

Examination Library Document Reference A5.2

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

First Draft Local Plan (Part 1)

Regulation 18 Stage Public Consultation

**Appendix B: Schedule of Representations -
Comments Submitted by Parish & Town Councils**

BLANK

Appendix B: Comments Submitted by Parish & Town Councils

Table of Contents

Comments on Proposed Policies	5
Sustainable Development Policies	6
Environment Policies	27
Housing Policies	38
Economy Policies	53
Vision, Aims & Objectives	63
Comments on Proposed Sites	64
Town & Village Proposals	66
Proposals for Cromer	67
Proposals for Fakenham	75
Proposals for Holt	78
Proposals for Hoveton	82
Proposals for North Walsham	85
Proposals for Sheringham	92
Proposals for Stalham	95
Proposals for Wells-next-the-Sea	97
Proposals for Blakeney	99
Proposals for Briston	100
Proposals for Ludham	102
Proposals for Mundesley	104
Proposals for Other Areas	108

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 **Parish & Town Councils** against a variety of proposed Local Plan policies. An additional table at the end of each policy/site provides a combined summary of the comments.

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 Parish & Town Councils)

Sustainable Development Policies

Policy SD1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD1)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy SD2 - Community-Led Development

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD2	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098 LP101	Support	The Council notes the principles that any development should support the vitality and viability of the community and that 'no significant harm should be done to the character or setting of the settlement and the surrounding countryside'. (LP Policy SD2 p. 9-10).The Council endorses the encouragement of Community Land Trusts (Homes for Wells) and Neighbourhood Plans. (LP 7.12)	Support for policy approach noted.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD2)
Objection	0	Approach endorsed.
Support	1	
General Comments	0	

Policy SD3 - Settlement Hierarchy

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD3	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	More clarity should be given to footnote 11 which explains the amount and type of "small-scale development" which could be permitted under this policy, so that it should be amended to read "infill development of between 1-20 dwellings (to be selected in a Part 2 Plan)". We're concerned that left as it is that "new allocations" could imply that this type of new development in the named Small Growth Villages could be different from more acceptable "infill development" and could result in estate-type developments of 20 houses	Noted the approach consulted on allowed for infill development and further small scale allocations up to 400 dwellings in total across the identified small growth villages.
SD3	Bacton & Edingthorpe Parish Council (149585)	LP239	Object	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: We conclude that Bacton should NOT be designated as a Growth Village in the forthcoming plan. This would allow the local community instead to exercise greater control in future housing growth over the plan period relying instead on the proposed provisions of Policy HOU03 and exception site delivery . Bacton Parish has over recent years accepted housing growth however, it is now time to curtail and control the quantity of housing within the village. Bacton has abysmal public transport links. Additional new houses within the village would lead to great traffic movements. The general level of service provision in the village is not conducive for its further expansion. We have lost two public houses and the retail offering is extremely small-scale. There are no doctors or other medical facility within the Parish. We have struggled in our co-operation with NNDC to find suitable sites for affordable housing so how and where any additional land can be sourced from is unknown to accommodate any future growth. -The village still have no clearly identifiable 'centre', but there remain noticeable breaks in the housing, with fields and farmland never far away, which enable the village to retain something of its "rural" character. The field between the village hall and Mill Lane is a case in point. Further significant amounts of "infill development", as well as new allocations of anything up to 20 dwelling units at a time, to fulfil housing targets, would necessarily lead to a lamentable loss of loss of this remaining rural character, and "quietness", over the plan period. Bacton only has very poor public transport links; the only bus service is sporadic, and does not even begin to compare with the comprehensive and frequent "Coast Hopper". There has been the loss of two public houses since the formation of the previous development plan: "The Ship" and the "Duke of Edinburgh", and retail outlets tend to be confined to small-scale village store, "fish and chip" shop, cafes and services geared towards holiday-makers/visitors. The post office is open a mere half an hour a week. The doctor's surgery is now reduced down to a satellite surgery open briefly by prior appointment, usually only twice a month. This hardly represents a sustainable portfolio of services upon which to base strategically-targeted housing growth.	Noted: Consider comments in the development the policy approach. 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.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD3	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP657	General Comments	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: There is little offered in the Local Plan to improve the sustainability of smaller towns eg Holt. The local market town initiative doesn't seem to be having much of an impact. If we lose these towns as retail centres, residents of the surrounding villages will be cut off from services eg banking, and car journeys will increase.</p>	Disagree. Policy ECN4 sets out the approach to retail development.
SD3	High Kelling Parish Council (1210779)	LP147	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: High Kelling is designated as Countryside and most of the village (north of the A148) lies within the North Norfolk Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Parish Council wishes to retain this status. The first draft of the Local Plan identifies 23 villages, including High Kelling, as Small Growth Villages, the majority of which are in the AONB. We are concerned that creeping development in these locations threatens the quality of the landscape which the Local Plan should be conserving. 2. We recognise that some development is necessary to respond to individual and community needs but feel such development should enhance the character of the village and its setting within the countryside and the AONB. We do not wish to see further development in the major part of the village located within the AONB, but believe there is potential for development in those parts of the village outside the AONB. Small scale developments will be permitted in the Small Growth Villages defined in Policy SD3 Settlement Hierarchy footnote 11 as "Infill development and new allocations of between 0-20 dwellings.." North Norfolk is a desirable place to live and we fear that the inclusion of High Kelling as a Small Growth Village will weaken the degree of protection it currently enjoys as Countryside. We feel that footnote 11 opens the way to piecemeal development which, incrementally, will undermine the diversity and essential nature of small villages so that communities with a real sense of local identity blur into adjacent, larger villages and towns or become ghost villages empty in the winter months. There are assurances about village identity - "...the Local Plan proposes modest small scale growth in order to help address housing need, enhance the vitality of the community and support the retention and viability of local services" (Background Paper 2: Distribution of Growth PP118-121). However, when we look at what has happened in our Parish under the existing district and national planning frameworks we are not convinced. Instead we see speculative development, garden grabbing, mansion building and questionable barn conversions. A policy of growth where there are existing services sounds reasonable, but for High Kelling which shares medical and dental provision with Holt, this means additional pressure on services already overstretched with the volume of users</p>	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. Evidence contained within the Housing and Economic Land Availability Study and NNDC Landscape Character Assessment 2019 and background paper 2 detailing service provision have also been used to inform distribution of growth site assessment and the potential impact on landscape character. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact.

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD3	Roughton Parish Council (149749)	LP240	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Roughton Parish Council wishes the Parish to be de-selected as a small growth village. The status it unnecessary and put a burden already on our current infrastructure. We conclude that Roughton should NOT be designated as a Growth Village in the forthcoming plan. This would allow the local community instead to exercise greater control in future housing growth over the plan period relying instead on the proposed provisions of Policy HOU03. The reasons for this is that Roughton Parish has over recent years accepted housing growth however, it is now time to curtail and control the quantity of housing within the village. Roughton has poor public transport links. Additional new houses within the village would lead to great traffic movements. The general level of service provision in the village is not conducive for its further expansion. We have minimal retail offering which is extremely small-scale. There are no doctors or any other medical facility within the Parish. ROU03 has still not been built on due to lack of interest from developers and this was allocated at the previous consultation circa 10 years ago.</p>	<p>Comments noted: Consider comments in the development the policy. Roughton is currently a service village in the adopted Local Plan and proposed to be a small growth village where infill development and small scale allocations across 22 villages up to 400 dwellings would be supported through a plan led approach</p>
SD3	Southrepps Parish Council (1216226)	LP225	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: We note with disappointment the intended Settlement Hierarchy (Policy SD3) approach insofar as it would relate to Southrepps. Whilst welcoming the removal of the current Plan's (Core Strategy 2008) 'Service Village' designation of Southrepps, its inclusion as a 'Small Growth Village' concerns us as – in practise – it would likely result in the same, additional growth the community seeks to limit and on which our previous representation was premised. The Parish Council and the community of Southrepps is not opposed to development; we acknowledge that sustainable growth is the life-blood of a community and necessary/desirable for the development of a village in supporting its facilities and services, and providing housing for its younger families and others. Nevertheless, this must be proportionate and sustainable; we re-affirm our belief that its designation - previously as a Service Village and proposed (in the Draft Local Plan) as a Small Growth Village - has and would undermine this objective, to the detriment of the village and its community. Recent development has been out of scale with the village and its physical/social/environmental infrastructure; our fear is that this would be perpetuated through a Small Growth Village designation. We therefore request that the village NOT be included as a Small Growth Village in the emerging Local Plan. We would have no objection to the village retaining a settlement boundary as such, provide that any related policy in the new Local Plan makes it clear that new any development must be within it and very limited to small-scale – perhaps one or two plots – our preference is for the village to carry a</p>	<p>Noted: Consider comments in the development the policy approach the distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, 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 the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. 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. 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</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
				<p>'Countryside' designation.</p> <p>We note that there is a concurrent 'Call for Sites in Small Growth Villages' consultation; However, we urge the Council to revisit this and not to identify any such sites for development/allocation beyond existing commitments. Please refer to the Parish Council's previous representation of 28th September 2015 and 9th August 2017 summarised below The School is in Antingham and the train station is in Thorpe Market. With a population of 537 the village is simply too small to warrant the Service Village designation. : 1. There is a need to ensure that with development come facilities. Not more development with no additional services for the residents. 2. North Norfolk suffers with over-development and poor infrastructure. This needs to be addressed before more houses are approved. The best infrastructure will always be in the larger settlements/towns which is where most new development should be concentrated. 3. The concept of Service Villages has done little to improve the overall system of development and it is flawed because it means that most villages in north Norfolk receive no development. It is by far the smallest of all the service villages and there are many larger villages which could benefit from some modest development of small numbers of houses spread evenly throughout the county. 4. Smaller villages where there has been no development allowed have suffered with an "aged" population; therefore, not evenly distributing wealth and the volume of new homes. 5. The re-use of rural buildings as dwellings should be welcomed as the eyesores which have been allowed to fall into disrepair will be restored and utilized. This automatically cuts down on the need for larger estates. 6. The introduction of the "CIL" system should be applied to North Norfolk Planning and passed on to the Parishes as a way of mitigating costs incurred by them. We also find that speeding is a bigger problem and that demands on our funds through repairing and replacing village items has been higher. This adds no benefits to the sustainability and cohesive community the residents wish to live in.</p>	<p>sites in areas of designated countryside will be reviewed in line with feedback and evidence of need.</p>
SD3	Weybourne Parish Council (1216147)	LP168	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: The Parish Council feel strongly that Weybourne should retain its' designation as Countryside and should not be designated as a Small Growth Village due to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of a full-time shop in the village and uncertainty regarding the future which is currently up for sale. • Lack of infrastructure, including but not limited to lack of places at local Doctor Surgeries and distance from a major hospital. • The lack of a bus service in the village. Out of season, the bus service in Weybourne is limited. The times of the last buses to/from the village means there is no public transport for children wishing to attend after school clubs or 	<p>Noted: Consider comments in the development the policy approach. 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. • The use of a second home is not defined in planning legislation,</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
				<p>for anyone wishing to travel to or from Weybourne for work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limits of the drainage infrastructure in the village. • The quality of the roads in and out of the village, especially to the South & lack of pavements in the village. • The need for Affordable Housing in the village. • The high proportion of second homes already in the village. • The parish council are also keen to highlight the need for the Second Homes Policy of NNDC to be reviewed. As a village with over 40% of houses either second homes or holiday homes, this has a huge impact on the sustainability of the village. 	<p>the occupation of residential dwellings is not a matter of land use planning and there are no planning controls that can be utilised to control the use of the existing housing stock as second homes. The approach through national guidance is one where an uplift is applied to the overall housing target to account for those homes lost through second homes ownership. The Council is supportive of communities utilising neighbourhood planning powers where there is an opportunity to bring forward additional growth in response to local issues and evidence.</p>

