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## Appendix 1 – List of Consultees (under Reg. 18)

### Statutory Consultees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Councils - Statutory</td>
<td>Norfolk County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Councils - Statutory</td>
<td>Broadland District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Yarmouth Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Norfolk District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waveney District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government – Statutory</td>
<td>Broadland Environmental Services Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East of England Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East of England Local Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Agency - BFAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Office for the East of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity and gas companies</td>
<td>British Pipeline Agency Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDF Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entec UK Ltd. (for National Grid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPower Renewables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Coal Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and water undertakers</td>
<td>Anglian Water Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Drainage Board Authorities - Waveney,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yare &amp; Lothingland*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essex &amp; Suffolk Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Management Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social - Statutory</td>
<td>NHS Great Yarmouth &amp; Waveney PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NHS Norfolk PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk Police Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk Police Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish and Town Councils - Statutory</td>
<td>Within in the Broads Executive Area (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent to the Broads Executive Area (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowestoft Charter Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk Rural Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk ACRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk Association of Local Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications operators</td>
<td>Atkins OSM (Cable and Wireless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Telecommunications plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTE Network Communications plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile Operators Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Transcommunications Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport – Statutory</td>
<td>Great Yarmouth Port Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State for Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage/Landscape</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Consultees</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEFRA (SLR Division)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department for Transport (DfT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of</td>
<td>Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Yarmouth Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waveney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK MEPs - Eastern Region (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward councillors</td>
<td>Ward Councillors within Broads Executive Area (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>Broadland Community Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chet Valley Development Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk County Strategic Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Norfolk District Council, Coasts &amp; Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich Local Strategic Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Norfolk Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stalham with Happing Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk Strategic Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waveney Local Strategic Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and employment</td>
<td>Business Link East of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBI East of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning and Skills Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk Chamber of Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Organisations/interests represented on the Broads Forum marked with (*)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General consultees cont.</th>
<th>Wildlife and Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May Gurney Ltd</td>
<td>Aurum Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Chamber of Commerce Industry</td>
<td>British Trust for Ornithology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Canoe Union*</td>
<td>BTCV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Marine Federation*</td>
<td>Butterfly Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Rowing</td>
<td>Forestry Commission East of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Water Ski Federation*</td>
<td>Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Waterways</td>
<td>Friends of the Earth*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Hire Boat Federation*</td>
<td>Norfolk Coast Partnership AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broom Boats Ltd</td>
<td>Norfolk Farming &amp; Wildlife Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruising Association</td>
<td>Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilham Boating Club</td>
<td>Norwich &amp; Norwich Naturalists’ Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglian Waterways Association*</td>
<td>Norfolk Wildlife Trust*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Development Agency</td>
<td>Norwich Fringe Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Rivers Ski Club*</td>
<td>RSPB Eastern Region*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Rowing Council*</td>
<td>Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis-Frost Marine Ltd</td>
<td>Suffolk Geodiversity Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Marina</td>
<td>Suffolk Wildlife Trust*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horning Sailing Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoseasons Holidays Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Waterways Association*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeckell and Son Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingfisher Boatyard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonfleet Marine Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Broads Direct Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk &amp; Suffolk Boating Association*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Frostbite Sailing Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulton Broad Community Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Plus (East Anglia) Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Boat Owners Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Yachting Association*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverline Marine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Quays Marina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Watersports Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yare Users Association*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windboats Marine Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Based Recreation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Association for Shooting and Conservation*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Horse Society*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglian Cycling Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglian Trail Riders Association*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich &amp; District Wildfowlers Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramblers Association*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England (Eastern Region)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishing/Angling</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglers Consultative Association for Norfolk &amp; Suffolk*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Angling Strategy Group*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farming and Landowners</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attree Estates Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Reef Growers’ Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Reed &amp; Sedge Cutters Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Wharton Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Land &amp; Business Association*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Farmers Union*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed &amp; Sedge Cutters Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters Farm Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing, land agents and developers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldreds Chartered Surveyors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnolds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART-TECH Design Services Lt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry J Bridgewood Building Designs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidwells/Carpenters Planning Consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown &amp; Co</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brundall Riverside Estates Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; M Architects Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Point Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DevPlan UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsheath, B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Support Practice Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPD Savills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion Online td.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibb, H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodliffe, B J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gt Yarmouth BC Architectural Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale-Sutton, R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogg, G E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Builders Federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ellis Architectural Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitewood Estates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Organisations/interests represented on the Broads Forum marked with (*)
### Appendix 1 – List of Consultees (under Reg. 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Heritage/Landscape</th>
<th>Education/Charities/Trusts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KLH Architects Ltd</td>
<td>Broads Society*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight Benjamin</td>
<td>Easton College*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights, A</td>
<td>Hertfordshire Schools Sailing Base*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land agents (20)</td>
<td>How Hill Trust*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanpro Services Ltd</td>
<td>Nancy Oldfield Trust*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Brown Associates</td>
<td>Norfolk Heritage Fleet Trust*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC (Trull) Ltd</td>
<td>Norfolk Schools Sailing Association*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; S Lynch Consultancy</td>
<td>Norwich City College*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy &amp; Stone (Developments) Ltd</td>
<td>Renewables East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Powerhouse LLP</td>
<td>Rural Action East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS Property Consultants Ltd</td>
<td>Ted Ellis Trust &amp; Wheatfen Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P H Design and Planning Ltd</td>
<td>The Horstead Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, R</td>
<td>University of East Anglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock and Smith Planning Consultants</td>
<td>Wherry Yacht Charter Charitable Trust*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Potential</td>
<td>Whitlingham Charitable Trust*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURE Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putman, J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard C Anderson-Dungar Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Powlesland Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes Hill Dyke Residents Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey, D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strutt and Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The River Thurne Tenants Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utton, J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan Keal Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Council England (East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broads Local Access Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk Youth and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich and Norfolk Racial Equality Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Gypsy Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waveney DC Leisure Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Waste and recycling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadland Environmental Services Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk Environmental Waste Services (NEWS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>National Parks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK Association of National Park Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign for National Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways Agency Network Ops East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk and Norwich Transport Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUSTRANS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Freight Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Three Rivers Way Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broads Authority Members (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broads Authority Co-opted and Independent Members (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals (170)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Organisations/interests represented on the Broads Forum marked with (*)*
APPENDIX 2: Preparation of Site Specific Policies DPD: Responses to Initial Consultation

Acle Parish Council

Acle Parish councillors feel that the following should be included in the DPD for Acle:

1. Inclusion of a site for a cemetery extension, north of the current cemetery in Pyebush Lane, Acle.

2. Inclusion of a small amount of housing, where suitable land can be found, to include land to the north of Damgate Lane. I believe that the road frontage of this site may be within the Broadland District Council boundary, but it adjoins the Broads Authority land.

(Later also suggested extension to Recreation Centre playing fields, and clarified that proposed housing area is actually partly in Broads area.)

Summary: Proposes allocation of land for a cemetery extension, playing fields extension, and for housing.

Broads Authority response: Options to give effect to each of these proposals have been created and assessed for potential inclusion in the DPD.

Adler, Anne

I would like the policy TSA 2 to be retained - and even enhanced. The retention should achieve the desired effect of an undeveloped area as an attractive feature of the town, especially when viewed from the busy north side of the river and even higher up the the valley edge. This can be enjoyed by townspeople & visitors alike.

Conservation, we all know, is about what features we should leave for future generations and, hopefully, in perpetuity so they will thank the farseeing authorities who left Thorpe Island a green area as a conservation area and ensured the stronger implementation of this policy.
Summary: Seeks continued conservation and restriction of development for Thorpe Island.

Broads Authority response: One of a number of comments received along these lines, which are reported in support of a potential replacement policy for the island.

Anglian Water

Anglian Water has a policy on Asset Encroachment (attached) that can also be viewed: http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/encroachment.aspx

The unpredictable nature of sewage, the treatment processes which can be used and the need to protect the environment mean that sewage treatment works and sewage pumping stations have an inherent risk of causing nuisance. Although odour is likely to be the most high profile issue, nuisance may also be associated with noise, visual impact, disruption from tankers and flies.

Where incompatible development is permitted close to sewage treatment works, there is an increased risk of nuisance and a potential constraint to future extension of the asset.

Anglian Water will generally oppose development within 400 metres of the boundary of a sewage treatment works if the development will increase the number of people within that area. Pre development enquiries will indicate whether or not Anglian Water will object to development proposals. Similarly, Anglian Water will seek to safeguard an appropriate buffer zone of between 15 and 100 metres from the boundary of sewage pumping stations, the exact distance to be determined after a site specific assessment.

Summary: Highlights the need to avoid development in close proximity to sewage treatment works and sets out the company’s policy on buffer zones around these.

Broads Authority response: Noted. (The proximity to a sewage works is one of the arguments against a proposed housing allocation at Acle.)
Appendix 2 – Initial stage representations and how these were taken into account

**Anonymous**

It's a pity much of this does not seem to be in English - Legalese perhaps? So I'll help keep it simple. More benches (so we can sit and look at views). More walks by rivers. Signs as tow here a footpath is going! (sat navs are not always available). Less hostility for 'private', 'no mooring', '...off' signs. Perhaps more dog friendly places to eat and walk. It is entirely possible that I have not understood.

**Summary:** (a) Complains about the difficulty of understanding the consultation documentation. (b) Proposes a number of measures for supporting enjoyment of the Broads.

**Broads Authority response:** (a) Considerable efforts are made to make accessible and understandable what is in fact a rather complex, legalistic process. These efforts will continue and new methods will be tried. Proposed changes in regulations etc., may help remove some of the current jargon. (b) Many of these suggestions are already carried out by the Broads Authority and others in the area, although it is recognised that there is scope for more. The Site Specific Policies DPD is unlikely to be able to include this level of detail, except perhaps in relation to a specific site where it may be particularly relevant.

**British Pipeline Agency**

We confirm our original comments of 24/12/10 remain valid and bring notice that BPA request that the rights of statutory consultation on all planning matters are maintained within our pipeline Area of Interest or easement.

**Summary:** Wishes to continue to be consulted on planning matters.

**Broads Authority response:** Noted.

**British Trust for Ornithology**
Appendix 2 – Initial stage representations and how these were taken into account

Thank you for giving the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) the opportunity to respond to your consultation. On behalf of a wide partnership that includes the JNCC, Country Agencies and RSPB the BTO monitors the birds of the UK.

As we anticipate that the RSPB and NE will be replying in detail we won't be replying specifically. However our data, including the Wetland Bird Survey waterbird counts of The Broads, are available should they be required.

**Summary:** Draws attention to the potential interest of ornithological organisations in the preparation of the DPD, and the availability of dat that may inform this.

**Broads Authority response:** Noted. The preparation of options has not, to date, identified specific ornithological issues. The following phases of consultation offer the opportunity to highlight any emerging issues of this nature.

**Brundall Riverside Association**

We are writing to record our comments on the above DPD for the Riverside Estate area of Brundall.

Our general concerns for the area are :-

1) Signs and access
2) Confidence to invest
3) Confrontational bureaucracy – lack of real dialogue
4) Information for visitors
5) Tired outdated environment

The first fundamental concern is that the area must NOT be classified as a functional flood plain. The Environment Agency spent over one million pounds a few years ago constructing flood protection for the area. This protection was designed to prevent flood water from covering about 60% of the area. The remaining area of the estate is very small in terms of a flood plain & therefore
should not be considered as such. This would ensure future investment & ensure that the buildings & environment continues to be improved & maintained. Limited development of new holiday bungalows & commercial buildings must be permitted to ensure that the area does not become derelict or shabby. The planning policy of only replacement bungalows of the same size being permitted is unnecessarily restrictive. Had this policy been in existence over the past 30 years, the area would consist of run down, poorly constructed, poorly insulated buildings, none of which would meet any of the modern building regulations. Where a small bungalow on a reasonable size plot falls into disrepair, it would not be financially viable to rebuild this as holiday accommodation of the same size. A larger replacement building, or new building if built on a vacant plot, must be permitted within the existing development boundaries to attract visitors to the area. All bungalows on Riverside are built on piles with the building floor level some one metre above flood level. Therefore any effect on the flow of flood water over the area is nonexistent & there is no danger to life. Any commercial development would be within the flood protected areas so would have no impact on flooding.

The Brundall Riverside Association is keen to maintain close links and discussions with the Broads Authority, in order to assist in the development and enhancement of the Brundall Riverside Estate for the benefit of visitors, boatyards, businesses and chalet owners.

We are aware of the stated desire of the Broads Authority to enhance the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads area and to increase tourism to this area of special interest and member of the National Parks family. Our members are well placed to offer and provide services and facilities for visitors to stay, tour and enjoy the Broadland area, and to sample the special activities it can offer. The facilities available at Brundall Riverside retain visitors in the area and thereby generate more for the local economy. It can be seen throughout Broadland where businesses, public houses & tourist attractions are unable to survive through lack of income.

In order to continue to provide this service within the tourist industry, the local environment must be maintained to a standard expected by twenty-first century visitors. This requires confidence on the part of local businesses to invest without unnecessary restriction and bureaucracy, whilst being within a locally developed plan. Visitors will expect to see the waterways, boats and wildlife from comfortable, modern accommodation.

The hire fleets have been severely reduced in recent years through competition from overseas package deals and stories of overcrowded waters and poor facilities. Much of the system can only be viewed from the water & although we are aware of the new access points to the Broads system proposed by the Broads Authority, more needs to be done. Access to rivers and broads is
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poor and information scanty, more-so with the closure of Information Centres at a few of the places where the public can access waterside. Parking is also a real problem at many of the Broads, nature reserves and historical centres.

We do hope that our Association can work with the Broads Authority to maintain & improve Riverside Estate in Brundall.

Summary: Seeks a less restrictive approach to development in the area, and removal of the flood plain classification, in order to promote renewal aned investment int the area.

Broads Authority response: Noted. On site discussions have been held with the Association to better understand their concerns and suggestions. There is a fairly fundamental conflict between the Associations aspirations and national policy on flood risk which the Site Specific Policies DPD cannot alter. However, the options drafted seek to provide a greater degree of flexibility and clarity of purpose than the Local Plan policies.

Cantley Parish Council

I have been asked to write to you on behalf of Cantley Parish Council to comment on the Cantley Local Extract from the Broads Plan, the village of Cantley no longer has a general store and post office or other shops as described in the plan. We still have the bowling Green, tennis courts, Public House, Playground, Village Hall and Church.

Summary: Updates the availability of local faciltiies mentioned in the Local Plan.

Broads Authority response: Noted. (May aid assessment of options and drafting of the Site Specific Policies DPD.)

Cates, Mr David and Wolfe, Mr Robert

We are contacting you to ask that you give attention to further enforcement of TSA 2, we would most welcome more stringent conditions appplied.

Summary: Seeks continued conservation and restriction of development for Thorpe Island.
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**Broads Authority response:** One of a number of comments received along these lines, which are reported in support of a potential replacement policy for the island.

**Cator, Mr H**

Please find attached a map detailing an area of Salhouse Broad which Mr Henry Cator would like included within the Broads Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document. The area outlined in blue is proposed for mixed leisure use development. Potentially Mr Cator would look at the following uses: leisure, holiday accommodation, restaurant, sailing school, camping area and outside arena. There are no specific proposals at present, just potential ideas for the future.

**Summary:** Proposes allocation of a large piece of land for mixed leisure development.

**Broads Authority response:** This proposal is included as an option for consideration. Requests for further detail of proposals have not resulted in much clarification.

**Charles Wharton Ltd (via agent Strutt and Parker)**

We write on behalf of our client, Charles Wharton, who owns the area of land as outlined on the enclosed plan, to the south of Marsh Road in Halvergate, extending to approximately 1.46 hectares. You will note that this land is located opposite houses and various roads serving housing estates, namely Broadland Close, Carr Close and Pockthorpe, and as such we believe that it could be considered for future residential development. Halvergate is an established settlement with facilities.

**Summary:** Proposes allocation of land at Halvergate for housing development.

**Broads Authority response:** The proposal forms the basis of an option drafted for consideration as a potential policy of the DPD.

**Clarke, Mr J**
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I write in regards to the recent review of site specific policies and in particular TSA 2.

For the avoidance of doubt, TSA 2 sets out to protect Thorpe Island from development as follows:

a) Development within the existing boatyard at the eastern end of Thorpe Island, which is needed to meet the essential operational requirements of the boatyard, will be permitted.

b) Other than that specified in a), development will not be permitted on Thorpe Island.

Unfortunately, even although TSA 2 has been current policy since 1997, unauthorised development on Thorpe Island has consistently evolved since 2007 contravening enforcement and stop notices. Therefore, at the very least, I believe the current policy should remain, or alternatively I would ask that a more stringent policy is adopted to protect this valuable link between the city and the Broads.

Summary: Seeks continued conservation and restriction of development for Thorpe Island.

Broads Authority response: One of a number of comments received along these lines, which are reported in support of a potential replacement policy for the island.

Climpson, Mr A

I understand the initial consultation on Site Specific Policies has come to an end. Unfortunately I was not aware of this consultation but hope that my comments can be considered.

I believe that the current Policy TSA 2 for Thorpe Island should stand. Or should be strengthened as the existing policy is being consistently flouted. The number of cars, bicycles and pedestrians accessing the western end of the island via Thorpe Hall Close continues to grow. This traffic includes pick up cars and vans.

Summary: Seeks continued conservation and restriction of development for Thorpe Island.
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**Broads Authority response:** One of a number of comments received along these lines, which are reported in support of a potential replacement policy for the island.

**CPRE Norfolk**

Water skiing on the river Yare downriver from Brundall conflicts with nature conservation interests on RSPB land on both sides of the river and on boat users. Conservation, boating and maintaining the tranquillity of the area should take precedence over water skiing

Stokesby village would benefit from becoming a Conservation Area. This issue has been looked into before and should be looked into again. (Broadland District Council review Conservation Areas from time to time, for example.)

**Summary:** (a) Identifies the conflict between water-skiing and nature conservation and quiet enjoyment of the area. (b) Proposes a Conservation Area for Stokesby.

**Broads Authority response:** (a) Water-skiing is not something that can be directly controlled by the Site Specific Policies DPD. However the CPRE’s concerns have been passed on to the navigation officers for information. (Water-skiing arrangement have been under review in the interim.) (b) The Authority was in the process of preparing a Conservation Area for Stokesby in response to local demand, but this work was abandoned after a local vote opposed the idea.

**Crown Point Estate (via agent Ingleton Wood)**

Our client proposes the allocation of the attached site at Whitlingham Lane for mixed use development to include education/training, leisure and tourism uses.
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The site is well related to local amenities and services. It benefits from good access and is accessible by alternative modes of transport. The site is available for development and is of a reasonable size to allow for a substantial design solution. The majority of the site is brownfield and any detailed design proposed would be undertaken with full reference to the Broads Authority Design Guidance, to ensure that it is a compatible use, sympathetic to the setting.

An allocation of the site within the Site Specific Policies DPD for education/training, leisure and tourism uses would be supported by the landowners. The development of such a use at this location would be an acceptable use in terms of:

- representing an appropriate use with respect to surrounding land uses;
- being deliverable within the short term;
- providing a sustainable location, adequate access and utility infrastructure; and
- promote sustainable economic growth and local jobs.

Summary: Proposes allocation of land at Whitlingham for mixed education/training, leisure and tourism uses.

Broads Authority response: Included as an option for consideration. However, requests for further detail have as yet yielded little clarification. (It is understood further details are in preparation and will be released later.)

Ditchingham Parish Council

The Parish Council is concerned about the continuing unsatisfactory state of the Ditchingham Maltings site, and the unsafe footbridge. The Parish Council believes state of the site speaks for itself but the current two concerns are, firstly, with priority change at the Pirnhow Street junction visibility for both drivers & pedestrians coming from the village direction has to be improved by removal of materials around the perimeter of the site.

The footbridge is a matter of replacing an existing one inside the site and can only be achieved with owner's consent and goodwill.

The Parish Council would be pleased if the Planning Policy Officer could arrange to visit with the Parish Council.
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**Summary:** Raises concerns about the continuing dereliction of this site and the problems arising from this.

**Broads Authority response:** There is an existing planning permission for redevelopment of this site, but the owners have not implemented this. An option has been prepared for allocation of this site in the Site Specific Polcies DPD. (Though note there are also current negotiations for a revised planning permission for the site which may result in development before the completion of the DPD.)

**Doe, Ted and Penny**

I understand that the policy regarding Thorpe Island is being reviewed, and that you are seeking feedback from the public. I also understand that current policy states:

“Further development on Thorpe Island is considered inappropriate. Access to the island is a severe constraint. For the most part, the island forms an attractive, partly wooded, backdrop to the built-up area north of the river. The policy permits modest development to meet the needs of the existing boatyard. Further development on Thorpe Island would also extend development into the river valley.”

As residents of Thorpe Hall Close, we would like the following to be taken into consideration.

1. Access: the only vehicular access is via a very narrow private roadway from Thorpe Hall Close, over an inadequately maintained bridge across the river. Already damage has been caused in Thorpe Hall Close itself when a mechanical digger was driven across the bridge. The roadway is very close to existing residences, and any traffic across the bridge inevitably causes disturbance to those residents.

2. Thorpe Hall Close itself is unsuitable for a high volume of traffic such as increased development of the island would inevitably bring, and the junction with Yarmouth Road, together with blind bends in the close itself, would be aggravated.

3. Any increase in the number of boats moored on the island would mean increased traffic.
Appendix 2 – Initial stage representations and how these were taken into account

4. Thorpe Hall Close is unsuitable for boat-owners to park their vehicles, neither is there any other suitable parking available in the vicinity.

We are also concerned that there is already work being undertaken on the Island contrary to existing policy, and no enforcement action is being taken. To lessen the requirements would imply that the Broads Authority is taking the line of least resistance because they are unable to enforce their rules and regulations.

Summary: Seeks continued conservation and restriction of development for Thorpe Island.

Broads Authority response: One of a number of comments received along these lines, which are reported in support of a potential replacement policy for the island.

English Heritage

English Heritage has recently commented on the Broads Development Management Policies DPD and some of the suggestions we have made for that document will overlap with the policy suggestions referred to here. You will no doubt be considering how the documents relate to each other. The Site Specific Policies DPD will be place-based and we would like to suggest it could address the following matters.

1. Settlement approach

We assume that the DPD will include separate chapters for individual settlements. It would be appropriate to ensure that, in each case, the historic evolution of the settlement is understood, and that the extent and significance of the local heritage is used to inform the nature and location of future development.

2. Evidence base

We hope that characterisation of the heritage assets in each location will be undertaken as appropriate and that Conservation Area Appraisals, archaeological assessments or other baseline heritage information is integrated into the DPD. Where sites are put forward for development we trust that the Council will require appropriate archaeological information from developers so that
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potential sensitivity can be taken into account at the earliest stage. The preparation of a local list of buildings valued for their heritage interest would also be a useful element of the evidence base.

3. Historic environment and place shaping

PPS5 highlights the importance of understanding the historic environment to place shaping (para 7, paras HE3.1, HE3.4 and HE7.4). We hope that the DPD will emphasise the role of heritage assets in promoting a sense of place and seek to ensure that the design of new development respects and enhances the local heritage.

4. A positive, proactive strategy for the historic environment

Policy HE3.1 of PPS5 recommends that LDFs set out a positive, proactive strategy for the historic environment. The Site Specific Policies DPD provides the opportunity to do this by reference to the distinctive heritage assets of each settlement. We hope that the DPD will address heritage assets at risk and consider the potential for their repair and re-use.

**Summary:** Emphasises the importance of heritage assets to the preparation and presentation of the DPD.

**Broads Authority response:** The preparation and assessment of the options for the DPD has been informed by careful consideration of the importance of heritage assets in themselves and to the character of the area.

**Environment Agency**

Thank you for your consultation on the above. We are pleased to support your Authority in the production of your Local Development Framework and we welcome early consultation. In respect of your Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document (DPD), we recommend that the following general principles are taken into consideration in the drafting of the document:

**Flood Risk:**

As you are aware, the majority of the Broads Authority area is at flood risk. We are aware that flood risk policies exist within your Core Strategy and your Development Management Policies DPD submission document. We advise that existing and future
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development should fully consider flood risk and further policies may be helpful within your Site Specific Policies DPD. You may also wish to consider the flood defences in the area. We highlight that there can be no guarantee that the defences will be maintained into the future.

Water Quality:

We advise that due regard should be had to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (including the Habitats Directive) which seeks to improve the status of all watercourses to ‘good’ status and to ensure that no deterioration in water quality occurs.

Particular regard should be had to sewage disposal and it should be ensured that adequate infrastructure is in place to accommodate the additional flows from any new development. You may also wish to consider whether existing development currently using non-mains drainage systems can be connected to mains sewerage infrastructure as this can often be environmentally preferable.

Depending upon the future uses of sites, pollution control measures may be required, especially given the nature of the Broads Authority area. Particular regard should be had to development adjacent to watercourses. Further advice can be found within our pollution prevention advice and guidance which is available at: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx.

Consideration should be given to land contamination to ensure that controlled waters are protected. In such cases, site investigation and remediation may be required.

Biodiversity:

We recommend that future development protects and enhances biodiversity features. Particular consideration should be given to the protection of internationally, European and locally designated sites. Green Infrastructure should be designed into development wherever possible.

Development adjacent to watercourses:

We advise that watercourses and the riverine environment should be protected and enhanced.
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We recommend that an adequate buffer zone is maintained from the top of the bank of the river. This is required in order to both protect the ecology of the area and in order to allow access to the watercourses, if required. The buffer zone should be as large as possible in order to protect the river landscape and should be without structures, hard standing, footpaths, fences or overhanging development such as balconies and should not include domestic gardens or formal landscaping. We would advise that the buffer zone should designed and managed to develop the natural character of the watercourse.

An ecological survey may also be required to support the development of sites in close proximity to watercourses and it should be ensured that adequate mitigation measures are proposed where necessary.

Consents:

Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9 metres of the top of the bank of a ‘main river’.

Erection of flow control structures or any culverting of a watercourse requires the prior written approval of the Environment Agency under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. The Environment Agency resists culverting on nature conservation and other grounds and consent for such works will not normally be granted except for access crossings.

**Summary:** Promotes careful consideration of flood risk, water quality, biodiversity and development adjacent to watercourses in preparing the DPD.

**Broads Authority response:** These issues have been addressed in the development and assessment of the draft options for policies. There is an ecologist in the group who have prepared then sustainability appraisal of the options, and specialist advice on water quality issues has been sought where necessary.

**Flett, Mr M**

Further to our telephone conversation today, I have some comments on the papers I have read, and some suggestions on the inclusion of one or two areas not apparently included in the Ludham reference.
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There appears to be no specific reference to either the Ludham Bridge area or to How Hill and surrounding area. Both are within the parish of Ludham, and within the Broads Authority administrative area in the local extract from the Broads Authority Local Plan 1997. Both places have an increasing relevance in that visitors are being encouraged to use Ludham Bridge as a potential start point for various walks and access to the St Benet’s Abbey site, and How Hill assumes greater importance than previously in being designated as a “hub” for Broads Authority sponsored activities.

Under the heading “Ludham (Inset No 18) Background Information” 1.30.1, there is no longer a furniture making operation south of Yarmouth Road. I believe the business ceased some years ago, and the site (several single storey “sheds”) is currently unused.

Heading 1.30.5 – protection of staithes (Policy C12), there is no mention of the public staithes at Ludham Bridge and How Hill, both of which are recognised in the Ludham Enclosure Award 1802, as is Womack staith. Reference is made to the “parish” staith (properly a “public” staith) at Womack Water (1.30.2), administered by a properly constituted charity known as Womack Staith (212112). The Parish Council of Ludham is the custodian trustee of the charity.

**Summary:** Highlights the absence of references in the Local Plan to Ludham Bridge and How Hill, and updates and corrects some of the information given in the text of the Local plan.

**Broads Authority response:** The information is welcomed and may be used in drafting of the Site Specific Policies DPD. At the time of writing it appears unlikely that there will be site specific policies to Ludham Bridge or How Hill.

**Fritton and St Olave Parish Council**

1. This area has steadily deteriorated over the last thirty plus years. It now looks dreadful as an approach to St Olaves on the A143 from the South West New Cut big bridge. Anything that can be done to improve matters would be welcomed.

2. Could we as a Parish Council be sent any Planning request documents. As you rightly say it is Haddiscoe P. C. but it is actually part of St Olaves Hamlet.

I have visited the location within our Parish boundary (ST01) and have observed the following:
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Access to the policy area is along Priory Road and this is in poor condition (this road privately owned). The condition is poor and any increase in traffic of vehicles moving to the ST01 area will cause more problems.

The ST01 area viewed from the Waveney Farm area inside the parish area was difficult to determine the full extent of the state of the moorings but some of them were untidy.

None of the area visited was suitable for what the village requires, namely a shop.

Any further inspection of the location would best be done from the river by boat.

**Summary:** (a) Highlights the impact of derelict site on the approach to the village, even though it is administratively in a different parish. (b) Highlights continuing concern over the riverside moorings.

**Broads Authority response:** (a) An option identifying this land for redevelopment has been included for consideration. (Arrangement have been made for the Fritton & St. Olaves Parish Council to be consulted on any planning applications for this site outside their formal area.) (b) The problems associated with the riverside moorings are long-standing and not capable of full remediation by the Site Specific Policies DPD. An option for a site specific policy would continue the controls available through the Local Plan.

**Halvergate Parish Council**

While we appreciate the constraints of development and alterations in a conservation area, we are keen that new houses and house alterations of a sympathetic nature are not ruled out or made impossibly difficult to achieve. We have in fact had a recent planning application refused partly on the grounds of being a conservation area. We feel if development is made difficult or impossible, a museum will be created of these villages. Unlike conservation areas in more affluent parts of the country such as Gloucestershire we do not have a wealthy population or catchment area. If we become a museum village it will condemn the village to a slow death. We feel ongoing development is vital so long as it is carried out in a sensitive way.

**Summary:** Promotes the potential of new dwellings and alteratimns of dwellings in oder to avoid the village becoming ossified.
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**Broads Authority response:** Much of Halvergate is outside of the Broads. Broadland District Council is the local planning authority for most of the village. Conservation Area status does not rule out alterations or new dwellings, but does require that they conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the designated area. More generally, there is no evidence that without growth villages will 'die'. Further, there has been very considerable growth in the village in the last century. A housing development proposal has been put forward in this consultation and is an option for a site specific policy.

**Harrison, Sir M**

I only wish to make a representation relating to West Somerton. My request is that the Broads Authority should realign the development/village boundary between Staithe Road and Common Road to accord with the request of the Parish Council. Such a realignment, in my view, accords with common sense.

**Summary:** Proposes an extension to the development boundary, a long standing aspoiration of the parish Council.

**Broads Authority response:** The proposed extension is included as an option for a site specific policy, and the respondents support for this noted.

**Hoveton Parish Council**

Hoveton Parish Council are keen to express our collective decisions and opinions on the Site Specific Development Plan.

In particular: WH 4, WH 2.

**WH 4 - Land off Norwich Road (Granary Staithe)**

Hoveton Parish Council have been consistent in our opinion that this area should remain a open space and that keeping this space open and accessible to the public is an important asset on the Northbound entry into Hoveton.
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HPC have also received feedback from a significant number of residents in agreement that this space should be kept as an open space for the enjoyment of both visitors and locals.

We would however make a consideration on any development, although it is unlikely that this opinion would change.

Therefore HPC believe that this space should continue to remain as an important open space alongside the river as has been the case for many years now.

We also believe that one of the key attractions of Hoveton for visitors is the ability to escape the bustle of their everyday routine and enjoy the rural aspects that are only a short walk from the village centre.

It is also felt that there is already a significant and sufficient number of retail facilities including a wide and varied choice of restaurants and takeaways in and around the village centre.

We also believe that any further development would further dissolve the rural character that Hoveton has progressively begun to lose, due to traffic levels and further urbanisation of the immediate area.

We also agree that any development that is approved should help to improve the built environment for residents and visitors as expressed in policy WH 4.

WH 2 - Hoveton Village Centre (Station Road)

Hoveton Parish Council also believe that land referred to in policy WH 2 is the most appropriate for re-development, especially as sites in this area have become increasingly abandoned and neglected.

We have recently agreed as a council that these areas should be considered as a priority for improvement and that new development is considered as one of the main ways to achieve this.

We also suggest that these areas are preferable to any development taking place on land referred to in WH 2 (please see above).

We also propose:

Policy WH 1 - Development which increases road traffic
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We consider this policy to be unclear, especially with the current division of planning between North Norfolk District Council and the Broads Authority in Hoveton.

This policy highlights an important planning issue that outlines the need for good liaison between the Broads Authority and NNDC. It is essential that planning policy within Hoveton is consistent, and that this is key to giving local residents confidence in planning policy.

