## Brundall Neighbourhood Plan Publication - Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Given Name</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR1</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR2</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Chenery</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR3</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR4</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>Anglian Water Services Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR5</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Grech</td>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

**BR1 Mr Mike Hammond**: I have been part of the Plan Working Group which has been very ably and professional managed by the Parish Council appointed agents. The resulting document has been fully researched and consulted upon with various groups and the village community and reflects the views and information gained from the consultations. I therefore fully support and recommend this document.

**BR2 Mr Roger Chenery Highways England**: Highways England manage the Strategic Road Network in England. This includes the A47 Trunk road that passes to the northern edge of Brundall. Currently Highways England have not been instructed to investigate any improvement measures for this length of A47. Highways England have therefore no comment to make regarding the proposed Brundall Neighbourhood Plan as it seeks to enhance and influence development in the parish. Highways England look forward to consultations on future development in the area that may have implications for the free flow of traffic and safety on the A47 Trunk Road.

**BR3 Mr Graham Steel Environment Agency**: The Environment Agency response remains as that submitted in their letter of 16 January 2015 (please see enclosed letter). Topics discussed include: - surface water drainage problems on The Street - the potential need for more waste and recycling facilities (particularly for tourists/visitors) - opportunity for sustainable drainage systems in identified ‘green corridor’ - Witton Run and River Yare need to be considered wrt. any developments likely to affect them - Sewage disposal needs to be considered wrt. any development proposals that come forward.

**BR4 Ms. Sue Bull Anglian Water Services Ltd**: On this occasion, Anglian Water has no comment to make or concerns to raise.

**BR5 Mr David Grech Historic England**: In January 2015 Historic England (then operating under the title of English Heritage) submitted comments on the Pre-submission Draft of this Plan direct to the Parish Council. I have now had the opportunity to review the latest version of the Plan and am pleased to see our earlier advice has been reflected in this latest version. We therefore do not wish to comment further at this stage.

19 August 2015
It would be helpful to have some cross reference to funding mechanisms and the plan should make it clear that any new or improved infrastructure will be funded/delivered through CIL and/or S106 agreements (including use of planning conditions) having regard to the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP).

Natural England considers that this Plan is generally unlikely to have any adverse effect on the natural environment, including designated sites and landscapes. We do not therefore wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation. This conclusion is consistent with Natural England's comments provided to Brundall Parish Council on the pre-submission draft Neighbourhood Plan and Sustainability Appraisal (our ref: 139279, dated 29th January 2015) and to your authority on the Neighbourhood Plan Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening report 01/04/2015.

The following is a summary. Please see enclosed representation for full response. National Grid has identified the following Intermediate Pressure Gas Distribution pipeline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary: Ormesby Saint Margaret 7 Bar IP pipeline. From the consultation information provided, the above gas distribution pipeline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.

The following is a summary. Please see enclosed representation for full response. In all maps that show the Broads, the legend needs to be changed to say 'Broads Authority Executive Area'. The document lacks page and paragraph numbers. These need adding to enable planning officers to reference parts of the Neighbourhood Plan when determining planning applications.

The following is a summary. Please see enclosed representation for full response. Throughout the document, the term 'support' is used. Is this without qualification? Will certain developments be supported no matter what the cost? Or would they be supported in principle subject to satisfying other considerations, such as LPA policies? Clarification is sought regarding what 'support' actually means in light of the issue above and if appropriate, a better phraseology should be used.

The following is a summary. Please see enclosed representation for full response. Throughout the document, the term 'support' is used. Is this without qualification? Will certain developments be supported no matter what the cost? Or would they be supported in principle subject to satisfying other considerations, such as LPA policies? Clarification is sought regarding what 'support' actually means in light of the issue above and if appropriate, a better phraseology should be used.
The following constitutes a summary. Please see the enclosed letter for full representation. Discouraged by the term 'small' business. Small businesses wishing to expand are having to move to bigger centres in Norwich. One Brundall business with 11 staff now has larger premises in Sprowston. This is a loss to Brundall's economy. The premises where 'Cards and Candy' traded from (in one of the 3 centres for improvement) has been vacant for +6 months. Pressing need for greater employment floor space in Brundall - this policy does not address this, nor problem of businesses closing/relocating.

It is noted that this was formerly policy 6 on which NPS has previously made comments. No changes appear to have been made in terms of the definition of 'clear gateways' as previously requested. NCC County Farms owns a large parcel of County Farms land in the location at Postwick Lane. NPS/NCC would want to ensure that any work undertaken at the western end of the village (Postwick Lane) on land owned by NCC does not prejudice the future and long-term interests in this location.