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
Objection	5	<p>Issues raised include more clarity around meaning and quantities around infill development. The following PC/TC's objected to being identified as small growth villages: Bacton, High Kelling, Roughton & Southrepps & Weybourne reasons given varied but included preference for exception site development, impacts on existing character & infrastructure and as such small scale allocations run the risk of disproportionate and unsustainable growth. One parish council requested more information on housing need methodology and that more support should be given to small growth towns for the retention and provision of services.</p>
Support	0	
General Comments	2	

Policy SD4 - Development in the Countryside

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD4	Bacton & Edingthorpe Parish Council (149585)	LP239	Support	Allowing unrestrained housing development in unsustainable rural locations would not be the correct way to go about addressing genuine housing need and we support this Policy.	Support welcome.
SD4	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP649	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Comes with so many exceptions as to be almost meaningless.	Disagree
SD4	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	Support	We strongly support this policy as worded in the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1), as it should ensure that only needed housing is built in areas designated as 'countryside'. It is important that affordable homes, as suggested by this draft policy, are included as being possible to develop in 'countryside' as a means of ensuring the continued vitality of smaller rural communities, whilst market housing is not permitted	Support noted: Market housing is permitted as part of an affordable scheme where it is needed to ensure viability in line with national policy.
SD4	Roughton Parish Council (149749)	LP240	Support	The countryside is an intrinsic and defining feature of North Norfolk. Allowing unrestrained housing development in unsustainable rural locations would not be the correct way to go about addressing genuine housing need and we support this Policy	Support welcomed.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD4)
Objection	0	This approach was strongly supported, 1 PC questioned the effectiveness of the policy given the number of exceptions.
Support	4	
General Comments	1	

Policy SD5 - Developer Contributions & Viability

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD5	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	NNDC does not currently operate a Community Infrastructure Levy. What are the reasons for this? STC would like NNDC to consider introducing a CIL and where funds from the CIL are to be distributed in connection with a project located in Sheringham, then STC should be consulted. STC would request that it is consulted regarding the negotiations of S. 106 planning obligations with developers in connection with developments in Sheringham	The Council have undertaken a proportionate assessment of Plan viability as laid out in the planning practice guidance in order to appraise the impacts of the emerging policies on the economic viability of the development expected to be delivered through the Local plan. The potential to accommodate a community infrastructure levy charge is considered as part of this. The study is published as part of the evidence base and concludes there is little potential to accommodate additional charges such as CIL. • Please note only signatories of the Local Planning Authority and those with an interest in the land can be party to such agreements under law.
SD5	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	There is a lack of allocation for social care provision within the local plan. With an aging population, the provision of adequate health and social care is increasingly important	Noted: 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. Policy HOU2 outlines the approach to specialist elderly accommodation.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD5)
Objection	0	No comments on the principle of the policy other than the consideration of a further Community Infrastructure levy and more contributions to adult social care.
Support	0	
General Comments	2	

Policy SD6 - Provision & Retention of Local Facilities and Services

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD6	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	Policy SD6, final paragraph, states that development proposals on designated Health and Social Care Campuses at specified towns will not be permitted unless certain conditions are fulfilled. Sheringham is omitted from the list of towns. Why is this?	Sheringham is a selected settlement and as such the first part of the policy applies. There are no designated health and social care campuses in Sheringham so the final paragraph is considered not to be relevant in this instance.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD6)
Objection	0	Sheringham town council requested the consideration for a health and social care campus. No comments were received on the principle of protection of such sites.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Policy SD7 - Renewable Energy

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD7	High Kelling Parish Council (1210779)	LP147	Object	North Norfolk actively supports renewable energy with existing on-shore solar and off-shore wind farms. In addition, the proposed Hornsea 3 and Vattenfall wind farms off the Norfolk coast are projected to meet 10%+ of current domestic UK energy demand. The scale of proposed off-shore development is such that there are suggestions to install a ring main at sea rather than separate pipe lines on land for each new wind farm. Support for renewables does not mean approving every development regardless of its impact on the environment and local community and at the expense of a unique landscape and skyline loved and valued by residents and visitors. There is a long-running planning dispute about applications for two wind turbines between Holt and Sheringham just outside the AONB boundary. North Norfolk District Council is be applauded for continuing to object to these turbines. Unfortunately the section in the Local Plan on Renewable Energy and Policy SD7 is depressingly general, offering little specific protection against future inappropriate on-shore wind turbine development. This is surprising in that the North Norfolk Landscape Sensitivity Assessment “found that there are no landscapes in North Norfolk that score ‘low’ or even ‘low-moderate’ sensitivity to commercial wind energy developments” (Observations on Landscape Sensitivity to Wind Energy Development Para 5.8)	Disagree (partly): The policy approach is one that emphasises the importance of the landscape and recognises its sensitivity to wind turbine development of all scales. Offshore development is beyond the scope of this local plan and falls under national significant infrastructure. Permission is however required for proposals that require associated on land infrastructure. The approach has been informed by the 2019 landscape Character assessment and landscape sensitivity Study.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD7)
Objection	1	1 comment received advising that support for renewables should consider landscape and the local community and that the policy approach should offer more prescribed protection.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy SD8 - Fibre to the Premises (FTTP)

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD8	Hoveton Parish Council (1216265)	LP180	General Comments	Improvements still need to be made to the local communications infrastructure (with unacceptably slow Broadband speeds and poor mobile signals limiting the amount of remote working possible, this may deter businesses from relocating to the local area);	Noted: 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.
SD8	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	Support	Employment • As more people work from home there needs to be provision for improved fibre internet connections within the local plan. • A technological hub is required to provide a facility for businesses. • Would like to see planning advice better and more flexibly linked to economic development needs	Noted: Support welcome for the proposed approach around high speed fibre to the premises at first occupation.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD8)
Objection	0	General approach for connection to high speed fibre endorsed.
Support	1	
General Comments	0	

Policy SD9 - Telecommunications Infrastructure

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD9	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD9)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy SD10 - Flood Risk & Surface Water Drainage

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD10	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD10)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy SD11 - Coastal Erosion

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD11	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD11)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy SD12 - Coastal Adaptation

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	
SD12	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	Condition 2 of the Proposals for the relocation and replacement of dwellings affected by erosion states that new dwelling(s) is/are used as a primary residence. STC's concern is that if the replacement of holiday homes/second homes is not permitted under the policy then this could lead to increased pressure on an already stretched housing supply.	Comments noted: Consider comments in the development the policy.
SD12	Bacton & Edingthorpe (149585)	LP239	Object	Concerned that cliff-top caravan parks to sites within the undeveloped coast would be potentially harmful to the landscape; the policies should provide for the safeguarding of the landscape are essential. This could encroach into the local countryside and conflict with Policy SD4. Designation of Bacton as a Growth Village could potentially limit the future availability of suitable sites for relocation of facilities threatened by coastal erosion.	Disagree, the policy presents a positive approach for long term resilience, community cohesion, enabling adaptation to take place in advance of actual loss. Proposals are required to respect existing character and appearance and accord with wider landscape policies as a whole.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD12)
Objection	1	Issues raised include the need to exclude existing second homes from the policy and exclude caravan parks in the "Undeveloped Coast" where impacts on the landscape are potentially damaging.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Policy SD13 - Pollution & Hazard Prevention and Minimisation

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD13	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP654	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Re comments on reducing light pollution, can we have this more robust, more enforceable? The council suggests developers avoid large glazed area and outside lights unless for security, how is this enforced? Can we have more areas designated as dark sky discovery sites? And how would we enforce this?	Dark skies need to meet strict criteria and be away from local light pollution.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD13)
Objection	0	Cley PC requested more areas designated as dark skies.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Policy SD14 - Transport Impact of New Development

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD14	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	The Principal Routes shown on the Policies Maps does not include the A149. STC believes it should because funding for buses only has to cover Principal Routes	The Identification of Principle Routes are a matter for the Highway Authority and include the A1082 into the Town.
SD14	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098 LP110	General Comments	The Council wishes to draw to the attention of the District Council the disappointing lessening of public transport provision in recent years and its effect on the ability of local people to find work out of town and to readily engage in further education, noting also its effect upon the increase of visitor parking of motor vehicles in the town. 21. The Council wishes to draw the attention of the District Council the urgent need to implement the Council's recent proposals in relation to parking restrictions and other traffic management.	Comments noted.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD14)
Objection	0	Consider adding A149 into Sheringham as a principle route. Concern expressed that poor public transport results in over reliance on cars and parking issues.
Support	0	
General Comments	2	

Policy SD15 - Parking Provision

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD15	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	The final paragraph of SD15 states that development proposals that would result in the loss of designated car parks identified on the Policies Map will not be permitted. STC believes this proposed policy is pertinent to the redevelopment of the Shannoeks Hotel in Sheringham because the NNDC proposed CPO and redevelopment plan proposes to develop the car park. STC would like to see the CPO instigated but would also like to see an element of public car parking retained.	Comments noted: CPO's are not a matter for the Local Plan.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD15)
Objection	0	Support expressed for the retention of designated car parks.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Policy SD16 - Electric Vehicle Charging

