

# Brundall Neighbourhood Plan Publication - Response Summary

## General

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
BR1	Mr	Mike	Hammond		
		<b>Comments:</b>	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	
		<b>Comments:</b>	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	
		<b>Comments:</b>	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	
		<b>Comments:</b>	On this occasion, Anglian Water has no comment to make or concerns to raise.		
BR5	Mr	David	Grech	Historic England	
		<b>Comments:</b>	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.		

BR10      Mr      Stephen      Faulkner      Norfolk County Council

**Comments:**

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).

BR14      Mr      Jack      Haynes      Natural England

**Comments:**

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.

BR15      Ms.      Laura      Kelly      National Grid Plc      AMEC Foster Wheeler E&I UK

**Comments:**

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.

BR16      Miss      Natalie      Beal      Broads Authority

**Comments:**

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.

## Policies (General)

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
----	-------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------

BR17	Miss	Natalie	Beal	Broads Authority	
------	------	---------	------	------------------	--

**Comments:**

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.

## Policy 1

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
----	-------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------

BR6 Mr Grant Nurden

**Comments:**

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.

BR11 Mr Stephen Faulkner Norfolk County Council NPS Property Consultants Ltd.

**Comments:**

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.

## Policy 2

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
----	-------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------

BR12	Mr	Stephen	Faulkner	Norfolk County Council	NPS Property Consultants Ltd.
------	----	---------	----------	------------------------	-------------------------------

**Comments:**

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.

BR23 Mr Les Brown Les Brown Associates

**Comments:**

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.

## Policy 3

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
----	-------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------

BR7 Mr Grant Nurden

**Comments:**

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.

BR18 Miss Natalie Beal Broads Authority

**Comments:**

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.

## Policy 5

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
----	-------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------

BR8	Mr	Grant	Nurden		
-----	----	-------	--------	--	--

**Comments:**

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.

BR13	Mr	Stephen	Faulkner	Norfolk County Council	NPS Property Consultants Ltd.
------	----	---------	----------	------------------------	-------------------------------

**Comments:**

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.

## Policy 7

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
----	-------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------

BR9	Mr	Grant	Nurden		
-----	----	-------	--------	--	--

**Comments:**

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.

BR19 Miss Natalie Beal Broads Authority

**Comments:**

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.

BR24 Mr Les Brown Les Brown Associates

**Comments:**

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

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
----	-------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------

BR20	Miss	Natalie	Beal	Broads Authority	
------	------	---------	------	------------------	--

**Comments:**

The following is a summary. Please see enclosed representation for full response. 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 Specifics 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?

BR25 Mr Les Brown Les Brown Associates

**Comments:**

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.

## Implementation and Monitoring

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
----	-------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------

BR22	Miss	Natalie	Beal	Broads Authority	
------	------	---------	------	------------------	--

**Comments:**

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?

## Sustainability Appraisal

ID	Title	Given Name	Family Name	Organisation	Agent
----	-------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------

BR21	Miss	Natalie	Beal	Broads Authority	
------	------	---------	------	------------------	--

**Comments:**

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