**Summary:** Sets out the Parish Council's views on the future planning of three areas within Hoveton.

**Broads Authority response:** (a) [WH4] Granary Staithe is proposed in an option to be included in an area of protected open space, which, if included in the final document, would support the Parish Council's position on the area. (This is noted in the planning assessment of this option.) (b) [WH2] The support for redevelopment in the former WH2 area is noted. The Authority is aware of the concern over the neglect and appearance of a number of buildings in the area, but both current (Local Plan) and proposed (Site Specific Policies DPD) policies support the redevelopment of these sites, and their continued decline is the result of the owners' approach to management of their lands, rather than any absence of planning policy seeking to remedy the problem. (c) [WH1] Both the Broads Authority and North Norfolk District Council, are well aware of the problems of traffic in the centre of Wroxham and Hoveton. Continued but revised wording to address the issue is included in the policy options put forward for consideration. The options for Broads site specific policies have been prepared in consultation with North Norfolk District Council officers, and that Council will continue to be formally consulted throughout the development of the DPD. It is anticipated that the two adjacent planning authorities' planning policies will continue to be different, reflecting the issues and status of their respective areas, but complementary.

**Kirby Bedon Parish Council**

With regard to the above Development Plan Document Kirby Bedon Parish Council would like to make the following comments concerning Whitlingham Country Park.
Many changes have occurred at the country park since the Broads Local Plan was published in 1997. Whitlingham Lane has recently been resurfaced and there are plans for a bridge over the River Yare which will allow more people to access the park. At the same time there has been a reduction in the number of staff employed to run the park.

Kirby Bedon Parish Council is concerned that there will be insufficient staff to deal with litter collection and with those who park along the lane instead of using the designated car parks.

There is no weight limit on the lane and the council is also concerned that heavy goods vehicles will continue to access the Whitlingham Sewage Works via the lane. In addition the improved road surface may encourage speeding and there are concerns about the dangers to pedestrians.

**Summary:** Expresses concern regarding problems related to Whitlingham Lane, and potential exacerbation of these by various changes.

**Broads Authority response:** The Parish Council's concerns are noted and are highlighted in relation to policy options relating to Whitlingham Country Park and a proposed allocation of land on the opposite side of the Lane.

**MacMillan, Mr Alastair**

I am composing this email to inform you of my feelings about the extent of damage being done to Thorpe Island.

There have been three planning applications – two denied and one withdrawn as he knew he would lose.

Since then there have been almost weekly additions to the boats moored in the “derelict boatyard” and some have people living on them. Others come and go as they please – one for instance usually stays for a week or so then goes away for a similar amount of time – then returns. The pontoons he was told to remove have multiplied and now have boats moored at all of them. How many enforcement notices have been issued and ignored? Was there a point in the planning committee making them as they had no intention or ability of backing them up.
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There is a digger on the island, trees have been chopped back, regularly there are vehicles there too – obviously belonging to the illegal houseboaters or their visitors. In my opinion TSA2 should be strengthened to legally stop these people from staying there and for the “owner” to cease and desist from doing any further damage or “work”. The local wildlife is being harmed by the actions of this individual - the moorhens have moved away (or died) for instance as they nested in the same area. There are two protected species of bats, a breeding pair of herons, ditto swans and many other creatures that make this special part of Norfolk what it is. I have lived opposite the island for 10 years and am increasingly disturbed by the slow but steady build up of activities on that lovely “protected” area. If you want the whole island to resemble the shambles/shanty town at the other end then do nothing – I am sure he will oblige. Do please feel free to contact me for any further information or pictures.

**Summary:** Seeks strengthened conservation and restriction of development for Thorpe Island.

**Broads Authority response:** One of a number of comments received along these lines, which are reported in support of a potential replacement policy for the island.

**Marsden, Mr C (Ward Councillor Great Yarmouth)**

The footpath which runs alongside Bure Park and towards Canister needs to remain and hopefully be developed in the future. We would like to see the Marina Quays (currently a derelict site) improved by the council and/or community and made use of with moorings and possible boat hire.

**Summary:** Wishes to see the Bure riverside path retained and improved, and the Marina Quays site and facilities brought back into use.

**Broads Authority response:** The Authority has no plans to close or downgrade the path within its area. The re-use or redevelopment of the Marina Quays complex is promoted in a policy option. Cllr. Marsden’s comments are reported in relation to this.
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McGovern, Dr D

I am aware that the Broads Authority is currently considering changes to the legislation already in place to prevent development on the western end of Thorpe Island. I would like to add my comments although I realise that they may be slightly late in the process.

The western end of Thorpe Island has had protected status and development has by and large not been allowed. I believe the clause in the existing legislation states that development may be allowed only if essential for the running of the boatyard on the eastern side of Thorpe Island. I believe that there has been activity in the large basin which is adjacent to the river opposite the Town House Pub which is contrary to agreed planning legislation with the development of moorings etc. I believe planning permission has been turned down several times for this site yet activity and traffic to the site still seems to be increasing. Access to the western side of the island is via a bridge which is narrow and at the end of a quiet residential cul de sac (Thorpe Hall Close).

There has been a steady increase in the traffic using the bridge and increasing activity which I believe is contrary to the planning legislation. There has been damage to the access roads by large vans and we have had increasing activity recently of illegal mooring in the cut and camping in Careys meadow. The development at river green does nothing to enhance the visual aesthetics of what formerly was a very nice area. There is now increasing evidence of rather shoddy boats and increased parking on the road which is causing obstruction to the traffic flow. It would be totally inappropriate to develop the western end of the island and ruin a site of special interest and recreation and to cause a similar general downgrading of the area. There is already evidence of general detritus including discarded lavatories and general rather unsavoury rubbish under the railway bridge at the western side of the island. This is likely to have come from the existing boats scattered round the island. I am unsure if any of these boats have permission to be moored there. The access route over the bridge at Thorpe Hall Close is totally inappropriate and any further increase in traffic should be curtailed. I would like to add my concerns to the very many which I believe you have and suggest to you that the planning restrictions be strengthened if anything to prevent development which will only result in a general downgrading of the area.

Summary: Seeks strengthened conservation and restriction of development for Thorpe Island.

Broads Authority response: One of a number of comments received along these lines, which are reported in support of a potential replacement policy for the island.
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**Natural England**

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

We welcome the opportunity to comment on the scope of this DPD, having already provided comments on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal. Evidence from the Sustainability Appraisal suggests that the Broads Authority’s approach to allocating land for development does not conflict with the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment in this unique location, or the desire to promote managed access for the public. In assessing proposed allocations within the Broads during the next stage of consultation, Natural England will be considering their implications for specific assets, including:

- Nature 2000 network sites – the Broads Special Area of Conservation; Broadland SPA and Ramsar; Breydon Water SPA and Ramsar; Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA, and Winterton to Horsey Dunes SAC

- Protected landscapes - The Norfolk Coast and Suffolk Coast and Heaths Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; the Broads as a member of the National Park family

- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (28 SSSIs within the Broads)

- Protected species [including the requirement for adequate survey effort and appropriate mitigation]

- Regionally Important Geological Sites, County Wildlife Sites etc. [Given their vital role in green infrastructure provision, and the pressures associated with planned growth in this area through the Joint Core Strategy, development likely to have a significant adverse effect on regionally or locally designated sites should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances]

- Coherent wider biodiversity and habitat networks, with particular regard to adaptation by species to climate change, and the need for BAP habitat re-creation to compensate for losses elsewhere

- Natural processes and systems, particularly coastal, flooding and surface water drainage
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- National Trails and important recreational assets

All allocations should be consistent with the core strategy, and the sites selected should meet the environmental criteria and other broad principles established in the core strategy. In considering issues and options for individual site allocations, the environmental implications and constraints associated with each potential site should be considered against the provisions of the Habitats Directive and relevant national planning policies.

The Site Specific Policies DPD should also consider the policy requirement for enhancement of the natural environment, through promoting the creation, extension and improved management of priority habitats identified in local Biodiversity Action Plans (e.g. floodplain grazing marsh and reedbeds). To this end, development should not be targeted where opportunity areas have been identified for new habitat creation or new green infrastructure provision.

**Summary:** Stresses the importance of the conservation of the natural environment to the preparation of the DPD, highlights the designated areas within the Broads, and promotes consistency with the Core Strategy and ensuring that site specific policies are assessed for their impacts on, and potential contribution to enhancement of, identified habitats.

**Broads Authority response:** Assessment of the natural environment implications of the emerging options has been central to the process of developing the potential site specific options. This has included the input of specialists including an ecologist to the sustainability appraisal of the options. Natural England will have further opportunities to comment on proposed options and the submitted DPD.

**Norwich City Council**

Thank you for consulting Norwich City Council on the Site Specific Development Plan Document that the authority is intending to produce. We have no suggestions for sites to be contained within the plan, but we would like to be kept informed about the plan as it develops. In particular we would like to be kept informed about sites put forward adjacent to the city council boundary.

The pre-application advice notes for developers at the Deal Ground and Utilities sites identifies land ownership which may be of use. This identifies site ownership details in Appendix 2 (see page 20):
The developer for the Utilities site will no doubt become involved in this plan: the consultant representing the site owner is Paul Knowles. Although I'm sure the Broads is in contact with Paul through the ongoing work at the Deal Ground and Utilities sites his contact details are below. (see note).

**Summary:** Wishes to be kept informed of the progress of the DPD preparation but has no specific suggestions at this point. Makes a number of comments in relation to the Utilities site.

**Broads Authority response:** Norwich City Council will be formally consulted at each public consultation stage,. In addition to any informal updates in the course of joint working on a number of fronts. The Utilities Site is one of the options for a site specific policy, and the draft wording of this is based on the 'pre-application advice note' referred to in the response.

**Norwich Frostbite Sailing Club**

We would recommend the following three topics as being suitable for consideration for site-specific attention.

The urban fringe of Norwich

Paragraph 5.4 of the document contains a clear reference to the different landscape character of the urban fringe of major settlements. We support this reference as area is clearly so very different from the wider rural area that constitutes the Broads Executive Area.

An important part of this policy document will be showing clearly how the priority to be given the development of brownfield sites will play out in practice.

Thorpe St Andrew
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The process of identification of settlements suitable for designation for general development must surely include Thorpe St Andrew. This forms part of the largest settlement adjoining the Broads LDF area and clearly has capacity to deliver significant sustainable development compatible with the aims of the wider LDF.

Any designation of development boundaries or identification of sites for development should specifically include the land east of Girling’s Lane, Thorpe St Andrew and occupied by the NFSC car park and two adjoining gardening operations for the following reasons.

1. These are brownfield sites.

2. They lie on the edge of a major settlement (Norwich)

3. They are surrounded on three sides by existing development.

4. The sites lie on a major public transport route between Norwich City Centre and the Broadland Business Park.

Land at Girling’s Lane, Thorpe St Andrew

Taking into account these points we would go on to recommend that these sites be the subject of a site specific policy reference. This policy would incorporate the following criteria.

1. Creation of a high quality residential development on the majority of the site.

2. The formation to the southern end of the site of a new landscaped car park for the Norwich Frostbite Sailing Club (and others).

3. Ensuring that any development here is in accordance with the wider LDF and other local and national design guidance.

In conclusion, we would see no difficulty with combining these three subject areas provided that each is given proper consideration in their own right.

Summary: Proposes the allocation of land at Yarmouth Road, Thorpe, for housing development.
Broads Authority response: The site referred to is included as an option for a site specific allocation, and the agent's arguments in support of this proposed development reported in relation to this.

Norwich Powerhouse LLP (via agents CGMS Consulting)

I write on behalf of my client, Norwich Powerhouse LLP, in response to your invitation to comment on the content of the Site Specific Policies document, and especially to make suggestions as to sites or areas that need special treatment, allocation or protection, and any local issues that would be helped by having such site specific policies.

As I am sure you will be aware, my client has already had a number of meetings with your officers, and with officers of Norwich City Council, to discuss the future of the area known as Utilities Site, which lies on the north bank of the River Wensum immediately to the east of the Norwich-London railway bridge. The site has been shortlisted for allocation for mixed use development in the Norwich LDF and is the subject of a pre-application briefing note prepared jointly by officers from the two authorities (and South Norfolk and Norfolk County Councils) in August 2010. A number of studies have been commissioned by the authorities to identify the site constraints and issues which need to be addressed in any development proposal.

I attach an extract from the Norwich Site Allocations DPD which shows the boundaries of the shortlisted site Utilities Site M014, on which is shaded the area which falls within the remit of your authority. The basis of this representation is that the whole area should be allocated for a mixed use development.

The shared objective of the partner authorities is stated as being 'the delivery of sustainable and comprehensive regeneration of the Deal Ground and Utilities sites, to support employment and housing growth in the wider Norwich area'. It is essential that incremental development proposals do not prejudice the wider benefits of comprehensive regeneration for the area.

The site in question has been used in the past for power stations and gas infrastructure. These buildings have been demolished and the site is largely redundant, though some of the electricity and gas infrastructure will need to be retained in the long term. The gas holder is redundant. The western part of the site within the Broads Authority area is mainly occupied by hard standings associated with the former buildings and structures, while the eastern part is partially re-vegetated with scrub species. The banks of
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the Wensum are engineered. Redevelopment of the site provides a major opportunity to remediate and re-use a strategically important area of brownfield land and to open up public access to stretches of the River Wensum.

Master planning of the site is currently underway with the aim of producing a scheme which will be entirely compatible with adopted and emerging planning policy and which will be of regional importance. The main elements of the scheme are likely to include:

- energy generation from renewable resources;
- a visitor centre based around energy, environmental and climatic change themes;
- employment uses, including affordable housing;
- water-based activities.

An access strategy is also under development which will focus on the use of non-private transport, including the use of rail for fuel delivery and dedicated public transport services for employees and visitors. One of the accesses to the site would be from Trowse over the Deal Ground, which would require a bridge over the River Wensum, details of which are being discussed your colleagues.

If the comprehensive redevelopment of the area including the Deal Ground and Utilities Site is to be secured, it will be important to ensure that the inter-relationships between the sites are recognised in the Local Development Frameworks of both the City Council and Broads Authority and that strategic objectives for enhancing the river corridor, improving access by all modes and securing integrated and sustainable development are met.

The Norwich draft site allocations document identified some key objectives for the site as follows:

- the development must be energy efficient, deliver a high quality local environment, incorporate sustainable access arrangements and flood protection measures, and protect and enhance natural assets
- a new pedestrian/cycle/vehicular bridge over the River Wensum, to link with the Deal Ground, is a key requirement of comprehensive development. This bridge must be in place prior to substantial development on either site.
- development proposals must pay particular attention to enhancement of the river frontage of the Deal Ground.
Appendix 2 – Initial stage representations and how these were taken into account

Our proposals for a mixed use development on the site will meet these objectives and will be in conformity with the Broads Core Strategy. In particular the development will make a positive contribution in terms of the following policies:

- the protection and enhancement of navigable water space (CS3);
- securing reductions in greenhouse gas emissions (CS8);
- strengthening the local economy and tourism base and protecting waterside employment sites (CS9/CS11/CS22);
- enhancing a gateway to the Broads (CS10);
- provision of visitor moorings (CS14);
- promotion of sustainable transport (CS16).

The proposals will promote the work of the Broads Authority in the sustainability arena. An assessment has been carried out using the methodology employed by your authority in appraising its draft Development Management Policies DPD and is attached.

**Summary:** Promotes allocation of site for mixed uses, and coordination with the development of the Deal Ground site, etc, outside the Broads area. Draws attention to the East Norwich 'pre-application advice note', and emerging policy in Norwich City, etc.

**Broads Authority response:** Allocation of the Utilities Site for mixed use is an option for consideration for the Site Specific Policies DPD. The wording of the option is based on the 'pre-application advice note', and specifically refers to the potential for a comprehensive development for the sites which straddle several planning authority boundaries.

**Norwich Rivers Heritage Group**

Below is the NRHG response to the proposed development of the Deal Ground. One of the aspects of the scheme which we find particularly brutal is the treatment of the river bank downstream of Trowse Rail Bridge. It is completely urbanised with 8 storey blocks built very close to the river’s edge. Also it is extremely regrettable that the opportunity to provide a good sized marina with all
the proper facilities has been missed. Such a marina would be an enormous asset to tourists visiting the Broads and the City by boat.

Norwich Rivers Heritage Group has had a long-standing interest in this particular site, having originally been instrumental in raising the profile of both the Deal Ground and Utilities sites and carrying out research and public consultation between 2004 and 2009. Our group was also the local steering group for the successful Norwich Connect2 bid before the formation of the local-authority led group and subsequent River Gateway project delivery team. A special meeting was held on 31st March 2011 to consider the NRHG's response to the above planning application for the Deal Ground, and I am forwarding the group's summarised response is as follows:

1. In the context of the aspirations of Connect2, while the crucial Wensum crossing is delivered, it is not acceptable that there is not planned any direct connection across the River Yare from the Deal Ground to Whittingham Park. This lack of connection greatly erodes the stated key objective of Connect2 of linking the city centre to the park, and it means in particular that pedestrians and wheelchair users would have to make an extremely inconvenient detour via Trowse Street to gain access to the park. This serious deficiency could have been overcome by the inclusion of a simple pedestrian bridge over the Yare at an appropriate position, and we would in any case expect any developer to be required to include such a bridge.

2. Members of our group have considerable direct experience of the drainage conditions on the Deal Ground, which have frequently flooded, and frankly there can be no confidence in any consultant who state that there is 'no historical evidence of flooding'. The base water levels on the site are affected by intermittent surge of water both from its open connection to the sea and from the river catchments. The application contains a lengthy 'flood risk analysis', but we have no confidence in these findings because it seems to ignore the reality that the site is part of a flood plain and frequently floods uncontrollably to a high datum level.

3. Irrespective of what is eventually built on the north bank of the Wensum, the proposed height of the buildings on Wensum Riverside is totally unacceptable and inappropriate for the river gateway. This gateway forms the transitional zone between the Broads and the city, the hard edge of which (when seen from the river) should be marked by the line of railway swing bridge. The buildings in this sensitive location on the Deal Ground should certainly be no more than two to three storeys and also set back...
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much further from the river's edge by means of a green strip and raised bank, to create a soft rather than completely urbanised river bank. We enclose a comparison of NRHG's original architect's proposal (showing low-rise development set well back) with the Lanpro proposals (showing excessively high blocks which would undoubtedly canyonise a potentially beautiful stretch of river in a brutal fashion).

4. The lateral extent of the building cover is also completely unacceptable in the context of the site. There is a major incursion onto the western side of the existing marsh shown, and also a large zone of building planned over existing undeveloped marshland abutting the western bank of the River Yare (SE of the proposed marina).

This land should never be developed.

5. Taking into account the group's previous research in Friesland, the proposed marina is nothing like large enough to provide an attractive stretch of water to allow craft of sufficient size to use the moorings. We would prefer to see this increased in plan size by a factor of 2 to 4 towards the order of scale shown on our original layout proposals as enclosed.

6. Notwithstanding the assessments done by the developer's team, members of the group expressed significant misgivings about the long-term prospects for retention of natural habitats given the proposed density of the development (the effect on the wildlife of Carrow Abbey Marsh will be fairly devastating).

7. Similarly, there is no confidence in how the traffic impacts on the Trowse area have been represented, because of various unrealistic assumptions that have been made about car ownership and travel behaviour. As it stands, and even if significantly curtailed by planning control, the proposed development is regarded by our group as commercial opportunism at an extreme level, and a very long way from representing a genuinely sustainable solution on this important site. We request that the application should be rejected, for any one or all of the reasons listed above.

**Summary:** Promotes a coordinated approach across the local planning authority boundaries for the Utilities and Deal Graod sites to foster comprehensive and sustainable development.

**Broads Authority response:** The Utilities site is subject of a site specific option to allocate this land for development. The wording for this draft policy is based in large part upon the 'pre-application advice note' coordinated by Norwich City Council, and specifically
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addresses the desirability of a comprehensive scheme ensuring the development of this site and the Deal Groaund asite outside the Broads is complementary.

Saunders, Mr G (BLAF)

I'd like to see the proposed three rivers way footpath given some priority to drive it ahead.

Summary: Promotes the inclusion of the proposed Three Rivers Way footpath in the DPD.

Broads Authority response: The Three Rivers Way project is not sufficiently advanced or certain to be simply identified or promoted in the Site Specific Policies DPD, and regrettably there are not sufficient resources available for the preparation of the document to allow development of the path proposals to be undertaken as part of this work.

Somerton Parish Council

Somerton Parish Council requests that this Parish be included for special policy treatment based upon the existing information contained on page 191 of the Broads Local Plan – Adopted Version May 1997, with the following additional points, viz:-

25.1 Include reference to National and International Wildlife importance (Ramsar site).
25.2 No changes.
25.3 Include the South side of Common Road in the mention of sporadic development.
25.4 Please note that the Lion Public House is now closed and that the Post Office also has closed.
25.5 No changes.
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25.6 Somerton Parish Council requests that the Parish retains the defined development boundary, but that it is modified to include the parcel of land pertaining to ‘The Firs’, Staithe Road.

25.7 No changes, but perhaps mention should be made of the recently new Broads Authority 24 hrs moorings close to the Village Staithe.

Can we also include mention of the Grade 2 listed ‘Somerton Mill’, approximately 200 yards from the Authority’s moorings along the Public Footpath. The Parish also has the part thatched roof of St. Mary’s Church, together with the Georgian Burnley Hall, although both buildings are outside the Broads Authority Executive area.

Further to our earlier correspondence Somerton Parish Council requests that the presently defined development boundary be modified to include the parcel of land on the South side of Staithe Road up to the end of Staithe Road and following the East side of the dyke (running North to South) to incorporate the ‘Firs’ garden (Mr and Mrs Grimmer) plus the two narrow strips of land pertaining to Staithe Road residents on which green houses, sheds and gardens are at present.

We have marked the amended boundary line in red on the copy of the map provided.

**Summary:** Promotes extension of the development boundary for West Somerton. Also suggests a number of changes, updates and additions to the text currently in the Local Plan.

**Broads Authority response:** The proposed development boundary extension is included as a policy option for consideration for inclusion in the DPD. The text suggestions will be considered for inclusion in the later development of the DPD.

**South Walsham Parish Council**

South Walsham Parish councillors feel that the following should be included in the DPD for South Walsham:

1. Re-opening of public toilets in Fleet Lane to support tourism in the area.

2. Protection of public moorings in Fleet Dyke.
3. Ensuring public access to the Broad.

**Summary:** Propose several aspects of improving public access to and use of the area.

**Broads Authority response:** Although the Parish Council's suggestions are good ones, the limited powers and resources associated with the preparation of their DPD preclude implementing the reopening of the toilets or ensuring public access. The Authority as Navigation Authority is keen to see the retention of public moorings, and will continue to cooperate with local interests to help facilitate this, but it is not a particularly appropriate subject for the Site Specific Policies DPD.

**Sport England**

We do not wish to put forward specific sites for consideration for allocation, or comment on particular settlements that may be suitable for development or for an extension of development boundaries.

However, we have a statutory role in relation to the protection of playing fields; therefore if any site is put forward for development that includes a playing field, the designation should only be supported if it is clear that one of the exceptions identified in Sport England’s policy ‘A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England’ can be met.

The policy states that Sport England will oppose the granting of planning permission for any development which would lead to the loss of, or prejudice the use of, all or any part of a playing field, or land last used as a playing field or land allocated for use as a playing field in an adopted or draft deposit plan, unless, in the judgement of Sport England, one of the specific circumstances applies. The specific circumstances are:

E1 – A carefully quantified and documented assessment of current and future needs has demonstrated to the satisfaction of Sport England that there is an excess of playing field provision in the catchment, and the site has no special significance to the interests of sport

E2 – The proposed development is ancillary to the principal use of the site as a playing field or playing fields, and does not affect the quantity or quality of pitches or adversely affect their use
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E3 – The proposed development affects only land incapable of forming, or forming part of, a playing pitch, and does not result in the loss of, or inability to make use of any playing pitch (including the maintenance of adequate safety margins), a reduction in the size of the playing area of any playing pitch or the loss of any other sporting/ancillary facility on the site.

E4 – The playing field or playing fields which would be lost as a result of the proposed development would be replaced by a playing field or playing fields of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to the commencement of development.

E5 – The proposed development is for an indoor or outdoor sports facility, the provision of which would be of sufficient benefit to the development of sport as to outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of the playing field or playing fields.

Similarly, with regard to any allocations that affect any other existing indoor or outdoor sports facilities (e.g. sports halls, swimming pools, tennis courts, bowling greens etc), Sport England would only support such allocations if any subsequent detailed policy required replacement facilities to be provided of equivalent or better quantity, quality and accessibility prior to the loss of the existing facility.

The above policy requirements are in line with both Sport England policy and national planning guidance in PPG17 (Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation 2002).

**Summary:** Sets out Sports England's approach to the protection of playing fields.

**Broads Authority response:** None of the options promoting development involves the loss of playing fields. There is, though, one option which involves allocating land for additional playing fields (at Acle).

**The Coal Authority**

Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.

**Summary:** No comment to make.
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**Broads Authority response:** Noted.

**Upton with Fishley Parish Council**

Upton Parish councillors feel the following should be included in the DPD for Upton:

1. Prohibition of any development on the parish staithe at Upton dyke.
2. Protection of the moorings at Upton dyke, including regular dredging.
3. Protection of the grazing marshes and Norfolk Wildlife Trust land around the Broads.

**Summary:** Wishes to see the parish staithe, Upton Dyke and grazing marshes protected.

**Broads Authority response:** The policies of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies are considered to give adequate protection to most of the areas such as those the Parish Council mention. The dredging of the Broads is undertaken by the Authority under its powers and responsibilities as Navigation Authority, and the Site Specific Policies DPD is not the most appropriate vehicle to address this issue.

**Warren, Mr Trevor**

I understand that it is not yet too late to make comments on certain aspects of the new replacement for the Broads Local Plan. I do hope so! My records show that Andrea Long sent an e-mail on 1st April to the effect that this DPD had been submitted to the Secretary of State on 31st March following receipt of public comments. Indeed, I had written to the Broads Authority on 15th July 2010 with some general comments on the subject of moorings, both recreational and residential. I did not pick up from Andrea's e-mail about the examination meetings on 12-14th July. In any case, I had thought that the new version of the Local Plan would be generic rather than site-specific, and saw no need to comment until the final draft was published for perusal. It now seems that
certain sections may in fact be site-specific - including the old TSA2 section. If this is so, I would wish to emphasise most strongly my view that there should be no weakening of the protection given to Thorpe Island. This is an important and sensitive area on the approach to Norwich from the Broads, with implications for both conservation and cultural heritage. If anything (and with the benefit of hindsight as to the changes that have been wrought on the island), I would urge even stronger protection. The Authority files contain much on these aspects of planning considerations for this area, but I would be pleased to repeat some of the outline of the arguments if it would help. I write both as an affected householder and on behalf of the Thorpe Preservation Group.

**Summary:** Seeks strengthened conservation and restriction of development for Thorpe Island. Also expresses confusion about the sequencing of consultation on the various Broads planning documents.

**Broads Authority response:** Mr. Warren was contacted to clarify relationship between the various consultations he had received, and that his comments about Thorpe Island would be considered in relation to the Site Specific Policies DPD preparation. His comments about Thorpe Island are among a number received along these lines, which are reported in support of a potential replacement policy for the island.

**Wickham, Sue**

In reference to the proposed review of Site Specific Policies I hope you will not mind if I express my experience and concerns regarding Policy TSA2. As a resident of Yarmouth Road my property backs on to the river Yare and Thorpe Island. I have watched with alarm as activity on the Island has increased, despite the repeated protests of local property owners.

I understand that the current policy does not allow development of the Island save for development at the eastern end to meet 'essential operational requirements'. Presumably the policy has stated that further development is 'considered inappropriate' because of the restricted access ('severe constraint'), the danger of the railway and the fact that it lies within the Thorpe St. Andrew Conservation area.

I have to say that continued developments on and around the island along with the potential threat posed by a review of the policy is very unsettling and I would be most grateful for your assurances that the policy will not undergo a change that would further harm the interests of local residents. These are my reasons:
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1. Access to the site is unsatisfactory, causing damage to an old bridge and inconvenience to householders on the approach road. Heavy machinery has been taken over the bridge and we are not sure it is strong enough to withstand such usage.

2. A lack of sanitation must surely be of concern with regards health and safety

3. Continued and increased activity will further damage the wildlife habitat

4. The railway line surely presents a hazard.

5. Broads Authority policies have already been flouted. Any lessening of the laws could result in further unwanted development in this CONSERVATION AREA. Local residents paid a premium on houses in this part of Thrope St Andrew. It would be unfair to implement changes that would have a detrimental effect on investments made in good faith.

6. Existing tenants in the area abide by the planning laws. When I purchased my property I approached the Authority with plans to construct an office in my garden. My application was turned down and I did not build the office. I am aware that neighbours have also abided by the planning laws. In view of our compliance, I feel that our rights should be protected.

I would be most grateful if this policy could be tightened to prevent further development on this special site.

**Summary:** Seeks strengthened conservation and restriction of development for Thorpe Island.

**Broads Authority response:** One of a number of comments received along these lines, which are reported in support of a potential replacement policy for the island.

**Woodbastwick Parish Council**

Woodbastwick Parish councillors feel that the following should be included in the DPD for Ranworth and Woodbastwick:

1. Protection of the land adjacent to Ranworth Broad to retain access for residents and tourists, including maintenance of the staithe area.
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2. Restrictions to development in the parishes so as to retain the natural landscape where important habitats have evolved.

**Summary:** Promote protection and maintenance of Ranworth Staithe and more generally restriction of development to retain natural landscape.

**Broads Authority response:** The policies of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies provide general protection and promotion of the types of access and conservation the Parish Council refers to, and it is not considered necessary at this time to have specific individual site policies for these.

**Woods, Capt. C**

Once small contribution I made to the previous plan was to suggest the production of a CD to be given to all new boat hirers on the Broads, giving some information and advice.

I was pleased to see that a CD was produced and I picked up a copy at Reedham. It was what I had hoped for, and was well produced although from a retired mariner’s point of view I think the boat handling aspect might have been extended, however, it is a good introduction to the Broads on several levels.

Having been involved with the concept of the idea I have taken every opportunity to ask holiday makers on hired craft whether they had received a copy and what they thought of it.

Results varied from not having heard of it, not having been offered a copy by their particular hire company, to being delighted with the CD and having found it a useful and helpful guide to being afloat on the Broads.

Basically – those that had received a copy gave it the thumbs-up and thought it was a good idea.

I wonder whether you might have had some feedback from the hire companies, the visitors, and the Broads Rangers about this CD, and whether any holiday makers involved in incidents/accidents afloat had seen a copy beforehand. Such feedback would probably be useful for this consultancy.
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**Summary:** Discusses the merits and distribution of an information CD for boat hirers.

**Broads Authority response:** The comments do not appear to relate to the development plan, and have been passed to the Authority's Boat Safety staff for consideration.
APPENDIX 4: This appendix sets out the representations received in response to the consultation of the Broads ‘Draft Site Specific Policies: Issues, Options and Preferred Options’ which took place 23 February to 5 April 2012.

The representations have been divided into comments on each settlement, draft policy, or supporting document. For each the original wording of the representation is given, followed by a Broads Authority officer summary, then the response to the representation (including changes to Draft Policies, etc.) agreed recommended to the Broads Authority by its officer.
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(in alphabetical order)

ACLE

ACL/DSSP-a Acle - Cemetery Extension [Successor Recommended Policy – PP/ACL 1]

Acle Parish Council Representation:
The Parish Council proposes to extend the existing adjacent cemetery. The Parish Council has taken the following steps towards the project:

* written to all the landowners around Acle asking to buy some land for a cemetery. No positive replies were received.
* commissioned an environmental audit of the proposed site, which was submitted to the Environment Agency.
* two trial pits were dug, 3 metres deep, one in the northern part of the existing cemetery and one in the adjacent recreation centre land to the east. The Environment Agency has confirmed no further monitoring of the site is needed for suitability for burials.
* obtained an up-to-date map of the existing cemetery and compared with the burial records to identify unmarked graves. It is expected that the cemetery will be full in less than 5 years' time.
* taken legal advice on the procedure for a negotiated sale or, if necessary, compulsory purchase order.