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD16	North Walsham Town Council (1218408)	LP730	Object	Town Council supports the NNDC commitment to meeting the 'climate emergency' and believes that the draft design guidelines need to be amended as below. The provision of charging points by developers in domestic driveways is excellent, but this should be extended to communal parking areas as well, with active charging points provided. (rather than passive)	Support for policy and additional active charging points in communal areas noted and welcomed.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD16)
Objection	1	Principle supported but policy should be amended to include requirement for active provision in communal areas.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy SD17 - Safeguarding Land for Sustainable Transport

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD17	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD17)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Environment Policies

Policy ENV1 - Norfolk Coast AONB & Broads National Park

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV1)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy ENV2 - Protection & Enhancement of Landscape Character

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV2	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV2)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy ENV3 - Heritage & Undeveloped Coast

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV3	Bacton & Edingthorpe Parish Council (149585)	LP239	Support	A great deal of Bacton is designated "undeveloped coast" . Strong support for the continued operation of this policy, with reference to the area's links to the near-by Norfolk Coast AONB and to the Bacton Gas Terminal.	Support Welcome.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV3)
Objection	0	The policy approach was strongly supported.
Support	1	
General Comments	0	

Policy ENV4 - Biodiversity & Geology

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV4	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV4)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy ENV5 - Green Infrastructure

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV5	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: More houses means more traffic movement to and from the houses including for example the collection and disposal of waste. Cromer is already a congestion hot spot. • Consideration is required in respect of public transport for people who cannot afford to live in Cromer and have to commute to the town. • Cycleways should be included as part of allocations. It is noted that improvements to the existing cycle routes are not proposed as part of the infrastructure position statement, and this could be a useful addition. • Details and referenced documents indicate that areas in and around Cromer make a significant contribution towards congestion “hot-spots”, though no ongoing actions are proposed to mitigate this in view of further major development. We feel an individual traffic and transport study is a requirement in Cromer to help identify means of mitigating against current congestion and other transport pressures. Footpaths • Northrepps FP16 – There is concern at the impact on biodiversity if this footpath is extended to Roughton Road	Noted: NCC highways have informed the identification of sit options. The impact of traffic generation and cumulative effects have been taken into consideration in setting the distribution and housing numbers. Support for on-site and off-site improvements and improved connectivity for green infrastructure is welcomed. Further requirements are detailed in the Green Infrastructure position statement and policy ENV5.
ENV5	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	Support	STC agrees with the proposed policy but would like to see the policy strengthened, particularly with regard to linking green areas and open spaces.	Supported welcomed. Consider comments in the development the policy.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV5)
Objection	0	General support expressed but policy strengthening could be provided around provision of cycleway and linkage between existing open spaces.
Support	1	
General Comments	1	

Policy ENV6 - Trees & Hedgerows

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV6	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV6)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy ENV7 - Open Spaces & Local Green Spaces

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV7	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	Play equipment • The provision of play equipment and youth provisions needs to be reinforced with a North Norfolk wide plan for provision to ensure we are supporting communities to work smarter and more expediently where limited and time sensitive opportunities for funding arise. Sport Strategy • There needs to be a wider inclusion of other sports and for all abilities	Noted: open space and Children's play equipment are required as part of policy ENV7. Evidence contained within the North Norfolk Open Space and Sport Recreation a study will be used to inform future requirements.
ENV7	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	Support	The proposed policy states that development on visually important Open Spaces will not usually be supported. STC would like to see this strengthened. The proposed policy also states that with regard to larger-scale developments, open space facilities will be required. STC would like to be consulted in connection with the location and type of open space to be provided when they are to be sited in Sheringham, which should also be the location for the open space when the corresponding development is in Sheringham.	Comments noted: Consider comments in the development the policy. STC are a consultee on relevant planning applications.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV7)
Objection	0	General support expressed but further strengthening of the policy around play equipment, sports strategy and the requirement to provide better linkages between existing open spaces.
Support	1	
General Comments	1	

Policy ENV8 - Public Rights of Way

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV8	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP647	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Cley Parish Council fully support the PROW proposals in the Local Plan. In particular Cley would like to see better connectivity for Public Rights of Way, using permissive paths, footways and new PROW where ever possible to connect and link to adjoining parishes, National Trails and local services. All new development should enhance the current PROW network whilst creating new off road opportunities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	Support Noted

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV8)
Objection	0	Support for increased connectivity through connection of public right if ways.
Support	1	
General Comments	0	

Policy ENV9 - High Quality Design

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV9	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV9)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy ENV10 - Protection of Amenity

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV10	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	STC agrees with NNDC that light and noise pollution arising from new development can have a significantly damaging impact on the countryside and settlements in north Norfolk. Our area boasts some of the darkest skies and this lack of artificial light helps the area retain its rural character. Lighting in new developments should be limited to that necessary for security. Consideration should also be given to ways of minimising light pollution from exterior lighting, large glazed areas, sky-lights etc.	Comments noted: Consider comments in the development the policy.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV10)
Objection	0	Support expressed for the inclusion of external light considerations.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Policy ENV11 - Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV11	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP648	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: More should be done to preserve heritage assets such as flint walls. Cley has a number of important ancient flint walls which are slowly getting replaced in association with minor development proposals such as extensions etc. Cley wishes to enhance and protect its historic environment, more effort needs to be done to protect flint walls which are affected by development.	Noted: The Council is supportive of Local communities bringing forward non strategic policies which add / address local distinction through neighbourhood planning

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV11)
Objection	0	More effort needs to be done to protect flint walls which are affected by development.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Housing Policies

Policy HOU1 - Housing Targets for Market & Affordable Homes

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU1	Bacton & Edingthorpe Parish Council (149585)	LP239	General Comments	Concerns re increase in traffic and impacts on quality of life of the parish of bacton including increased visitor pressure on bacton woods/ Witton woods- Inflating housing target in North Walsham just to reach infrastructure thresholds deprives other areas of the District of the ability to address infrastructure deficiency and represents an disproportionate amount of growth in the east. Targeting North Walsham to take so much of the bulk of the housing target, together with a disproportionately high density of growth villages in our part of the district, represents a poor attempt at forward planning, likely to have an unfairly detrimental impact on the geography of this part of the district, and quality of life of existing residents.	Noted: The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF , 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 the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing , jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. 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.
HOU1	Blakeney Parish Council (1215955)	LP272	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Second Homes and change of use from residential to holiday accommodation - We would like these to be subject to a change of use application. Second Homes - We would like to see them levied with a higher Council Tax, which then goes back into the village, towards new affordable housing for local people. New Development - We would like new properties to be solely used as principle dwellings only, no new additional second homes. Local Employment	Noted: Use classification is a matter for law and is outside the scope of current land use planning. The Council is actively supporting the provision of rural exception sites and affordable housing provision through grant funding and working with local communities in the identification of and delivery of sites to address local need. Such sites can also be brought forward through the emerging neighbourhood plan. The use of a second home is not defined in planning legislation, the occupation of residential dwellings is not a matter of land use planning and there are no planning controls that can be utilised to control the use of the existing housing stock as second homes. The approach through national guidance is one where an uplift is applied to the overall housing target to account for those homes lost through second homes ownership. Blakeney is preparing a neighbourhood plan and the Council is supportive of communities utilising these planning powers where there is an opportunity to bring

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					forward additional growth in response to local issues and evidence.
HOU1	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP646 LP650 LP655	General Comments	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Need to build 11 k houses to deal with future population growth, but this is largely driven by inward migration, not by growth of the existing North Norfolk population. What do we need to build to serve the needs of the local population? Why aren't we building just to cover these needs? Inward migration may change eg with the economy, so is it wise to base large future housing numbers on this factor? If all these new homes are built, how can the council as it aspires still provide increased access to the countryside and protect the environment? North Norfolk's economy is largely based on tourism, and this will be impacted by the effect of the new housing on our natural surroundings. North Norfolk will be a less attractive place to visit. Also, What about the impact of the new housing on the infrastructure visitors use, eg the roads. - States historically windfall development has provided a substantial number of homes and there is no evidence to say this will decrease, but they are reducing your expectation by 50%. What is the basis for this? Surely windfall development reduces the number of new homes needing to be built. - Healthcare, parking and education are all constraints in Holt. How are these going to be tackled? For instance 330 more homes requires more doctors, how will this be achieved?</p>	Noted: Plans should be positively prepared to meet all development needs as a minimum. The Council is supportive of Local communities bringing forward additional growth to support local identified need through neighbourhood planning. The housing numbers make an allowance for windfall development.
HOU1	Northrepps Parish Council (1218479)	LP789	Object	Members do not support the need for any additional housing in Cromer. If more housing is actually required, brownfield sites should be developed and empty properties brought back into use before any additional housing is considered especially in the countryside and the AONB. • Members noted the comments put forward by CPRE	Disagree: The housing target and distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including the NPPF's aims of boosting significantly the housing supply and with regard to level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. This includes through planning making sufficient provision for housing ,including affordable housing. 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

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2. Cromer itself functions as a higher order town and provides significant housing , employment and services to residents of the town and District.
HOU1	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098 LP103	Support	The Council accepts the allocation of eighty dwellings for the town as part of its share of government housing requirements for the District. The Council supports the building of affordable housing over the plan period up for the full number remaining as required by the District	Support noted. The Council considers it important to retain land supply solely for employment uses.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU1)
Objection	1	Issued raised include: The over-concentration of growth in North Walsham impacts on the ability of other more remote areas to improve infrastructure, brownfield sites should be used first, growth should be principle homes only and growth is not supported in Cromer. The allocated numbers in Wells are supported. One parish Council questioned the housing number methodology, the impacts of windfall and the effects in service provision.
Support	2	
General Comments	3	

