

**Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses**  
Report by Planning Policy Officer

<b>Summary:</b>	This report informs the Committee of the Officers' proposed response to planning policy consultations recently received, and invites any comments or guidance the Committee may have.
<b>Recommendation:</b>	That the report be noted and the nature of proposed response be endorsed.

**1 Introduction**

- 1.1 Appendix 1 shows selected planning policy consultation documents received by the Authority since the last Planning Committee meeting, together with the officer's proposed response.
- 1.2 The Committee's endorsement, comments or guidance are invited.

**2 Financial Implications**

- 2.1 There are no financial implications.

Background papers: None

Author: Natalie Beal  
Date of report: 15 December 2014

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Schedule of Planning Policy Consultations received

### Planning Policy Consultations Received

<b>ORGANISATION:</b>	Brundall Parish Council
<b>DOCUMENT:</b>	Brundall Neighbourhood Plan
<b>LINK</b>	<a href="http://www.inghampinnock.com/brundall-neighbourhood-plan/">http://www.inghampinnock.com/brundall-neighbourhood-plan/</a>
<b>RECEIVED:</b>	5 December 2014
<b>DUE DATE:</b>	30 January 2015
<b>STATUS:</b>	Consultation
<b>PROPOSED LEVEL:</b>	Planning Committee endorsed.
<b>NOTES:</b>	<p><u>Background</u> This Pre-Submission Consultation Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Brundall has been prepared over the course of 2014 by a Working Group representing a range of community interests in the village. It represents the first opportunity for local residents and other stakeholders to see the first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan in full. The Brundall Neighbourhood Plan Working Group was formed at the end of 2013 after a call for members. It comprises Ingenuity in Business (local business group), Brundall Primary School, Brundall Memorial Hall, Brundall Local History Group, Brundall Riverside Association, Brundall Allotments Association, Broads Society, Brundall Health Centre, Brundall Parish Council and a number of local residents.</p> <p>Planning Committee (and Broadland Council) designated Brundall as a Neighbourhood Area for the purpose of producing a Neighbourhood Plan on 28 March 2014.</p> <p><u>Summary of document</u> Our vision for Brundall is to remain a high-quality rural village surrounded by tranquil open countryside and the Broads landscape where people want to live, visit, work and engage with a vibrant and thriving community.</p> <p>Policy 1: Run Dike Green Corridor Policy 2: Walking and cycling routes Policy 3: Important views Policy 4: Boating and marine businesses Policy 5: Leisure and tourism Policy 6: Improving the pedestrian environment on The Street Policy 7: Enhanced recreation provision Policy 8: Enhanced provision for the very young and the very old</p> <p><u>Next Steps</u> Once this stage of consultation is complete the Working Group will review the comments received and revise the document accordingly. The document will then be submitted to Broadland District Council and the Broads Authority for review. Following a further process of public consultation. Broadland District Council will appoint an independent specialist examiner to review the Plan. The results of this examination will be publicised. Following that, Broadland District Council will organise a local referendum where residents of Brundall (Parish) will be asked to vote on the Plan. If</p>

	<p>more than 50% of votes are in favour of the Plan. It will become an adopted document and have sufficient status to help make a real difference to the future of the village and shape future proposals put forward by developers.</p>
<p><b>PROPOSED RESPONSE:</b></p>	<p><b><u>Main Comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no mention of the following designated/protected sites, which are shown on the Broads Authority’s policies maps of the Sites Specifics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Broadland Ramsar site</li> <li>○ Yare Broads and Marshes SSSI</li> <li>○ Mid Yare National Nature Reserve</li> <li>○ The Broads SAC</li> <li>○ Highnoon Farm County Wildlife Site</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There is no mention of the JCS or Broadland Site Allocations or the Broads Site Specifics Local Plan. That is the context in which the Neighbourhood Plan needs to operate, as it will be part of the development plan for the area.. Strongly recommend a summary of the policies (existing and under examination) that relate specifically to Brundall.</li> <li>• Some policies are not clear in their intentions or what they refer to. See detailed comments below. Namely policies 2, 5, 6 and 7.</li> <li>• Brundall consistently comes up in the top three of places where access to the water needs to be improved (as a result of numerous surveys). Slipways are therefore desired in the area. Is this something the Neighbourhood Plan could look into? The BA would be interested in any work undertaken on this.</li> <li>• In assessing policy 4, the SA identifies that traffic movement and contributions to climate change could get worse as a result of the policy. It identifies a mitigation measure of Travel Plans. However the mitigation measure for ENV1 is not included in the policy and therefore the effect is not mitigated. Suggest there is either reference to the need for travel plans in line with local policy (and say what it is) or include such a requirement in the policy. At the moment, it does not seem the effect of the policy is mitigated.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Specific Detailed Comments</u></b></p> <p><u>Section 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 1 – for the avoidance of doubt, suggest that it is stated that the Neighbourhood Area is the same as the Parish Boundary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Section 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First paragraph – Broads has a status equivalent to a National Park.</li> <li>• Throughout – perhaps the use of maps to display what is talked about might be a useful way of presenting things.</li> <li>• The text implies that the Great Yarmouth bus service has ceased – is this correct?</li> <li>• Are there any community transport schemes that could be worthy of mention?</li> <li>• Many of the gardens in Brundall are of a decent size and many provide private greenspace which is important for wildlife.</li> <li>• There is no mention of flood risk. The Brundall and Brundall Gardens maps of the Broads Sites Specifics could be used to assist.</li> <li>• As with the mention of historic buildings, this section needs to contain text on the quality of this environment. This area is notable for its wildlife supported by these</li> </ul>

wetland habitats.