The Parish Council hopes to purchase the land from the landowner, rather than resort to a compulsory purchase order. The Council is meeting with Mr Hooper of Brown & Co in April to instruct him to negotiate with the landowner to try to secure a sale. The Council has agreed that the land required is as shown on the attached map, considerably reduced from the first correspondence. This takes a straight line across from the current recreation centre land and would be a practical shape to enable efficient farming by the
owner of the remaining land. The land is the best place for a cemetery extension. Residents are proud of the cemetery and it is much visited. Acle is a popular retirement village and the planned new housing on Springfield and between the Norwich Road and Mill Lane will result in a further 200 houses. The population will grow and there will be a need for more burial space and for ashes plots. The proposed land would be fenced and a line of trees and hedging plants planted on the north, east and west sides. It is thought that the current, established trees on the north boundary of the current cemetery would be maintained, with a roadway cut through between the trees to the new cemetery. There would be space to consider a turning circle within the new cemetery to allow the turning of the hearse, freeing up the existing small car park for the cars of the bereaved family. Some additional planting of trees could be considered in the north-west point to integrate the land into the landscape and to create a small copse. The Council is happy to undertake an archaeological survey as required.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
The Parish Council's letter is part of a correspondence on the progress of its proposals, and is taken as a representation indicating:
1) That the Parish Council supports the allocation of the site for a cemetery;
2) The Parish Council has demonstrated commitment to, and potential feasibility of the project, but does not have ownership of the site and the timescale for resolution of this matter is uncertain;
3) Details of the site area proposed have been amended from those previously under discussion, and proposed boundary treatment clarified.

Broads Authority Response:
The representation supports the Policy in general, and gives further confidence as to its practicality and the Parish Council’s commitment to implementation. The reduced site area lessens the uncertainty and potential difficulties associated with the proposal, and the policy site area is reduced accordingly. The outstanding issue of the ownership, and the Parish Council’s endeavours to resolve this, are noted. [Successor Policy – PP/ACL 1]

ACL/DSSP-a Acle - Cemetery Extension [Successor Policy – PP/ACL 1]

Broadland District Council Representation:
The provision of such community facilities is supported. The ‘summary planning rationale’ refers to the likelihood that only part of the area will be developed for a cemetery in the medium term, and that it is envisaged that implementation may involve compulsory purchase. If it is felt that the allocation of the entire area is not justifiable at this time, it might be appropriate to consider whether an allocation be made to meet needs in the short and medium-term, with land reserved for future expansion in the longer-term, and subject to consideration of the needs at that time.
Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Supports the provision of such community facilities. Queries the immediate allocation of the whole site originally identified.

Broads Authority Response:
The District Council’s support is noted. The area proposed is now reduced, following the Parish Council’s review and clarification of its intentions.

ACL/DSSP-a Acle - Cemetery Extension  [Successor Policy – PP/ACL 1]

Environment Agency Representation:
In order to protect the water environment, we generally we would require the following basic controls to be implemented with regard to cemetery extension proposals:

- 250m minimum distance from potable groundwater supply source;
- 30m minimum distance from watercourse or spring;
- 10m minimum distance from field drains;
- no burials into standing water, with a minimum of 1m unsaturated ground below the base of the coffin.

As a minimum, a basic Tier 1 risk screening assessment is required for all cemetery extensions. Details can be found in our guidance book ‘Assessing the Groundwater Pollution of Cemetery Developments’, which is a free publication downloadable from our website (http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/). The Tier 1 assessment is primarily a desk study and should include amongst other things, published information regarding the geology and hydrogeology (groundwater levels across the site including seasonality). An assessment of the hazard(s) should be made, potential pathways and receptors should be identified and reviewed, and a qualitative assessment undertaken of the significance of the risks posed, for example, high, intermediate or low. Depending upon the results of this initial assessment, a Tier 2 investigation may also be required. The burial of human remains results in the release of a variety of substances and organisms into the subsurface. These may, in time, find their way into the groundwater. Hence, groundwater can be at risk of pollution from human burials where the numbers are sufficient and the protection afforded by the subsurface geology is poor. Although this is an extension to an existing cemetery, which has not caused any known pollution, this is not in itself adequate evidence to rule out the extension causing pollution. Our usual position would be to object to any planning application which did not provide this basic Tier 1 information. Without further information (as a minimum a Tier 1 risk assessment) including details relating to the proposed number/rate of burials, we are unable to confirm the suitability of the site for use as a cemetery extension. However, in this instance, we note that we have previously been contacted by Acle Parish Council regarding the development of the site. This included some site investigation work. Following review of the information submitted to us, we generally accept the principle of the proposed land use in this location. However, please be aware that, should the details submitted with any future planning application differ from those already given to us, our advice may change. This issue will require
consideration through any future planning application. We suggest that this is referenced within the policy in a similar way to the requirement for an archaeological assessment.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
States that EA generally accepts the suitability of the site for cemetery use in terms of water environment protection, but cautions that this assessment is based on some site investigation information previously provided. Highlights that the Agency’s stance may change if future information, accompanying a planning application for this use, were to differ from that already assessed. Also sets out the Agency’s normal requirements and justifications for investigation and approval of cemetery extensions in terms of water environment protection. It is implied that the Agency’s requirements of information in support of a planning application are more onerous than the investigative work carried out to date.

Broads Authority Response:
Notes the Environment Agency’s general acceptance for a cemetery extension use, and its caveat regarding approval of any future planning application. The Agency’s general acceptance on the basis of earlier site investigations is considered adequate basis for allocation of the site, but a note is added to justification of the Policy to draw attention to the caveat and the Agency’s requirements. (A copy of the Agency’s comments on this Policy have been sent to Acle Parish Council for information.)

ACL/DSSP-a Acle - Cemetery Extension [Successor Policy – PP/ACL 1]

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No safeguarded features.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Advises no minerals or waste safeguarding affecting for this site.

Broads Authority Response: Noted.

ACL/DSSP-b Acle - Acle Playing Field Extension [Successor Policy – PP/ACL 2]

Acle Parish Council Representation:
The Acle War Memorial Recreation Centre is promoting the playing field extension but the application is supported unanimously by the Parish Council. They have asked us to reply to your points as follows: The purchase of this land will be part of the negotiations by the Parish Council referred to above. The attached map shows the land required, significantly reduced from the original submission. It is determined by the existing rectangular plot of recreation land purchased some years ago. It leaves a straight line
for the farmer to farm his land efficiently. The land would be fenced and a line of trees and hedging planted to match the boundary of the cemetery extension. The village needs additional recreational facilities. There are currently four senior football teams and one ladies team and it is wished to provide space for junior teams. The land would also be used as a practice area for the 75 teenagers involved in cricket in the village. The land would also provide much needed open space for unstructured play for local residents. Broadland District Council has stated in the past that Acle is short of play space for the number of residents. This extra land would address that need. Additional open space would provide a facility for recreational play, open space and community use. The Recreation Centre and Social Club is the hub of the village and popular with local families. There are plans at present to use the last remaining unallocated space at the Recreation Centre land for a skate park and zip wire, for teenagers. A planning application is to be submitted shortly to BDC.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
The Parish Council unanimously supports the draft policy. Further details of the proposals are provided, including a reduction in area from that previously discussed, relationship to the adjacent proposed cemetery extension, and potential boundary treatment. Details of the need for additional sports area and intended provision are also provided.

Broads Authority Response:
The Parish Council’s support, clarifications and amendments give further confidence that the draft policy is appropriate, but should be amended to reflect the smaller area now proposed.

ACL/DSSP-b Acle - Acle Playing Field Extension [Successor Policy – PP/ACL 2]

Broadland District Council Representation:
The provision of such community facilities is supported. The policy refers to the development being ‘subject to clarification of the extent of the land required and likelihood of implementation’, and a similar reference is made in the Summary Planning Rationale. I would suggest that the final policy makes it clear what the requirement is, with explanatory justification in the supporting text.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Supports the provision of such facilities. Looks for clarification of approach to area, etc.

Broads Authority Response:
The District Council’s support for the provision of such facilities is noted. The proposals have subsequently been clarified. The Policy reflects this, and no longer includes the ‘open-ended’ section that concerned the District Council.

ACL/DSSP-b Acle - Acle Playing Field Extension [Successor Policy – PP/ACL 2]
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Your SFRA defines this area as ‘extent of flooding uncertain’. Our Flood Map shows it to fall partly within flood zones 2 and 3. However, playing fields are likely to be defined as a ‘water-compatible’ land use in the Technical Guidance to the NPPF and therefore considered an acceptable land use in areas at risk from flooding.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Proposed use considered acceptable in flood risk terms.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Acceptability of the proposed use to EA in flood risk terms noted.

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: Partially on safeguarded sand and gravel resource. As this is for a playing field extension it is considered to be exempt from CS16 so long as no permanent buildings were proposed.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Site is partially on safeguarded mineral resources. No objection to allocation, in light of proposed use, provided no permanent buildings are proposed.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Relation to safeguarded minerals, and qualified lack of objection noted. Reference to these included in justification.

**Sport England Representation:**
Sport England supports the enhancement of this existing sport facility in principle, as it presumably will meet an identified local need for additional sports pitch provision in the local area. We would advise that if additional pitches are provided there may well be a need to enhance ancillary facilities such as changing rooms and car parking/access, in order to cater for the more intensive use of this site, unless the existing facilities are adequate to accommodate this additional demand.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the sport facility enhancement in principle. Highlights that additional pitches may give rise to additional changing rooms and other ancillary facilities.
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**Broads Authority Response:**
Support noted, as is the suggested potential need for additional ancillary facilities. The landscape and minerals safeguarding constraints of the site mean that ancillary facilities would primarily need to be accommodated within the existing area of the sports centre. The Recreation Centre Trust has since confirmed that the additional changing rooms and any other facilities will be accommodated within the existing Recreation Centre grounds.

**BECCLES**

**General comment Beccles**

**Waveney District Council Representation:**
Section 3.3.3, Second Paragraph: States that Beccles “is the focus of significant housing growth” - Beccles has experienced significant growth over the past 15 years, however, only a limited amount of growth is proposed in the plan period to 2021 (2025 for housing). Correspondingly, the main focus for development is on Lowestoft during the current plan period and not the market towns such as Beccles and Bungay. This is misrepresented in the written text.
Section 3.3.3, Fifth Paragraph: In relation to the Beccles Conservation Area it is stated that it was “reappraised in 2009” - although this is technically correct, the document has not yet been completed so it would be better if this was not referred to.
Section 3.3.3, Sixth Paragraph: The text states that improvements to the outdoor swimming pool have been completed. Whilst the future of the outdoor swimming pool has been secured, improvements to the complex are ongoing and therefore referring to the outdoor swimming pool as ‘completed’ is considered to be incorrect. It is noted that Policy BEC1 is no longer extant and the possible implications of changing the development boundary have been discussed in BEC/DSSP-a, Planning Summary Assessment, paragraph 3.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Clarifies (together with subsequent discussions) that the significant growth previously planned for Beccles has now largely occurred and slowed.
Preferences reference to completion of Conservation Area re-appraisal omitted, and reference to completion of works to swimming pool amended. Corrects date of Article 4 Direction.
Broads Authority Response:
Clarification of Beccles’ growth and plans noted, and text amended accordingly. In the light of the various constraints to development in the Broads part of Beccles, this development boundary is no longer being pursued.

BEC/DSSP-a Beccles - Beccles Development Boundary  [Successor Policy – None]

Environment Agency Representation:
The water environment should be protected and enhanced. Where development is necessary on sites adjacent to water bodies, including streams and ditches, the water body should be retained and incorporated into any development proposal and promoted as a positive feature of the development. It is vital that the riverine environment is also protected as it is integral to the sustainability of the watercourse. To this end, suitable buffer zones should be incorporated to protect the watercourse. We are pleased to note that policy BEC/DSSP-a requires an open riverside margin to be retained.... You may wish to consider whether this requirement could be included for any other waterside locations.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Welcomes the requirement of retention of an open margin to the riverside, in the interests of protecting and enhancing the water environment.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted. Development boundary for Beccles no longer being pursued, in light of a range of constraints to development.

BEC/DSSP-a Beccles - Beccles Development Boundary  [Successor Policy – None]

Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association Representation:
Presumably, the reference in the Draft Policy for Beccles (p 24 and (e) on p 25) to ‘the lokes’ is to ‘the scores’. ‘The scores’ is the term used in the Beccles planning summary assessment on p 25 (and what in other places is known as a ‘loke’ is in Beccles called a ‘score’).

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Points out the mistaken use of the term 'lokes' instead of 'scores' in the Draft Policy text (but not planning summary assessment) relating to Beccles.

Broads Authority Response:
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Noted. Development boundary for Beccles not being pursued, in light of a range of constraints to development here.

**BEC/DSSP-a  Beccles - Beccles Development Boundary**  **[Successor Policy – None]**

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Confirms no safeguarded minerals features within the Draft Beccles development boundary. (Note this relates only to the minority of the Draft development boundary which lies in Norfolk - the larger part is within Suffolk, where Suffolk County Council is the Minerals Planning Authority.)

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted. Development boundary for Beccles no longer being pursued, in light of a range of constraints to development.

**BEC/DSSP-a  Beccles - Beccles Development Boundary**  **[Successor Policy – None]**

**RSPB Representation:**
Any development must manage and monitor changes to water quality.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Suggests management and monitoring of water quality is required.

**Broads Authority Response:**
It is not clear why the likely modest scale of any redevelopment within the existing built-up area of Beccles would necessitate an additional need for water management and monitoring. However, a development boundary for Beccles is no longer proposed, in light of a range of constraints to development.

**BEC/DSSP-a  Beccles - Beccles Development Boundary**  **[Successor Policy – None]**

**Suffolk County Council Representation:**
Archaeology: There is high potential for encountering archaeological remains at this location. Groundworks associated with development in these areas have the potential to cause significant damage or destruction to any archaeological deposits that exist.
In accordance with Paragraph 141 of the NPPF, any permission granted for these areas should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed. Highways: As the highways authority, our ambitions for Beccles are established in the Suffolk Local Transport Plan. Assuming that the transport impacts of development are assessed and mitigated in line with sustainable travel and safety principles, the county council would not have any transport objection to development of the scale proposed in the location described. The county council may seek developer contributions, by way of a Section 106 agreement or CIL, for transport improvements in the town.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Draws attention to high archaeological potential, and to national policy supporting this being addressed in any grant of planning permission.
Has no objection, as highway authority, to development of the scale/location envisaged, subject to normal assessment & control of development proposals. The County Council may seek developer contributions towards transport improvements in the town.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Archaeological and Highways comments noted. Development boundary for Beccles no longer being pursued, in light of a range of constraints to development, including those highlighted by the County Council.

**BEC/DSSP-a Beccles - Beccles Development Boundary [Successor Policy – None]**

**Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Representation:**
Groundworks associated with development in these areas have the potential to cause significant damage or destruction to any archaeological deposits that exist. In accordance with Policy HE12.3 of PPS5, any permission granted for these areas should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed. Justification: There is high potential for encountering archaeological remains at this location.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Draws attention to the high potential for encountering archaeological remains in the area, and the potential for damage to this from construction works. Recommends that any planning permission here is subject to condition requiring archaeological investigation and recording.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted. Development boundary for Beccles no longer being pursued, in light of a range of constraints to development, including those raised here.
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**Waveney District Council Representation:**
The Article 4 direction was adopted in 1997 not 1998.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Corrects the adoption date of the Article 4 direction mentioned in the supporting text and documentation.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted. Development boundary for Beccles no longer being pursued, in light of a range of constraints to development.

---

**BRUNDALL RIVERSIDE**

**General comment**

**Brundall Riverside**

**Brundall Parish Council Representation:**
The Council has asked me to submit their comments which are largely "No comments or criticisms" but do contain a question, which we are hoping you can answer: As regards both the draft site specific policies for Brundall Riverside or the general policies relating to Church Fen and Brundall Gardens Marina, we do not have any criticisms of what is proposed. However, we would ask the Broads Authority what action they will take by way of supporting environmental improvements at the area’s many pubs, in particular The Yare? It is to be hoped that both the Riverside Association and the Broads Authority will monitor the effects of the draft policy for Brundall Riverside, given its importance both to Brundall and the local economy.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Has no comment or criticisms of the draft policies, but asks two questions. The first about the environmental improvements mentioned in the Riverside Pubs policy, the other about monitoring the effects of the draft policy and the involvement of the Brundall Riverside Association.

**Broads Authority Response:**
General contentment with the draft policies noted. The Parish Council were provided with, and satisfied by, the following answers to their queries: “...[I]f the policies as currently drafted are adopted, the Authority would be supporting and promoting environmental improvements relating to riverside public houses, rather than carrying them out themselves. Although it is already the case that the Authority will seek (and in certain limited cases actually undertake) environmental improvements generally across the Broads area, the purposes of the reference to this in the draft policy on riverside pubs is to draw attention to the benefits of this, including to the owners (via
enhanced value and trade, for instance) and to ensure this is on the agenda if development is proposed at one of the identified establishments (including the Yare P.H. at Brundall).

With reference to monitoring of the effects of the policy at Brundall Riverside, the Broads Authority certainly intends to do this. While the Authority is constrained in its role as local planning authority and the need to comply with national planning policies, and is not able to agree all the Riverside Association would like, it is keen to listen to the Association and hear its views on the impacts, positive and negative, of its policies. It is hoped that recent discussions with the Association will help foster personal contacts and ongoing communication between the Authority and the Association on this and related matters.”

**BRU/DSSP-a  Brundall Riverside - Riverside Chalets and Mooring Plots[Successor Policy – PP/BRU 1]**

**Brundall Riverside Association Representation:**

The details of the draft policies for Brundall Riverside are noted. Brundall Riverside Association has no fundamental reservations with the Draft Proposals but is still most concerned that any constructive proposals made with local concerns and knowledge are severely limited by the Environment Agency blanket national policy on development within flood plains. This national policy when applied to small and existing developments within the Broads should be challenged by the Broads Authority, who have the local background knowledge and expertise to maintain, sustain and develop this special area to the benefit of local people, business and wildlife. Sadly undervalued in recent times. The area of Brundall Riverside is not a functional flood plain. Generally, buildings and their occupants are not at risk from the forms of flooding that have caused such devastation in other parts of Britain, which have led to the ‘blanket policy’.

Floor levels of buildings, although not to be constructed or raised excessively above ground level, should be of a level above any anticipated flood level. It would be helpful if a maximum floor level of say 2.50 OD could be stated in the proposals.

It is difficult to understand how any minor development would affect an increase in flood risk or any discernible harm to nearby Yare Broads or Marshes SSSI, from which the Riverside Estate is effectively separate. Brundall Riverside is a well defined area, surrounded by water. We consider these constraints to be unnecessary.

The constraint regarding road access is over stated. Although there are a large number of vehicles using Riverside during summer months, the access road has been continually maintained and improved over the past 20 years by the Association. Station Road is currently being improved by Norfolk CC, although kerbing to reduce bankside soil from spilling onto the road surface has reduced the width of the carriageway. Being in regular communication with users of the estate, the Association is not aware of any specific problems relating to access and therefore consider this constraint to be unnecessary.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Has no fundamental reservations about the draft policy. Expresses concern about the impact of national planning policy for areas at risk of flooding on the Brundall Riverside area, and the impact of this on local people, businesses and wildlife. Believes that adequate flood protection for this particular area can be achieved by raised floor levels, but that a maximum level should be stated in the policy to ensure that buildings are not raised excessively. Believes that minor development should be unconstrained by the policy, as the Association does not believe this could either affect flood risk or harm the nearby SSSI.

Believes, in the light of the experience of members of the Association and the recent improvements to Station Road, that the limitations of the road access have been overstated.

Broads Authority Response:
Contentment with the fundamentals of the policy noted.
The application of national planning policy for flood risk to this area is effectively a given. The policy seeks to show how this can be reconciled with the continued contribution to the economy and enjoyment of the Broads.
The limitations of the road access are not mentioned in this particular policy as it is considered unlikely that any development within its area would be of such a scale or type to be limited by the access.
Raised floor levels are one of the likely techniques to minimise flood risk of new development, but this level should be set in the light of a site specific flood risk assessment. Consideration was given to the potential of specifying an upper limit to such floor levels, but this was judged not appropriate in the light of the potential for future change in flood risk assessments and advice, and the potential for variation in the impact of building height in different parts of the policy area, according to the degree of screening by trees, etc., and the height of neighbouring buildings and structures.
Certain minor development, including extensions, is exempt from some of the provisions in the National Planning Policy Framework on flood risk, and the Policy accords with that. This will be taken into consideration in the negotiation and determination of planning applications in the area. Advice on the types and significance of these exemptions can be obtained from the Authority’s Development Management staff.

BRU/DSSP-a Brundall Riverside - Riverside Chalets and Mooring Plots [Successor Policy – RP/BRU 1]

Environment Agency Representation:
BRU/DSSP-a, -b, -c, -d, -e – Brundall Riverside:
We are pleased to note that flood risk has been given particular consideration within these policies. We support the specific reference to flood risk within policies BRU/DSSP-a, BRU/DSSP-b and BRU/DSSP-d which is important as your SFRA shows the entire area to fall within Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. The general flood risk comments made above apply.
We note that planning permission will not be granted for permanent dwellings or changes of use to permanent dwellings or holiday uses. However, we ask whether there is the potential, within the area covered by the policy, for the development of new holiday buildings/dwellings or new ‘less vulnerable’ development which currently do not appear to be covered within the policy. We understand, given the requirements you have set out in the policy, and that the policy attempts to ‘facilitate adaptation and updating of existing chalets’, that it is not your intention to allow such new development within the area. We therefore ask whether this requires specific reference within the policy given the serious nature of the flood risk associated with the area. Table 3 of the Technical Guidance to the NPPF states that ‘more vulnerable’ land uses, such as holiday accommodation, are not appropriate within Flood Zone 3b.

In addition, we note that part (c iv) relating to existing and replacement buildings, requires buildings to be single storey of modest height, with the floor not raised excessively above ground level. You may wish to consider how this requirement may tie in with part (a), compliance with flood risk policies, in particular with safety requirements.

We also note that your draft SA highlights that this policy may allow an increase in chalet size. We assume this statement relates to small extensions to existing buildings. We highlight that your Flood Risk SPD requires replacement residential development to be on a like-for-like basis, with no increase in the number of bedrooms and on the same sized footprint.

Flood Risk Assessments supporting future planning applications should consider opportunities to reduce flood risk and should demonstrate that any residual risk can be safely managed as required in paragraph 103 of the NPPF. Betterment should be sought within replacement buildings.

We are pleased to note that . . . policy BRU/DSSP-a requires buildings to be kept well back from the river frontage.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**

- EA pleased that flood risk has been given particular consideration here. Supports the specific reference in the policy to flood risk as whole area is in high flood risk zone. General comments (under separate heading) may also apply.
- Expresses concern that the Draft Policy might permit new holiday accommodation and other development not compatible with national planning policy on flood risk, suggesting that this is explicitly addressed.
- Suggests consideration of the ground floor level restriction in relation to the need to meet flood risk requirements. (Presumably meaning to suggest that flood requirements likely to require raised floor levels which might be incompatible with the height limitations in the Policy.)
- Highlights that the draft policy appears not as restrictive in terms of the comparative size of replacement chalets as the Broads ‘Development and Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document’.
- States that future planning applications should consider opportunities to reduce flood risk and manage residual risk. It also states ‘betterment should be sought within replacement buildings’. (The latter is understood to suggest that improvements in terms of flood risk and management should be sought.)
- Supports the policy intention to keep buildings back from the water’s edge.
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**Broads Authority Response:**
The EA’s acknowledgement of the attention paid to flood risk is noted, as is its support for the specific reference to this in the policy. The support for the intention to keep buildings back from the water's edge is welcomed. Policy wording clarified to exclude new holiday dwellings. The restriction of excessive raising above ground level is not considered incompatible with the likely need for some raising to address flood risk issues. The wording of the Policy has been amended to explicitly address this point. The development plan status of the Site Specific Policies (once adopted) will normally outweigh any differing requirements of the Development and Flood Risk SPD. The latter document will be reviewed in the light of the introduction of the NPPF and the progress of the Site Specific Policies DPD preparation. The reduction of flood risk and management of residual risk is addressed by Development Management Policy DP29. It is not considered that additional reference is necessary in the Site Policy. Support for keeping buildings back from the water's edge noted.

**BRU/DSSP-a Brundall Riverside - Riverside Chalets and Mooring Plots [Successor Policy – PP/BRU 1]**

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Confirms no minerals or waste safeguarding affecting this site.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

**BRU/DSSP-b Brundall Riverside - Riverside Estate Boatyards, etc., including land adjacent to railway line [Successor Policy – PP/BRU 2]**

Environment Agency Representation:
BRU/DSSP-a, -b, -c, -d, -e – Brundall Riverside:
We are pleased to note that flood risk has been given particular consideration within these policies. We support the specific reference to flood risk within policies BRU/DSSP-a, BRU/DSSP-b and BRU/DSSP-d which is important as your SFRA shows the entire area to fall within Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. The general flood risk comments made above apply. BRU/DSSP-b and BRU/DSSP-d:
As highlighted above, these areas fall within Flood Zone 3b. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF highlights that only ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ land uses are appropriate within this zone. It appears to be your intention that, through these policies, water-compatible uses (boatyard/marina) will be developed/retained. However, we note that your Development Management Policies DP18 and DP20 appear to allow the development of other uses in some circumstances. In light of this, you may wish to clarify acceptable land uses within the policy/supporting text.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
EA pleased that flood risk has been given particular consideration here. Supports the specific reference in the policy to flood risk as whole area is in high flood risk zone. General comments (under separate heading) may also apply.
Identifies that the proposed continued boatyard use is compatible with national policy, but suggests clarification of alternative development that may be permitted under already adopted Development Management Policies for the protection of employment sites and waterside commercial use sites.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The EA’s acknowledgement of the attention paid to flood risk is noted, as is its support for the specific reference in the policy. Confirmation of the compatibility of the thrust of the Policy with national policies is noted, and will be referred to in the justification of the Policy.
Flood risk in general is already identified as a criterion in the Policy. It is not considered necessary to add specific reference to the flood risk limitations on development of types which are not actually promoted by the Policy.

**BRU/DSSP-b Brundall Riverside - Riverside Estate Boatyards, etc., including land adjacent to railway line [Successor Policy – PP/BRU 2]**

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Confirms no minerals or waste safeguarding affecting this site.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**RSPB Representation:**
Clearer guidance should be provided on landscaping. Planting should include nectar-mixes and should not focus solely on trees.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Wishers to see clearer guidance on planting, inclusion of nectar-mixes, and a broader focus than just trees.

**Broads Authority Response:**
It is not considered necessary or appropriate to include excessive detail on planting within the Policy which highlights its importance. There are a range of businesses and premises and a variety different existing and potential planting. The Draft Policy mentioned, but was not restricted to, trees. The wording of the Policy has been altered slightly to clarify this, and to include reference to nectar-mixes.

**BRU/DSSP-c Brundall Riverside - Mooring Plots**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
BRU/DSSP-a, -b, -c, -d, -e – Brundall Riverside:
We are pleased to note that flood risk has been given particular consideration within these policies. We support the specific reference to flood risk within policies BRU/DSSP-a, BRU/DSSP-b and BRU/DSSP-d which is important as your SFRA shows the entire area to fall within Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. The general flood risk comments made above apply.....
Given the flood risk associated with the Brundall area, we are pleased to note that this land will be used for the mooring of boats only, and the permanent/seasonal occupation of the land and the stationing of caravans, will not be permitted.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
EA pleased that flood risk has been given particular consideration here. General comments (under separate heading) may also apply.
Welcomes the use of the area for mooring, and the presumption against permanent and seasonal occupation and the stationing of caravans, on flood risk grounds.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The EA’s acknowledgement of the attention paid to flood risk is noted.
Support for the mentioned aspects of the policy noted, and referred to in the justification of the Policy.

**BRU/DSSP-c Brundall Riverside - Mooring Plots**
Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association Representation:
The Draft Policy relating to mooring plots at Brundall (p 29) refers to the encouragement of tree planting. Part of the area of plots is adjacent to the River Yare. The NSBA has concerns lest such planting could have the same deleterious consequences for sailors as has been caused by tree planting at Whitlingham (to the particular detriment of the Norwich Frostbite Sailing Club). Coldham Hall Sailing Club is just downstream of the mooring plots. The NSBA is aware that the management of trees along the river corridor in line with agreed management guidance and criteria is referred to in the Broads Plan and is a strategic priority of the Authority. However, a survey of its members currently being conducted indicates dissatisfaction with the level of such management of the existing trees along the river corridor. To allow even more trees would compound the problem.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Concern that the element of the policy seeking retention of trees and encouragement of new planting could have a harmful effect on sailing in the vicinity, including that associated with Coldham Hall Sailing Club just downstream. [Note that the reference to the Sailing Club being downstream, rather than upstream as it is from the defined area of this policy, suggests that the Association may have meant its comments in relation to the area covered by the policy BRU/DSSP-a (rather than c), and hence this will be treated a comment on both policies unless this can be clarified with the Association.] Association considers that existing management of trees on the river corridor is inadequate to protect the interests of sailing and that this aspect of the policy could exacerbate these problems.

Broads Authority Response:
The Authority is well aware of the potential tension between the contribution of trees to the riverside landscape and the interests of sailing, but considers that this can, in most cases, be adequately resolved by appropriate management of existing planting and by careful selection of suitable siting and species for new planting, and by acceptance by all parties of a need for a degree of compromise. It also recognises that, especially in these straitened times, riverside tree management cannot always be as responsive and comprehensive as might be wished.

The intention of the policy is not to promote high or dense planting, but retention and development of a degree of softening and screening, for landscape and visual amenity reasons, and wildlife habitat. It is the case that this policy area has only a small frontage (length around 65 metres) onto the River Yare, and only around half of this frontage, about 33 metres length, has planting, and this is unlikely to change.

It is considered that the reference to trees and planting in the policy should stand, but clarification added to ensure it is understood that what is proposed should not harm sailing in the vicinity.

BRU/DSSP-c Brundall Riverside - Mooring Plots [Successor Policy – PP/BRU 3]
Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Confirms no minerals or waste safeguarding affecting this site.

Broads Authority Response: Noted.

BRU/DSSP-d  Brundall Riverside - Brundall Marina  [Successor Policy – PP/BRU 4]

Environment Agency Representation:
BRU/DSSP-a, -b, -c, -d, -e – Brundall Riverside:
We are pleased to note that flood risk has been given particular consideration within these policies. We support the specific reference to flood risk within policies BRU/DSSP-a, BRU/DSSP-b and BRU/DSSP-d which is important as your SFRA shows the entire area to fall within Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. The general flood risk comments made above apply.....

BRU/DSSP-b and BRU/DSSP-d:
As highlighted above, these areas fall within Flood Zone 3b. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF highlights that only ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ land uses are appropriate within this zone. It appears to be your intention that, through these policies, water-compatible uses (boatyard/marina) will be developed/retained. However, we note that your Development Management Policies DP18 and DP20 appear to allow the development of other uses in some circumstances. In light of this, you may wish to clarify acceptable land uses within the policy/supporting text.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
EA pleased that flood risk has been given particular consideration here. Supports the specific reference in the policy to flood risk as whole area is in high flood risk zone. General comments (under separate heading) may also apply.
Identifies that the proposed continued boatyard use is compatible with national policy, but suggests clarification of alternative development that may be permitted under already adopted Development Management Policies for the protection of employment sites and waterside commercial use sites.

Broads Authority Response:
The EA’s acknowledgement of the attention paid to flood risk is noted, as is its support for the specific reference in the policy.
Confirmation of the compatibility of the thrust of the policy with national policies is noted, and will be referred to in the justification of the Policy.
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Flood risk in general is already identified as a criterion in the Policy. It is not considered necessary to add specific reference to the flood risk limitations on development of types which are not actually promoted by the Policy.

**BRU/DSSP-d Brundall Riverside - Brundall Marina [Successor Policy – PP/BRU 4]**

**Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association Representation:**
The same point mutatis mutandis can be made about the Draft Policy relating to Brundall Marina (p 30) which refers to the desirability of increasing the number of trees on the site.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Concerned that the element of the policy seeking retention of trees and encouragement of new planting could have a harmful effect on sailing in the vicinity.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Authority is well aware of the potential tension between the contribution of trees to the riverside landscape and the interests of sailing, but considers that this can, in most cases, be adequately resolved by appropriate management of existing planting and by careful selection of suitable siting and species for new planting, and by acceptance by all parties of a need for a degree of compromise. It also recognises that, especially in these straitened times, riverside tree management cannot always be as responsive and comprehensive as might be wished.
The intention of the policy is not to promote high or dense planting, but retention and development of a degree of softening and screening, for landscape and visual amenity reasons, and wildlife habitat.
It is considered that the reference to trees and planting in the policy should stand, but clarification added to ensure it is understood that what is proposed should not harm sailing in the vicinity.