Policy HOU2 - Housing Mix

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU2	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	Policy needs to be firmed up to ensure that affordable homes are maintained in perpetuity. • Community led housing is supported.	Noted: Affordable housing by definition is required to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households.
HOU2	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	STC would like to see an agreed percentage of houses in all new large-scale developments reserved for permanent occupancy	Noted. Use classification is a matter for law and is outside the scope of current land use planning.
HOU2	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	There is a lack of allocation for social care provision within the local plan. With an aging population, the provision of adequate health and social care is increasingly important	Disagree. The Council aims to ensure that a proportion of all new homes built are suitable and easily adaptable for occupation by the elderly and infirm through policy HOU8 and makes specific provision for those that require specialist care through policy HOU2.
HOU2	North Walsham Town Council (1218408)	LP730	Object	There is no mention in the draft of social housing. Given the long waiting list for such housing at present the Town Council strongly believes that up to 30% of housing be affordable. At least 50% of this must be Social Housing (15% of total housing) to help alleviate the current and future waiting lists. The Town Council believes that Social Housing should be distributed throughout the developments and not congregated in a single area	Disagree: Policy HOU2 details the affordable housing requirements. Evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Needs Assessment identified a need for 2,000 affordable homes to be developed each year and continues to demonstrate there is an annual need for 100 dwellings a year. The Standard Housing assessment methodology on housing need introduced in 2018 includes an uplift to address the high affordability to house price ratio and is reflected in the housing target.
HOU2	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	Support	STC agrees with the proposals outlined in the Plan and believes the greater demand for affordable housing is from prospective renters/purchasers for 2 or 3 bedroomed dwellings but particularly for rented properties and accordingly this is what developers would be encouraged to build. This is not included in the plan and STC believe this is essential and reflects the views of our community	Agree: consider feedback in the development of the policy. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies strong need for affordable; rented properties.
HOU2	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098 LP102	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: The Council wishes to draw attention to the importance of a good quality of services and facilities for residents of the town, the importance of school provision, health care and	Partial support noted. Consider comments in the development the policy. The Council has used current

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
		LP104 LP105		emergency services and of housing for their providers and asks that they be explicitly included in the considerations of the District Council. Sustainable Development . The Council wishes the town to be developed sustainably with a healthy demographic balance for future generations in accordance with government guidelines (NPPF). The Council endorses the encouragement of Community Land Trusts (Homes for Wells) and Neighbourhood Plans. (LP 7.12). The Council wishes local plan policies explicitly to include provision for families, for local people as well as the elderly, those unable to live at home and those working in the town. (LP 9.24-30) Housing The Local Plan states its purpose as ensuring that sufficient homes of the right type are built in the right place and at the right times to meet all of the accommodation needs of the town as identified in the most up-to-date evidence. (LP 9.1) It states that affordable homes need to be genuinely affordable to those with lower incomes but recognises that rented accommodation will be the main form of affordable tenure. Given the topography of the town, any building would have to be on the edge of the built area. The Council supports the proposal that a 'significant proportion' of new homes shall be affordable and not be available for second home use (LP 9.5). The Council supports the idea of second homes' occupancy restrictions in order to make possible the buying of property by locals. The Council is of the view that in order for the town to function effectively as a strong and vibrant community those who need to live reasonably close include not only teachers, medical and care staff and those who man emergency services but also those who provide for the needs of tourists as well as residents' needs	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 welcomes the recognition that towns should grow sustainably and the support for the policy approach which address the need for small scale family homes, sets the viable affordable home percentage and requires specialist elderly accommodation on larger scale sites.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU2)
Objection	1	Issues raised include: Affordable homes need to be in perpetuity, the approach to community housing is supported, approach to health and social care with regard elderly people needs more emphasis. Provision of social homes should be stipulated. There was however support expressed for the approach outlined in the policy. One respondent indicated that a further policy on type and tenure requirements would strength the overall approach and add clarity.
Support	2	
General Comments	3	

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

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU3	Bacton & Edingthorpe Parish Council (149585)	LP239	Support	Broadly expressing support for this policy.- policy is also an alternative to “Growth Village” designation.	Support noted. 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.
HOU3	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP651	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Some confusion on how housing need is calculated. We would welcome more information on this	A full explanation is included in background paper 1 which is published on the NNDC web site along with the consultation material

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU3)
Objection	0	Broad support expressed for this approach.
Support	1	
General Comments	1	

Policy HOU4 - Agricultural & Other Key Worker Accommodation

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU4	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098 LP101 LP106	Support	The Council is of the view that in order for the town to function effectively as a strong and vibrant community those who need to live reasonably close include not only teachers, medical and care staff and those who man emergency services but also those who provide for the needs of tourists as well as residents' needs. The Council wishes to express its concern that those applying for key local jobs from outside the town are deterred from doing so because of the price of housing.	Noted: Consider comments in the development the policy,(key workers).

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU4)
Objection	0	Broad support expressed but the approach could be expanded to cover key workers first in the towns and not just focus on those connected to the land.
Support	1	
General Comments	0	

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

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU5	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU5)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy HOU6 - Replacement Dwellings, Extensions & Annexed Accommodation

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU6	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP652	General Comments	Policy HOU6, they say extensions, replacement dwellings should not materially increase the impact on the environment. How are they putting this into practice as there is plenty of evidence this policy isn't being taken into account. More value needs to be placed on the impact on the environment	Policies can be enforced when there is a breach of a condition
HOU6	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	STC would like NNDC to consider that new extensions to existing dwellings are likely to increase the capital or rental value of those dwellings, thereby making it harder for a first-time buyer or renter to acquire that property.	Noted. STC should be aware that not all extensions require an application for planning permission due to permitted development rights laid down by national policy.
HOU6	High Kelling Parish Council (1210779)	LP147	Object	HOU6 & HOU7 High Kelling Parish Council consider the protection against over-development offered by these policies too vague, for example, HOU 6 that a proposal "would not materially increase the impact.....". Similarly, the definition of infilling is open to wide interpretation. A permissive attitude to infill and small developments - a house here, an exclusive development squeezed in there - is precisely how, over a period of time, the character of a small village is eroded or the unique nature of the countryside and AONB is undermined. That these policies need to be made more explicit in terms of, for example, design, footprint, height, scale, volume and materials in order to ensure that extended, replacement or re-used dwellings do not overwhelm neighbouring properties or the countryside. 2. We also suggest that infilling should be defined more precisely and that replacement should normally be on a one-for-one basis and that multiple dwellings on a plot previously occupied by one should be permitted only in exceptional circumstances.	Noted: Consider comments in the development the policy approach.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU6)
Objection	1	Allowing extensions to properties makes it harder for first time buyers to purchase a property. More value should be placed on the environmental impacts. Another objected that the policy should be more prescriptive and ensure extension and infill development are of appropriate (small scale) footprint restrictions, height. Specifically replacement dwellings should be restricted to one on a plot to avoid over intensification.
Support	0	
General Comments	2	

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

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU7	High Kelling Parish Council (1210779)	LP147	Object	HOU6 & HOU7 High Kelling Parish Council consider the protection against over-development offered by these policies too vague, for example, HOU 6 that a proposal “would not materially increase the impact.....” . Similarly, the definition of infilling is open to wide interpretation. A permissive attitude to infill and small developments - a house here, an exclusive development squeezed in there - is precisely how, over a period of time, the character of a small village is eroded or the unique nature of the countryside and AONB is undermined. That these policies need to be made more explicit in terms of, for example, design, footprint, height, scale, volume and materials in order to ensure that extended, replacement or re-used dwellings do not overwhelm neighbouring properties or the countryside. 2. We also suggest that infilling should be defined more precisely and that replacement should normally be on a one-for-one basis and that multiple dwellings on a plot previously occupied by one should be permitted only in exceptional circumstances.	Noted. Consider comments in the development the policy approach.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU7)
Objection	1	Considered the policy is too vague.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy HOU8 - Accessible & Adaptable Homes

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU8	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU8)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy HOU9 - Minimum Space Standards

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU9	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU9)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy HOU10 - Water Efficiency

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU10	North Walsham Town Council (1218408)	LP730	Support	We recommend that the 110 litres/person/day is applied across the NNDC	Support for the policy approach is welcomed
HOU10	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP653	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Fully Support water efficiency proposal	Support welcomed
HOU10	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	Support	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.	Noted: Consider comments in the development the policy approach. The Local Plan supports the transition to a low carbon future. In accordance with the 2015 written ministerial statement policy Hou11 seeks a 19% improvement in energy efficiency over the 2013 target emission rate and is in line with the Paris Accord. Flexibility of how this will be achieved is depended on type and scale of proposal.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU10)
Objection	0	Support for prescriptive water efficiency targets.
Support	3	
General Comments	0	

Policy HOU11 - Sustainable Construction, Energy Efficiency & Carbon Reduction

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
HOU11	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	<p>STC would like to see NNDC attempt to reduce the impacts of Climate Change through the planning system. The existing 'Merton Rule' which ensures all new commercial buildings create at least 10% of their energy from renewables is out-of-date. A new rule could set staged targets for efficiencies of energy, carbon removal, water reduction and waste recycling. This new rule could be designed into planning permissions/conditions. • There needs to be an approach to local planning that addresses the Climate Emergency that has been declared by NNDC and STC. An environmental impact assessment needs to be conducted and implemented as to the environmental impact of the local plan including the design guides in order to address the concerns of councils and our community, which have led to the declaration of a Climate Emergency. As a result STC expect to see NNDC reduce the impacts of climate change through the planning system. The existing 'Merton Rule', which ensures all new commercial buildings create at least 10% of their energy from renewables is out of date. A new rule could set staged targets for efficiencies of energy, carbon removal, water reduction and waste recycling. This new rule should be designed into planning permissions and conditions. Sheringham Town council expects NNDC to uphold and enforce those climate related principles and rulings in the process of approving planning applications.</p>	<p>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 address 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. Hou11 seeks a 19% improvement in energy efficiency over the 2013 target emission rate and is in line with the Paris Accord. Flexibility of how this will be achieved is depended on type and scale of proposal. • The Local Plan is informed by a sustainability appraisal which reviews the key environmental, social and economic considerations that affect the District</p>
HOU11	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: 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</p>	<p>Noted, Consider comments in the development the policy approach. The Local Plan supports the transition to a low carbon future. In accordance with the 2015 written ministerial statement policy Hou11 seeks a 19% improvement in energy</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
				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.	efficiency over the 2013 target emission rate and is in line with the Paris Accord. Flexibility of how this will be achieved is depended on type and scale of proposal. Policy HOU10 restricts water uses through design.
HOU11	North Walsham Town Council (1218408)	LP730	Object	The Town Council also believes that careful attention should be given to roof orientation within the proposed developments in order to maximise the efficient generation of solar energy. We suggest that rainwater harvesting should be required, not simply recommended. Amend Rainwater harvesting: This is the collection of water that would otherwise have gone down the drain, into the ground or been lost through evaporation. Large surfaces such as roofs and driveways are ideal for rainwater harvesting. Generally green roofs do not provide as much harvesting potential as traditional roofing materials, so the use of rainwater harvesting and green roofs on the same building requires careful consideration. This water is not suitable for drinking but can be used for flushing toilets, watering gardens and even supplying the washing machine. Rainwater harvesting has the potential to save a large volume of mains water and therefore help reduce the pressure on water resources. Water butts to supply garden watering requirements are the simplest form of rainwater harvesting system, their installation is required in all new dwellings	Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU11)
Objection	1	Support for more prescription in setting targets around energy efficiency and carbon reduction in order to address climate change. Objection on the grounds that the policy should be more prescriptive around roof orientation and priority to grey water recycling systems rather than green roofs and water storage/ runoff capabilities.
Support	0	
General Comments	2	

