development needs to respect and fit in with the local environment.
Overall Summary		The responses primarily focus on concerns over the landscape impact and impact on infrastructure. That development would be prominent, have detrimental impact on views of church and other landmarks and impact on tourism and on wildlife. Open Space considered to be surplus to requirement. Exacerbate existing traffic issues. Concerns with the safety of the access and the pedestrian footpaths. No footpath to access school. Further pressure on doctors, schools and public transport. Site adjacent to Coastal Erosion Zone. Potential for more flooding from water erosion. Need more affordable housing. Market housing will merely increase second home ownership. Not enough work opportunities. Suggest that development be dispersed around the village, more preferential sites within village. Development needs to respect and fit in with the local environment.
Council's Response		Sites have been assessed against a detailed set of criteria and have been subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal. The decision on whether a site should be proposed as a draft allocation is made having regard to all of the factors set out in para 11.10 of the emerging LP and detailed in Background Paper 6 - Development Site Selection methodology. Landscape and settlement considerations including environmental constraints, the potential impact of development on landscape and views have been taken into account when considering all sites. Addressing housing needs, both market and affordable is an important consideration in meeting all identified housing needs across the district and contributing to a balanced and sustainable community. The Council has liaised with the Local Highways Authority to identify the likely impacts of new development for the local and strategic road network in terms of highways safety, congestion, access arrangements and cumulative growth. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact. Development proposals would need to comply with a number of policies (including those relating to affordable housing, open space, supporting infrastructure) elsewhere in the Plan. The proposed allocation is subject to a specific policy which identifies requirements that development proposals would need to address in order to secure planning permission. This includes a requirement to provide new pedestrian and cycle routes linking to the existing footway on Church Lane/All Saints Way to Links Road. Comments on open space noted. The Council has used current evidence base and engaged with relevant bodies including health and education bodies to identify where additional social infrastructure may be required as a result of new development and it is recognised that there is a requirement for further ongoing dialogue to support any final policy position. The Council has engaged fully with the Environment Agency and other relevant key professional bodies/persons. It has used the most up-to-date flood risk evidence base in order to identify the likely flood risk of sites. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact (for example the need for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems). The Council will take into account consultation feedback from bodies such as Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Natural England to inform decisions regarding the likely impact of developing a site for biodiversity and geodiversity and continue to work with site promoters to take into account biodiversity and geodiversity features. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact.

Proposals for Other Areas

DS30: Tattersett Business Park

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
DS30	E7	N/A	N/A	N/A	None received.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS30)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Support	0	None received
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary	No comments received	