**BRU/DSSP-d Brundall Riverside - Brundall Marina [Successor Policy – PP/BRU 4]**

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Advises no minerals or waste safeguarding affecting this site.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**BRU/DSSP-d Brundall Riverside - Brundall Marina**  
*Successor Policy – PP/BRU 4*

**RSPB Representation:**
Draft Monitoring Indicators state that there should be no discernible harm to the Yare Broads and Marshes SSSI. This needs to be more specific to ensure that appropriate measures are applied and that suitable baseline data is also available. The indicators need to adopt a SMART approach to ensure the success of the proposed policies can be easily assessed at the end of the plan period and appropriate intervals in between.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Wishes to see ‘SMART’ indicators, baseline data, etc. to enable impact of the policy to be ‘easily assessed’.

**Broads Authority Response:**
It is not agreed that so-called ‘SMART’ targets are necessarily appropriate to all planning policies. The indicator is quite specific in identifying ‘discernible harm to [the] nearby ... SSSI’ as its focus, and avoidance is an implicit objective of the policy. Measurement and achievability are in tension, as the resources for monitoring are severely limited. There is currently no possibility that additional detailed research would be commissioned to provide a comprehensive identification of potential impact mechanisms and measures of potential effects. Neither would the resources for such an endeavour be justified by the policy, which simply applies precautionary measures to an already developed area. It is also considered that a policy with a modest and practicable monitoring regime is far preferable to either having no policy, or having one with an impressive but undeliverable monitoring framework. The monitoring indicators presented are intended only to outline the foci of the monitoring of the policy. The detail of how this will be achieved will be developed and elaborated later. At present it is envisaged that in this case data from Natural England’s SSSI Condition assessments (which are only periodically updated), along with more detailed and qualitative input from the Authority’s in-house experts in ecology and related matters, will be used to identify whether there are identifiable negative factors affecting the condition of the SSSI (i.e. resulting in decline or slowing improvement), and, if so, whether there are plausible mechanisms.

**BRU/DSSP-e Brundall Riverside - Land east of the Yare Public House**  
*Successor Policy – PP/BRU 5*

**Environment Agency Representation:**
BRU/DSSP-a, -b, -c, -d, -e – Brundall Riverside:
We are pleased to note that flood risk has been given particular consideration within these policies. The general flood risk comments made above apply.

Given the flood risk associated with the Brundall area, we are pleased to note that this land will be kept free of built development.
Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
EA pleased that flood risk has been given particular consideration here. General comments (under separate heading) may also apply.
Pleased that the area will be kept free of built development, because of the flood risk to the area concerned.

Broads Authority Response:
The EA’s acknowledgement of the attention paid to flood risk is noted.
Support for this policy noted, and incorporated in the justification of the policy.

BRU/DSSP-e  Brundall Riverside - Land east of the Yare Public House

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Advises no minerals or waste safeguarding affecting this site.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted.

BUNGAY AND DITCHINGHAM

General comment  Bungay & Ditchingham

Suffolk County Council Representation:
Archaeology: There is high potential for encountering archaeological remains at this location. Groundworks associated with development in these areas have the potential to cause significant damage or destruction to any archaeological deposits that exist. In accordance with Paragraph 141 of the NPPF, any permission granted for these areas should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

Highways: As the highways authority, our ambitions for Bungay are established in the Suffolk Local Transport Plan. Assuming that the transport impacts of development are assessed and mitigated in line with sustainable travel and safety principles, the county council would not have any transport objection to development of the scale proposed in the location described. However, it should
be noted that Bridge Street/Ditchingham is a key cycle route into the town, and any development should respect this. The county council may seek developer contributions, by way of a Section 106 agreement or CIL, for transport improvements in the town.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Draws attention to high archaeological potential, and to national policy supporting this being addressed in any grant of planning permission.
Has no objection, as highway authority, to development of the scale/location envisaged, subject to normal assessment and control of development proposals. The County Council may seek developer contributions towards transport improvements in the town.
Draws attention to Bridge Street, Ditchingham as a key cycle route, and development here should respect this.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Reference to archaeological potential, highways comments and cycle route noted. In the light of the range of constraint to development in the area, including those highlighted here, a development boundary for the Broads part of Bungay is no longer considered appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comment</th>
<th>Bungay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waveney District Council Representation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.3.7, Second Paragraph: States that “Bungay is the focus for significant growth”. Bungay has experienced a significant amount of residential development in the past 15 years; however, only a limited amount of land has been allocated for development during the current plan period (to 2021, 2025 for housing). The allocation of industrial land will help diversify the economy, however, given the traffic constraints identified in the town there is limited potential to develop the town as a transport hub, particularly as there is no train network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.3.7, Second Paragraph: The Bungay Conservation Area was re-appraised in 2007.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.3.7, Third Paragraph: Bungay has limited opportunities for growth when considering constraints such as flooding and landscape as stated in Waveney’s Site Specific Allocations DPD. This is misrepresented in the third paragraph. Bungay has access to public transport but it would be incorrect to describe public access as ‘well provided’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation: | |
| Disagrees with the statement that ‘Bungay is the focus for significant growth’ (as most development planned has already occurred, and only a limited amount of land remains allocated for further development in current plans). Corrects erroneous reference to Bungay as a transport hub, and date of conservation area re-appraisal. | |
**Broads Authority Response:**
Points noted, and text updated/corrected accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUN/DSSP-a Bungay &amp; Ditchingham - Development Boundary</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – None]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Environment Agency Representation:**
In respect of BUN/DSSP-a, your SFRA shows the majority of Bungay to fall within Flood Zone 1. Therefore as part of the Sequential Test for any future planning application we advise that reasonably available sites within Flood Zone 1, even if under the planning control of Waveney District Council, should be developed in preference to those sites in Flood Zone 2/3 falling within the development boundary defined by this document.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Suggests that, through the planning application process, sites elsewhere in Bungay (outside the area of this plan and planning authority) should be preferred locations for development to that covered by this Draft Policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
In the light of the Environment Agency's advice, and taken together with the constraints on development in the area in terms of visual amenity, landscape and historic environment, it is no longer considered appropriate to have a development boundary in the Broads part of Bungay and Ditchingham Dam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUN/DSSP-a Bungay &amp; Ditchingham - Development Boundary</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – None]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Advises no minerals or waste safeguarding affecting this site.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted. Development boundary for Bungay no longer being pursued, in light of a range of constraints to development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUN/DSSP-a Bungay &amp; Ditchingham - Development Boundary</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – None]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Representation:**
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Groundworks associated with development in these areas have the potential to cause significant damage or destruction to any archaeological deposits that exist. In accordance with Policy HE12.3 of PPS5, any permission granted for these areas should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed. Justification: There is high potential for encountering archaeological remains at this location.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Draws attention to the high potential for encountering archaeological remains in the area, and the potential for damage to this from construction works. Recommends that any planning permission here is subject to condition requiring archaeological investigation and recording.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted. Development boundary for Bungay no longer being pursued, in light of a range of constraints to development, including the archaeological potential.

Waveney District Council Representation:
Constraints & Features: The Article 4 Direction in Bungay was adopted in 1997 and extended in 2007. Planning Summary Assessment, Second Paragraph: Bungay does not have access to a rail network.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Corrects references to Article 4 Direction and rail service.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted. Development boundary for Bungay no longer being pursued, in light of a range of constraints to development..

Environment Agency Representation:
This site is shown by our Flood Maps and your SFRA to be at risk from flooding. As referred to within the supporting text, we are aware that a planning application (BA/2012/0005/FUL) has now been submitted on site and is currently being determined. The information submitted in support of the planning application has demonstrated that only a small portion of the centre of the site, surrounding the river, is at risk from flooding. The general flood risk comments made above will apply. In particular, the sequential
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approach will be important to the development of this site. Built development should be located within the areas at lowest flood risk. You may wish to reference this within the policy.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Refers to the then current planning application for development of the site as demonstrating the flood risk to the site as more limited in area than indicated by the EA and SFRA maps. Suggests that built development should be located in the lower risk areas, and reference is made to this in policy.

Broads Authority Response:
Policy reference included as suggested. (Note planning permission since granted for the development proposal referred to by EA.)

BUN/DSSP-b Bungay & Ditchingham - Ditchingham Maltings [Successor Policy – PP/DIT 1]

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies that the site is on a safeguarded minerals resource (sand and gravel).

Broads Authority Response:
The County Council did not object to the recent planning application (BA/2012/0005/FUL) for the site, which was granted in accordance with this Policy. It concluded that this site has a significant number of constraints that limit the potential area and depth where prior extraction could take place, while still allowing housing development to take place. The limitations were such that regardless of the quality of the deposit, the amount that could be extracted would not be economically viable. Therefore, the Mineral Planning Authority did not object to application.
It did advise that the area to be excavated as compensatory flood storage may yield quantities of sand and gravel, and would encourage any developer of the site to consider any opportunities for the sand and gravel to be used in the construction phases of developments to improve the sustainability of the project. This is referred to in the policy and the sustainability appraisal for the site.

BUN/DSSP-b Bungay & Ditchingham - Ditchingham Maltings [Successor Policy – PP/DIT 1]

RSPB Representation:
Whilst the policy may be appropriate it must be clearly demonstrated that there will not be an impact on water quality. It is stated that Anglian Water have confirmed that there is adequate capacity to accommodate the development but no evidence is presented to support this statement. If the information is available then this should be presented in the SSP DPD to support the policy approach and demonstrate that the development is justified and deliverable.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Policy may be appropriate. Water quality must be shown to not be adversely affected. No evidence is provided to support statement that Anglian Water has confirmed adequate capacity. Such evidence should be presented in the DPD.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Water quality impact avoidance will be assessed through the development management process. Two previous planning permissions for residential redevelopment have been granted without objection from the EA. It was not considered necessary to include documentary evidence for Anglian Water’s confirmation of adequate capacity for this site in the Draft Site Specific Policies Consultation Document.

**Waveney District Council Representation:**
Support the policy for building refurbishment and the requirement to provide a quality environment.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the building refurbishment and quality environment requirements of the Policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
District Council support noted.

**Environment Agency Representation:**
We are pleased to note that flood risk has been highlighted as a potential constraint to development. Your SFRA shows the site to lie partly within Flood Zone 2 and partly within Flood Zone 3b. The general flood risk comments made above will apply. It appears from the policy that your intention is for the site to retain and continue its current use for sports facilities. It is not clear whether this will include additional buildings. However, we note from your draft SA that changing rooms etc may be proposed. The Technical
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Guidance to the NPPF highlights that only ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ land uses are appropriate within Flood Zone 3b. We note that Table 2 defines ‘outdoor sports and recreation and essential facilities such as changing rooms’ as ‘water-compatible’ land uses. However ‘Assembly and leisure facilities’ are classed as a ‘less vulnerable’ land use, which is not appropriate within Flood Zone 3b. If such uses are likely, we recommend that the requirement for them to be restricted to the area of the site that is above the 1 in 20 year flood level and so outside of Flood Zone 3b, is included within the policy.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Highlights the flood risk to the site, and the distinction between sports facilities including changing rooms, which are classified as ‘water-compatible’, and assembly and leisure uses, which are classified as ‘less vulnerable’ and incompatible with the apparent flood risk to much of the site. Recommends that any such uses are restricted to that part of the site at a specified lower level of flood risk.

Broads Authority Response:
The distinction the EA points out is noted, and the policy wording has been modified to incorporate its recommendation about the restriction of potential assembly and leisure uses. Almost the whole of the site falls within Flood Risk Zone 3 on the EA maps, but the more detailed Broads Strategic Flood Risk Assessment shows a lesser proportion of the site covered by high risk zones 3a and 3b, even allowing for anticipated climate change. A site flood risk assessment may modify the affected area one way or the other, thus the wording relating to the restriction is tied to the EA’s scale of the assessed risk, rather than a specified part of the site.

BUN/DSSP-c Bungay & Ditchingham - Maltings Meadow Sports Ground, Ditchingham

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource. It is the view of [Norfolk County Council as] MPA that an Environmental Statement in support of any future planning application on [such a site] should address the issues above, and that this should be reflected in any site allocation policies. A list of exemptions to this policy is contained within Appendix C of the adopted Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. Where it is considered that a site is exempt from CS16 by virtue of its location, size, or the nature of the proposed allocation this is noted in the response, if the site area or proposed use were to be amended, this may alter the exemption status of the site. A spreadsheet showing the comments on the draft sites is attached. Norfolk County Council as the statutory authority for Mineral Planning in Norfolk wishes to be kept informed as these proposals progress.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies that the site lies on a safeguarded minerals resource.
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**Broads Authority Response:**
The presence of the safeguarded minerals is noted, and reference added to the Policy.

**BUN/DSSP-c Bungay & Ditchingham - Maltings Meadow Sports Ground, Ditchingham**

| Successor Policy – PP/DIT 2 |

**Sport England Representation:**
Sport England supports the protection of this existing sporting facility from inappropriate development, though we accept that any further enhancement of the site will need to take account of its sensitive environmental character.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the Policy in its protection of the sports facility and the need to take into account its sensitive environment.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Sport England’s support noted.

**BUN/DSSP-c Bungay & Ditchingham - Maltings Meadow Sports Ground, Ditchingham**

| Successor Policy – PP/DIT 2 |

**Waveney District Council Representation:**
Support the allocation for the continued use of the sports ground which will increase recreational facilities in the area.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports Policy and considers this will increase recreational facilities in the area.

**Broads Authority Response:**
District Council’s support noted.

---

**CANTLEY**

**CAN/DSSP-a Cantley - Sugar Factory**

| Successor Policy – PP/CAN 1 |

**Environment Agency Representation:**

---
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**Flood Risk:**
Please note the general flood risk comments above. Your SFRA shows the majority of the east of the site to lie within Flood Zone 3b with the remainder of the west of the site in an area of ‘flood risk uncertain’. You may wish to highlight flood risk as a constraint to development. Any new development should be located on the highest parts of the site in line with the sequential approach to site layout. Please note, industrial/employment uses such as those proposed here, are classified within the Technical Guidance to the NPPF as a ‘less vulnerable’ land use. Such uses are not considered to be appropriate within Flood Zone 3b. It is therefore important that any new development is located outside of the functional floodplain.

**Ecology:**
We are pleased to note that development is subject to protection/improvements to wildlife/habitats. This is particularly important due to the proximity of the site to SPA, SAC SSSI and Ramsar site, as highlighted within the constraints section.

| Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation: |
| Draws attention to the level and uncertainty of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) about the flood risk to parts of the policy area. Suggests consideration of highlighting the flood risk constraints to development of the site, and outlines the application of national policy classifications to the policy. |

| Broads Authority Response: |
| Policy amended to refer to the flood risk, and the need for compliance with national flood risk policy, and reference to the limitations of SFRA in the area included and need for site flood risk assessment in the written justification. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAN/DSSP-a Cantley - Sugar Factory [Successor Policy – PP/CAN 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Under the heading Planning Summary Assessment it is suggested for clarity that the second sentence should be amended to read: “Any new development should ensure there is no unacceptable impact on highway capacity or safety in the area.”

| Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation: |
| Suggests addition of caveat regarding highway capacity and safety to the Policy. |

| Broads Authority Response: |
| Policy amended to address these issues (using slightly different wording than suggested). |
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Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: Within consultation area of safeguarded waste management site. As this is a policy regarding the continued use of the site as a sugar works and that the safeguarded waste management site forms part of the works it is considered exempt so long as no development unconnected with the sugar works were proposed.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Advises policy area is within the consultation area of a safeguarded waste management site, but this waste management is part of the sugar works and hence compatible with the draft policy provided no development unconnected with the sugar works is included.

Broads Authority Response:
The relation to the waste management site safeguarding is noted. No development apart from that related to the sugar works is promoted, but the Policy wording has been supplemented to explicitly address the potential issue and its relation to waste safeguarding.

CAN/DSSP-a Cantley - Sugar Factory [Successor Policy – PP/CAN 1]

RSPB Representation:
Bullet point (a) recommends that development on the site enable amenity and wildlife improvements. The approach is then weakened by stating “...or at the least avoids harm to these interest features.” We recommend that the bullet point simply read: “Provides improvements to the amenity or nearby residents and to wildlife and habitats.” The policy should also include the need for any development to avoid adverse effects on Natura 2000 sites given the proximity to parts of the Broadland SPA and The Broads SAC. Draft Monitoring Indicators should better specify measures that will be used to assess impacts on Natura 2000 sites and SSSIs. These need to be more specific to ensure that appropriate measures are applied and that suitable baseline data is also available. The indicators need to adopt a SMART approach to ensure the success of the proposed policies can be easily assessed at the end of the plan period and appropriate intervals in between.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Considers that the policy should require all developments to improve residential amenity and wildlife habitats. Policy should include avoidance of harm to Natura 200 sites, given proximity of SPA and SCA. Draft Monitoring Indicators should better specify measures used to assess Natura 2000 impacts, including baseline data and SMART indicators.

Broads Authority Response:
The policy is clear that improvements to amenity and habitats are sought in general, but also reflects the reality that some, especially minor, developments of an industrial facility are likely to be entirely unrelated to, and have no adverse impact upon, amenity and habitats, and in such cases imposition of requirements for such improvements would be unreasonable and contrary to the economic interests of the area.

Draft policy included avoidance of adverse impacts on habitats. Specific reference to Natura 2000 sites added.

The approach to monitoring and the information sources to be used is now elaborated.

**DILHAM**

DIL/DSSP-a  Dilham - Tyler's Cut Moorings  [Successor Policy – PP/DIL 1]

Dilham Boating Club Representation:
From the Draft Policy on Page 41 and considering Map Nr 7 – Dilham.
Line 1: Explanation is required for the phrase ‘be kept generally open’.
Second sentence: No comment.
Third sentence: I assume that in English this should read ‘the retention of existing…’, in which case it is suggested that all trees are inspected in connection with possible danger to life and vessels by falling and obstruction of light. Security is another reason for the removal/cutting back of some trees/hedges. New trees appropriately placed and of suitable type could be planted by arrangement with the owners of the land.
Fourth sentence: “The permanent or seasonal occupation of the land, vehicles, boats, etc., or the stationing of caravans, will not be permitted”. This will require detailed explanation. Has the Broads Authority ever considered scrutinising the deeds relating to these privately owned properties?
Planning Summary Assessment: The ‘treatment’ of this area is intended to be that as for ‘similar’ unspecified areas across the Broads. Why? What ‘treatment’ is intended and for what purpose? What and where are the other ‘similar areas’? Who has ‘perceived’ a need to control ancillary development? What ancillary development? ‘Specific reference to the importance of the trees, etc..’ To what does ‘etc.’ refer? It is generally agreed that trees do have an important part to play in this world, but they should be controlled.
Draft monitoring indicators:
a) To what does this refer?
B) These properties are listed with the Land Registry as Boat Moorings. Why is this being queried? It should be remembered by the Broads Authority that Tylers Cut was sold to them with the legal agreement that it must be kept open for navigation to these properties.
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C) The nearest SSSI is on the North Walsham & Dilham Canal and therefore does not impinge on the navigation between Dilham and Wayford Bridge.
D) Please see above re. Tree

Finally, it is concerning that further restrictions and regulations are being considered to be placed on the boating fraternity. This could be a further insertion of the thin end of the wedge to keep man off the water and let nature take over with the inherent dangers of flooding and the eventual return to total unusable marshland.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Queries detailed wording of draft policy, and questions rationale for elements of it.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Discussions have been held with Dilham Boat Club to clarify both their concerns and also the Broads Authority’s intentions in drafting and pursuing this policy. As a result of these discussions and a redraft of the Policy to clarify it, the Boating Club has stated it is now content with the proposals.

**DIL/DSSP-a Dilham - Tyler’s Cut Moorings [Successor Policy – PP/DIL 1]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Your SFRA shows this site to fall partly within Flood Zone 2 with the majority of the site falling within Flood Zone 3 with the addition of climate change. Given this flood risk, we are pleased to note that this land will be used for the mooring of boats only, and the permanent/seasonal occupation of the land and the stationing of caravans, will not be permitted.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the intended uses as compliant with national flood risk policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Conformity confirmation, and Environment Agency’s support noted.

**DIL/DSSP-a Dilham - Tyler’s Cut Moorings [Successor Policy – PP/DIL 1]**

**Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association Representation:**
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With regard to Tyler’s Cut Moorings (p 41), the NSBA has the following comments. The phrase ‘be kept generally open’ requires explanation. Concerns have recently been expressed to the NSBA that the overhanging of the existing trees makes passage down the Cut difficult for some craft and that those trees unduly obstruct light (with associated security risks). The encouragement of the retention of the existing trees and the planting of new ones, as envisaged in the Draft Policy for the moorings, is therefore something to which the NSBA would object unless they were appropriately placed and of a suitable type. The NSBA considers that the planning summary assessment is unduly vague: what are these ‘some other similar areas across the Broads’ and what is the ‘similar policy’ which will be applied? In the light of the comments above the NSBA objects to the bald proposal in the planning summary assessment that there should be specific reference to the importance of trees.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Concerned that the element of the policy seeking retention of trees and encouragement of new planting could have a harmful effect on sailing in the vicinity, obstruct light, and reduce security. The Association would object unless such planting was of a suitable type and position.
The Association considers the justification and assessment of the Policy is insufficiently clear.
The Association considers that existing management of trees on the river corridor is inadequate to protect the interests of sailing and that this aspect of the policy could exacerbate these problems.

Broads Authority Response:
The Authority is aware of the potential conflicts between trees and sailing, security, etc. The wording of the Policy has been refined in consultation with the Dilham Boat Owners Association to address this issue and clarify the Authority’s intentions in this regard.

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Advises no minerals or waste safeguarding required for this site.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted.
FILBY

FIL/DSSP-REJ/1 Filby - Provisionally Rejected Option - Development Boundary for Filby

[Succeedor Policy – None]

PURE Architecture Representation:
We support the provisionally rejected option for Filby – Ref. FIL/DSSP-REJ/1, with modifications to the development boundary later described in this response. We disagree with the proposal to remove the development boundary altogether, and support the rejected option (with modifications) for the following reasons:

- Filby is supported by a good range of facilities including shops, a cafe/restaurant, two public houses, a village clubhouse, and good infant and primary schools, together with other facilities. These support notions of sustainability for the area, and would support new development. New development would also improve prospects for the development of the existing facilities, and in turn improve employment opportunity.
- The development boundary from the 1997 Broads Local Plan has resulted in ‘good’ development. The Broads setting has provided unique opportunity for architectural design that has enhanced the area. This should continue.
- It is identified that there is theoretical scope for further infilling within the current Local Plan development boundary. This would be subject to the same control applied since 1997 which would present continued opportunity for the prospect of similar good quality development.
- Environmental sensitivity is referenced with respect to water pollution in the provisionally rejected option. Residential use would pose little risk to the contamination of Trinity Broads. The public sewage system would be subject to potential additional load from the Great Yarmouth Planning area, and thus prevention of development in the Broads Authority Planning area will not alone alleviate the problems described. We feel that a more proactive approach to improve the current drainage system would be better than a ‘do nothing’ approach. The existing development boundary is located away from the water edge and offers protection for the Broadside habitats. This protection measure has been suitable to date, and we cannot see why this adopted method should not continue to be the mechanism for control.
- Development Management Policy DP3 offers control to infrastructure capacity already. The Broads Authority could in theory refuse development on the grounds that there is insufficient drainage capacity of the local system. This leaves development opportunity for proposals that incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and other measures to mitigate loads on existing infrastructures.
- Development Management Policy DP29 ensures that development will be subject to a flood risk assessment which should ensure that it is safe in flood risk terms and reduces the vulnerability to climate change and flooding. We do not see that it is necessary to multiply policy to cover matters with existing control.

We further believe that there is opportunity to modify the development boundary in certain locations to provide scope for development similar to that which we described above. The attached site location plan illustrates one such site which we believe is in this category. If the provisionally rejected option is favoured following the consultation we wish for this area to be considered for inclusion within a future development boundary.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Objects to the rejection of this option, argues that there should be a development boundary for Filby, and suggests that such a boundary should include a specific identified piece of land. Offers the following justifications for continued provision of a development boundary: Good range of facilities in village, which additional development would help support; 1997 Local Plan development boundary has resulted in good development and architectural enhancement; there is further scope for infilling in the 1997 development boundary; residential use in this location would pose little risk to water quality in the Trinity Broads, development at Great Yarmouth is more significant in this respect, and it is preferable to remedy existing problems rather than allow these to stifle development; alignment of 1997 development boundary has protected the water’s edge, and this could be continued; development boundary should not be lost on basis of infrastructure deficiency because Development Management Policy DP3 controls development in relation to this and would allow development that used innovative sustainable methods to deal with drainage issues; existing policies control development in relation to flood risk, and additional measures are not necessary.

**Broads Authority Response:**
It is agreed that there are a number of policies of various ages that seek to address the issues mentioned. However, it is the combination of these issues, and that sites in Filby outside the Broads area (and the coverage of this plan) could better provide the potential benefits of development that the objector refers to, that militates against retention of a development boundary for the Broads part of the village.
As it is not the Authority’s intention to provide a development boundary it is not necessary to fully assess the proposed site (which is outside the development boundary of the 1997 Local Plan) that the objector wishes included; in any case it is not immediately apparent what the planning benefit of inclusion of this site within any such boundary would be.

**GREAT YARMOUTH (NEWTOWN)**

**GTY/DSSP-a** Great Yarmouth - Newton - Development Boundary  
[Successor Policy – None]

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Great Yarmouth – GTY/DSSP-a and GTY/DSSP-b:
In your draft sustainability appraisal for both policies it is stated that the area is outside the zone of flood risk defined by your SFRA. However, we are aware that your SFRA does not provide the most up to date information for this location. Great Yarmouth has recently been remodelled. This shows that the area falls within Flood Zone 3a and is at risk from flooding in the 1 in 200 year flood event, assuming no defences. Furthermore, when the defences are taken into account, at the end of the lifetime of the development, the area would be at actual risk of flooding by over 2m in the 1 in 200 year flood event including an allowance for climate change. We therefore recommend that flood risk is highlighted as a constraint to development in both policies. Please see
the general flood risk comments set out above which will apply to both policies. Please note, due to the flood risk at the sites, it is unclear at this stage whether future development will be safe (Exception Test). Your Authority may wish to give further consideration to this issue. We note that policy GTY/DSSP-a relates to a modern housing estate and petrol station where you confirm that there is no immediate prospect of redevelopment. In addition, it appears that through policy GTY/DSSP-b you intend the existing facilities to be reused for river users and leisure visitors which you may consider to be a water-compatible land use. However, we advise that your Authority should be satisfied that this area can be developed safely. In particular, it is unclear at this stage whether the area could be made safe for land uses that are not water-compatible.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Advises that more up-to-date flood risk analysis shows that these policy areas are at greater risk of flooding than identified in the Broads SFRA, and that these policies should thus be reconsidered.

**Broads Authority Response:**
In the light of the Environment Agency’s advice it is no longer considered appropriate to designate a development boundary for the Newtown area.

### GTY/DSSP-a Great Yarmouth - Newton - Development Boundary [Successor Policy – None]

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

### GTY/DSSP-b Great Yarmouth - Newton - Marina Quays [Successor Policy – PP/GTY 1]

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Great Yarmouth – GTY/DSSP-a and GTY/DSSP-b:
In your draft sustainability appraisal for both policies it is stated that the area is outside the zone of flood risk defined by your SFRA. However, we are aware that your SFRA does not provide the most up to date information for this location. Great Yarmouth has recently been remodelled. This shows that the area falls within Flood Zone 3a and is at risk from flooding in the 1 in 200 year flood
event, assuming no defences. Furthermore, when the defences are taken into account, at the end of the lifetime of the development, the area would be at actual risk of flooding by over 2m in the 1 in 200 year flood event including an allowance for climate change. We therefore recommend that flood risk is highlighted as a constraint to development in both policies. Please see the general flood risk comments set out above which will apply to both policies. Please note, due to the flood risk at the sites, it is unclear at this stage whether future development will be safe (Exception Test). Your Authority may wish to give further consideration to this issue. We note that policy GTY/DSSP-a relates to a modern housing estate and petrol station where you confirm that there is no immediate prospect of redevelopment. In addition, it appears that through policy GTY/DSSP-b you intend the existing facilities to be reused for river users and leisure visitors which you may consider to be a water-compatible land use. However, we advise that your Authority should be satisfied that this area can be developed safely. In particular, it is unclear at this stage whether the area could be made safe for land uses that are not water-compatible.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Advises that more up-to-date flood risk analysis shows that these policy areas are at greater risk of flooding than identified in the Broads SFRA, and that these policies should be reconsidered in the light of this.

Broads Authority Response:
In the light of the Environment Agency’s advice the wording of the policy has been amended to delete the reference to residents (which could be misconstrued) and include a warning that the potential range of development of the site is likely to be limited by flood risk.

GTY/DSSP-b Great Yarmouth - Newton - Marina Quays [Successor Policy – PP/GTY 1]

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted.

GTY/DSSP-b Great Yarmouth - Newton - Marina Quays [Successor Policy – PP/GTY 1]

RSPB Representation:
The RSPB recommends that development at the Marina Quays must demonstrate that there will be no adverse effect on Natura 2000 sites, particularly Breydon Water SPA and Ramsar site. The final sentence of the Planning Summary Assessment (p.47) should be amended to read: “...demonstrate no adverse effect on the integrity of the Natura 2000 sites, particularly Breydon Water.”

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Recommend policy includes no adverse impact on Natura 2000 sites, particularly Breydon Water SPA and Ramsar site.

**Broads Authority Response:**
National and local policies already protect the Natura 2000 sites. Marina Quays lies approximately 2.5 kilometres by water from the Breydon Ramsar and SPA. It is approx 1.3 kilometres as the crow flies, with an industrial estate, holiday camp and agricultural land in between. (In fact it is closer to the North Denes SPA, but separated by urban development.) Given the long established boat mooring use at this location, and the limitations of the site, development leading to a significant impact on Breydon is not considered sufficiently likely to warrant specific reference in the policy.

---

**GTY/DSSP-b Great Yarmouth - Newton - Marina Quays**

[SUCCESSOR POLICY – PP/GTY 1]

**Walpole, Mr R Representation:**
A similar situation [to the potential for Norwich riverside walks highlighting historical sites] is revealed in 3.3.20 Gt.Yarmouth, where the Authority also manages the Yacht Station. From here, there is a need to develop jointly with the Borough a riverside path to Bure Park GTY/DSSP-b (page 46). Again within the Borough, it is puzzling to find no mention of Fleggburgh within the Settlement-based Options. There is at least one traditional thatched cottage on the road alongside Little Broad. As there is holiday development here around Filby Broad, with an attractive RoW alongside, there is justification for an investigation.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Suggests development of a riverside path to Bure Park.
Queries the absence of reference to, or investigation of, Fleggburgh.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The writer’s point about a riverside path is unclear, as there is an existing path to Bure Park. Fleggburgh, like many settlements in the Broads, has no specific reference in the consultation document as there was no perceived need, or earlier suggestions of need, for policies in addition to the Broads-wide ones already adopted in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.
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**HALVERGATE**

**HLV/DSSP-REJ/1** Halvergate - Provisionally Rejected Option - Proposed Housing Development - Land at Halvergate  
*[Successor Policy – None]*

**Anglian Water Representation:**
Anglian Water does not envisage water supply being a constraint to development. Wastewater treatment and sewerage network are constraints. It is also noted the existence of a pumping station in the vicinity that should be protected by a minimum encroachment zone of 15 metres. I have no further comments to make.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Development of the site would be constrained by wastewater treatment facilities and sewerage network that are inadequate to meet the needs of the proposed development. Capacity and detailed design of development of this site would be constrained by the proximity of the existing pumping station. Water supply unlikely to be a constraint.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The inadequacy of the wastewater treatment and sewerage facilities weighs heavily against the development of this site, which is in any case not favoured for other reasons.

**HORNING**

**HOR/DSSP-a** Horning - Development Boundary  
*[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 1]*

**Horning Parish Council Representation:**
Agreed.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Parish Council’s support for the policy noted.

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
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Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.

**HOR/DSSP-b Horning - Car Parking**

**[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 2]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Your SFRA appears to show the site to lie just within Flood Zone 1. However, given the proximity of the site to the Flood Zone, we recommend that should a change of use occur on the site in the future, the planning application should consider the issue of flood risk. In particular, we recommend that a topographical survey should be carried out and the outputs compared with the flood levels to determine if the site is at risk from flooding. If this is the case, the flood risk comments set out in the general section above would apply to the planning application.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Suggests that although the site lies in a lower flood risk zone, the proximity of identified higher flood risk areas should result in consideration of flood risk if a change of use is proposed in future.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Policy has been amended to refer to the need to take flood risk into account in the event an alternative use is proposed.