Economy Policies

Policy ECN1 - Employment Land

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ECN1	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	The table on P. 143 shows Sheringham has 3.95ha of existing employment land which STC would like retained as proposed in this Plan.	Noted: The Local Plan proposes to retain the existing designated employment area
ECN1	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098 LP109	Support	The Local Plan comments on the dominance of tourism as the major employer, the decline of agriculture and manufacturing in the area. (LP 5.6-8). The Council wishes to encourage the continued sensitive development of the Harbour as an employer and provider of facilities for fishing, wind farm support and leisure boating. The Council wishes to draw to the attention of the District Council the need to develop existing industrial sites identified on the map (page 265).	Support noted. The Council considers it important to retain land supply solely for employment uses.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ECN1)
Objection	0	Support expressed to develop existing industrial sites and development of the harbour in Wells.
Support	1	
General Comments	1	

Policy ECN2 - Employment Areas, Enterprise Zones & Former Airbases

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ECN2	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ECN2)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy ECN3 - Employment Development Outside of Employment Areas

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ECN3	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ECN3)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Policy ECN4 - Retail & Town Centres

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ECN4	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Concern that some shops are not within the commercial area. ALL shops need to be included within the primary shopping area. This includes the East End of Cromer from Church Street to the junction with Overstrand Road, the western end of Overstrand Road, Bond Street, Loudon Road and Mount Street. Public Art • Public art should be positively encouraged more than it is in the draft. We should be working towards securing contributions towards public art from developments, and the provision of public art on new open space	Consider comments in the development the policy approach. The primary shopping area is a defined area where retail development is concentrated, the Town centre boundary is defined as the PSA and areas that predominantly occupied by "main town centre" uses within or adjacent to the PSA. Consider revising PSA to include east of Church Street towards Overstrand Road
ECN4	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	STC notes that S. 10.35 proposes Sheringham is a smaller town centre to complement the larger town centres in the district. However, STC considers it imperative that Sheringham continues to offer year-round retail facilities with a wide range of outlets. The Table shows the Projected new retail floor space requirement 2016-2026 for Sheringham with 588sqm for Convenience Goods, 457sqm for Comparison Goods and 268sqm for Food and Beverage. STC is keen to limit the development of food and beverage floor space in favour of other retail use and therefore would like to see these projections adhered to through the planning process. The designated Town Centre boundary includes the north end of High Street which contains a number of retail and leisure outlets. However, the designated Primary Shopping Area does not include this area. STC would like the red line of the Primary Shopping Area extended northwards to include both sides of High Street.	Noted. Proposals for retail development at an appropriate scale will be supported provided that they reflect the identified capacity to support growth established through the most up to date evidence and in line with impact thresholds put forward through policy ECN4. • Consider comments in the development the policy approach, the primary shopping area is a defined area where retail development is concentrated, the Town centre boundary is defined as the PSA and areas that predominantly occupied by "main town centre" uses within or adjacent to the PSA. Consider revising PSA to include the northern end of the highstreet.
ECN4	North Walsham (1218408)	LP730	Object	The Town Council recognises that the Town Centre is very fragile, and initiatives are in progress to improve this situation. The Town Council also believes that the primary shopping area needs to be protected from residential conversions and other losses, such that it has capacity to serve the likely future specialist shops, social and entertainment needs of the expanded town that are implied in the Local Plan. The Town Council suggest this protection should also include the retail units in Mundesley Road, Vicarage Street and Kings Arms Street, as highlighted in green in the plan attached.	Consider inclusion of retail units and main town centre uses as suggested in the finalisation of the PSA and TC boundary and policy ECN4 - the defined area where primary retail development is concentrated. The primary shopping area is a defined

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					area where retail development is concentrated, the Town centre boundary is defined as the PSA and areas that predominantly occupied by "main town centre" uses.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ECN4)
Objection	1	The town council would like further consideration of an extension to the primary shopping area to the north end of the High Street in Sheringham. In North Walsham the town council would like the PSA extended to include retail units in Mundesley Road, Vicarage Street and Kings Arms Street. In Cromer it was also suggested that the PSA should be expanded to cover all streets where there are retail shops. contributions for public art where supported by one respondent.
Support	0	
General Comments	2	

Policy ECN5 - Signage & Shopfronts

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ECN5	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ECN5)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

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

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ECN6	Bacton & Edingthorpe Parish Council (149585)	LP239	General Comments	Concerned that cliff-top caravan parks to sites within the undeveloped coast would be potentially harmful to the landscape; the policies should provide for the safeguarding of the landscape are essential. This could encroach into the local countryside and conflict with Policy SD4.	Noted: The policy approach calls for net benefits in terms of ant landscape and ecology when compared to existing business.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ECN6)
Objection	0	Caravan development on cliff tops was not supported due to concerns around impacts on the landscape.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

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

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ECN7	Bacton & Edingthorpe Parish Council (149585)	LP239	General Comments	Concerned that cliff-top caravan parks to sites within the undeveloped coast would be potentially harmful to the landscape; the policies should provide for the safeguarding of the landscape are essential. This could encroach into the local countryside and conflict with Policy SD4.	Noted: Consider comments in the development the policy approach. The policy approach calls for no significant detrimental impacts in the areas landscape. ECN6 however calls for net landscape gain. Both policies should be reviewed for consistency along with SD11/12 Coastal adaptation.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ECN7)
Objection	0	Caravan development on cliff tops was not supported due to concerns around impacts on the landscape.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Policy ECN8 - New Build & Extensions to Tourist Attractions

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ECN8	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ECN8)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

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

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ECN9	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ECN9)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Vision, Aims & Objectives

Vision, Aims & Objectives

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
Vision & Aims	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Vision & Aims)
Objection	0	None received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) Comments

Comments on Proposed Sites

(Submitted by Parish & Town Councils)

BLANK

Town & Village Proposals

DS1: Proposed Allocations

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS1	N/A	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Phasing of housing is not specifically offered as an option within the documentation. We consider that 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 existing allocated sites are built out, but 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. - Brown field sites should be prioritised.	Plan making is iterative - Housing Trajectory and Phasing is beyond the scope of this consultation document and will be addressed once more certainty over the overall housing target and allocations is provided in future iterations of the emerging Plan. - The Council has looked firstly at previously used land and buildings within settlements, secondly at suitable infill sites and thirdly at other land which is well located for housing, jobs, services and infrastructure.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS1)
Objection	0	Would like to see more phasing of site.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Proposals for Cromer

DS2: Land at Cromer High Station

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS2	C07/2	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	Concerns pedestrian safety and access and connectivity across the Station Road junction and Norwich Road, particularly if additional public transport infrastructure is proposed as part of any allocation. • A contribution to play equipment for Fearn's Park via S106 arising from any development is requested. • Affordable housing on this site needs to be held in perpetuity.	Concerns 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, congestion and access arrangements. Play equipment and open space provision is required to be provided in line with emerging policy ENV7. Evidence contained within the North Norfolk Open Space and Sport Recreation a study will be used to inform future requirements.
DS2	C07/2	Northrepps Parish Council (1218479)	LP789	Object	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Members have looked at all of the options for Cromer do not support the need for any new sites. • There are empty properties in Cromer which should be brought back into use and any brownfield sites developed before new sites are considered. • If any new housing is allocated the infrastructure needs to be in place before any sites are occupied. This includes healthcare, road network, utilities etc. • The road system in Cromer cannot cope with current demands and needs to be reviewed. Traffic on the A149 queues back to Northrepps in the summer months. If additional housing for Cromer is built, the traffic levels will increase on the roads into the town which will also increase the levels of CO2. This will be further increased by visitors traveling from the surrounding towns for which there are also new developments proposed. • It was suggested that Cromer needs to think outside the box and be radical in respect of traffic management. Maybe even banning all non residential traffic from the town centre with the introduction of out of town car parks and a shuttle bus service. • There is already a strain on the utilities with properties on the outskirts of Cromer regularly dealing with low water pressure. • Healthcare in Cromer is currently under strain with patients having to wait up to a month for doctors' appointments. The Local Plan indicates that Cromer has an ageing population and that in the future 40% of people in North Norfolk will be over 65. Provision for adequate health and social care must be in place before any additional housing is built. • Concern re the impact of these developments on the countryside and in particular the AONB especially with the loss of mature trees and hedgerows. • Previous responses to planning applications for the	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.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					Land at Pine Tree Farm (P0/18/2169), Land at Roughton Road (P0/18/1551) and Land at Cromer High Station (P0/19/0281) still stand and can be taken as responses to each site. •C07/2 - Land at Cromer High Station Members of Northrepps Parish Council stand by their previous objections: • The access onto Norwich road is already difficult especially in the busy summer months. Members feel that the increased number of vehicles from the development will make exiting this site and also nearby Station Road even more hazardous, particularly when turning right towards Cromer. Concern was also raised that the road passes several existing businesses which attract many customers/patients to the site. Pedestrian safety must also be ensured. • A resident has advised that there are rare orchids on the site which should be protected. • The Parish Council has also been made aware that the water pressure in this area is very unreliable and are concerned that the additional housing would add extra pressure to the water supply.	