It is noted that reference is made within the policy to the support towards the provision of a continuous orbital route and comprehensive high quality network around the village, linking up Postwick Lane in the north west with the Lackford Run in the north east. NCC County Farms owns a large parcel of County Farms land at Postwick Lane. NPS/NCC would want to ensure that any work undertaken at the western end of the village (Postwick Lane) on land owned by NCC does not prejudice the future and long-term interests in this location.

Our client (Dacre Property Holdings) owns the majority of land for the southern footpath. The aim of the policy is fully supported. The link through Brundall Gardens Marina, past Brundall Broad to Brundall Riverside is a significant length of footpath across privately owned land. With significant pressure on the resources of most funding agencies, whilst desirable, the footpath link is only likely to be delivered if associated with viable riverside development such as the increase in mooring opportunities within the area of Brundall Gardens and Brundall Broad to provide for an element of developer-led funding.
The following constitutes a summary. Please see the enclosed letter for full representation. How will LPA determine when a view is no longer enjoyable? How do you measure distance to/from 'distant buildings'? How can you measure 'overly intrusive'? Why are views now deemed important in planning terms when not so previously? (cites recent example of residents objecting to loss of pleasant view due to planning application in west of village, which was approved regardless). Why are views from centre/east of village now more important than those in west? Development can only occur in the east.

The following is a summary. Please see enclosed representation for full response. The term 'historic' implies heritage assets. Are views obscured by listed buildings and the like or by existing built development? If the latter, suggest replace 'historic' with 'existing built development' to clarify.

The following constitutes a summary. Please see the enclosed letter for full representation. This looks after the needs of the old. There is no mention of provision for the young or those on low income.

It is noted that this was formerly part of policy 8 on which NPS has previously made comments. NPS would support the principle of providing 'housing with care' facilities designed for the elderly within the village. It is noted that reference is made to preference to a brownfield site with good proximity to complementary facilities, amenities and services. NPS feels the opportunities of a brownfield site of a sufficient size being realised are limited, but would suggest land owned by NCC at Postwick Lane would provide a good location for any new housing with care facility.

The following constitutes a summary. Please see the enclosed letter for full representation. Support redevelopment of areas used for boat building, to avoid loss of employment. However, would query meaning of 'to detriment of the boat building industry'. Phrase is very vague - who decides whether something is 'to the detriment of the boat building industry'? This policy opposes other large scale manufacturing enterprises that require large supplies of water (employing large numbers of people). I cannot support the Neighbourhood Plan in its current format.
The following is a summary. Please see enclosed representation for full response.

1) Support approach in principle, but policy as worded is inflexible and does not recognise constraints on sites. 2) Ref. to Policy DP2 (Broads Authority) should be replaced with DP29. 3) SA identifies issues relating to climate change and air quality but there seems to be no mitigating action in the policy itself. 4) The policy no longer refers to flood risk so it is not clear how it rates as positive in the SA. 5) Policy should consider adopted BA Site Specific Local Plan policies BRU1 to BRU5 inclusive (In particular BRU2). 6) Policy supportive of boat building only and doesn't recognise related marine industries. 7) Policy refers to 'significant loss of employment' but this is not explained. 8) The constraints of the road access aren’t recognised. 9) In what circumstances would loss of these businesses be permitted? 10) The area the policy refers to needs to be clearly shown on a map.

Policy 7 should be expanded to recognise the importance of increased quality mooring facilities to support the boat building and marine associated activities of local boat yards and riverside businesses.

Policy 8 should be expanded to recognise the importance of maintaining and enlarging quality boat mooring facilities in the locality in order to encourage the increase in other tourist and leisure activities in the settlement.

1) It is not clear what the policy intends in relation to food and drink. There is already a public house in the area. 2) How does policy 8 fit with the adopted Broads Authority policies? We mentioned previously that the policy should consider adopted policies BRU1-BRU5 (Sites Specific Local Plan). 3) Replace reference to policy 'DP2' (Broads Authority) with 'DP29'. 4) Regarding sentence that starts 'It is possible that...' How can independent proposals be brought together?

1) When the tables say 'could include CIL receipts' does that mean the 25% top slice of CIL once the NP is adopted? 2) Policies 5, 6, 8 - will suitable land for these policies be identified?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Given Name</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR21</td>
<td>Miss</td>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Beal</td>
<td>Broads Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
Pg 28, ENV7 - still says 'historic'. Do you mean existing? See comments within BR19 that relate to SA.