**HOR/DSSP-b Horning - Car Parking**

**[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 2]**

**Horning Parish Council Representation:**
Agreed. The car park is currently operated by Mitchell and Butler. The Council suggests that some of the profit element from this car park might be put towards improving the surrounding area.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Support for the policy. Suggests contribution from the proceeds of car parking here to improvements in the surrounding area.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Parish Council’s support for the policy is noted. The potential for contributions from the car park to local improvements is not a matter for this document, but may be something the Parish Council could perhaps discuss with the owners.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-b</th>
<th>Horning - Car Parking</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</strong></td>
<td>Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Response:</strong></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-c</th>
<th>Horning - Open Space</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 3]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency Representation:</td>
<td>This area falls within Flood Zones 3a and 3b, as defined by your SFRA. It’s designation as open space is therefore an appropriate land use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</strong></td>
<td>Confirms appropriateness of proposed designation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Response:</strong></td>
<td>Confirmation of appropriateness noted and reference to this added to written justification of policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-c</th>
<th>Horning - Open Space</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 3]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horning Parish Council Representation:</td>
<td>Agreed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</strong></td>
<td>Policy supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Response:</strong></td>
<td>Parish Council’s support for the policy noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**HOR/DSSP-c Horning - Open Space**

**[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 3]**

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOR/DSSP-d Horning - Waterside plots**

**[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 4]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Your SFRA shows that a large proportion of this area falls within Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. The remainder of the area falls within Flood Zone 3a, the high risk flood zone. Therefore, the general flood risk comments set out above will apply. We are pleased to note that this policy confirms that development should adhere to policies on flood risk. For consistency, you may wish to include flood risk as a potential constraint to development. We note that a flood risk monitoring indicator has been included for this policy. We understand that the intention of this policy is not to allow new development, but instead to encourage the maintenance/upgrading/replacement of existing buildings. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF highlights that only ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ land uses are appropriate within Flood Zone 3b. Replacement of other uses may be acceptable provided the requirements of paragraph 4.90 of the PPS 25 Practice Guide are met. Flood Risk Assessments supporting future planning applications should consider opportunities to reduce flood risk and should demonstrate that any residual risk can be safely managed as required in paragraph 103 of the NPPF. Betterment should be sought within replacement buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcomes the reference to the need for compliance with flood risk policies. Provides detailed advice regarding the guidance available to achieve this and proposes that opportunities to reduce and manage flood risk should be addressed in flood risk assessments for proposed developments, including replacement buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having identified in the policy the need for compliance with flood risk policies (because of the nature of the site), it is not considered there is any specific need to reiterate the detailed content of the flood risk policies and guidance already in, or associated with, the relevant flood risk policies at national and local level (i.e. Broads Development Management Policy DM29 and the NPPF).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-d</th>
<th>Horning - Waterside Plots</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 4]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Horning Parish Council Representation:**
Agreed.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Policy supported.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Parish Council’s support for policy noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-d</th>
<th>Horning - Waterside Plots</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 4]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-d</th>
<th>Horning - Waterside Plots</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 4]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Ropes Hill Dyke Residents Association Representation:**
RHDRA members are not generally happy at being grouped under the same policy with some of the waterfront properties accessed via the saw dust road to Crabbett’s Marsh in the designation of ‘waterside plots’. It is thought not to reflect our long term (1920’s) establishment, permanent non-seasonal occupancy of substantial properties, excellent metalled road access, proximity to the village limit and existing connection to electricity, water, telephones and mains sewage services etc. and also mains gas on the northern bank of the dyke.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Considers that the properties on Ropes Hill Dyke should not be included within this Policy area, and are more appropriately included within the development boundary, on the grounds of permanence, proximity to the village, infrastructure, etc.
Broads Authority Response:
The delineation between different policy areas is often challenging and a matter of fine judgement. In this case the objectors’ arguments are accepted in part, and the policy boundaries redrawn to include part, but not the whole, of the area within the development boundary. The northern part of the area has not been changed as suggested as the general openness and character here is considered more appropriately retained within the Waterside Plots policy area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-e</th>
<th>Horning - Horning Sailing Club</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Environment Agency Representation:
Your SFRA shows the site to fall partly within Flood Zones 3a and 3b. This area is greater with the addition of climate change. Therefore, the general flood risk comments set out above will apply. We are pleased to note that this policy confirms that development should adhere to policies on flood risk. We note that the policy encourages the use of the site for sailing facilities, classified as water-compatible development in the Technical Guidance to the NPPF and, given the flood risk associated with the area, we are pleased to note that dwellings and holiday accommodation will not be permitted. For consistency, you may wish to include flood risk as a potential constraint to development and as a monitoring indicator.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Notes site is in high flood risk zones, but that the supported use is compatible with this under national policy, and is pleased to note that dwellings and holiday accommodation will not be permitted. Suggests addition of flood risk as a constraint and monitoring indicator for the Policy.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted. It is not considered necessary to add flood risk to the Policy as this is already covered by other policies and there are not particular circumstances of this site that require reinforcement of these.

Horning Parish Council Representation:
Agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-e</th>
<th>Horning - Horning Sailing Club</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| | Horning Parish Council | |
|----------------|---------------------||
| | Representation:     | Agreed.            |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-e</th>
<th>Horning - Horning Sailing Club</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horning Sailing Club Representation:</td>
<td>The Management Committee of Horning Sailing Club would be grateful if you would consider amending the wording to read ‘Dwellings, holiday accommodation or business use will not be permitted.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</td>
<td>Suggests amended wording to the policy to preclude business use in the policy area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority Response:</td>
<td>The Sailing Club’s response is taken to imply it is broadly content with the policy. The Club’s suggested amendment to the Draft Policy is consistent with the intent of the policy and has therefore been incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-e</th>
<th>Horning - Horning Sailing Club</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</td>
<td>Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority Response:</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-f</th>
<th>Horning - Crabbett’s Marsh</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency Representation:</td>
<td>Your SFRA shows that this area falls partly within Flood Zones 3b, 3a and 2, and that the remainder lies within Flood Zone 3a with the addition of climate change. Protecting this area for landscape and nature conservation value is an appropriate land use in terms of flood risk. We are pleased to note that particularly vulnerable forms of development such as caravans, will not be permitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Supports the protection of the area for conservation, and the prohibition of caravans etc., as in accordance with the flood risk to the site. |
|Broads Authority Response: |
|Support noted, and reference to this added to the written justification of the policy. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-f</th>
<th>Horning - Crabbett’s Marsh</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horning Parish Council Representation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation: |
|Policy supported. |

| Broads Authority Response: |
|Parish Council’s support for the policy noted. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-f</th>
<th>Horning - Crabbett’s Marsh</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk County Council Representation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation: |
|Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding. |

| Broads Authority Response: |
|Noted. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-g</th>
<th>Horning - Boatyards, etc. At Ferry Rd. &amp; Ferry View Rd.</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 7]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency Representation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your SFRA shows this area to fall almost entirely within Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. You may therefore wish to include flood risk as a constraint to development in this location and to highlight flood risk in your SA. The general flood risk comments set out above will apply. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF highlights that only ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ land uses are appropriate within Flood Zone 3b. Boatyard uses may be considered to be ‘water-compatible’. However, it appears that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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your Development Management Policies DP18 and DP20 may allow the development of other uses in some circumstances. In light of this, we recommend that you clarify which land uses would be acceptable within the policy/supporting text to ensure that this policy complies with national planning policy. General industrial or commercial land uses are classified as ‘less vulnerable’ and are not appropriate within Flood Zone 3b.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Suggests consideration of inclusion of high flood risk status of the site in Policy and SA.
Recommends identification of alternative uses that might be acceptable under other policies applying to the site.

Broads Authority Response:
Reference to flood risk in area added to Policy and SA.
It is not considered necessary to identify alternative uses which might, in certain circumstances, be acceptable on the site, as these are not promoted by the Policy, and in any case are fully controlled by existing flood risk policies.

HOR/DSSP-g Horning - Boatyards, etc. At Ferry Rd. & Ferry View Road [Successor Policy – PP/HOR 7]

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted.
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**HOR/DSSP-g** Horning - Boatyards, etc. At Ferry Rd. & Ferry View Rd. [Successor Policy – PP/HOR 7]

**RSPB Representation:**
Clearer guidance should be provided on landscaping. Planting should include nectar-mixes and should not focus solely on trees.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Clearer landscaping guidance should be provided. Planting should include nectar-rich species and not focus solely on trees.

**Broads Authority Response:**
It is not considered desirable or necessary to provide detailed guidance on landscape planting in the policy. This can be provided at the planning application stage and tailored to the specific development proposed. Wording of reference to landscape planting widened beyond trees, and specific reference to nectar mixes and wildlife added.

**HOR/DSSP-h** Horning - Woodbastwick Fen moorings [Successor Policy – PP/HOR 8]

**Environment Agency Representation:**
The area lies predominately in Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. The proposed policy is that ‘no buildings will be permitted apart from small-scale storage cupboards associated with the mooring of navigable craft’. This can be considered a water compatible use which is appropriate in Flood Zone 3b. We welcome the policy to remove the existing houseboats and residential moorings if opportunities arise, as this will reduce the existing flood risk to the inhabitants on this site, by removing a vulnerable land use from Flood Zone 3b. This follows the approach in Table 1 of NPPF Technical Guidance which states that in Flood Zone 3b ‘developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to relocate existing development to land with a lower probability of flooding.’

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports proposed restriction of buildings, removal of houseboats and residential moorings where possible, on the basis of the flood risk to the site and national planning policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support for these elements of the policy noted, and included in the written justification of the policy.

**HOR/DSSP-h** Horning - Woodbastwick Fen moorings [Successor Policy – PP/HOR 8]

Horning Parish Council Representation:
Agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy supported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horning Parish Council's, support or the policy is noted. (NB: Though closely associated with Horning this policy area is within Woodbastwick Parish.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOR/DSSP-h</th>
<th>Horning - Woodbastwick Fen Moorings</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOR 8]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUDHAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUD/DSSP</th>
<th>Ludham (General)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Norfolk Heritage Fleet Trust Representation:
I can confirm on behalf of the Norfolk Heritage Fleet Trust that the policies outlined for the Womack area are acceptable for the Trust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers the policies for the Womack area acceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Trust's acceptance is noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUD/DSSP-a</th>
<th>Ludham - Development Boundary</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – None]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

### LUD/DSSP-a Ludham - Development Boundary

**RSPB Representation:**
Any development at Ludham must not exacerbate water quality issues in the area. Clear evidence to demonstrate that the water supply and particularly sewerage system can accommodate new development must be outlined. This is necessary to show that there will not be impacts on nearby Natura 2000 sites or SSSIs.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Development in Ludham must not worsen water quality. Seeks evidence that water supply and sewerage system can accommodate new development, to show no adverse impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Development boundary for Ludham no longer proposed.

**NORWICH**

**NOR/DSSP Norwich (General)**

**Lanpro Representation:**
On May 28th 1827, a bill of parliament was passed making Norwich a port.
In 1994 Norwich City Council published its planning guidelines for the redevelopment of some 47 acres of land known as The Riverside area of Norwich. The overall development strategy advocated for this part of Norwich sought to create new residential and retail areas onto which the City centre could expand. This Riverside area redevelopment work was completed around the year 2000. At this time the City Council began to Plan the regeneration of the King Street area within the final development vision being
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contained in the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan published during 2004. The vision for King Street was to create new largely residential areas on then derelict employment sites supported by a convenience and specialist shopping offer. The situation today is that both banks of the river Wensum around Station Quay and Corporation Quay within the Port of Norwich are underused and provide no economic benefit to the City of Norwich. Worse still, due to the comprehensive redevelopment of the land adjacent the quay headings within the new Riverside and King Street regeneration areas for a mix of nonconforming retail and residential uses, the Port of Norwich now has no real economic future for industrial, storage and distribution uses.

The development strategy advocated by Lanpro and BACA Architects in the Port of Norwich study seeks to maximise the economic future use of the Port of Norwich. Our vision is to deliver a floating high-tech business park within the heart of the City of Norwich that is highly attractive to research and development industries operating in a global market place. We believe that the lack of planning controls on this section of the tidal river combined with the City Council’s ownership of the river bed within the City provides a unique opportunity to deliver a science and innovation park that is able to react ultra-quickly to technological change. Lanpro see the navigation within the Port of Norwich as being a vacant site onto which new and second hand business floor space (that is able to navigate the tidal river) can be located quickly and easily without the need for specific planning permission. We believe that this highly flexible business park that is situated over an accessible duct that is the river has the potential to become a strong magnet for rapid growth global businesses.

Lanpro and BACA have examined a number of sites between the port and Griffin Lane in Thorpe St Andrew that have the potential to accommodate new uses to develop a strong river bus service between the port and City Boats home base at Griffin Lane. The sites identified have the ability to deliver unique employment, leisure and residential opportunities within The Broads. A number of the opportunities have been submitted in response to the current ‘The Broads Draft Site Specific Policies DPD’ consultation.

STRATEGIC MASTERPLAN
01 The Port of Norwich: River Walk
02 Corporation Quay: Floating Hi-tech business units
13 Deal Ground: Floating restaurants
04 Carey’s Meadow: Activity and visitor centre
05 Thorpe Island: Contemporary floating homes within marina
06 Thorpe Island: City centre moorings
07 Whittingham Country Park: Riverside Weddings, cafe and theatre
08 Thorpe Marshes: Activity and visitor centre
09 Griffin Lane: High quality floating homes, tourism and River Bus centre

Corporation Quay VISION:
• A highly responsive location that is flexible for transient businesses
• A long term and secure economic future for the Port of Norwich
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- Maximizing the mix of vacant, available and flexible spaces in the heart of the City
- A global hi-tech and start-up business destination within an accessible river environment
- The opportunity that is the lack of planning control on a tidal river
- A business park that is ultra-flexible and the quickest to react to change in a global market
- The creation of public space and filling of gaps in the riverside walk through boulevard pontoons

Thorpe Island VISION:
- A unique new residential cluster within The Broads
- A soft edge to the City at the point where the urban area meets The Broads
- Maximizing the use of the existing mooring basin
- Living in close proximity to nature and better management of the ecological resources
- Facilitating the cessation of lawful existing uses on Thorpe Island
- Enabling development to deliver new linear public moorings within the City of Norwich
- Meeting the needs of global businesses attracted to the Port of Norwich
- The river as a developed transport corridor

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Proposes a conceptual ‘development strategy’ to use various parts of the Wensum and Yare in and close to Norwich for floating office (or business) space, houses, etc. Identifies a number of opportunities in the area, as follows:
1. Port of Norwich: River walk
2. Corporation Quay: Floating hi-tech business units
3. Deal Ground: Floating restaurants
4. Cary’s Meadow: Activity and visitor centre
5. Thorpe island: Contemporary floating homes within marina
6. Thorpe Island: City centre moorings
7. Whitlingham Country Park: Riverside weddings, café and theatre
8. Thorpe Marshes: Activity and visitor centre
9. Griffin Lane: High quality floating homes, tourism and river bus centre.

Accompanying conceptual graphical material relates page by page to Vision, Strategic Master plan, Corporation Quay and Thorpe Island.

Broads Authority Response:
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Although the representation contains some interesting ideas and arresting visual imagery, it is founded on some fundamental misapprehensions about the planning status of the area, and does not address some of the critical issues, including access, infrastructure and relation to surrounding areas, which would need to be addressed before these concepts could be realised. The representation refers to ‘the lack of planning controls on the tidal river’ as providing a unique opportunity. The tidal river is, in fact, subject to planning control, and the Broads Authority is the local planning authority for the river. (Norwich City Council is the local planning authority for the land either side within most of the city.)

The document goes on to state ‘Lanpro sees the navigation within the Port of Norwich as being a vacant site...’ The navigation is not a vacant site, but a statutory navigation, with a public right of navigation upon it. The Broads Authority is the navigation authority for the Norwich navigation (and the wider Broads navigation), with a statutory duty to maintain it for navigation.

In addition to the planning controls that this representation overlooks, works within and adjoining the navigation area require a licence from the navigation authority, which would be unlikely to be granted if this restricts the navigational use of the river.

At no point does the representation acknowledge that the area has status equivalent to a national park, and the highest level of planning protection of its landscape and scenic beauty, or the statutory purposes of the Broads Authority, charged with managing it.

No reference has been made to the Broads Core Strategy. Neither is there assessment of how the proposed development might support or undermine the Norwich, Broadland and South Norfolk Joint Core Strategy.

No attention is given to the significant flood risk in the area, that national planning policy strongly steers most new development away from areas at such risk, or that there are areas available without such flood risk which could readily accommodate the uses, and amounts of these, proposed.

No indication is given of the way that these potential floating development would be accessed, particularly in terms of vehicular access, how basic infrastructure such as water supply, sewerage and electricity could be provided, or whether there is local capacity in the relevant systems or could be funded by any or all of the proposed development. The relationship to existing or proposed development in the vicinity is unexamined.

The suggestion is made that the proposed new uses would help develop a strong river bus service between Griffin Lane and the city but, appealing as that might seem, the scale of development proposed seems unlikely to be able to support such a service, and no evidence has been put forward to substantiate the claim.

CORPORATION QUAY: The area indicated is misnamed in the documentation. Corporation Quay itself is outside the area identified as such. (It is upstream of Carrow Bridge, not downstream as shown, and on the north bank of the river, not both banks.) The riverbanks, included in the indicative proposals (‘higher riverside density for larger businesses’), are within Norwich City Council’s planning area.

CONCLUSION: Notwithstanding the above, there may be opportunities in specific instances in the Broads for some of the concepts illustrated or mentioned in the documentation. However, it is far from clear that the proposals in this representation
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amount to a realistic and desirable form of development. Certainly the proposals are insufficiently developed to facilitate incorporation into the Site Specific Policies DPD at this stage, and as they stand do not warrant a delay to the DPD preparation programme in order that they can be further researched and refined before it proceeds.

NOR/DSSP Norwich (General)

Walpole, Mr R Representation:
It would also be in the public interest to explain how the Authority is a partner in the Greater Norwich Development Partnership. The Partnership’s Green Infrastructure impinges on some Specific Sites. It may also create a means of developing greater public access through liaison with neighbouring planning authorities. For example the Authority is responsible for navigation along the river Wensum up to New Mills Norwich. Should the Norwich Policy 3.3.29(page60) be extended to include its riverside paths? Especially as the Authority manages the Yacht Station on its banks. By assisting in the promotion of the Wensum River Pathway and its extension from the Boom Towers (river gateway to Norwich City) to the Utilities Site, the Authority would contribute to more people having cycling/walking access to Whittingham Country Park. Moreover the Authority would also assist in completing the missing link in the inter-European route from Hull to Harwich, Sustrans No 1. It would also join the county’s trails of Marriott’s Way to Wherryman’s Way. The Authority’s expertise in developing angling sites and canoe-slipways together with restoration of day-boating (old boat-house almost adjoins Dragonfly House) could be used to enhance riverside attractions for both residents and tourists. A mention in this Policy might provoke a joint exploration with Norwich Corporation of historical sites along the riverside paths, such as the ancient Swannery.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Discusses the potential for access improvements around Norwich, and impacts of potential green infrastructure related to planned growth around Norwich.
Suggests policies could be extended to cover riverside paths in Norwich, connections to other routes and locations, and the potential links with historical sites.

Broads Authority Response:
The Authority is supportive of the sorts of endeavours that the writer mentions, and involved in some projects he mentions in a variety of ways. However, during the preparation of the draft Site Specific Policies there were no projects sufficiently certain, in route or execution, to make inclusion of a site specific policy appropriate.
On the specific matter of extending the policies to the riverside paths (or potential paths) in Norwich City, these are outside the Broads area designated by Parliament and the Broads Authority’s planning powers. The provision of a specific planning policy on these is unlikely, in itself, to greatly assist or speed up the overcoming of the obstacles to further enhancement and connection of
the riverside paths. The existing arrangements and cooperation between the Broads Authority and the City Council are considered adequate, at least for the moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOR/DSSP-a Norwich - Utilities Site</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/NOR 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency Representation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are pleased to note that this policy requires flood risk to be considered through any future development. The site is shown by your SFRA to fall within Flood Zone 2. Please see general flood risk comments above. The requirement for our prior Flood Defence Consent applies to any waterside development.... In particular, we note that through policy NOR/DSSP-a your Authority may seek a pedestrian/cycle link across the Wensum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation: |
| Supports Draft Policy requirement for flood risk to be addressed. Highlights the need for Flood Defence Consent from the EA in relation to the development addressed in the policy, and any bridge across the Wensum. |

| Broads Authority Response: |
| Support noted. Reference to the likely need for Flood Defence Consent added to the policy supporting text. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOR/DSSP-a Norwich - Utilities Site</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/NOR 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk County Council Representation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation: |
| Identifies that the site is within an area of safeguarded mineral resources (sand and gravel). |

| Broads Authority Response: |
| The Policy identifies the issue of the minerals as requiring resolution. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOR/DSSP-a Norwich - Utilities Site</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/NOR 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk County Council Representation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The policy ought to refer in the second set of bullet points (covering what the LPA will seek) to: “Any other obligations necessary to mitigate the impact of the development e.g. education and other community uses”. In addition it would be helpful in the supporting text to cross-reference to the developer contributions policy in the adopted Development Management DPD (Policy DP 30).

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Suggests the Policy should include planning obligations for community facilities, and reference made to the Development Management Policy (DP30) on this topic.

**Broads Authority Response:**
It is not considered necessary to repeat the content of existing other policies except where these have a distinct or particular site relevance.

---

**NOR/DSSP-b Norwich - Riverside Walk [Successor Policy – PP/NOR 2]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Flood Defence Consent:
The requirement for our prior consent applies to any waterside development (as highlighted above). In particular.... Policy NOR/DSSP-b also requires that a riverside walk is maintained. Any trees that are planted would also require our consent. It will need to be ensured that access for our maintenance machinery is maintained.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights the need for the Agency’s Flood Defence Consent for development and trees in the vicinity of the river, and flood defences maintenance access to be maintained.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted. Reference to the likely need for Flood Defence Consent added to the policy supporting text.

---

**NOR/DSSP-b Norwich - Riverside Walk [Successor Policy – PP/NOR 2]**

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is in the area of a safeguarded minerals (sand and gravel) resource.
Broads Authority Response:
Reference to the minerals issue has been added to the Policy text.
The proposed riverside walkway does not depend on either the retention or the removal of the minerals, but there would be potential conflict with extraction of the minerals once the path was in place, or interruption of the accessibility of the pathway while this took place. In practice, the provision of the path is likely to be achieved in conjunction with the development of the adjacent Utilities Site.

ORMESBY ST. MICHAEL

ORM/DSSP-a  Ormesby St Michael - Ormesby Waterworks  [Successor Policy – PP/ORM 1]

Environment Agency Representation:
This area is shown by your SFRA as ‘flooding uncertain’. Our Flood map shows part of the area to fall within Flood Zone 3. At least part of the area covered by this policy may therefore be at risk from flooding. Future planning applications should have regard to this flood risk and should be in line with current national/local planning policy. You may wish to refer to this within the policy. See general flood risk comments above.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Highlights that part of the area is identified by EA as in a high flood risk zone, and the flood risk should be addressed in any future planning applications. Suggests that this might be referred to in the policy.

Broads Authority Response:
EA’s mapping of flood risk zones noted and reference added in justification of policy.

ORM/DSSP-a  Ormesby St Michael - Ormesby Waterworks  [Successor Policy – PP/ORM 1]

Essex and Suffolk Water Representation:
We support a policy that protects this important Water treatment works. We would like to see the following wording included “Development that is required to enable Essex & Suffolk Water to meet it statutory duty as a water supply undertaker will be supported, that development where possible to be designed to minimise its impact on the landscape or make a positive contribution to the landscape. Where there are trees on site that make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the area, where possible they will be retained and protected during any construction works.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports the protection afforded to the water treatment works by this policy. Suggests some slightly amended wording for that part of the policy setting out the approach to development of the waterworks.</td>
<td>Support for the protective element of the policy is noted. The proposed revised wording would reduce the criteria for support for proposed development. This is not considered appropriate. Development that does not meet these criteria would not necessarily be refused, but it would be necessary to justify this by reference to other material considerations (including, perhaps, the importance of the proposed works to the water supply network, compensatory landscape/environmental improvements, etc.). The wording has been amended to include the suggested reference to the statutory duty of a water supply operator (which is wider than simply the operation of the waterworks referred to in the Draft Policy).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORM/DSSP-a Ormesby St Michael - Ormesby Waterworks [Successor Policy – PP/ORM 1]</th>
<th>Norfolk County Council Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.</td>
<td>Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORM/DSSP-a Ormesby St Michael - Ormesby Waterworks [Successor Policy – PP/ORM 1]</th>
<th>RSPB Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Monitoring Indicators should better specify measures that will be used to assess impacts on Natura 2000 sites and SSSIs. These need to be more specific to ensure that appropriate measures are applied and that suitable baseline data is also available. The indicators need to adopt a SMART approach to ensure the success of the proposed policies can be easily assessed at the end of the plan period and appropriate intervals in between.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation: | |
|---------------------------------------------------| |
Wishes to see more information on monitoring measures, specifically in relation to Natura 2000 sites & SSSIs, and use of ‘SMART’ approach.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Headline draft indicators only were included in the Draft Site Specific Policies Consultation Document. Details of the approach to monitoring are elaborated in the Proposed DPD.

**OULTON BROAD**

**General comment**

**Oulton Broad**

**Waveney District Council Representation:**
Section 3.3.31, First Paragraph: "This is intended to support regeneration, diversify the economy and develop its role as a transport hub." It is assumed this statement refers to Lowestoft rather than Oulton Broad but this remains unclear. Section 3.3.31, First Paragraph: The Area Action Plan is now adopted (January 2012).

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Seeks clarification of whether text mentioned refers to Lowestoft or Oulton Broad. Highlights that Area Action Plan now adopted.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Text clarified and updated to address these points.

**General comment**

**Oulton Broad**

**RSPB Representation:**
Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan was adopted on 25th January 2012. The information in this section should be updated accordingly.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Reference to status of Lake Lothing Area Action Plan in consultation draft requires updating.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Reference updated.
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OUL/DSSP-a Oulton Broad - Development Boundary [Successor Policy – PP/OUL 1]

**Environment Agency Representation:**
With regard to policy OUL/DSSP-a, the development boundary is very close to the designated flood zones and therefore part of the area defined by this policy may be at risk from flooding. It would therefore be beneficial if a topographical site survey could be undertaken with planning applications in this area, and compared to the flood levels to determine accurate flood zone boundaries. We would then recommend that the sequential approach is applied to locate built development within Flood Zone 1.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights the desirability of undertaking topographical surveys to inform flood risk assessment of sites close to identified higher flood risk zones.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Advice noted. Site flood risk assessments are required as a matter of routine for proposed developments close to the indicated higher flood risk zones. It is not considered that there is a particular need to highlight this in Oulton Broad.

OUL/DSSP-a Oulton Broad - Development Boundary [Successor Policy – PP/OUL 1]

**Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Representation:**
and OUL/DSSP-c and OUL/DSSP-d
Groundworks associated with development in these areas have the potential to cause significant damage or destruction to any archaeological deposits that exist. In accordance with Policy HE12.3 of PPS5, any permission granted for these areas should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed. Justification: There is high potential for encountering archaeological remains in these locations.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Draws attention to the high potential for encountering archaeological remains in the area, and the potential for damage to this from construction works. Recommends that any planning permission here is subject to condition requiring archaeological investigation and recording.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Requirement for archaeological condition added to policy.
Environment Agency Representation:
We have no specific comments to make on this policy as it relates to traffic issues. However, we would highlight that your SFRA shows the northern part of the area falls within Flood Zone 3b, with the remainder of the south of the site falling within Flood Zone 1. Any development that does occur in the area defined by this policy will need to take flood risk into account. See general flood risk comments above.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Notes that part of the area included within the draft policy lies within a high flood risk zone, and any development here would need to take this into account.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted. The Draft Policy did not promote development in the identified area. Policy now not being pursued.

Ivy House Country Hotel (Agent - Wheatman Planning) Representation:
I am acting on behalf of our clients, the Ivy House Country Hotel.... Our clients welcome and support Policy OUL/DSSP-b in the area shown on Map 14 for recognising the sustainability of this location for tourism related development; offering excellent access to public transport, both bus and rail, and the local shops and services within walking distance in Oulton Broad. The Policy places a restriction imposed by the Marsh Road junction to limit development/redevelopment opportunities to a level of traffic flows consistent with the existing uses and extant consents within this area. However, there is the potential for a secondary access via Ivy Lane to service some of the identified area, either separately or in conjunction with Marsh Road. This could provide the benefit of reducing the traffic flows using the Marsh Lane/Bridge Road junction in the interests of highway safety while encouraging investment in tourism facilities to the benefit of the local economy. We therefore request that the policy is amended to include the potential for a secondary means of access via Ivy Lane, but without this provision the restriction remains on not increasing traffic flows above the existing and extant uses.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Supports the policy. Wishes to see it amended to include a potential secondary access to the policy area from Ivy Lane.

Broads Authority Response:
The support for the Draft Policy is noted. Policy no longer being pursued.
(With regard to the potential for an access off Ivy Lane, the Authority was neither promoting nor precluding development in the area identified. Development proposals here would need to be judged against the criteria in the Broads Core Strategy and Development Management Policies. The Draft Policy simply sought to ensure that any such development would not lead to further aggravation of the road access at Marsh Road. If such development obtained its access via Ivy Lane, then this may be a means by which this constraint may be overcome, but it is not a solution that the Authority is specifically promoting, as it has undertaken no assessment of either the desirability of further development in the draft policy area, nor the merits and demerits of an access via Ivy Lane, and the cost of providing such an access may well be dependent on a scale of development that would bring its own problems.)

OUL/DSSP-b Oulton Broad - Development off Marsh Road [Successor Policy – None]

Suffolk County Council Representation:
Archaeology:
There is high potential for important heritage assets of archaeological interest remains to be defined at allocation OUL/DSSSP-b, which has not been the subject of systematic archaeological investigation. As stated in Paragraphs 128 and 129 of the NPPF, this information must be identified in the application. The application should include an archaeological impact assessment, taking into account the potential for, and importance of, any heritage assets of archaeological interest in this area. There is high potential for encountering archaeological remains at locations OUL/DSSP-a, OUL/DSSP-c and OUL/DSSP-d. Groundworks associated with development in these areas have the potential to cause significant damage or destruction to any archaeological deposits that exist. In accordance with Policy Paragraph 141 of the NPPF, any permission granted for these areas should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

Highways:
Development at these locations should recognise the traffic issues noted in LTP3, particularly the congestion on the A1117 (Bridge Road) between the Oulton crossing of the River Waveney and Oulton Broad North Rail Station. The county council may seek developer contributions, by way of a Section 106 agreement or CIL, for transport improvements relevant to these locations. We would also suggest that OUL/DSSP-b could be seen as overly restrictive. A more effective policy may be one which says that development will not be allowed if it is adjudged to cause excessive additional traffic to the unacceptable detriment of the safety and amenity of the Marsh Road/Bridge Road junction. If the traffic impacts of the development could be mitigated, or contributions used to improve the safety of this junction, then development in this location could be acceptable in highways terms.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Considers the policy over-restrictive, and suggests development could be acceptable if detriment to highway safety and amenity was not unacceptable, and that traffic impacts of development could be mitigated, or contributions for junction safety improvements.
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Draws attention to the high archaeological potential in the area, that this could be significantly damaged by groundworks associated with development, and suggests that planning applications should include archaeological assessment/recording.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Policy deleted in the absence of support from the highway authority, and in light of the misunderstanding of the significance of the policy area by a number of respondents, including the County Archaeological Service.

**OUL/DSSP-b Oulton Broad - Development off Marsh Road [Successor Policy – None]**

**Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Representation:**
There is high potential for important heritage assets of archaeological interest remains to be defined at this location. As stated in Policies HE6.1 and 6.2 of PPS 5, this information must be identified in the application. The application should include an archaeological impact assessment, taking into account the potential for, and importance of, any heritage assets of archaeological interest in this area. Justification: There is high potential for encountering important archaeological remains within this large allocation (much of which is greenfield), which has not been the subject of previous systematic investigation.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Draws attention to the high potential for encountering archaeological remains in the area, and the potential for damage to this from construction works. Recommends that any planning permission here is subject to condition requiring archaeological investigation and recording. Refers (erroneously) to the Draft Policy as a large Greenfield allocation.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted. Contrary to the Archaeological Service’s understanding the Draft Policy was not an allocation for development. Policy now deleted in the absence of support from the highway authority, and in light of the misunderstanding of the significance of the policy area by a number of respondents, including the County Archaeological Service.