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS2)
Objection	1	Both raised concerns re access while one objected to the principle that the site and Cromer accommodate growth due to the existing infrastructure constraints of the town.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

DS3: Land at Runton Road / Clifton Park

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS3	C10/1	Runton Parish Council (1210204)	LP035	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: It is important to be aware that this land lies in the Parish of Runton and NOT in the town of Cromer. Indeed it provides a break between the two authorities and prevents a continuous series of housing developments along the coast road. The site is bordered by a sewage works, two roads and a railway line. The former, in particular, is almost by definition a less than desirable neighbour, given the nature of its operations. With the existing highways infrastructure, the increase in vehicular traffic through both East Runton and Cromer can only exacerbate current difficulties. A proposal to build a two form entry Primary School flies in the face of known existing 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 Plan consultation. In any event it seems more probable that any increase in pupil numbers would derive from developments at the opposite end of Cromer. The Parish Council believes that it is important to preserve "open space" along a tourist route and opposite the sea- shore, to maintain the differentiation between town and village and avoid urbanisation in a tourist area. The District Council's Notice of Decision in relation to an application by Noble Properties in 2004 to develop this site delineates a number of still valid reasons why this piece of land should not be built upon. Same issues raised in Rep no LP 036.</p>	Noted. Consider comments in the development the policy. The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development. This includes highways, water and sewerage and the Education authority and continues to do so. These issues have been taken into account in site assessments.
DS3	C10/1	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	Object	<p>Concern on the impact on East Runton as a nucleated village. • This land is a natural barrier between Cromer and East Runton. • There needs to be a proper evaluation of biodiversity of this site before it is considered for the Local Plan. • There also needs to be a consideration of its current use, essentially as an area of 'open space'. • Cromer Town Council would prefer this site to be withdrawn</p>	<p>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 in the identification in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity features. Mitigation measures will be a requirement to offset any potential adverse impact. The Amenity Green Space Study has been used</p>

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
						to inform decisions on the designation of land as open space.
DS3	C10/1	Northrepps Parish Council (1218479)	LP789	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Members have looked at all of the options for Cromer do not support the need for any new sites. • There are empty properties in Cromer which should be brought back into use and any brownfield sites developed before new sites are considered. • If any new housing is allocated the infrastructure needs to be in place before any sites are occupied. This includes healthcare, road network, utilities etc. • The road system in Cromer cannot cope with current demands and needs to be reviewed. Traffic on the A149 queues back to Northrepps in the summer months. If additional housing for Cromer is built, the traffic levels will increase on the roads into the town which will also increase the levels of CO2. This will be further increased by visitors traveling from the surrounding towns for which there are also new developments proposed. • It was suggested that Cromer needs to think outside the box and be radical in respect of traffic management. Maybe even banning all non residential traffic from the town centre with the introduction of out of town car parks and a shuttle bus service. • There is already a strain on the utilities with properties on the outskirts of Cromer regularly dealing with low water pressure. • Healthcare in Cromer is currently under strain with patients having to wait up to a month for doctors' appointments. The Local Plan indicates that Cromer has an ageing population and that in the future 40% of people in North Norfolk will be over 65. Provision for adequate health and social care must be in place before any additional housing is built. • Concern re the impact of these developments on the countryside and in particular the AONB especially with the loss of mature trees and hedgerows. •</p>	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.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS3)
Objection	3	Town and adjacent Council's raised issues based around coalescence of settlement, impacts on existing informal use of open space and biodiversity. Concerns raised re impacts on highway network capacity. Education provision was challenged as unnecessary.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS4: Former Golf Practice Ground

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS4	C16	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	Concern over draining and flooding at this site. • Proper soil investigations are needed before this site is considered. • Concern at the impact on biodiversity.	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).
DS4	C16	Northrepps Parish Council (1218479)	LP789	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Members have looked at all of the options for Cromer do not support the need for any new sites. • There are empty properties in Cromer which should be brought back into use and any brownfield sites developed before new sites are considered. • If any new housing is allocated the infrastructure needs to be in place before any sites are occupied. This includes healthcare, road network, utilities etc. • The road system in Cromer cannot cope with current demands and needs to be reviewed. Traffic on the A149 queues back to Northrepps in the summer months. If additional housing for Cromer is built, the traffic levels will increase on the roads into the town which will also increase the levels of CO2. This will be further increased by visitors traveling from the surrounding towns for which there are also new developments proposed. • It was suggested that Cromer needs to think outside the box and be radical in respect of traffic management. Maybe even banning all non residential traffic from the town centre with the introduction of out of town car parks and a shuttle bus service. • There is already a strain on the utilities with properties on the outskirts of Cromer regularly dealing with low water pressure. • Healthcare in Cromer is currently under strain with patients having to wait up to a month for doctors' appointments. The Local Plan indicates that Cromer has an ageing population and that in the future 40% of people in North Norfolk will be over 65. Provision for adequate health and social care must be in place before any additional housing is built. • Concern re the impact of these developments on the countryside and in particular the AONB especially with the loss of mature trees and hedgerows.</p>	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.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS4)
Objection	1	One objection on the principle that the site and Cromer accommodate growth due to the existing infrastructure constraints of the town. A further general comment was received raising the attention of Officers to matters of flooding on the site.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

DS5: Land West of Pine Tree Farm

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS5	C22/1	Cromer Town Council (1218420)	LP732	General Comments	Concern due to highways impact. • Concern to lack of continuous footways towards Town Centre and schools. • Concern at the constraints which need to be mitigated in terms of off site highways impact and pedestrian safety. • Concern at the potential impact on mature trees	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.
DS5	C22/1	Northrepps Parish Council (1218479)	LP789	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: C22/1 - Land West of Pine Tree Farm Northrepps Parish Council raises strong objections to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on the AONB with the loss of an area of open countryside, disturbance to wildlife and light pollution from the floodlights and streetlights. • impact of increased traffic movements to and from the football club and the housing development on a busy road. It is already very difficult to exit from the side roads onto the A149 especially in the summer months. Should any development proceed, the speed limits should be reduced to 30mph along Crossdale Street and Norwich Road. A proper traffic plan is required before there are any new developments. • concern in respect of the narrowing of the roadway over the railway bridge. • concern for the safety of pedestrians, especially children, walking to and from the sports facility along this busy road. • loss of farmland. • impact on already stretched utilities. <p>Residents report that the water pressure in this area is already low and there is a concern that additional housing will cause further problems on the water supply. Concern about the impact on the sewerage system. • concern re the additional pressure on schools, doctors surgery and care providers. The infrastructure needs to be in place before any houses are occupied. • there is a need for more affordable housing particularly for key workers.</p>	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. The Council continues to work with Anglian Water to identify and address network issues. • 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.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS5)
Objection	1	Objected to the principle that the site and Cromer accommodate growth due to the existing infrastructure constraints of the town. A further general comment was received raised general concerns around the pedestrian connectivity and off site highway mitigation along with the potential impact on mature trees.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Proposals for Fakenham

DS6: Land North of Rudham Stile Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS6	F01/B	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS6)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS7: Land at Junction of A148 & B1146

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS7	F03	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS7)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS8: Land South of Barons Close

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS8	F10	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS8)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Proposals for Holt

DS9: Land South of Beresford Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS9	H04	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS9)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS10: Land North of Valley Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS10	H17	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS10)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS11: Land at Heath Farm

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS11	H20	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS11)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS12: Land at Heath Farm (Employment)

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS12	H27/1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS12)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Proposals for Hoveton

DS13: Land East of Tunstead Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS13	HV01/B	Hoveton Parish Council (1216265)	LP180	General Comments	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: would prefer to see Hoveton’s proposed land allocation (and the approximately 150 dwellings the allocation seeks to deliver) split between several smaller sites, in a holistic, integrated approach to local development, rather than this allocation being fulfilled through the single large development. The Parish Council would like to seek assurances, however, that should this change be made, the percentage of dwellings classified as affordable housing within this allocation would remain unchanged. - Hoveton Parish Council has previously been advised that the already approved new developments at Church Field (25 homes) and Tilia Business Park (28 homes) would be included in Hoveton’s housing allocation and that, with the approval of these two developments, Hoveton had already begun working towards its First Draft Local Plan housing allocation. The Parish Council notes, however, that the First Draft Local Plan does not mention these two developments. Hoveton Parish Council believes that these pre-approved developments should count toward the fulfilment of Hoveton’s housing allocation and the Parish Council seeks assurances and confirmation from NNDC that this is the case. Hoveton Parish Council has serious concerns about the inevitable increase in traffic that will arise as a result of the proposals included in the First Draft Local Plan, and about the impact of this extra traffic on an already stretched local road system and on the health and wellbeing of local residents. - A recent study showed half a million vehicle movements passing through the villages of Hoveton and Wroxham in just over two months. While there are many practical problems posed by such congestion – traffic queues causing long delays in entering and leaving the villages; difficulties for residents in joining the main road traffic from driveways and residential roads; delays experienced by emergency vehicles, etc. – of particular concern is the noise pollution and air pollution resulting from this level of traffic, which has a serious impact on local quality of life. - Hoveton Parish Council has serious concerns about a number of unresolved problems with the local sewerage network and about this network’s ability to cope with further local development. - In addition, Hoveton has experienced many problems in recent years with surface water flooding on roads within the parish, making some key routes impassable at</p>	<p>Noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy. Plan making is iterative. The settlement commitments and completions table in HOU1 takes into consideration live permissions and commitments and is a point in time. Affordable housing policy is informed by Plan wide viability study and the requirements including thresholds are set out in policy HOU2. 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. The Council continues to work with Anglian Water to identify and address network issues. 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.</p>

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					times, and creating dangerous and difficult conditions for road users and pedestrian. - Hoveton Parish Council has serious concerns about local infrastructure and its ability to cope with further large-scale development, such as that proposed within the First Draft Local Plan. - concerns of many local residents that a growing population caused by overdevelopment will seriously impact on residents' access to quality health care, education, and many other vital local services, thereby impacting on the quality of life offered within the local community. Hoveton and Wroxham's medical centre and other local healthcare services are already under pressure, and the Parish Council fears that a population increase from further housing development such as that proposed here would only exacerbate the problems being experienced by local residents trying to access timely, quality health care. Similarly, the Council fears that an increase in demand for places at local schools will prove unsustainable unless a sufficient supply of school places goes hand-in-hand with the proposed housing development	
DS13	HV01/B	Hoveton Parish Council (1216265)	LP180	General Comments	The Parish Council shares the concerns of many local residents that the proposals for "access to be provided off Tunstead Road with a through connection to Stalham Road" will result in the creation of a road which will be used as a 'rat run' through both the new development and the existing Brook Park development, creating a road safety hazard near the Brook Park children's play area and negatively impacting on the residents of these developments. Furthermore, the provision of highway access on Tunstead Road (an extremely busy road at peak times, which has a proven problem with speeding traffic) will also impact negatively on residents of Tunstead Road and the nearby Two Saints Close, with not even a new roundabout proposed to assist residents trying to exit Two Saints Close or the new development with safely joining the main road. The Parish Council fears these access proposals could lead to road traffic accidents in an area very close to Hoveton's high school. the Parish Council is concerned that Persimmon will most likely be the developer involved in the delivery of the large-scale development proposed for Hoveton in the First Draft Local Plan (Site Reference HV01/B, Land East of Tunstead Road). The Parish Council is therefore concerned that, should this proposal go ahead, the problems encountered with Brook Park 'phase one' (in terms of the work done by Persimmon) may be repeated with Brook Park 'phase two'. The Council believes that difficulties experienced with a developer should be taken into account by the planning authority if that developer applies to take on	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, congestion and access arrangements. Any potential developer of a site is not a consideration in land use planning, however mitigation measures will be identified in policy requirements to address and offset any potential adverse impact. The Draft Design Guide also details expected approach to be taken in relation to design.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					another site and the Council seeks assurances from NNDC that this will be done. If this is not possible, then Hoveton Parish Council considers this one further reason why it must object to Site Reference HV01/B.	