- There is no mention of the Country Park that is mentioned later on in the document.

#### Policy 1

- People only benefit from public access in some parts of the river course. It is incorrect to say that the run dyke benefits from public access when in fact there may be conflicts such as wildlife disturbance and dogs running off the lead for example.
- Would the NGOs (RSPB) be more important than the statutory organisations unless planning permission is required or funding will be forthcoming from CIL/S106 and LPAs are holding this?
- In the policy itself, it is suggested that ‘.....creation of natural margins to buffer the run dyke from any agricultural inputs and....’ could be added.

#### Policy 2

- Are the journeys to which this policy relates recreational or every day?
- It is very similar as Policy 6 in its background and justification. Recommend clarifying the fundamental aim of this policy or explaining how it does relate to Policy 6.
- .
- Suggest the map identifies locations or destinations which are talked about in the text to show how the routes relate to these.
- The existing routes – are they of adequate quality or do they need improving?
- ‘Proposed Potential Routes’ – are these the gaps in the network? Have the changes or improvements been looked into?
- The Waterways and Recreation Team at the Broads Authority is interested in this proposal and any detail.

#### Policy 3

- Could photos be used to help illustrate the important characteristics? This could aid Development Management Officers.

#### Policy 4

- Fourth paragraph of the background. What is meant by ‘valuable’? Employment land is valuable to the economy.
- Fourth paragraph of the background. We understand that access to this area is an issue for Boat Builders. Access could be mentioned here.
- Suggest an assessment of this policy against the Broads Authority Sites Specifics DPD, policies BRU1 to BRU6. Does Policy 4 repeat the provisions of those adopted policies?
- Recommend a plan to show the area to which Policy 4 applies.

#### Policy 5

- The term ‘leisure’ is very broad. It is not clear what this policy actually relates to.

	<p>What are some examples that this policy would relate to?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest an assessment of this policy against the Broads Authority Sites Specifics DPD, policies BRU1 to BRU6. Does Policy 5 repeat the provisions of those adopted policies?</li> <li>• Recommend the map zooms in to the area this policy applies to.</li> <li>• Is there merit in a concept plan of some kind to show what this policy means?</li> </ul> <p><u>Policy 6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments on Policy 2 relating to clarifying the difference between the two policies.</li> <li>• The policy says ‘see plan’ but there is no map for Policy 6. A Plan would be useful in showing where each part of the policy refers to. Is the plan that accompanies policy 7 actually the plan for policy 6? If so, recommend the plans are zoomed in.</li> </ul> <p><u>Policy 7</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The term ‘recreation’ is very broad. It is not clear what this policy actually relates to. What are some examples that this policy would relate to?</li> </ul> <p><u>Sustainability Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 5, Query the following in the table: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Obj1 v Env2</li> <li>○ Obj1 v Soc7</li> <li>○ Obj1 v Econ1</li> <li>○ Obj2 v Econ1, 2 and 3</li> <li>○ Obj3 v Econ1</li> <li>○ Obj3 v Econ3</li> <li>○ Obj4, 5 and 6 v Env7</li> <li>○ Obj7 v Soc2</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Page 17 – suggest use ‘single occupancy car use’ rather than ‘private car’.</li> <li>• Page 21 – Env 7. Rather than using the term ‘historic’, perhaps consider ‘existing’. Historic buildings tend to be protected, or the term refers to a particular type of building, but it seems this policy refers to all buildings that are already there. Suggest this is clarified.</li> <li>• Page 21 – Env8. The policy considers flood risk as an issue so it is recommended that there is a ‘+’ in this row.</li> <li>• Page 22 – SOC3. Suggest there is a positive from this policy in relation to skills.</li> <li>• Page 23 – Env8. The policy considers flood risk as an issue so it is recommended that there is a ‘+’ in this row.</li> <li>• Page 24 – SOC9. There is no information in the ‘justification and evidence’ cell.</li> <li>• Page 25 – Env 1, Env3 and Env7. As this policy could result in more people walking to the area, there could be benefits of the policy to these three SA Objectives.</li> <li>• Paragraph 4.2. As stated above, it is not clear how the issue has been mitigated as there is no mention of travel plans in the policy or supporting text.</li> </ul>
--	---