**Waveney District Council Representation:**
The policy is proposed to replace existing policy OB3 and uses the same wording: “Development which would lead to increased traffic movements on Marsh Road will not be permitted.” Whilst this approach to additional traffic is supported, the development boundary in the Marsh Road area has been extended westwards to include an additional open field which would be classified as green field land. The Broads Authority has not proposed any new development within the extended development boundary area,
however, there remains uncertainty as to why this extension is required. Justification put forward in the document states that this extension will “…better reflect areas with road access via Marsh Road.” This extension of the development boundary reflects the layout of the land (fenced field), and the road to which the justification relates is a farmers lane. This lane traverses the field south of the existing development boundary and north of the proposed additional area. The statements put forward to support the extension of the development boundary are not considered to be adequate justification without greater clarity as to what would be considered appropriate development. The concern for Waveney is that whatever limited development that could come forward on this site, there is uncertainty as to what types of use would be considered acceptable and why the inclusion of this additional greenfield land within the development boundary is considered necessary. The proposed extension of the development boundary in the vicinity of Marsh Road to encompass greenfield land without identifying potential uses does not provide certainty. From Waveney District Council’s perspective, this approach is inconsistent with that applied by Waveney in other parts of Lowestoft and elsewhere in the District. If there is potential to develop the site without increasing traffic in the vicinity of Marsh Road then allocating the site for development and setting out the type(s) of development that would be considered acceptable would provide greater clarity.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Expresses concern that the Policy ‘extends the development boundary’ significantly without justification.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Council has misconstrued the Draft Policy, which is not a development boundary and does not promote development on the area identified. The Policy is not being pursued, in part to avoid this confusion.

**OUL/DSSP-c Oulton Broad - Boathouse Lane Leisure Plots**  
[Successor Policy – PP/OUL 2]

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Your SFRA shows the northern half of this area to fall within Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. Therefore, any future planning applications for this area will need to have regard to this flood risk and development proposals will need to be in line with current national/local planning policy. Please see general flood risk comments above. Within Flood Zone 3b, appropriate land uses include ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ development types. You may consider the land uses proposed within this policy to be water-compatible, provided they are in association with moorings. For consistency, you may wish to highlight that flood risk issues require consideration. Please note, any raised car parking should have a void underneath to allow flood waters to flow underneath and so ensure that the volume of flood storage is not reduced. This will ensure that the proposed development will not increase flood risk elsewhere. Given the flood risk associated with this area, we are pleased to note that the permanent/seasonal occupation of the land and the stationing of caravans, will not be permitted.
Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Part of the policy area is in high flood risk zone. National and local flood risk policies will need to be applied in the area.
Development in such areas should be limited to ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water compatible’ development categories.

BA may consider development associated with moorings to be water compatible. Suggests highlighting flood risk considerations. Any raised car parking provision should incorporate void underneath to avoid reduction in flood water capacity. Supports exclusion of seasonal or permanent occupation, and stationing of caravans.

Broads Authority Response:
The flood risk and capacity issues are noted and text amended to highlight these. The national and local policies will be applied as normal on the site. Specific reference has been added stating raising ground levels will not generally be acceptable, and reference to raised parking areas omitted.

OUL/DSSP-d Oulton Broad - Former Pegasus/Hamptons Site [Successor Policy – PP/OUL 3]

Environment Agency Representation:
Part of this site is at risk from flooding. In particular, your SFRA shows part of the site to fall within Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. We are pleased to note that development will only be permitted where compatible with the flood risk associated with the site. This will require detailed consideration through any future planning application and development proposals will need to be in line with current national/local planning policy and the general flood risk comments made above will apply. In particular we would highlight that the precise location of the flood zones should be determined through a comparison of the site levels (obtained through a topographical survey) with the flood levels. We would recommend that the sequential approach is then followed on site to ensure that the most vulnerable land uses, such as residential development, are located in the areas of least flood risk. Only ‘essential-infrastructure’ and water-compatible’ land uses are appropriate within Flood Zone 3b. You may wish to refer to this within the policy. For consistency we recommend that you include flood risk as a potential constraint to development and as a monitoring indicator.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Supports reference to the flood risk to the site. Advises that this will require detailed assessment through any planning application for the site and in relation to national and local policies on flood risk. Reiterates parts of national policy. Suggests reference to the uses acceptable under this in functional flood plain areas of site, and recommends identifying flood risk as a potential constraint to development of the site and as a monitoring indicator.

Broads Authority Response:
Appendix 4 - Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

Support for reference to flood risk noted. It is not considered necessary to reiterate existing national and local policies in the policy. Flood risk management added as a monitoring indicator.

**OUL/DSSP-d** Oulton Broad - Former Pegasus/Hamptons Site [Successor Policy – PP/OUL 3]

**RSPB Representation:**
Draft Monitoring Indicators should better specify measures that will be used to assess impacts on Natura 2000 sites and SSSIs. These need to be more specific to ensure that appropriate measures are applied and that suitable baseline data is also available. The indicators need to adopt a SMART approach to ensure the success of the proposed policies can be easily assessed at the end of the plan period and appropriate intervals in between.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Wishes to see more information on monitoring measures, specifically in relation to Natura 2000 sites and SSSIs, and use of ‘SMART’ approach.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Only headline draft indicators were included in the Draft Site Specific Policies Consultation Document. Details of the approach to monitoring are elaborated in the Proposed DPD.

---

**POTTER HEIGHAM**

**POT/DSSP** Potter Heigham (General)

**Repps with Bastwick Parish Council Representation:**
The Council have asked me to draw to your attention the question of car parking at Pug Street Staithe (Map 15b Potter Heigham Bridge). The Council would like to see the picnic area developed into an area for car parking to ease the congestion on the approach road to the Staithe and on the Staithe itself. As you will be aware, the Environment Agency are carrying out improvement work connected with the pump house and this seems like a good opportunity.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Would like to see a car park developed to ease congestion on the Staithe at Repps (Pug Street), and suggests that forthcoming EA flood relief works in the vicinity could present an opportunity for this to be achieved.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

Regardless of the merits of the proposal, in the light of the considerable difficulties often encountered in achieving agreement, provision and management of car parking in such situations, it is considered that the scheme is not known to be sufficiently developed to warrant inclusion in the DPD. Policies in the Broads Core Strategy and Development Management Policies would offer some support for such a project gaining planning permission without an allocation in the DPD.

POT/DSSP-a Potter Heigham Bridge - Bridge Area [Successor Policy – PP/POT 1]

Environment Agency Representation:
We understand that this area is shown on map 15e rather than 15c. This site is at risk from flooding. In particular, your SFRA shows that the west of the site lies partly in Flood Zone 3b, the east of the site lies partly in Flood Zone 2, and the vast majority of the site lies in Flood Zones 3a and 3b in the future with climate change. We are pleased to note that flood risk has been included as a potential constraint to development. Future planning applications for this area will need to have regard to this flood risk and development proposals will need to be in line with current national/local planning policy. Please see the general flood risk comments set out above.

It may be beneficial to consider this further through the policy so that it is clear to future developers what land uses will be appropriate. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF states that only ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ land uses are appropriate within Flood Zone 3b. We note that new residential development will not be permitted. However, should new holiday accommodation be promoted through this policy, it should be ensured that it is located outside of the area of functional floodplain.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies error in map number reference. Notes the identified flood risk to the area and supports reference to flood risk in the policy. Mentions future development proposals will need to have regard to national and local flood risk policies. Suggests further clarification of acceptable uses in view of the flood risk. Re-states parts of national flood risk policy. Supports exclusion of residential uses. Notes that any additional holiday accommodation permitted under the policy should be in accordance with national policy and the variation in flood risk across the area.

Broads Authority Response:
Map number reference error corrected. Support for reference to flood risk noted. Having referenced this issue, it is not considered necessary to repeat national policy on flood risk, or (considering the nature of the policy and the likely pace and scale of development) apply this in detail to the area. Support for exclusion of residential housing noted. Proposals for holiday accommodation in the area would be determined in the light of national and local flood risk policy.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POT/DSSP-a</th>
<th>Potter Heigham Bridge - Bridge Area</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/POT 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk County Council Representation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POT/DSSP-b</th>
<th>Potter Heigham Bridge - Waterside plots</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/POT 2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency Representation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your SFRA shows that the majority of the area defined by this policy falls within Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. Given the serious nature of this flood risk we are pleased to note that additional dwellings or holiday accommodation will not be permitted through this policy. Such development would not be appropriate according to the advice given within the Technical Guidance to the NPPF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy does however allow maintenance/upgrading/replacement of existing buildings. We are pleased to note that this is providing that such proposals are consistent with policies on flood risk. The replacement of existing buildings within Flood Zone 3b may be appropriate according to paragraph 4.90 of the PPS 25 Practice Guide. However, it should be ensured that the design of the replacement buildings/dwellings will reduce the flood risk to the occupants and that residual risk is safely managed. Betterment over the existing should be sought within replacement dwellings. We recommend that this is addressed through your policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We note that the policy requires that particular care is taken to limit the height of replacement development. You may wish to consider how this requirement will tie in with the need for the property to be safe from flooding. We also note that the policy refers to limiting the extent of the buildings to approximately their present levels. However, we highlight that your Flood Risk SPD requires replacement residential development to be on a like-for-like basis, with no increase in the number of bedrooms and on the same sized footprint. As highlighted by your SA, the area is located in front of existing flood defences and in an area of high flood risk. We would therefore urge your Authority to consider the sustainability of continued development in such an area. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF highlights that within Flood Zone 3b, opportunities should be sought to relocate existing development to land with a lower probability of flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Pleased to note that the policy does not permit additional dwellings or holiday accommodation, and also that maintenance/upgrading/replacement of existing buildings is subject to consistency with policies on flood risk. Recommends that policy should provide for reductions in flood risk as a condition of replacements and upgrades. Queries how the tension between the policy limitations on height of replacement buildings and the likely need for raised floor levels to reduce flood risk can be compatible. Identifies differing requirements between the policy and the Broads Development and Flood Risk SPD in relation to whether additional extent of building is acceptable. Urges the Authority to consider the sustainability of continued development in this high flood risk area and draws attention to the NPPF encouragement of seeking opportunities to relocate existing development to land with a lower risk of flooding.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support for exclusion of additional dwellings and holiday homes, and for the making extension/upgrading/replacement subject to consistency with existing flood risk policies noted. The approach to extensions/upgrading/replacement is considered compatible with the national and local policies (including DP29[f]) which will also apply in tandem to such development. Explicit reference to the desirability of reducing flood risk is now added to the policy. The limitations to building height are not considered incompatible with reasonable raised floor heights. The height limitation is deliberately couched as ‘approximate’ to allow for a degree of flexibility to address such issues as any need for a raised floor height, without allowing these and other issues to drive a general increase in building height in the area, for landscape and visual amenity reasons. In the light of experience it is considered that restricting redevelopment to the existing footprint is both unnecessarily restrictive and can give rise to pressure for additional storeys. Once adopted, the development plan status of the policy will take precedence over the SPD, the future of which is in any case under review. There is no realistic opportunity to relocate these uses and buildings to an area of lower flood risk at the present time, given that the waterside location is their raison d’être, their history and cultural significance, the contribution they make to the enjoyment of the Broads (part of its statutory purposes), and the environmental and landscape sensitivities of the surrounding areas, and the costs and ownership complications involved.

**POT/DSSP-b Potter Heigham Bridge - Waterside Plots**

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

**POT/DSSP-b  Potter Heigham Bridge - Waterside Plots  [Successor Policy – PP/POT 2]**

**RSPB Representation:**
Draft Monitoring Indicators should better specify measures that will be used to assess impacts on Natura 2000 sites and SSSIs. These need to be more specific to ensure that appropriate measures are applied and that suitable baseline data is also available. The indicators need to adopt a SMART approach to ensure the success of the proposed policies can be easily assessed at the end of the plan period and appropriate intervals in between.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Wishes to see more information on monitoring measures, specifically in relation to Natura 2000 sites and SSSIs, and use of ‘SMART’ approach.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Only headline draft indicators were included in the Draft Site Specific Policies Consultation Document. Details of the approach to monitoring are elaborated in the Proposed DPD.

**POT/DSSP-c  Potter Heigham Bridge - Green Bank Zones  [Successor Policy – PP/POT 3]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
We welcome the prohibition of development within the green bank zones as these lie predominantly in Flood Zone 3b. Nature conservation is an appropriate ‘water compatible use’ within this flood zone.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Welcomes the prohibition of development in these areas, and considers the use compatible with the flood risk.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

---

**REEDHAM**

REE/DSSP-a  Reedham - Development Boundary  [Successor Policy – None]

**Broadland District Council Representation:**
It is proposed that the development boundary is amended to exclude gardens to the rear of properties because garden land is excluded from the definition of ‘previously developed land’. However, this would seem to be mixing up two issues. The development boundary is to indicate where development is acceptable in principle, and whether land is previously developed could be a factor in deciding this. However, it is not the only factor. It would seem illogical to exclude a sliver of land that is located between the development boundary in the Broads Area, and the similar settlement limit in the Broadland Lpa area, merely because it is not now classed as ‘previously developed’. There would seem to be no real reason why the land is not suitable for development in principle, given its location between existing properties.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Seeks revision of the development boundary at the rear of properties to provide continuity with the development area in the Broadland District Council planning area. Suggests that the basis of the exclusion of this area from the boundary is ill-founded, and that area would be suitable for development.

**Broads Authority Response:**
It is agreed that the availability of previously developed land is but one factor in determining whether and where a development boundary might be appropriate. In the case of Reedham the rear gardens of the river frontage properties were deliberately excluded from the draft development boundary primarily because of their importance in providing a green backdrop to the river frontage. Unfortunately, the reference to this was omitted from the main supporting text (leaving only the mention of the general approach to development boundaries, including consideration of previously developed land), though it was included in the draft monitoring indicators. It is not considered inappropriate to exclude particular areas from the development boundary where
justified. However, in this case the Draft Policy is not being pursued, following a further review of the approach to development boundaries.

**REE/DSSP-a  Reedham - Development Boundary  [Successor Policy – None]**

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource. It is likely that any development considered suitable would be exempt from CS16, due to its nature and scale, and the location of the site.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that safeguarded minerals (sand and gravel) lie in the area, but that the nature of development likely would not be constrained by this.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted. The Draft Policy is now not being pursued, following a further review of the approach to development boundaries.

**ST. OLAIVES**

**SOL/DSSP  St. Olaves (General)**

Fritton with St Olaves Parish Council Representation:
We are pleased to note that there are to be no new houses in this area to be built, unless in exceptional circumstances.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Expresses support for no new houses in the area, unless exceptional circumstances.

**Broads Authority Response:**
This is taken as support for the absence of a development boundary proposal or housing allocations around St. Olaves.

**SOL/DSSP-a  St. Olaves - Riverside Area and Moorings  [Successor Policy – PP/SOL 1]**

Environment Agency Representation:
The proposed policy allows for the mooring of boats and uses incidental to that activity such as storage lockers. This is an appropriate water-compatible, low vulnerability, use of land at risk of flooding.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers the proposed (continued) use compatible with the flood risk to the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOL/DSSP-a St Olaves - Riverside Area and Moorings [Successor Policy – PP/SOL 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk County Council Representation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:** Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:**

**SOL/DSSP-b St Olaves - Land adjacent to A143 Beccles Road and the New Cut (Former Queen’s Head Public House) [Successor Policy – PP/SOL 2]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
As your policy highlights, this area is at risk from flooding. This is shown within your SFRA. We are pleased to note that the policy requires future development to address the risk of flooding. Please see the general comments set out above regarding flood risk.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Pleased that the Policy requires future development to address the flood risk to the site.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOL/DSSP-b St Olaves - Land adjacent to A143 Beccles Road and the New Cut (Former Queen’s Head Public House) [Successor Policy – PP/SOL 2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk County Council Representation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STALHAM STAITHE

### STA/DSSP-a  Stalham - Land at Stalham Staithe (Richardson's Boatyard)  

**[Successor Policy – PP/STA 1]**

### Environment Agency Representation:

The majority of this land is shown by your SFRA to currently fall within Flood Zone 1. However, with the addition of climate change, the area will lie within Flood Zone 3b in the future. We understand that this boatyard area will be maintained for boatyard uses, which are classified within the Technical Guidance to the NPPF as a ‘water-compatible’ land use. Future planning applications for this area will need to have regard to this flood risk and development proposals will need to be in line with current national/local planning policy. Please see the general flood risk comments set out above.

### Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:

Notes that the proposed continued boatyard use is compatible with the anticipated higher future flood risk to the site.

### Broads Authority Response:

Noted.

---

### Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association Representation:

Land at Stalham Staithe (Richardson's Boatyard) (p 81): the NSBA considers that the same point may be made about the proposed planting of trees on the land at the peninsula as was made in respect of the two Brundall sites referred to above.

### Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:

Concerned that the element of the policy seeking retention of trees and encouragement of new planting could have a harmful effect on sailing in the vicinity.

### Broads Authority Response:

The Authority is well aware of the potential tension between the contribution of trees to the riverside landscape and the interests of sailing, but considers that this can, in most cases, be adequately resolved by appropriate management of existing and by careful
selection of suitable siting and species for new planting, and by acceptance by all parties of a need for a degree of compromise. It also recognises that, especially in these straitened times, riverside tree management cannot always be as responsive and comprehensive as might be wished. The intention of the policy is not to promote high or dense planting, but retention and development of a degree of softening and screening, for landscape and visual amenity reasons, and wildlife habitat. It is considered that the reference to trees and planting in the policy should stand, but clarification added to ensure it is understood that what is proposed should not harm sailing in the vicinity.

STA/DSSP-a Stalham - Land at Stalham Staithe (Richardson’s Boatyard) [Successor Policy – PP/STA 1]

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

Broads Authority Response: Noted.

STA/DSSP-a Stalham - Land at Stalham Staithe (Richardson’s Boatyard) [Successor Policy – PP/STA 1]

RSPB Representation:
The RSPB’s Sutton Fen reserve boundary lies immediately east of Stalham Dike and abuts land forming part of Richardson’s Boatyard. Whilst the policy area covers the peninsular containing the boatyard only, monitoring of activity in the adjacent area should be included in the Draft Monitoring Indicators for this site to ensure any future increases in watercraft does not increasing mooring near the Sutton Fen boundary.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Concerned that future increases in watercraft at the boatyard may increase mooring near the RSPB’s Sutton Fen Reserve. Suggests that monitoring of activity in the adjacent area should be included in the monitoring indicators of this policy.

Broads Authority Response:
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

Clarification of the area of the RSPB’s concerns was sought but not received. In the absence of this, the link between the policy provisions and any impacts on the RSPB’s reserve, and hence any need to monitor this, remains obscure.

STOKESBY

STK/DSSP  Stokesby (General)

Nichols, Mr and Mrs J  Representation:

Further to our discussion in the past few weeks with yourself and John Clements, I am enclosing details of my request in the second round of consultations on the site specific policies of Stokesby, and wish to propose my land (map enclosed) for an allocation of development. As stated on the map the proposal is for a modest three bedroom bungalow with double garage, although the plan submitted shows the siting in the middle of the land opposite the lands main road access this is purely indicative and the dwelling could be positioned in the least obtrusive and most favourable location. I have also sent past history papers as suggested since 2002 in which I have been pursuing this request with a number of your past colleagues. I was turned down for planning in 2006, then went to appeal and requesting to meet your dept with the planning inspectorate on site, but unfortunately your dept did not keep this appointment so she was very concerned in running late to go to Wroxham and I did not get a chance to put my case across in which I was very disappointed, I then was told not to apply again as the LDF would hopefully be in place by 2008 in which to this date still waiting. As you can read by my letter dated 15 November 2002 our reasons to want to return to the village is stronger than ever, as watching the village get in the hands of people who are not interested in the country life, such as the church, pub, community centre, youth and being on the committee for the parish, my cousins would like to return home to live there but only one has achieved this by their parents building in the garden. We were all pushed out of the village in the 1970s as could not afford to buy, and nothing to rent. Now prices of houses are out of reach, this is the only way we can do this. On a site visit from your past colleague I was told to let the grass grow up and leave it to go wild, this is not how our values work as a farmer's daughter, we respect the land and our neighbours, we are trying to restore the old orchard and to encourage the wildlife and keep it tidy. At one point we had a theft of a £500 lawn mower from my uncles sheds at the back of our land and was never recovered, so a local farmer kindly cut it for us now at the charge of £40 a year. We consulted in 2010 Reedling consultants Matthew Hollowell BA (letters enclosed). I also was told nothing more could be done until the LDF was completed. In the past we have been spoke about developing lines going through the village and policies in which I do understand, but we are only a local country couple who was pushed out in the 70s and want to return back home to look after our family land what is left, what is the harm in that? I am proud to be a country girl although I am sixty years old, please consider this on country folk feelings not policies and lines. We cannot see what the problem is, as my dwelling would be in between two houses, and only will enhance the village. I
hope you read the enclosed past papers and look at it as above paragraph in which you make your decision. If you want any more information or would like to discuss this request further we would be very happy to assist you.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**

Seeks allocation of identified land for development of a three-bedroomed bungalow with double garage.

Recounts dissatisfaction with the history of unsuccessful attempts to gain planning permission for the site.

In favour of the proposal it is stated that the proponent is a farmer's daughter from the village, but who could not afford to stay there, now wishes to return and this is the only way she could afford to do so. The village is now in the hands of incomers who have no interest in country and community life. The decision should be made on country folk feelings, not policies and lines.

**Broads Authority Response:**

(Note: This proposal was not received in the initial round of consultation and therefore was not included in the Draft Site Specific Policies document for consultation, either as a draft policy or a provisionally rejected option.)

The land is outside the development boundary for Stokesby in the 1997 Local Plan, and this fact featured in the earlier decisions both to refuse planning permission and to dismiss the appeal for a similar proposed development.

While it is not difficult to have sympathy for the position the proponent finds herself in, this is not alone a justification for facilitating development in the countryside and a landscape with the highest national level of protection.

Earlier decisions on this site considered the location of the proposed development would result in a spreading of the village and obtrude into the landscape around it.

Stokesby is one of a number of smaller, less well connected and serviced settlements which had a development boundary defined in the 1997 Local Plan, but which was assessed, in the light of changes in national and local policy, as no longer being an appropriate location for general new development, on the basis of its size, facilities, accessibility, etc. A settlement boundary for Stokesby was (provisionally) rejected as an option for the Proposed Site Specific Policies DPD.

Thus, while the NPPF gives a high priority to additional new housing, this is not considered a sustainable location for such development in the absence of any specific functional need, and allocation of the site is not considered appropriate.

In the absence of a likelihood that the proposal might be regarded favourably it has not been considered necessary or appropriate to arrange consultation on this specific proposal.

---

**THORPE ST. ANDREW**

**TSA/DSSP Thorpe St. Andrew (General)**

Charlesworth, R (Agent - Lanpro) Representation:
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

This representation is submitted in response to the publication of the Broads Draft Site Allocations Policies (Vol. 1 – Issues and Preferred Options) forming part of the Broads Local Development Framework by my client Rachel Charlesworth as owner of the land promoted.

My client objects to the current wording of emerging Thorpe St Andrew Policy reference TSA/DSSP-a entitled Cary’s Meadow and adjoining land contained within the Draft DPD. My client is seeking an alteration to the current wording to enable the delivery of key infrastructure previously proposed by SUSTRANS under Connect 2 and shown on the accompanying drawings. It is proposed that this infrastructure will be funded in part by the built development proposed on my clients land. Your Council will be aware that the same routes were previously supported by the Broads Authority as members of the Norwich River Gateway Group and my client considers that early delivery of the routes proposed will assist in the delivery of key sites within the East Norwich Regeneration Area. Built development within the land promoted could also provide visitor car parking to serve Cary’s Meadow and fund the long term management of the resource. The accompanying drawings demonstrate how the land promoted by my client could be developed.

Site Concept:
1) Connection to Thorpe Road
2) Pedestrian connection as an integral part of a desire line from Thorpe St. Andrew to Trowse
3) Future vehicular connection allowing a separate route to the southern utility site
4) Visual and noise barrier to existing railway line
5) Open space to allow natural flooding and encourage greater biodiversity within the site
6) Flood resilient housing

Site Features:
Flood Resilient Play Space, Planted Filter Strip, Raised Platforms, Board walks through swale.

[NB:. Graphic materials also submitted.]

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:

Although the response is in part an objection to Draft Policy TSA/DSSP-a regarding Carey’s Meadow (and that is dealt with under that Draft Policy), the submission text and graphics also refer to areas outside that Draft Policy boundary. The submission promotes (a) the allocation of a site for residential development and (b) the delivery of a range of access infrastructure. The site key infrastructure related to the wider area, includes a pedestrian/cycle link between the city centre and Whittingham Country Park, and road access to the nearby Utilities and Deal Ground sites (including NOR/DSSP-a, but also areas outside the Broads planning area).

Broads Authority Response:
The Authority is supportive of the principle of providing improved vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access in the wider area to facilitate development of the Deal Ground and Utilities sites, and improve cycle connections between the city centre and Whitlingham/Trowse. However, achieving this would require a range of highly challenging and complex problems to be resolved. In the absence of any such resolution, the linkages shown on the plan are highly speculative and unlikely to be deliverable or desirable. The Broads Authority would have very serious reservations about the impacts of a road route across Carey’s Meadow, which is contrary to its long established approach to the area. Hence it is not considered at all appropriate to provide policy support for such an arrangement in the present circumstances. The form of and scale of housing development indicated is unlikely to be compatible with the limited vehicular access to the site, and the landscape setting and environmental and ecological value of the surroundings. However, the Authority initiated further discussions with the agent to explore whether there is an alternative form of development which might perhaps provide benefits to both the owner and the wider environment. A proposal for a smaller housing development providing also enhancement and enlargement of the Cary’s Meadow wildlife/amenity has been put forward by the agent, but issues regarding highways and access are not yet sufficiently resolved to justify an allocation of this adjacent site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSA/DSSP-a Thorpe St. Andrew - Cary’s Meadow and adjoining land [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broadland District Council Representation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As worded the draft policy is rather vague and does not seem to add to the general policies that would apply to areas such as this. A specific policy should give an indication of how it will be ‘conserved and enhanced’, and how this relates to development and use of the land. This reflects the stance taken by the Broads Authority in respect of the ‘Provisionally rejected option for Salhouse’ ref SAL/DSSP-REJ/1. This was rejected because ‘in the absence of any clear proposals, justification or assessment of merit it would not be appropriate to promote this option’. The same could probably be said of the Cary’s Meadow policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Suggests that the draft policy is too vague and, comparing this to a rejected site, suggests that it is probably lacking clear proposals, justification or assessment.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The wording of the policy has been elaborated to clarify the intention that this area is to be maintained as generally open and semi-natural. It is not considered that the situation here is at all comparable to that of the provisionally rejected option for Salhouse Broad, where the suggested allocation could potentially have involved extensive or large-scale built development. It is considered that the policy is now adequately clear, and that it had always been adequately justified and assessed.
Charlesworth, R (Agent - Lanpro) Representation:
This representation is submitted in response to the publication of the Broads Draft Site Allocations Policies (Vol. 1 – Issues and Preferred Options) forming part of the Broads Local Development Framework by my client Rachel Charlesworth as owner of the land promoted.

My client objects to the current wording of emerging Thorpe St Andrew Policy reference TSA/DSSP-a entitled Cary’s Meadow and adjoining land contained within the Draft DPD. My client is seeking an alteration to the current wording to enable the delivery of key infrastructure previously proposed by SUSTRANS under Connect 2 and shown on the accompanying drawings. It is proposed that this infrastructure will be funded in part by the built development proposed on my clients land. Your Council will be aware that the same routes were previously supported by the Broads Authority as members of the Norwich River Gateway Group and my client considers that early delivery of the routes proposed will assist in the delivery of key sites within the East Norwich Regeneration Area. Built development within the land promoted could also provide visitor car parking to serve Cary’s Meadow and fund the long term management of the resource. The accompanying drawings demonstrate how the land promoted by my client could be developed.

Site Concept:
1) Connection to Thorpe Road
2) Pedestrian connection as an integral part of a desire line from Thorpe St. Andrew to Trowse
3) Future vehicular connection allowing a separate route to the southern utility site
4) Visual and noise barrier to existing railway line
5) Open space to allow natural flooding and encourage greater biodiversity within the site
6) Flood resilient housing

Site Features:
Flood Resilient Play Space, Planted Filter Strip, Raised Platforms, Board walks through swale

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Objects to the draft policy on the grounds it should be amended to facilitate the construction of a vehicular access to the Utilities site.

Suggests that residential development of an adjacent site (dealt with separately under General Comments) would provide a contribution to infrastructure (presumably including this road), and for Cary’s Meadow a car park and funding for its long-term management.

Broads Authority Response:
The Authority is supportive of the principle of providing improved vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access in the wider area to facilitate development of the Deal Ground and Utilities sites, and improve cycle connections between the city centre and Whitlingham/Trowse. However, achieving this would require a range of highly challenging and complex problems to be resolved. In the absence of any such resolution, the linkages shown on the plan are highly speculative and unlikely to be deliverable or desirable. The Broads Authority would have very serious reservations about the impacts of a road route across Cary’s Meadow, which is contrary to its long established approach to the area. Hence it is not considered at all appropriate to provide policy support for such an arrangement in the present circumstances.

Neither does the Authority favour the submitted proposals for housing on the adjacent site. (This is dealt with under separate heading). However, the Authority initiated further discussions with the agent to explore whether an alternative form of development that might perhaps provide benefits to both the owner and the wider environment. A proposal for a smaller housing development providing also enhancement and enlargement of the Cary’s Meadow wildlife/amenity has been put forward by the agent, but issues regarding highways and access are not yet sufficiently resolved to justify an allocation of any additional area for Cary’s Meadow at this stage..

TSA/DSSP-a Thorpe St. Andrew - Cary's Meadow and adjoining land [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 1]

Environment Agency Representation:
Ecology: We are pleased to note that areas valuable to wildlife are being protected.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Pleased that valuable wildlife areas are being protected.

Broads Authority Response: Noted.

Grahame, Lesley (Ward Councillor, Thorpe Hamlet) Representation:
My comments relate to those areas of importance to residents in my ward. I would like to commend the protection of Cary’s Meadow.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

Commends the protection afforded by the Policy.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSA/DSSP-a Thorpe St. Andrew - Cary’s Meadow and adjoining land</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/TSA 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
On safeguarded sand and gravel resource. As the proposed policy is for the retention of the area for nature conservation/open space, it is considered that this would be exempt from CS16, so long as no permanent buildings were proposed.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site lies in an area of minerals (sand and gravel) safeguarding, but this would not affect the intended (continued) use, provided that no new buildings were proposed.

**Broads Authority Response:**
No permanent buildings are proposed by the Policy. In the unlikely event that such development were proposed, this could be picked up and addressed through the development control process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSA/DSSP-a Thorpe St. Andrew - Cary’s Meadow and adjoining land</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/TSA 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RSPB Representation:**
The RSPB is supportive of the policy for Cary’s Meadow to ensure that it is protected during the plan period. However, the Draft Monitoring Indicators need to be more specific. For example what landscape, wildlife and amenity measures will be used to show that the policy has been successful? For wildlife we suggest that suitable measures could include the number of breeding birds on site (potentially identifying a few key species for longer term trend analysis), a measure of the area of habitat available for wildlife, assessment of key mammal populations using the site, and assessment of plant assemblages on site. As a County Wildlife Site (CWS) such assessments will be undertaken on a regular basis to ensure the site is delivering against specific objectives and it may be possible to take some of the CWS indicators and highlight them as Monitoring Indicators in the DPD.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supportive of the policy.
Wishes to see more specific monitoring indicators, and makes a number of detailed proposals in this regard, including reference to County Wildlife Site Assessments.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support for policy noted. Only headline indicators were included with the Draft Site Specific Policies. The approach to monitoring is presented in more detail in the Proposed DPD, including reference to County Wildlife Site assessments.

**TSA/DSSP-b  Thorpe St. Andrew - Thorpe Island**  
**[Successor Policy – PP/TSA 2]**

**Broadland District Council Representation:**
The first part of the ‘draft policy’ is explanation for the actual policy that is in the second part of the paragraph. As such, it is suggested that the explanatory bit would be better as supporting text, rather than given policy status.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Suggests that part of the draft policy is inappropriate and better included elsewhere.