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS13)
Objection	0	General comments received from the town council raised concerns around the reliance on one site for the towns allocations and the additional impact growth would have on existing highways and other infrastructure along with the quality of life of existing residents. Specifically access concerns would result in a 'rat run'. Issues around the quality of development on the previous allocation were also raised.
Support	0	
General Comments	2	

Proposals for North Walsham

DS14: Land at Norwich Road & Nursery Drive

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS14	NW01/B	North Walsham Town Council (1218408)	LP730	Object	Development brief should incorporate the following additional points: Point 8 - and demonstration that there is acceptable capacity in utilities provision to include electricity, gas and telecommunication services 9. an overall design framework building on the principles of the District's most up to date Design Guide	Support for the development brief approach welcomed. Consider comments in the development of the development of the policy.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS14)
Objection	1	General comments received from the town council raised concerns around the reliance on one site for the towns allocations and the additional impact growth would have on existing highways and other infrastructure along with the quality of life of existing residents. Specifically access concerns would result in a 'rat run'. Issues around the quality of development on the previous allocation were also raised.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS15: North Walsham Western Extension

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS15	NW62	North Walsham Town Council (1218408)	LP730	Object	<p>North Walsham Town Council wishes to formally confirm its objection to the Draft Local Plan in its current form. We attach our commentary on the North Walsham section of the plan, but our key concerns are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Industrial Link Road is essential and must be built in advance of the residential developments • The Western Link Road must be built as a single project and be open to public traffic before any housing construction begins • The Town Council has not yet had sight of NCC's ongoing traffic study, nor of traffic forecasts and impacts of the developments, without which accurate comments are impossible • It is unclear how the Declaration of a Climate Change Emergency might impact on the proposals as there is no current policy available. • North Walsham Town Council understands the importance of setting a clear framework for the future development of North Norfolk, and indeed has held very constructive discussions with planning officers over the past two or three years during which it was acknowledged that North Walsham was viewed as a growth town. The Town Council is concerned that under the current proposals that North Walsham runs the risks of becoming a dormitory town for employment in other areas at the expense of employment within the town. It has been understood from the outset that North Walsham would need to expand significantly, and both planning officers and the Town Council agreed that the expansion should be to the west of the town for practical reasons. • However, the Town Council has also from the outset made clear that such expansion must come ONLY with the infrastructure that the town needs in order to meet the current and future requirements of residents, visitors and employers. • A key observation that we wish to make up front is that the draft does not appear to take into account the environmental impact and should adhere to the highest legislation at that time. A statement such as this must by its very nature have a major impact on key policies such as Planning and Future Development, and we believe very strongly that the Local Plan – as a central policy document - needs to be informed by this. North Walsham Town Council wishes to formally confirm its objection to the Draft Local Plan in its current form. • The Industrial Link Road is essential and must be built in advance of the residential developments. The Town Council is concerned that there is no 	<p>Comments noted: 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. Recognition of collaborative working to date and support for the principle of growth and commitment to a development brief is noted and welcomed. The Council has committed to the development of a development brief in partnership and will be subject to further public consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local plan is informed by a sustainability appraisal which reviews the key environmental, social and economic considerations. • Climate Change is recognised as an important consideration to the Council. 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 address 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

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					<p>firm commitment in the current draft to link the A149 Cromer Road via the existing railway bridge to the Folgate Road Industrial area – this was a central part of the earlier discussions between planning officers and the Town Council, and it is difficult to understand why it has been left out at this stage. This link is of fundamental importance to the town, irrespective of any future residential development. The Town Council believes that the road from Cromer Road to this area will need to be in place in advance of any development. This will make the area more attractive to prospective businesses, as full height vehicles can more easily gain access. It is vital that commercial growth precedes the housing such that new residents have opportunities for local employment. The Industrial Link Road would also allow high vehicles to avoid the town centre, which at present they have to use as Aylsham Road provides the only high vehicle route beneath the railway. This is a historic problem, which needs be alleviated and must be added to the plan as a primary objective. The Industrial Link Road would provide significantly more cost-effective solution to access than the very costly and disruptive lowering of the highway beneath Cromer Road bridge and Norwich Road bridges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Western Link Road must be built as a single project and be open to public traffic before any housing construction begins. The Western Link Road is a very welcome feature. The Town Council believes that this needs also be built in advance of development and not piecemeal over the length of the plan. By doing this it will avoid construction traffic having to pass through the town centre and enable HGVs to have access to the industrial link outlined above (par 16.17). If it is to be of value then it must be in use throughout the development stage. The Town Council suggests that this should be of similar construction of the 'Atlantic Avenue' link road between Sprowston and Salhouse Roads in Norwich, built as part of the current residential development i.e. with wide grass verges, cycle/ footpaths and public open spaces • The Town Council has not yet had sight of NCC's ongoing traffic study, nor of traffic forecasts and impacts of the developments, without which accurate comments are impossible • It is unclear how the Declaration of a Climate Change Emergency might impact on the proposals as there is not current policy available. • The Town Council strongly believes that a Working Party should be convened with representation from Town, District and County Councils and 	

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					<p>the major stakeholders to progress the Local Plan for North Walsham to ensure that it can be made acceptable to our town</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the Town Council accept the importance of responding to the government's growth objectives, it is concerned at the implications and effects of a 40% increase in population over the 20-year period, a rate of growth far in excess of any experienced in recent decades. The Town Council believes that this can only take place in tandem with timely and appropriate improvements to the town's infrastructure, such that the quality of life of our residents will be significantly enhanced by appropriate inward investment 	
DS15	NW62	North Walsham Town Council (1218408)	LP730	Object	<p>Continuation.... It is likely that retail chains may seek to serve the new residential development and we would like to see a defined location for a convenience store only, in the western development together with resistance to further large retail units away from existing retail locations to avoid fragmenting town centre retail trading. • It is likely that retail chains may seek to serve the new residential development and we would like to see a defined location for a convenience store only, in the western development together with resistance to further large retail units away from existing retail locations to avoid fragmenting town centre retail trading. • The Town Council notes the need for an additional Primary School and, with improvements to reduce the current traffic problems, and believes that a site for this should be reserved adjacent to Millfield School, allowing two schools on the same campus. Additional access from the outset from an early-built Western Link Road would alleviate current and future access issues and allow for planned development of a joint campus, as it is our understanding that temporary classrooms are being considered at the current school as a short- to medium-term solution to the likely increase in demand for primary school places Early years provision, i.e. covering the 2-4 years old cohort, must also be incorporated into the plan, as this is in short supply in North Walsham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town Council recognises that Anglian Water's infrastructure will need to be enhanced and reinforced at the developer's cost, and also understands that UKPN's power network and the local infrastructure of other statutory bodies is also likely to need reinforcement if it is to accommodate expansion on the proposed level. The Town Council believes that clear commitments from all utilities that they will support the proposed development should be in place before the plan can be finalised 	<p>Agree: The proposal includes approximately 7 ha of employment provision and suitable small scale retail in line with town centre policies ECN4 and the identified need could come forward. Outside allocations proposals will have to accord with sequential test and national town centre first approach. Consideration for specific allocations for retail will be undertaken through the delivery group. • 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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for green infrastructure welcomed- specific proposals and opportunities have been included in background paper no 5 and will be taken forward to inform the development brief. • Support for the development brief approach welcomed. Consider additional

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town Council believes that there should be a firm commitment to reserve land for a potential third GP Practice, should this be identified as necessary. Although it recognises the national GP recruitment issues, the Town Council's view is that expansion of the town on the scale proposed will require additional provision to the West of the town. • There are grave concerns about traffic entering the town via Aylsham Road, which is already heavily used, narrow and unsafe for pedestrians. The Town Council suggests that traffic management will be required to ensure that traffic uses Cromer Road instead. • The Town Council proposes a strong green element to the design of public spaces within the new developments, maintaining or creating green corridors using hedges and other features. Green spaces and residential areas should include a high level of tree planting. All new roads should have cycle lanes included and where possible linking into existing cycle routes. Space for cemeteries, allotments and recreation must also be included in the plan. The existing Weavers Way offers an opportunity for an enhanced wildlife and amenity corridor from the town together with a possible Country Park on the west side. We would like local experts to be involved in the design of open green spaces, particularly those for recreational use, as the town has a strong volunteer community with significant practical experience of design and delivery. • The Town Council regrets that excessive, high quality agricultural land is being designated for development. This will remove the ability of food production from future generations, at a time when home production is becoming more important for food security. In the context of the Declaration of a Climate Change Emergency, the Town Council would like assurance that planning officers have rigorously assessed all brownfield sites, particularly the Crane Fruehauf site (which has been empty for in excess of 20 years) and the Bullens site along with lower value agricultural land, before committing to permanently removing higher quality, potentially productive land. Development brief should incorporate the following additional points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After point 5 details addressing the off-site mains water reinforcement and enhancement to the foul sewerage network capacity and demonstration that there is acceptable capacity in utilities provision to include electricity, gas and telecommunication services • New pedestrian links should include links to the railway station, town centre and local schools 	<p>comments in the development of the policy.</p>

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water, flooding & drainage management, should reflect the historic and existing problems at the Crane Fruehauf site. • Other sporting facilities sin addition to expansion options to North Walsham football club should be considered 	

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS15)
Objection	1	Support for the principle of growth to the west of the town however the Town Council raised objections over the potential for growth without jobs, lack of joined up infrastructure and the requirement to deliver a link road first that connects into the industrial site. The Council also asks that development is brought forward in one phase, that retail element is defined, that the school site is adjacent to Millfield school, and additional land put aside for a new GP surgery. Connectivity and open spaces should feature in any site.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS16: Land at Cornish Way

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS16	E10	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS16)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Proposals for Sheringham

DS17: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS17	SH04	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	Support	STC want top priority given to retaining open and green spaces and for these to be connected as detailed in P. 241-242 S. 17.9-17.10. STC agrees with the three proposed residential sites to be allocated for development and acknowledges the intention to deliver approximately 45 new affordable homes. STC would prefer to see an agreed number of the affordable homes for rent. • STC requires access to Morley Hill from the Community Centre thereby providing a link from the town to Morley Hill. The access will also enable STC to maintain the area within motorized landscaping equipment.	Support noted: The constraints and opportunities have informed the approach to Sheringham. Consider the proposal for direct access to the community centre in the development of this policy
DS17	SH04	Upper Sheringham Parish Council (1215702)	LP117	Support	To see the two other Sheringham sites SH04 and SH07 as the only proposed sites for Sheringham.	Support noted.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS17)
Objection	0	Support is given for the allocation with the town council requesting improved access to the community centre direct from the site, affordable rented properties and open space provision. Preference also expressed by adjoining parish council for this site.
Support	2	
General Comments	0	

DS18: Former Allotments, Weybourne Road, Adjacent to Splash

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS18	SH07	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	Support	STC agrees with the three proposed residential sites to be allocated for development and acknowledges the intention to deliver approximately 45 new affordable homes.	Support noted.
DS18	SH07	Upper Sheringham Parish Council (1215702)	LP117	Support	To see the two other Sheringham sites SH04 and SH07 as the only proposed sites for Sheringham.	Support noted.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS18)
Objection	0	Support is given for the allocation with the town council expressing a preference for rented affordable properties. Preference also expressed by adjoining parish council for this site.
Support	2	
General Comments	0	

DS19: Land South of Butts Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS19	SH18/1B	Upper Sheringham Parish Council (1215702)	LP116	Objection	The proposed site SH18/1B is encroaching into an area of countryside within an AONB. This site is stated as in the Sheringham settlement area however please note it is actually in the Parish of Upper Sheringham.	Agree. The site is in the parish of Upper Sheringham.
DS19	SH18/1B	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	Support	STC agrees with the three proposed residential sites to be allocated for development and acknowledges the intention to deliver approximately 45 new affordable homes. STC would prefer to see an agreed number of the affordable homes for rent. STC would seek clarification that site SH18/1 Land South of Butts Lane is in Sheringham rather than Upper Sheringham.	Support noted. The Site is located in Upper Sheringham.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS19)
Objection	1	Support is given for the allocation with the town council expressing a preference for rented affordable properties, however objection from neighbouring parish council with regard to encroachment into the countryside and AONB.
Support	1	
General Comments	0	

Proposals for Stalham

DS20: Land Adjacent Ingham Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS20	ST19/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS20)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

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

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS21	ST23/2	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS21)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Proposals for Wells-next-the-Sea

DS22: Land at Market Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS22	W01/1	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098 LP107	Support	The Council wishes to support the development of the Market Lane strip previously identified for an exceptions site development (for local people) and wishes it to be used for that purpose, believing that up to thirty starter homes could be built on the site. In addition, the Council wishes to draw to the attention of the District Council two other sites adjacent to the town boundary, one to the south of Mill Road and the other opposite the Hopkins development to the west of Two Furlong Hill both of lie adjacent to arterial roads.	Support welcomed. Alternative site suggestions put forward will be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS22)
Objection	0	One comment of support received.
Support	1	
General Comments	0	

DS23: Land Adjacent Holkham Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS23	W07/1	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098 LP108	Object	The Council wishes to express its concern that the proposed Mill Road development is in a prominent position on the brow of a hill threatens the viability of a small local provider of touring caravan accommodation and equine facilities and does not have good vehicular access. In addition, the Council wishes to draw to the attention of the District Council two other sites adjacent to the town boundary, one to the south of Mill Road and the other opposite the Hopkins development to the west of Two Furlong Hill both of lie adjacent to arterial roads.	Comments noted. Alternative site suggestions put forward will be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS23)
Objection	1	Given the prominent position limited access and existing use.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Proposals for Blakeney

DS24: Land East of Langham Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS24	BLA04/A	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP656	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: Proposed development will be quite visible from higher ground, and abuts a SSSI, so will have quite an impact on the surroundings. Also, the council says the sewage network will need to be upgraded but what about the sewage treatment works which we know are already overloaded at holiday times?	Noted: The Council has liaised with Anglian Water and key service providers to identify capacity issues and inform the development of the Local Plan

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS24)
Objection	0	Cley PC commented that the sewage capacity should be assessed and better provision provided and some thought should be given to appropriate screening of new development.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Proposals for Briston

DS25: Land East of Astley Primary School

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS25	BRI01	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS25)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS26: Land West of Astley Primary School

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS26	BRI02	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS26)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Proposals for Ludham

DS27: Land South of School Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS27	LUD01/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS27)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DS28: Land at Eastern End of Grange Road

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS28	LUD06/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS28)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Proposals for Mundesley

DS29: Land off Cromer Road & Church Lane

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS29	MUN03/A	Mundesley Parish Council (1218493)	LP794	General Comments	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE CONSULTATION PORTAL FOR FULL REPRESENTATION: We are very appreciative that within the Local Plan, for Mundesley, you have incorporated the need for the retention of green spaces and are being sympathetic towards the construction and finish of any new houses. We also acknowledge the need for more houses to be built. There are only two areas which have not been developed on this length of road (Cromer road), the Memorial Gardens and MUN03/A. Council shares your desire for the village to be as attractive as possible and is concerned about the impact 50 new houses will have if they are all built on the proposed site. We are concerned that further development in this area may impact on the wellbeing of existing people who live in the area as well as tourists. Existing use provided a natural break in and is an elevated position. With the spires of 3 Parish churches visible. It is also the only pedestrian access from the housing in Collingwood Drive to the Village Centre, Library, and Doctors Surgery. Losing the one open green space in this very built up area could have a serious effect on the wellbeing of the parish, as well as having a detrimental effect on our economy, i.e., the many tourists who come to this village for its as yet un-spoilt charm. You wisely recognize the importance of this consideration in your report on page 36 section 5.11-5.15: "Protecting Character 5.11 North Norfolk's landscape has a significant economic, social and community value, contributing to a sense of identity, well-being, enjoyment and inspiration and being a major contributor to a strong tourism industry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The low-lying coast, the coastal cliff sections and the inland landforms are some of the finest of their kind in the British Isles. The landscape of North Norfolk has been strongly influenced by the sea and is composed of, and enriched by, the combination of distinctive geological and geomorphological features. These features have resulted in valuable characteristics including nationally important wildlife habitats as well as features of cultural significance such as archaeological deposits, field patterns, building materials and settlement forms. The link between people and place is engrained into the landscape of North Norfolk. The proposed development of MUN03/A would obstruct the view of the 	Comments noted. The review of the physical attributes has informed the policy considerations of retaining appropriate open space and connectivity site recognises. 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 cumulative growth and access arrangements. The Local Plan seeks to address the strategic needs of the District and is supportive of Local communities bringing forward additional growth to support local identified need through neighbourhood planning.

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					<p>Parish Church which is visible from most areas of the village. It is the highest point, so any new estate built on MUN03/A will be seen from all aspects. We have included two photographs which show one of the 4 new roll back houses currently being built on MUN03. It is self-explanatory how dominating another 50 houses on this site would be, and this house is not even sited at the highest point. One fact which is controversial is the relevance in planning terms of the loss of view. It is often said “there is no right to a view”. Whilst this is correct in strictly legal terms, it does not mean that the loss of a view is necessarily irrelevant to planning. The enjoyment of a view could be an important part of the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, and its loss might therefore have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Loss of a view from a public viewpoint might also have a wide impact on a neighbourhood, and such matters ought to be taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our next material planning consideration comes under the heading of Highways Issues because Cromer Road and Church Lane carry a considerable amount of traffic, and this development will substantially increase the traffic flow. The access to the proposed site is just past a blind bend. The pavement is narrow in a number of places, causing difficulties for the elderly and people with young children. The whole frontage of MUN03 runs parallel to the section of Cromer Road which is within the coastal erosion zone. • It is understood that MUN03 was considered as a potential site about 8 years ago, and was rejected as being unsuitable for development as stated in North Norfolk District Councils Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Final Consultation Statement 2010: “MUN03, Land West of Church Lane Not recommended for allocation: Proximity to erosion zone and development would prevent future re-alignment of the coast road that may be required as a result of coastal erosion. • Should be retained for farming due to climate changes and also to minimise farm vehicle traffic through the village centre • Concern over height of land and that development would dominate the village.” We share your aspiration that Mundesley continues to be a successful tourist village, particularly with the new “Deep History” project coming this summer. Council are concerned that building 50 new houses in one location could conflict with this shared aspiration. We 	

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
					<p>understand from the Draft Local Plan that there is a need to build 50 new houses, but believe building them in smaller clusters around the village, rather than one large development would better fit with our tourism objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do think that a limited development could possibly be permitted on MUN03, e.g., another small cluster of roll back houses built behind the properties currently under construction via the roll back scheme. This means that “open green space” will still exist on the site, but the impact of the building will not have a negative effect on the vista and overall wellbeing of the village. • In order to meet the needs of social housing MPC would like to rectify this imbalance. MPC currently owns the freehold of land at Cromer Road/Tasman Drive (MUN11), 1.6 (Ha) which we consider is ideally suitable for Community-Led Housing. The land could be used for development, making them suitable for rent, and possible purchase, at prices which are affordable. MPC has nearly completed negotiations with NNDC, who are gifting a parcel of land, adjacent to Watson Watts Gardens, which MPC will develop as community allotments, and a new playground, MPC will be funding these facilities so public open space in this area will be greatly enhanced, and strengthened. MPC proposes to instruct an Architect to prepare an initial design scheme and prepare a financial appraisal. Depending on the density, 30 houses might be achievable on this site. Views of the sea will still be achieved by the retention of the field opposite this site. MPC purchased “Woodhurst” 5, High Street, Mundesley, several years ago specifically for community use. This property is in the village centre, this bungalow sits in a large garden, and could be developed into an attractive courtyard of several home. • Through developing affordable housing only on HOU2 and a smaller number on MUN03/A - officers interpretation - We hope that we have demonstrated that the housing requirement can be met, by alternative sites providing high quality and affordable housing, in smaller developments, rather than one large estate 	

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS29)
Objection	0	One town council expressed support for well-designed homes and retention of open spaces but raises concerns over the impacts development of this site would have on the vista, increase in traffic and erosion of a natural break in development.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Proposals for Other Areas

DS30: Tattersett Business Park

Site Policy	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
DS30	E7	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Site Policy DS30)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