**Broads Authority Response:**
It agreed that the policy could be better worded than the draft. Wording of the Policy has been revised in the light of a number of comments, including this one, and an important enforcement appeal decision relating to the island.

**TSA/DSSP-b  Thorpe St. Andrew - Thorpe Island**  
**[Successor Policy – PP/TSA 2]**

**Clarke, Mr J  Representation:**
I would like to register my support for TSA/DSSP-b i.e. The future protection of Thorpe Island. My only comment is that I wonder if the wording should be amended slightly so that development of the naturalised western end cannot be argued if in similar ownership to the eastern boatyard end.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the draft policy. Suggests wording revised slightly to avoid unintended consequences in the event of a change in ownership.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support for the Policy noted. Wording of the Policy has been revised in the light of a number of comments, including this one, and an important enforcement appeal decision relating to the island.
Environment Agency Representation:
As highlighted within your policy, the area is at risk from flooding. Your SFRA shows the site to fall predominantly within Flood Zone 3b with the remainder falling within Flood Zone 3a. We are pleased to note that flood risk has been included as a potential constraint to development and as a monitoring indicator. Future planning applications for this area will need to have regard to this flood risk, and development proposals will need to be in line with current national/local planning policy. Please see the flood risk comments within the general section above. We note that the policy restricts development to ‘that needed to meet the essential operational requirements of the boatyard at the eastern end of the Island, and minor extensions and improvements in connection with other existing lawful uses’. Development considered to be essential for the operation of the boatyard may be considered to be a water-compatible land use and therefore appropriate within areas of flood zone 3b. In addition, our Flood Risk Standing Advice considers minor extensions to be lower risk. However, both types of application should consider the impacts of flood risk through a flood risk assessment relative to the scale and nature of the development.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Advises that the site is indicated to be predominantly within a high flood risk zone, and that future planning application decisions will need to have regard to this and relevant national and local policy. Refers to wording of Draft Policy and notes that boatyard operations and minor extensions are compatible with high flood risk area, but likely to still need a site flood risk assessment.

Broads Authority Response:
Comments noted. The wording of the Policy is changed from the Draft referred to, and is now considered to be in accordance with the above advice.

TSA/DSSP-b Thorpe St. Andrew - Thorpe Island [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 2]
Grahame, Lesley (Ward Councillor, Thorpe Hamlet) Representation:
My comments relate to those areas of importance to residents in my ward.... Some support for customary usage of Thorpe Island would be welcome, including clarification of rights to use the bridge, and support for improving facilities for boat users. A small site for storing dinghies on the road side of the river would seem sensible meanwhile. There may security issues around this, but they should not be insurmountable.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Would welcome some support for the customary usage of Thorpe Island, including clarification of rights to use the bridge, and support for improving facilities for boat users. Suggests provision of dinghy storage area on the road side of the river.

Broads Authority Response:
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

The Policy has been substantially revised from the draft, reflecting a number of comments, and an important enforcement appeal decision. The policy offers support for the authorised uses on the island, and refers to the navigational importance of the area. The rights to use the bridge are a private legal matter, and not directly related to the Site Specific Policies. The Authority has neither the land nor other resources to deliver dinghy parking. This is something that the potential beneficiaries, landowners or Town Council may wish to take forward. The Authority would consider the advantages of such provision in judging any planning application for such development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSA/DSSP-b</th>
<th>Thorpe St. Andrew - Thorpe Island</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/TSA 2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk County Council Representation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource. It is likely that any development considered suitable would be exempt from CS16, due to its nature and scale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies that safeguarded minerals (sand and gravel) lie in the area, but that the nature of development likely would not be constrained by this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted, and reference added to the written justification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wickham, Mrs S and Sofroniou, Mr C Representation:
We would like to thank you for producing a draft policy for this area that takes account of the flood risks, road and river access problems, the value of the site within the conservation area and the rights of the existing local community. I have attached a copy of a letter sent on 8th January to object to the illegal development on the site. It conveys the strength of feeling over the contraventions of the Planning Laws. The island is currently littered with storage buildings, cars and a large digger. This is not in keeping with the intention to preserve the character of the area and we sincerely hope that your policy proposals will be carried so that the clearance of the site may be effected.

‘To Kate Palfrey, Planning Inspectorate: Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Land at: former Jenners Basin, Thorpe Island, Thorpe St Andrew Norwich; Appeal against Enforcement Notice APP/E9505/C/11/2165 We are, once again, in a position of having to lodge a complaint in connection with the above over the use of the land to the west of Thorpe Island. As residents with property on the opposite bank we have become increasingly alarmed at the developments on the site. Apart from one small
window looking onto Yarmouth Road, our view is solely over the valley. This outlook, as well as the privacy of our garden, has been drastically compromised by the actions of Mr Wood. We wish to register our strong objection to the unauthorised changes that have been made. Lying between the River Yare and the new cut, Thorpe Island, falls within the Conservation Area of Thorpe St Andrew. Its role as a haven for wildlife is fragile and the increasing disruption from mown vegetation, illegally felled trees, boats, vehicles and people has had a negative impact on the environment. Wanton destruction of natural habitats for profit is being allowed to contribute to the detriment of the area, the wildlife and the people who live here. The Town Plan states the aim to ‘protect open spaces and land for the public to enjoy’. The Enforcement Notices state that ‘the uses and structures do not protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Broads and are contrary to development plan policies’. Residents have expressed grave misgivings over unauthorised alterations to land use over recent years. The character of the area has already suffered. The eastern end of the island has been, again without planning permission, turned into an ugly suburban sprawl, littered with boats. The river bank now hosts ornamental shrubs, washing lines and plastic chairs. It is an eyesore and has caused irritation to the community and visitors to this once natural spot. The river bus and tourists in hire boats come to see views of important historical buildings only available from the river. Others visit in order to enjoy the unspoilt views recorded in the work of painters from the Norwich School: Cotman, Stannard and Crome (see five enclosed photographs). The presence of cars and heavy machinery blight the vistas and render the island an unsightly parking lot. An increase in the volume of river craft and road traffic will hamper the enjoyment of visitors and residents alike. Furthermore, it is thought that people may be living on the boats raising yet more planning and health and safety issues. The rural character of the ancient Thorpe village is being eroded. We know that we are not alone in opposing the appeal and have the support of Victor Scrivens a Liberal Democrat candidate for Thorpe St Andrew. We trust that representations will, once again, have been made to you by the many concerned residents in the area. We would be grateful for and acknowledgment of this letter and updates on the proceedings relating to this issue. In conclusion, we strongly object to breaches in the planning laws and a gradual but determined erosion of our rights. As local residents we have submitted plans to the local authority. When approved, alterations have been carried out but when rejected, they have been adhered to. Local residents obey the planning laws. It is fundamentally wrong that others flout the rules and that the rights of law abiding citizens have been ignored. Constant revisiting of this dispute takes up much valuable time and the effects of a threat to this area have been most stressful. It appears that several houses in Thorpe Hall Close are on the market and one can only assume that the repeated disruption and increased flow of traffic is contributing to a sense of extreme unease. Recent belated, costly, and apparently largely ineffective action on the Dale Farm Estate in Essex might serve as a warning against allowing illegal developments to flourish. We would urge the authorities to uphold the enforcement notice and thereby reduce some
of the risks faced by our community. Thank you for your attention to our petition against the appeal. Yours sincerely Mrs S Wickham and Mr C Sofroniou'

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Offers thanks for the policy’s attention to flood risk, road and river access problems, the Conservation Area, and the rights of the local community. Refers to and reproduces a letter in relation to an enforcement appeal on the island.

Broads Authority Response:
The Policy has been substantially revised in the light of the subsequent enforcement appeal decision for part of the island, and various comments received in consultation. The amended Policy continues to emphasise the importance of the sorts of issues mentioned by this writer.

| TSA/DSSP-c | Thorpe St. Andrew - Griffin Lane - boatyards and industrial areas | [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 3] |

Environment Agency Representation:
We are unable to locate this area on either map 20a or 20b. Please provide an additional map showing the location of the site and we will be happy to provide further comments.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Unable to identify the site on the map. Requests an additional map to enable further comments.

Broads Authority Response:
Some versions of the consultation maps were missing the relevant map for this site (including instead a duplicate copy of the preceding map). Apologies were made, and the correct map provided to the EA. No further comments have been received.

| TSA/DSSP-c | Thorpe St. Andrew - Griffin Lane - boatyards and industrial areas | [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 3] |

Norfolk County Council Representation:
It would be helpful if there was some cross reference to the adopted developer contributions policy in this section. In addition the maps covering this area do not clearly show Griffin Lane and Bungalow Lane areas (i.e. The key is unclear).

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Suggests reference is made to the Development Management Policy (DP30) on this topic.
Broads Authority Response:
It is not considered necessary to repeat the content of existing other policies, except where these have a distinct or particular site relevance. Some versions of the consultation maps were missing the relevant map for this site (including instead a duplicate copy of the preceding map).

TSA/DSSP-c  Thorpe St. Andrew - Griffin Lane - boatyards and industrial areas  [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 3]

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource. It is likely that any development considered suitable would be exempt from CS16, due to its nature and scale.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies that safeguarded minerals (sand and gravel) lie in the area, but that the nature of development likely would not be constrained by this.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted, and reference added to the written justification.

TSA/DSSP-c  Thorpe St. Andrew - Griffin Lane - boatyards and industrial areas  [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 3]

RSPB Representation:
Policy areas TSA/DSSP-c (Griffin Lane) and TSA/DSSP-d (Bungalow Lane) are not presented on the maps as indicated by the key. This should be amended in the final draft.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Highlights that the two sites mentioned are not shown on the maps.

Broads Authority Response:
Some versions of the consultation documents had the map showing these two sites missing, and included a second copy of the previous map instead. (The correct maps were available on the website, and on request.) This error will not be repeated in the final draft.
Appendix 4 - Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSA/DSSP-d</th>
<th>Thorpe St. Andrew - Bungalow Lane - mooring plots and boatyards</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/TSA 4]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Environment Agency Representation:**
We are unable to locate this area on either map 20a or 20b. Please provide an additional map showing the location of the site and we will be happy to provide further comments.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights that the two sites mentioned are not shown on the maps and requests a copy of the map.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Some versions of the consultation maps were missing the relevant map for this site (including instead a duplicate copy of the preceding map). The correct maps were available on the website, and on request, and a copy has been sent to the EA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSA/DSSP-d</th>
<th>Thorpe St. Andrew - Bungalow Lane - mooring plots and boatyards</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/TSA 4]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource. It is likely that any development considered suitable would be exempt from CS16, due to its nature and scale.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that safeguarded minerals (sand and gravel) lie in the area, but that the nature of development likely would not be constrained by this.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted, and reference added to the written justification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSA/DSSP-d</th>
<th>Thorpe St. Andrew - Bungalow Lane - Mooring Plots and Boatyards</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/TSA 4]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RSPB Representation:**
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

Policy areas TSA/DSSP-c (Griffin Lane) and TSA/DSSP-d (Bungalow Lane) are not presented on the maps as indicated by the key. This should be amended in the final draft.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights that the two sites mentioned are not shown on the maps.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Some versions of the consultation documents included incorrect maps for this area in error, and did not show the two sites mentioned. (The correct maps were available on the website, and on request.) This error will not be repeated in the final draft.

**TSA/DSSP-e Thorpe St. Andrew - Development Boundary [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 5]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
We are unsure whether map 20a shows the entire development boundary. Should this not be the case, please consult us again for further comments.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Was uncertain whether there was any further area within the development boundary on another map (the EA had two copies of Map 20a and none of 20b), and wished to be consulted again if this was the case.

**Broads Authority Response:**
There is no development boundary in the area covered by the missing Map 20b, and therefore no further consultation required.

**TSA/DSSP-e Thorpe St. Andrew - Development Boundary [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 5]**

**Grahame, Lesley (Ward Councillor, Thorpe Hamlet) Representation:**
I have some reservations about the Ref. TSA/DSSP-e, Thorpe St. Andrew Development Boundary, Map 20a, as the justification for growth here relies on the Joint Core Strategy, currently being challenged. This area may be better suited for employment than residence, it is well served by bus, and could potentially have a station too. It is also very noisy, being so close to the A47.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Expresses concern about the proposed development boundary, its relationship to the development proposed in the Norwich, Broadland and South Norfolk Joint Core Strategy (for the adjacent planning areas), and suggests the development boundary area may be more suitable for employment than residential development.

**Broads Authority Response:**
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The development boundary proposal is not the result of the Joint Core Strategy's (and Regional Spatial Strategy's) plans for large scale growth in the adjoining planning areas. It is rather intended to facilitate incremental change in the more developed and accessible parts of the Broads, and very similar to the development boundary that has operated in the area (as part of the Local Plan) since 1997. The development boundary is not restricted to residential development, and employment development here would also be acceptable in principle.

The Authority is not aware of any likelihood of a new station for Thorpe St. Andrew in the foreseeable future, but this does not directly affect the Policy.

**TSA/DSSP-e Thorpe St. Andrew - Development Boundary**

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource. It is likely that any development considered suitable would be exempt from CS16, due to its nature and scale.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies that safeguarded minerals (sand and gravel) lie in the area, but that the nature of development likely would not be constrained by this.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted, and reference added to the written justification.

**TSA/DSSP-f Thorpe St. Andrew - River Green Open Space**

Grahame, Lesley (Ward Councillor, Thorpe Hamlet) Representation:
My comments relate to those areas of importance to residents in my ward. I would like to commend the protection of.... River Green....  A small site for storing dinghies on the road side of the river would seem sensible meanwhile. There may security issues around this, but they should not be insurmountable.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Commends the protection of River Green.
Suggests a small dinghy storage area on that side of the river (relates also to comments about Thorpe Island).

Broads Authority Response:
Support for the Policy noted.
Provision of dinghy storage is complicated. Such provision would have advantages, particularly for Thorpe Island occupiers and visitors, but would put additional pressure on the limited car parking availability in the area. Ownership, access rights and management would also need resolution. Without prejudice to any future planning application for such provision, the Authority does not consider allocation of a site for such use appropriate in the Site Specific Policies DPD.

TSA/DSSP-f Thorpe St. Andrew - River Green Open Space [Successor Policy – PP/TSA 6]

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: On safeguarded sand and gravel resource. As the proposed policy is for the retention of the area as open space, it is considered that this would be exempt from CS16, so long as no permanent buildings were proposed.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies that safeguarded minerals (sand and gravel) lie in the area, but that the open space use is compatible with this, provided no permanent buildings were constructed.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted. No permanent buildings are proposed by the policy.

TSA/DSSP-REJ/1 Thorpe St. Andrew - Provisionally Rejected Option - Proposed housing at Yarmouth Road. [Successor Policy – None]

Norwich Frostbite Sailing Club Representation:
The Norwich Frostbite Sailing Club wish to object to Individual Area Map 20: Thorpe St Andrew. As you will be aware the Norwich Frostbite Sailing Club has been promoting the redevelopment of the site east of Girling’s Lane (and north of railway line) throughout the LDF process. This area is now shown on the Draft Map as a ‘provisionally rejected option’, reference TSA/DSSP-REJ1. The DSSP document appears to recognise merit in the site’s location that supports some form of housing development. It accepts that factors such as its brownfield nature and location with respect to transport and facilities make it a suitable candidate site for development as follows;

‘The site is, indeed, suitable for housing in so far as it is on a public transport route (a bus stop is immediately adjacent), has some facilities very close, and easy access to the full range of facilities available in Norwich City Centre, and to a range of employment opportunities.’

Two reasons are given for provisionally rejecting the redevelopment of the site. Firstly, the ‘semi-natural’ nature of the site and, secondly, its exposure to flood risk. I will deal with these in turn.
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Role of site in landscape:
The site is described as forming ‘a semi-natural buffer between the urban area and the wider Broads, and was deliberately included within the designated Broads area for its value. From the main road the site is visible as primarily trees and shrubs behind a fine rubble stone wall’. This seems a slightly complementary description of the site. At a closer inspection from Yarmouth Road it is hard to avoid noticing the fencing, temporary buildings, parked cars and arrays of concrete garden decorations that also characterise much of the site. Nonetheless the Club accepts that this is an important location on the edge of the settlement. For this reason any development would need to allow for generous undeveloped space, landscaping and planting. This is, in fact, quite easy to achieve here.

Housing development will only ever cover the northern part of the site due to increasing flood risk as the land falls away to the Yare valley. The requirement for a new Club car-park could be accommodated very carefully with very heavy planting within the parking area and around its edges. Even so, this inevitable leaves a generous area of land unspoken for and available for a creative landscaping and open space proposition.

The Club has submitted a sketch scheme to show how this may be achieved.

Flood Risk:
We accept that most of the site lies within Zone 3a for flood risk. The site falls away from north to south and the risk of flooding increases as the land level falls.

Our representation has been accompanied by a plan showing a possible way of developing the site for housing, open space and a replacement car park for the sailing club. The plan shows that all the proposed new housing may be provided outside zone 3b for flood risk where new housing is unacceptable. The balance of the site is then developed for domestic gardens, open space and car parking.

PPS25 does set out circumstances under which housing may be considered acceptable in zone 3a. This is principally where significant sustainability benefits would follow from the development and we consider this to be the case here. It is, of course, a brownfield site. We also consider there to be sustainability benefits from the site’s development given its exceptionally good location against the guidance in PPS3. My reading of PPS25 suggests that the uses of open space, car-parking related to sailing activity and domestic gardens are acceptable within the 1:20 return zone.

I appreciate that a full flood risk assessment would be a useful document at this point. However, this could only be obtained at a cost beyond the resources of the Frostbite Sailing Club. NFSC is a small dinghy sailing club with a relatively small membership. It relies almost entirely on the subscriptions paid annually by members. Any available resources tend to go on keeping the aged club house and boatsheds in serviceable order. It is unreasonable to expect the Club to pay for a potentially expensive FRA with no guarantee at this stage that a planning permission is reasonably achievable.

Proposal:
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For these reasons we propose that the site shown on Map 20 should be identified and shown as an ‘area for housing, relocated car-park for sailing club, landscaping and open space (extent of each use to follow flood risk assessment)’. I believe this would be sufficient to give the Club confidence to go ahead with a proper Flood Risk Assessment or to partner up with a developer prepared to do so. This seems to be a reasonable way forward here. Even a very pessimistic view of flood risk over the site will show that at least some land on the Yarmouth Road frontage is not subject to undue flood risk. Even in such a worst-case-scenario some form of housing development is always going to be possible. The only impact of a pessimistic view of flood risk on the site would be that the balance of land uses would shift away from housing and towards gardens, open space and landscaping etc. We would be grateful to see the DSSP Map (20) for Thorpe St Andrew amended accordingly.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:

Objects to the rejection of the option. Suggests that the planning summary assessment recognises the suitability of the location for housing, and that it has only been rejected for two reasons; landscape and flood risk. Argues that (1) the landscape value of the site is overrated in the Planning Summary Assessment, but that its value is recognised by the Club and redevelopment could allow for generous landscaping, open space and planting; and (2) while much of the site floods, the frontage is indicated by the EA to be at low enough risk to accommodate housing, and that the extent of housing would reflect the precise ‘safe’ area established by a future site flood risk assessment. Such an assessment is beyond the means of the club and it needs the confidence of an allocation to be able to carry this forward.

Broads Authority Response:

Further discussion has been held to clarify the Club’s aspirations, and the proposal further considered in the light of revised national planning policy which places great weight on the delivery of additional housing. While provision of housing here could fund refurbishment of recreational facilities (the Norwich Frostbite Sailing Clubhouse), and in many ways this is an acceptable location for housing development, flood risk maps (both EA and SFRA) show very little of the site outside high flood risk (Zone 3). In the absence of a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (which the club says it cannot afford) to demonstrate the proposed housing would be in accordance with national flood risk policy, an allocation is not considered appropriate.

WEST SOMERTON

General comment West Somerton

Somerton Parish Council Representation:
1. Somerton consists of both West and East Somerton and not all of the properties in West Somerton are within the Broads area. Approx. 25% of properties in West Somerton are outside the Broads area as are all properties in East Somerton. It would be correct to state that the centre of West Somerton is within the Broads area.
2. This is the second time that the village pub has closed. It is presently for sale as a commercial property. The reference “Now even that pub has closed” is perhaps a pessimistic conclusion of the current situation. The property could, as before, be sold and re-opened.
3. Has the Broads Authority sought the agreement and approval from Great Yarmouth Borough Council of the references made to those parts of Somerton which fall within the Borough’s planning control? We would have preferred a document which concentrated on the area within the Broads area.
4. The Parish Council supports the retention of a development boundary as we feel this conveys a simple but firm message of the limitations available for development in the centre of the village.
5. Our reasons for requesting a modification to the existing development boundary have been repeated on numerous occasions since the Parish Council first raised this matter with the Broads Authority in 1995. In summary, these are the main points;
   a. The Parish Council was led to believe that, following a meeting with Broads Authority officers in 1995, the request to modify the boundary was agreed.
   b. It was not until the 5th February 2008, that the Broads Authority wrote to the Parish Council informing that an Independent Planning Inspector had looked at the matter and had concluded in his recommendation that “In addition, the village development boundary should be extended to include the property known as The Firs up to its relevant boundaries within OS parcel no. 8092”.
   c. The assessments and appraisals should have mentioned the Broads Authority approval for five large executive dwellings at Staithe House Farm, close to the property The Firs but immediately opposite it on the north east side of Staithe Road. Unfortunately, Staithe road is not clearly marked or shown on the map provided for the consultation neither are some properties further along Staithe Road. Some references should have been made to this approved development in order to give a more balanced appraisal. The five dwellings will, in part, be built in the conservation area, on an ‘open space’, close to the AONB, SAC, SPA, Ramsar and SSSI. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to explain the justification and reason for allowing five large executive houses on one side of Staithe Road but refusing a single storey dwelling on the opposite side.
   d. Mention of the EA identified flood risk area as a constraint is correct, however, the site in question has a completed flood risk assessment.
6. The land which the Parish Council has suggested be included within the development boundary is, as stated, currently garden land, however, this also includes wooden garages, greenhouses and sheds and should not be described as an ‘open area’.
7. The Parish Council cannot understand why on page 97 it mentions “West Somerton is relatively well connected by public transport” yet on page 99 this changes to “the village has limited accessibility by public transport”.

Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account
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8. There appears no explanation as to why or how the construction of one single story dwelling “would lead to an erosion of the rural qualities of the village and its setting, impacting negatively on the adjacent Conservation Area etc” neither is their any reference as to why the approved five large dwellings in the nearby Staithe House Farm would not.

9. It is also difficult to understand the reference that “additional dwellings in an area where almost all schooling, employment, shopping and other activities would require car travel”. This statement, we assume, did not apply to the approved development at Staithe House Farm. Somerton is no different to many villages of similar size in the Broads. We do suggest you verify your reference to schooling requiring car travel and request accurate data on the percentage of school children using County Council provided coach/bus transport.

Conclusions: The Parish Council requests that the development boundary remains in place and be modified to include the area of land marked on the consultation document map. (That the boundary be extended to follow the east side of the existing dyke from a point at the western end of Staithe Road, southwards to where the same dyke meets with existing development boundary/Common Road).

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
1) Notes that not all of West Somerton is in the Broads area, but the centre of it is.
2) Suggests that the reference to the pub being closed is pessimistic, as this could be temporary.
3) Questions whether the adjoining local planning authority has agreed to the references to its area in the Consultation Document.
4) Supports retention of a development boundary for West Somerton.
5 & 6) Rehearses the Parish Council’s view of some of the history and geography of the Staithe Road site.
7) Points out a discrepancy in the description of the public transport for the village.
8) Comments on the justification of the provisional rejection of the Staithe Road site, suggesting inconsistency with developments approved nearby.
9) Queries the justification of rejection of the Staithe Road site in relation to public transport accessibility, and suggests inconsistency with approval of another development nearby.

CONCLUSION: Requests that a development boundary be retained, and that it be extended further down Staithe Road. Trusts the comments will be given full consideration and the Broads Authority will review its provisional conclusions.

Broads Authority Response:
1) The text in the Consultation Document stated ‘almost the whole of West Somerton is in the Broads’. This is now changed to read ‘most of’.
2) It was the Parish Council, in its response to the earlier consultation, that stated the pub was closed. Happily, the pub is now said to have changed ownership and is expected to reopen.
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3) The references in the consultation documents to Great Yarmouth Borough’s planning area are predominantly matters of fact, and no issue with them has been raised by Great Yarmouth Borough Council. The Consultation Documents do concentrate on the Broads area, and it is not clear why the Parish Council might think otherwise. In the interests of the proper planning of the area (and the legal duty to cooperate) it is necessary to have regard to circumstances and policies across administrative boundaries.

4) This case against a development boundary for West Somerton was explained in the Consultation Document under the ‘Issue’ of ‘Development Boundaries’ and WES/DSSP-REJ/1. The Parish Council’s comments on its wish for a boundary do not address the conflict with the Core Strategy and national planning policy, and the Authority remains of the view that a development boundary is no longer appropriate for this and other small settlements in that context.

5 & 6) These are dealt with under WES/DSSP-REJ/2.

7) The drafting error, which arose as new information came to light and was added to the text, has been corrected.

8) This is dealt with under WES/DSSP-REJ/2.

9) This is dealt with under WES/DSSP-REJ/2.

CONCLUSIONS: A development boundary is no longer considered appropriate for West Somerton, but the potential Staithe Road extension is dealt with under WES/DSSP-REJ/2. The Parish Council’s views have, indeed, been carefully considered and the Draft rejected options carefully re-assessed in the light of those, resulting in an allocation of land for housing at Staithe Road.

WES/DSSP-REJ/2 West Somerton - Provisionally Rejected Option [Successor Policy – PP/WES 1]

Harrison, Sir M Representation:
I would like to make representations about the above mentioned draft DPD insofar as it relates to West Somerton. In my representation on the Initial Consultation, I supported the Somerton Parish Council’s request that the development boundary of West Somerton should be re-aligned to the extent requested by the Parish Council. Matters have now moved on and the Broads Authority has decided to do away with development boundaries for settlements like West Somerton, justifying the decision as being consistent with the Core Strategy. Whilst I would have preferred this matter to have been dealt with by way of a realignment of the development boundary at West Somerton, I am content to make my representations consistent with the approach in the draft DPD by pursuing them on the basis that there should be a site specific allocation for housing in the DPD relating to the area which the Parish Council had sought to include within the development boundary of West Somerton. That area is shown outlined on Map 22. It can be conveniently described as consisting of two parts - firstly, the land that forms part of the property known as ‘The Firs’ and, secondly, the land lying to the west of ‘The Firs’ between the coniferous hedge forming the western boundary of that property and the dyke which runs south from the end of Staithe Road by the ‘kissing gate’ as far as Common Road. Both parts comprise OS parcel 8092. I will refer to them as Land A and Land B respectively.
The case which relates to Land A, namely that part of the land identified on Map 22 which forms part of ‘The Firs’, seems, on the information available to me, to be unanswerable because the Inspector in his report following the 1977 Local Plan inquiry concluded that land should be included within the development boundary. He concluded in paragraph 9.75 of his report: ‘...the village development boundary should be extended to include the property known as ‘The Firs’ up to its relevant boundaries within OS parcel no. 8082.’ There is no doubt what he meant about the property known as ‘The Firs’ because, in paragraph 9.73, he referred to it as a large detached house with a well maintained spacious garden, the remainder of the land (i.e. Land B) being separated from the property by a dense clipped conifer hedge. For some reason unknown to me, the Broads Authority failed to include all the land known as ‘The Firs’ within the development boundary, contrary to the Inspector’s express recommendation. Instead, the Broads Authority only included part of it within the development boundary with the bizarre result that the line of the development boundary now goes through the middle of the ‘spacious garden’ of ‘The Firs’ referred to by the Inspector. It is, quite frankly, a nonsense and, on the information available to me, it has all the appearance of a planning wrong that ought to be remedied. The owners of ‘The Firs’ have thereby suffered an injustice. An attempt to remedy the situation was made by them by way of a planning application for a bungalow on the part of the spacious garden which lay outside the development boundary. It would have been their retirement home, but it was refused on appeal on the ground that the land lay outside the development boundary of the Local Plan. In his decision letter dated 3 April 2009, the Inspector said: ‘The Inspector who held the public inquiry into the LP prior to its adoption recommended extending the development boundary from that previously proposed to include The Firs up to its relevant boundaries within OS parcel No 8092. The Authority made a boundary amendment in the light of this. The appellants consider that the change did not accurately reflect the Inspector’s intentions and that the appeal site should have been included within the boundary. ...The position of the boundary is not a matter for me and any changes proposed would be for a review of the appropriate part of the development plan to consider.’ The draft DPD forms part of a review of the development plan and it follows that this is the appropriate time for the matter to be considered. An attempt was made to rectify the situation by making representations in the context of the Development Management Policies DPD but the Broads Authority correctly pointed out that that was not a suitable vehicle for dealing with it and that the Site Specific Policies DPD would be the appropriate vehicle. Having waited for that document, the Broads Authority now refer to the possibility of the Parish Council dealing with it by a neighbourhood development order and a local referendum. In my view, it is wholly inappropriate to put such a burden on a small Parish Council to rectify a mistake made by the Broads Authority as long ago as 1997. This matter has been outstanding for 15 years. It should be rectified now, and the Site Specific Policies DPD is the appropriate vehicle to do so.

Turning to Land B, that is to say the land between the western boundary of ‘The Firs’ and the dyke, it is right to say that the Inspector did not recommend the inclusion of that land within the development boundary. It is clear from paragraph 9.73 of the Inspector’s report that the Broads Authority had been under the false impression that the land (and also ‘The Firs’) was predominantly open and undeveloped although it contained a caravan and 3 timber sheds on it. However, the Inspector concluded in paragraph 9.74 that a dwelling on that land would be out of character with the land around it, that it would intrude into the open
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landscape of the surrounding countryside and that any increase in traffic along the unmade track serving it would be likely to be harmful to road safety. I would invite the Broads Authority, and, in default, the Inspector, to revisit that decision. The land at present consists of two gardens on which are two garages, a greenhouse and a caravan, most of which are not shown on Map 22. The size of a dwelling on the land could be controlled by conditions to be similar to the dwellings on the other side of the road, one of which is a bungalow, and any effect on the countryside would be no different from these dwellings. The Inspector wrongly referred to an unmade track serving the land. In fact it is a tarmacked public highway called Staithe Road which is not even shown on Map 22. It only becomes an unmade track west of the dyke. Traffic generated by one dwelling would be negligible and, in any event, a dwelling on the site would enable Staithe Road to be widened at that point. It is also relevant to point out that in 2006 planning permission was granted (despite objections from the Parish Council, myself and others) for 6 dwellings at Staithe House Farm on the other side of Staithe Road. That permission (which has not yet been implemented but which is capable of implementation because a specified operation has been carried out) involves a site which is in a much more prominent position in relation to the surrounding countryside than Land B, it would generate much more traffic on Staithe Road than Land B and it includes part of the Conservation Area which would not be affected by Land B. Furthermore, the inclusion of Land B, together with Land A, as a site specific allocation for housing would round off the village at this point in a logical way, as well as righting a planning wrong. For all those reasons, I would urge the Broads Authority, and, in default, the Inspector, to make a site specific allocation for housing on Lands A and B.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Seeks allocation of land at Staithe Road for residential development on the grounds that it would round off the village in a logical way; be in accord with the wishes of the Parish Council; would not overload the road access; could be controlled by conditions to be of similar size to existing dwellings opposite; that planning permission is extant for 6 dwellings opposite. Comments on the history of the planning policy for this area in terms the Authority would dispute.

Broads Authority Response:
The issues around the potential for residential development at Staithe Road, including the comments of this writer, are the subject of a separate section of the Report on further consultation about this area. As a result of additional consultation and the high level of support among local residents, land at Staithe Road is allocated for housing.

WHITLINGHAM, TROWSE AND KIRBY BEDON

WHI/DSSP Trowse, Whitlingham & Kirby Bedon (General)

Crown Point Estate (Agent - La Ronde Wright) Representation:
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The Crown Point Estate is generally supportive of the principles and approach of the Draft Policy for Trowse, Whitlingham and Kirby Bedon. However it is felt that there is potential for sustainable growth of existing and new recreational and tourism related compatible uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports principles and approach to area (presumably including WHI/DSSP-a), but believes there is potential for additional recreational and tourism related uses. (This potential presumably relates primarily to the adjacent site subject of WHI/DSSP-REJ/1.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broads Authority Response:**

Support for principles and approach to Trowse, Whitlingham & Kirby Bedon noted. (Potential for additional recreation and tourism related uses dealt with under WHI/DSSP-REJ1.)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHI/DSSP-a</th>
<th>Trowse, Whitlingham &amp; Kirby Bedon - Whitlingham Country Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP/WHI 1</td>
<td>[Successor Policy – ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environment Agency Representation:**

Part of the area defined by this policy is shown to be at risk from flooding. Your SFRA shows that the vast majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 3b with some areas to the south and east lying in Flood Zone 1. The flood risk comments set out within the general section above will therefore apply.

We understand this policy to allow the continuation of this area for amenity open space and nature conservation which is considered, in the Technical Guidance to the NPPF, as a ‘water-compatible’ land use. We would however recommend that any buildings required to support the use are located within the area of Flood Zone 1 in line with the sequential approach.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**

Notes that part of the area is at serious risk of flooding, and draws attention to the EA’s general comments in respect of this. Confirms that the principal use of the site supported by the policy is compatible with this zoning under national policy. Would wish to see any buildings required to be allocated within the lower, zone 1, flood risk area of the site.

**Broads Authority Response:**

Flood risk to the site, and EA’s general comments, noted. Confirmation of the compatibility of the principal use of the site noted. No buildings are specifically proposed for the site, and if any come forward these are likely to be in the vicinity of the existing main building and road, and hence in the lower flood risk part of the site.
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Any such development would in any case be subject to national and local flood risk policies, and the Authority does not perceive a need to repeat these considerations in this policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHI/DSSP-a</th>
<th>Trowse, Whitlingham &amp; Kirby Bedon - Whitlingham Country Park</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/WHI 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Grahaeme, Lesley (Ward Councillor, Thorpe Hamlet) Representation:**
My comments relate to those areas of importance to residents in my ward. I would like to commend the protection of .... Whitlingham Country Park....

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Commends the protection of Whitlingham Country Park.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support for the Policy noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHI/DSSP-a</th>
<th>Trowse, Whitlingham &amp; Kirby Bedon - Whitlingham Country Park</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/WHI 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: Within consultation area of safeguarded WWTW. A small part of the proposed allocation is within the consultation area, any development within this area would need to comply with CS16.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
A small part of the site is within the consultation zone for the nearby Waste Water Treatment Works, and any development would need to comply with Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Inclusion of part of the site within consultation zone noted. Given the nature of the uses supported by the Policy, specific reference to this is not considered necessary.
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**RSPB Representation:**
Whilst the recreation aspect of this policy area is important, the site also has a high biodiversity interest. The policy should highlight this and state that Whitlingham Country Park will be managed for wildlife as well as recreation and quiet enjoyment. Management of the area’s habitats and species will add to the enjoyment for visitors and maintain features that are part of the attractiveness of the site.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights the biodiversity importance of the site and considers this should be highlighted in the policy, and supports the recreation aspect of the policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Biodiversity importance and potential added to the policy.

---

**WHI/DSSP-a Trowse, Whitlingham & Kirby Bedon - Whitlingham Country Park [Successor Policy – PP/WHI 1]**

**Trowse with Newton Parish Council Representation:**
The area that concern us relates to maps 21a and 21b. We wish to express our deep concerns over the increased traffic using Whitlingham Lane in Trowse. There are already problems generated by the increased use of the Country Park. The home football matches cause great traffic increase and disruption to the whole of Trowse but especially to the residents and users of Whitlingham Lane with traffic flow becoming very difficult at times. During the working week parking along Whitlingham Lane becomes difficult especially as any new restrictions do not seem to be adhered to and are not monitored or enforced by the Police. Consequently people often flout yellow lines and the Clearway. The car parks are not used to the full as people do not like to pay to park. We feel we must object to any future development along Whitlingham Lane.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Objects to any future development along Whitlingham Lane. Details great concern about traffic problems on Whitlingham Lane, stated to be caused by increased use of Whitlingham Country Park, and particularly during days of matches (at nearby Norwich City football club) and the working week. Complains that existing restrictions are not enforced or monitored, and notes that the car parks are not used to the full, because people prefer not to pay.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Parish Council’s concerns and observations are noted. The Parish Council has identified that the management of highway restrictions, the charging regime in the car parks, and cyclical parking demand in relation to commuting and football matches, are...
among the factors affecting the problems the Council highlights. The Authority recognises the access problems that currently exist, and seeks to avoid further aggravating these. However, it does not believe a complete ban on further development off Whitlingham Lane is warranted. Rather, any new development likely to give rise to additional car traffic should be dependent on the promoters demonstrating how the car parking and traffic volumes will be accommodated (which might include both physical and management changes).

**WHI/DSSP-REJ/1  Trowse, Whitlingham & Kirby Bedon - Whitlingham Country Park [Successor Policy – None]**

Crown Point Estate (Agent - La Ronde Wright) Representation:
Within the context of this policy it is considered that the former Plant Site at Whitlingham should be allocated as a mixed use site for tourism related, youth hostel, recreational, leisure, education and training uses and a site specific policy proposed. The following draft policy is proposed for the Plant Site:

PROPOSED DRAFT POLICY:
Development of the Plant Site should contribute to the enjoyment and economy of the Broads, be compatible with existing uses in the Country Park and be of a scale and design that is compatible with its setting. Subject thereto, support will be given to tourism related, recreation, leisure, education, hostel and training development and, where a need for it is demonstrated, holiday accommodation. Careful consideration must be given to potential impacts on nearby residents. Loss of existing car parking provision should generally be limited and adequate car parking must be provided to serve new facilities. New buildings and large structures will generally be restricted to the area identified on Plan 1 unless a specific locational need is demonstrated.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Reiterates proposal that this land should be allocated for a variety of uses. Elaborates the types of uses envisaged, and suggests wording for a policy.

Broads Authority Response:
While the Authority is not opposed in principle to some development in this area complementing the facilities and use of the adjacent Country Park, there is to date insufficient detail on the nature, scale, servicing and form of development proposed to enable assessment, or justify the allocation of the land at this point in time.

**WHI/DSSP-REJ/1  Trowse, Whitlingham & Kirby Bedon - Provisionally Rejected Option - Crown Point Estate Land [Successor Policy – None]**
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**Trowse with Newton Parish Council Representation:**
We would like to endorse the Anglian water objection to any further development on land adjacent to the Country Park. The implication of the statements in this section of the document seem to imply that this is not the end of development in this area. The Council completely rejects any such development. There is no access and no facilities available for any development. We wish to ask some further questions:
1) What form of development was being considered?
2) We hope that holiday development is not being considered on the car park and picnic meadow site?
3) The new car park has been developed and is not being used is there going to be an argument that it was unnecessary and can be redeveloped?
4) The run off water from the new car park is absorbed by the soft landscaping at present any changes to this car park will result in surface water entering and polluting the new Broad. Is there any plan to change the surfacing of the car park to allow development?

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Completely opposed to development such as this option (i.e. supports rejection), endorses Anglian Water’s ‘objection’. Claims there is no access or facilities available for any development. Queries what form of development was being considered, how this relates to the recent car park and its apparent lack of use, whether there will be any change to the car park surfacing. Suggests potential problems of drainage and resultant pollution of the new broad. Hopes holiday homes will not be developed here.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Parish Council’s opposition to development here is noted. The Authority is unable to answer most of the queries posed. The owners have discussed and consulted on a range of suggested developments, but have yet to put forward any firm or detailed proposals. The Authority is not opposed in principle to any development here, but would need to be able to assess it properly in the light of all relevant considerations, including those raised by the Parish Council.

The Parish Council is mistaken in thinking that Anglian Water has ‘objected to any development here’. Anglian Water has indicated that a connection to the sewerage network would need to be constructed to serve any development, and that the water supply network would need upgrading, but there is sufficient capacity in both water supply and waste water treatment to serve some development.

Since the consultation on the Draft Site Specific Policies and the Parish Council’s response, the owners have undertaken further work on their proposals, but at the time of writing there was still no firm proposal or details put forward for consideration for the Site Specific Policies, and hence the reasons for the rejection remain.
WROXHAM AND HOVETON

WRX/DSSP Wroxham & Hoveton (General)

Hoveton Parish Council Representation:
Correction: Volume 1, Page 100, Paragraph 3, line 2, Hoveton Parish Council (Hoveton is not a town). Correction: Volume 1, Page 103, Paragraph 2, line 1, Granary Staithe (not Quay). Correction: The vast majority of the content of 3.3.47 relates to Hoveton. Hoveton Parish Council requests that the heading should read “Hoveton & Wroxham”.
“Draft Policy: A development boundary is defined for Hoveton and Wroxham*. Within this area development will generally be acceptable, subject to the other policies of the development plan (and in particular flood risk). Outside the designated Hoveton* village centre area retail uses will not be acceptable, in order to secure the continued viability and vibrancy of retailing in Hoveton* (*requested alterations) village centre, and limited the spread of traffic congestion. Particular care will be taken to avoid uses which may generate excessive traffic on the minor roads of the area or in the village centre/bridge area, and to secure the retention of boatyard uses and related employment land.”
Comment & request for improvement in wording: The BA author has not appreciated and stressed sufficiently the immense difficulties caused by extreme traffic congestion on the A1151 through the two villages and the very limiting factor of the 15th century Ancient Monument bridge over the River Bure. The bridge comes under the direct authority of The Broads Authority.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Suggests a couple of corrections to minor errors in names. Requests that Hoveton be given precedence over Wroxham in the heading as most policies relate to the Hoveton area. Considers insufficient stress is laid on the traffic congestion problems around the bridge.

Broads Authority Response:
Both names now corrected. Heading amended to ‘Hoveton and Wroxham’ as requested.
The traffic congestion issues are explicitly addressed and mitigated in Proposed DPD Policies for the area, but the planning policies for the Broads area are not capable of resolving these. The monitoring of air quality is the responsibility of the District Council, and traffic management that of the County Council. Planned growth outside the Broads in the ‘north-east triangle’ of Norwich, on the northern outskirts of Hoveton, and elsewhere in North Norfolk, is likely to have a more significant impact on the traffic in the centre of the village than the relatively minor change planned for the Broads part of the village.

WRX/DSSP-a Wroxham & Hoveton - Development Boundary [Successor Policy – PP/HOV 1]
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**Environment Agency Representation:**
In some cases, the development boundary includes areas of Flood Zone 3b, functional floodplain. In particular, we would highlight that the majority of the development boundary defined within policy WRX/DSSP-a is shown by your SFRA to fall within Flood Zone 3b (with the southern area falling within Flood Zone 1). We are pleased to note that development within the area will be subject to policies on flood risk. However, given the vast area of Flood Zone 3b, you may wish to consider whether policy WRX/DSSP-a should specify the types of development appropriate within the development boundary and whether safety requirements should be detailed. We highlight that the Technical Guidance to the NPPF restricts new development to ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ land uses only in areas of functional floodplain. Replacement buildings may be acceptable in line with paragraph 4.90 of the PPS 25 Practice guide, however betterment over the existing development should be sought.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Notes that majority of the area within development boundary is at serious risk of flooding. Pleased that development within the area will be subject to policies on flood risk. Suggests consideration of whether the policy should specify the appropriate types of development, given the preponderance of highest flood risk zoning. Highlights national policy restriction to essential infrastructure and water compatible development categories in such areas.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Authority is aware that most of the policy area is within high risk flood zones, and the need to comply with national and local flood risk policies is highlighted in the policy, as the EA notes. The area is almost entirely developed, and it is unlikely that there would be substantial new development. Such development as does take place will likely be incremental development of existing properties, many of which are in long established uses that would now not be permitted under current flood risk policies. At the same time, the uses, and many of the buildings and structures, are a vital part of the character and facilities of this part of the Broads. Both national and local planning policies do allow, within limits, replacement and extension of buildings associated with these uses. There may also be opportunities to replace particularly vulnerable uses with ones that are less so but still not in the categories acceptable for ‘new’ development in such locations. In the circumstances it is not considered necessary or helpful to state that development is restricted to the uses the EA mentions.

**WRX/DSSP-a Wroxham & Hoveton - Development Boundary [Successor Policy – PP/HOV 1]**

**Hoveton Parish Council Representation:**
Hoveton Parish Council broadly agrees with the BA comments in the Draft Site Specific Policies document but would point out that there is already “excessive traffic” on A1151 during the rush hour and tourist season.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**Broads Authority Response:**
Parish Council’s broad support noted. The Broads Authority is well aware of the traffic congestion problems in the village core, and also the limitations this places on the potential for additional development. The policy wording is intended to ensure that this, and the potential for exacerbating it, is fully taken into account in judging future development proposals, without precluding all development in the area.

---

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

---

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Your SFRA shows this area to fall partly within Flood Zone 3b, partly within Flood Zone 3 with the addition of climate change and partly in Flood Zone 1. We therefore are pleased to note this policy has been included which will ensure that the flood capacity of the floodplain will be maintained.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Pleased that the policy includes ensuring flood capacity of the area will be maintained. Notes the flood risk zonings within the area.

**Broads Authority Response:**
EA’s support for the maintenance of flood risk capacity noted.

---

**Hoveton Parish Council Representation:**
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

Hoveton Parish Council broadly agrees with the BA comments in the Draft Site Specific Policies document.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Broadly supports policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Parish Council’s broad support for policy noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRX/DSSP-b</th>
<th>Wroxham &amp; Hoveton - Open Space</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOV 2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRX/DSSP-b</th>
<th>Wroxham &amp; Hoveton - Open Space</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/HOV 2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Wroxham Parish Council Representation:**
We believe that there is one omission at WRX/DSSP-b (PAGES 102-103). This should also make mention of Caen Meadow, leisure area accessed from Church Lane, Wroxham and the Parish Council owned, Trafford memorial Ground together with the Public Staithe and Slipway accessed from Malthouse Lane, off Church Lane as public open space.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Proposes inclusion of areas around Church Lane as ‘public open space’.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Site Specific Policies document does not attempt to identify ‘public’ open space as such, but areas defined are for their visual openness or, in some instances, more general ‘green’-ness and absence of built development. Not all of these are public spaces. The policy emphasis here is on their visual value, rather than whether they necessarily provide public recreation, and their distinction from, and importance to, adjacent areas where built development has, and is likely to continue to, take place.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

The area proposed by the Parish Council meets these criteria (it is close to the development boundary in the Broadland District Council Local Plan, outside the Broads area), and also provides valuable recreation space and facilities. It is now included within the Policy in response to the Parish’s representation.

WRX/DSSP-c Wroxham & Hoveton - Station Road Car Park [Successor Policy – PP/HOV 2]

Environment Agency Representation:
The site lies in current Flood Zone 1 but in Flood Zone 3a with climate change. The policy indicates that there is potential for a change of use in the future. In this case, the flood risk comments set out in the general section above would apply in relation to that future planning application.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Highlights flood risk and potential change of use in future, and draws attention to other comments on managing flood risk.

Broads Authority Response:
The policy promotes the continued use of the site for car parking. It is not considered necessary to explicitly address a hypothetical alternative future use. Flood risk is already adequately covered by Development Management Policy DP29 and national policies.

WRX/DSSP-c Wroxham & Hoveton - Station Road Car Park [Successor Policy – PP/HOV 2]

Hoveton Parish Council Representation:
Hoveton Parish Council broadly agrees with the BA comments in the Draft Site Specific Policies document.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Broadly supports policy.

Broads Authority Response:
Parish Council’s broad support noted.

WRX/DSSP-c Wroxham & Hoveton - Station Road Car Park [Successor Policy – PP/HOV 2]

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

---

**WRX/DSSP-d  Wroxham & Hoveton - Village Retail Core [Successor Policy – PP/HOV 4]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
We are pleased to note that flood risk has been highlighted as a constraint to future development. You SFRA shows the site to fall within Flood Zone 3b and within Flood Zone 3a with the addition of climate change. Please see the general flood risk comments set out above. We would highlight that the Technical Guidance to the NPPF considers, that within Flood Zone 3b, only ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ land uses are appropriate. New development should therefore be restricted to these land uses only. Redevelopment of existing buildings may be acceptable in line with paragraph 4.90 of the PPS 25 Practice Guidance and your SPD (Development and Flood Risk). Having reviewed the policy, it does not appear that new development is expected. Instead the policy appears to allow only the redevelopment of sites and buildings within the area. We would however recommend that flood risk is highlighted within the policy itself so that future developers are aware of this constraint.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights the area is within a high flood risk zone, and the national policies and guidance on development in such areas. Recommends inclusion of flood risk in policy to ensure future developers aware.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The flood risk in the area is well known locally, would in any case be picked up in the planning application process, and is addressed by Development Management Policy DP29 and national policies. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to repeat such policies within this one.

---

**Hoveton Parish Council Representation:**
Hoveton Parish Council broadly agrees with the BA comments in the Draft Specific Policies document but would accentuate the existing “traffic congestion” during the rush hour and tourist season.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Broadly supports policy. Highlights existing traffic congestion at peak times.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

**Broads Authority Response:**
Parish Council’s broad support for the policy noted.
The existing traffic congestion (and associated air quality problem) is specifically recognised in the wording of the policy.

**WRX/DSSP-d Wroxham & Hoveton - Village Retail Core [Successor Policy – PP/HOV 4]**

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
The draft Policy ought to have a third bullet point referring to: “developer contributions will be sought, where necessary, to mitigate the impact of any development”. Again it would be useful if the supporting text referred to the developer contributions policy in the adopted Development Management DPD.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Suggests the policy should include reference to developer contributions and the adopted Development Management Policy on this.

**Broads Authority Response:**
It is not considered necessary or appropriate to repeat Development Management Policy DP30.

**WRX/DSSP-d Wroxham & Hoveton - Village Retail Core [Successor Policy – PP/HOV 4]**

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
Mineral and Waste safeguarding: No Safeguarded features.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies that the site is not affected by minerals or waste safeguarding.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.

**NON-SETTLEMENT BASED POLICIES**

**TRINITY BROADS**

**General comment Trinity Broads**

Essex and Suffolk Water Representation:
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

We think that mention needs to be made about the sailing bases at the Trinity Broads. They provide a very valuable recreational resource yet there are no policies for the development of their sites. There should be a policy that recognises their need to develop from time to time and stating the form of development that is appropriate and this needs to be linked to the policy for the Trinity Broads above (ZYX/DSSP-a).

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Proposes mention of the sailing bases at Trinity Broads, and that there should be a policy for the development of their sites, which is needed from time to time.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The value of the sailing bases is recognised, but it is not considered necessary to provide a specific policy for them. It is considered that their future development needs and aspirations can be adequately addressed under the Trinity Broads Policy together with the policies of the Broads Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Given the aim highlighted both within the policy supporting text and within your draft SA to improve water quality, we are pleased to note that this area will be conserved and protected.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Pleased to note this area will be conserved and protected, given the aim of improving water quality.

**Broads Authority Response:**
EA’s support for the policy’s conservation and protection noted.

**Essex and Suffolk Water Representation:**
We support a policy that covers access to the Trinity Broads however we think that the proposed draft policy needs to be extended to cover all the different types of access to the water that currently take place e.g. Sailing, Rowing, Bank fishing, Boat fishing, Tour boat, Canoeing etc. The policy as worded does not cover these uses and in particular a policy needs to be fair and transparent as to what nature of development is acceptable. At present it seems to the users of the Trinity Broads that what is acceptable is not clear at all and this leads to management problems. The Trinity Broads may be capable of further development for quiet recreation,
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

however there needs to be a requirement on any developer as part of their application to carry out the necessary ecological surveys and monitoring to establish a base line and show that their development has no detrimental effect on the species for which the site is designated. This may mean that some development takes place on a trial basis for a number of years before a final decision can be taken. This policy needs to cover not only the water but the land close to the water as well and those business and properties located adjacent to the water who either have access to the water or whose activities are likely to cause an effect on the species for which the site is designated. We also think that the water side businesses based at the Trinities need to be included in this policy rather than in the general policy Riverside, etc, pubs Ref ZYX/DSSP-f which by its very nature is not able to reflect the different locations these businesses are in.

| Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation: |
| Supports provision of a policy on the Trinity Broads, but wishes to see more detail on what is and is not acceptable, provision for temporary consents and monitoring for operations with uncertain impacts, and explicit inclusion of waterside businesses in the policy coverage. |

| Broads Authority Response: |
| The suggestions are considered helpful and amendments (though slightly different to those proposed) have been made to the policy wording to: |
| (i) remove the presumption against additional boating activity, while retaining the strict control on changes in boating to conserve the area; |
| (ii) clarify the application of the policy to development of the banks of the broads, even where these are within built-up areas; |
| (iii) Provide for trial periods and monitoring to facilitate appropriate development while ensuring that the value and qualities of the Trinity Broads are maintained. |

It is not considered that there is any contradiction between inclusion of waterside premises in both the Waterside Pubs Network policy and the Trinity Broads policy, and therefore no change is made here.

| ZYX/DSSP-a Non Settlement Based - Trinity Broads [Successor Policy – PP/XNS 1] |

| PURE Architecture Representation: |
| Our comments are concerned with the Filby Broad area of Trinity Broads within the non-settlement based Draft Site Specific Policies – ref. ZYX/DSSP-a. We believe that the policy options should be modified to omit Filby Broad from the areas covered by the proposed policy, for the reasons set out below. With respect to Filby Broad area of Trinity Broads, our comments are as follows: |
| • We do not see that residential development within the existing development boundary of Filby should have any impact on the water quality of Trinity Broads. |
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

- The special habitats of Filby Broad are protected by the current development boundary in that it is set away from the water’s edge. On this basis we believe that the proposed policy for Trinity Broads should have the Filby Broad area omitted.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Suggests that Filby Broad should be excluded from the area of the Trinity Broads Policy, because cannot see that residential development within the existing development boundary should have impact on water quality or special habitats.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The identification of potential impacts from existing and potential development in Filby upon the water quality and habitats of the Trinity Broads is based on the expert advice of the Broads Authority’s Senior Ecologist, and Essex and Suffolk Water’s Catchment Officer for the Trinity Broads.

**RSPB Representation:**
The RSPB supports this policy and its aspiration to maintain the site’s biodiversity value. However, the Draft Monitoring Indicators need to be more specific. For example, how will the site’s value for wildlife be assessed, and what measures will be used to determine that the “special nature, character and tranquillity [are] conserved?”

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the policy and its aspiration to maintain the biodiversity of the site. Wishes to see more specific monitoring indicators.

**Broads Authority Response:**
RSPB’s support for the policy noted.

---

**UPPER THURNE**

**ZYX/DSSP-b Non Settlement Based - Upper Thurne**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Given the water quality issues highlighted within the policy supporting text, we are pleased to note that this area will be conserved and protected.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Pleased to note this area will be conserved and protected, given the water quality issues identified.

**Broads Authority Response:**
EA’s support for the conservation and protection offered by the policy noted.

**ZYX/DSSP-b Non Settlement Based - Upper Thurne [Successor Policy – PP/XNS 2]**

**RSPB Representation:**
The RSPB supports this policy and its aspiration to maintain the site’s biodiversity value. However, the Draft Monitoring Indicators need to be more specific. For example, how will the site’s value for wildlife be assessed, and what measures will be used to determine that the “special nature, character and tranquillity [are] conserved?”

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the policy and its aspiration of maintaining the biodiversity of the area.
Wishes to see more specific monitoring indicators.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support for policy noted.
Only headline monitoring indicators were included with the Draft Site Specific Policies. The approach to monitoring is presented in more detail in the Proposed DPD, including the means of judging special nature, character and tranquility.

**THE COAST**

**ZYX/DSSP-c Non Settlement Based - The Coast [Successor Policy – PP/XNS 3]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Flood Risk: This area falls within Flood Zone 3 and is at high risk of tidal inundation in the event of a breach of the coastal defences. We note that the policy prohibits most development, partially due to this flood risk. Exceptionally small scale development which furthers the aims of the policy may be allowed. Such proposals should give consideration to flood risk. We also recommend that consideration is given to extending this policy area further along the coast to other areas also at risk of flooding in the event of a breach of the defences.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights the high risk of tidal inundation in the event of a breach of the coastal defences.
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Suggests that the small-scale development permitted by this development should be subject to consideration in terms of flood risk. Recommends extending this policy area further along the coast.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Policy has been amended to draw attention to both the high risk of tidal inundation, and the application of flood risk policy to any development permitted by the policy. It is not possible for the Broads Authority to extend this policy further along the coast. The Policy already extends to the whole length of coast for which the Broads Authority is the local planning authority.

---

**ZYX/DSSP-c Non Settlement Based - The Coast [Successor Policy – PP/XNS 3]**

**Natural England Representation:**
Natural England welcomes the inclusion of this policy within the Site Specific DPD as it promotes public enjoyment of the resource and will encourage engagement of the local community within the environment.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Welcomes the policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support of Natural England for this policy noted.

---

**ZYX/DSSP-c Non Settlement Based - The Coast [Successor Policy – PP/XNS 3]**

**RSPB Representation:**
The RSPB supports this policy and its aspiration to maintain the site’s biodiversity value. However, the Draft Monitoring Indicators need to be more specific. For example, how will the site’s value for wildlife be assessed, and what measures will be used to determine that the “special nature, character and tranquillity [are] conserved?” In addition, whilst some of the suggested infrastructure that may be acceptable could be appropriate it should be clear that these should be used to manage and control visitors to sensitive locations. Such infrastructure must be in keeping with site conservation objectives and not make issues of recreational disturbance worse.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the policy and its aspiration of maintaining the biodiversity of the area. Wishes to see more specific monitoring indicators.
Is concerned it should be clear that the suggested infrastructure should be used to manage and control visitors to sensitive locations, in keeping with conservation objectives, and not worsen recreational disturbance.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support for policy noted.
Only headline monitoring indicators were included with the Draft Site Specific Policies. The approach to monitoring is presented in more detail in the Proposed DPD.
The policy subjects development to the test that it furthers the aims of conservation for quiet recreation and as a wild bird and seal refuge. The issues that the RSPB raises are implied by the draft text, but specific reference to supporting management of visitor pressures is now added to the policy text.

**MAIN ROAD NETWORK**

| ZYX/DSSP-d | Non Settlement Based - Main road network | [Successor Policy – PP/XNS 4] |

**Suffolk County Council Representation:**
Whilst the county council recognises and supports the Broads Authority in its attempts to ensure the safety of users of the defined primary route roads, we have some concerns regarding the clarity of this policy. We feel uncertain as to whether part a) refers to development with a frontage directly onto a primary route road, or access roads from a development onto a primary route; i.e. what constitutes 'access' could be made clearer. We would suggest that this policy could be improved by recognising that development with access onto the Primary Route Network could be acceptable if transport impacts are sufficiently mitigated to the satisfaction of the highways authority. Similarly, the clarity of the introduction to part b) could be improved. We would support the principles set out in i) to iv), but would suggest that the same caveat is inserted as in part a); that impacts could be acceptable if they are sufficiently mitigated, to the satisfaction of the highways authority. Part c) could perhaps be improved by making reference to Transport Assessments and Travel Plans, rather than traffic impact assessments. We would suggest making reference to appropriate national guidance (currently DfT’s 2007 Guidance- http://www.dft.gov.uk/publications/guidance-ontransport-assessment/), which sets thresholds for transport assessments and travel plans.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the principle of ensuring the safety of users on defined primary routes. Suggests policy text amendments to clarify terms, refer to the potential for mitigation, and update the nomenclature of traffic assessments.

**Broads Authority Response:**
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Comments noted and Policy wording amended in the light of these.

**DRAINAGE MILLS**

**ZYX/DSSP-e Non Settlement Based - Drainage Mills**

**[Successor Policy – PP/XNS 5]**

**Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council Representation:**
The Parish Council welcomes the new draft policy on drainage mills.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the Drainage Mills policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support for the policy noted.

**ZYX/DSSP-e Non Settlement Based - Drainage Mills**

**[Successor Policy – PP/XNS 5]**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
This policy relates to the maintenance, restoration, and in some cases, the reuse of existing drainage mills. We are unsure of exactly what is envisaged by this policy or what specifically is likely to be proposed. We would be pleased to receive some additional information in this respect, particularly with regard to what the works may involve. We ask whether this policy is likely to alter existing drainage patterns or to introduce new drainage patterns. It is unclear whether any in-channel works will be required by this policy. Depending upon the specifics of each proposal, there may be a number of specific requirements, for example, the impact on flows would need to be considered, it would need to be ensured that there is no impact on fish populations (development will need to include the installation of fish passes), flood risk should not be increased and the water environment should not be impacted including in terms of sediment. In addition, there may also be specific WFD requirements and WFD assessments may be necessary. Our consent for such works may be required under the Water Resources Act 1991 and Anglian Region Land Drainage Byelaws. This would not necessarily be granted. Once we have received the additional information requested above, we will be pleased to provide further comments/advice on this policy.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Expresses uncertainty, and wishes to be further advised, as to what the policy entails in respect of works to mills, and identifies issues and consents which may need to be addressed, depending on the works involved.
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Broads Authority Response:
The Policy promotes and supports a programme, or strategy, of mill conservation, rather than any particular works to any particular building. The requirements for planning permission, listed building consent, and the consents the EA refers to are unaffected by the policy, but referred to in the supporting text.

RIVERSIDE PUBS

ZYX/DSSP-f Non Settlement Based - Riverside, etc., pubs [Successor Policy – PP/XNS 6]

Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Parish Council Representation:
The Parish Council welcomes the new draft policy on riverside pubs.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Supports the Waterside Pubs Network policy.

Broads Authority Response:
The support of this riverside parish for the policy is noted.

Environment Agency Representation:
This policy protects, and encourages environmental improvements in, public houses. We note from the supporting text that the majority of the public houses are in zones of high flood risk. We therefore recommend that as part of the environmental improvements, flood risk improvements are also considered. We would also encourage the assessment, and upgrading where needed, of foul water facilities at all riverside pubs. Their seasonality, proximity to the watercourse and nature of effluent means they can pose a locally significant risk to both the amenity and ecology of the area.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Suggests the policy is expanded to include improvements to flood risk and foul water facilities.

Broads Authority Response:
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Flood risk is addressed by Development Management Policy DP29, and water quality/sewerage by DP3. It is not considered necessary or desirable to dilute the essential focus of this policy, particularly when the range of locations and premises varies so greatly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZYX/DSSP-f</th>
<th>Non Settlement Based - Riverside, etc., pubs</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/XNS 6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essex and Suffolk Water Representation:</td>
<td>We support the principle of this policy but the context does not really fit with the Trinity Broads as they are not connected to the river system. We think for the Trinity Broads this needs to be amalgamated with the policy above (ZYX/DSSP-a) to form a single policy for the Trinity Broads. Also if it is to specify the business then The Waterside Restaurant needs to be listed as currently it is not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Supports policy in general, but does not think it relevant to the Trinity Broads. If it is to apply to Trinity Broads, it should include the Waterside Restaurant (at Rollesby).

Broads Authority Response:
The Authority does not see a contradiction between the Riverside, etc., Pubs policy, and the Trinity Broads policy. (The title of the former will be changed to Waterside Pubs to avoid an overly restricted interpretation of its application.) While the presence and importance of the Waterside Restaurant at Rollesby is acknowledged, the Waterside Pubs policy is aimed at public houses and very similar premises, which the Waterside is not. Consideration is being given to a potential future elaboration of the policy to include restaurants and other such waterside premises, but this is not feasible within the current timeframe and resources available for the Site Specific Policies DPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZYX/DSSP-f</th>
<th>Non Settlement Based - Riverside, etc., pubs</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/XNS 6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grahame, Lesley (Ward Councillor, Thorpe Hamlet) Representation:</td>
<td>My comments relate to those areas of importance to residents in my ward. I would like to commend the protection of Carey’s Meadow, River Green, Whitlingham Country Park, and related pub sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Commends the protection of pub sites relating to the Thorpe St. Andrew area.

Broads Authority Response:
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Support for the Policy noted.

**ZYX/DSSP-f**  Non Settlement Based - Riverside, etc., pubs  *[Successor Policy – PP/XNS 6]*

**Ivy House Country Hotel (Agent - Wheatman Planning) Representation:**
I am acting on behalf of our clients, the Ivy House Country Hotel. Policy ZYX/DSSP-f includes a list of public houses and hotels with public bars and restaurants. These are either located adjacent to the waterside or set back some distance from their associated public moorings; for example the Dukes Head at Somerleyton which is situated approximately 310m from the public moorings. Our clients’ property, Ivy House Country Hotel, is located approximately 190m from the waterfront to Oulton Broad, with a frontage of about 300m. The Hotel has moorings located to the east of their frontage, some 280m at the closest point from the main complex of the hotel. The Hotel’s facilities are open to users of the Broads as well as staying guests. We therefore consider the Ivy House Country Hotel is an appropriate establishment to benefit from inclusion within the policy and request that the Hotel be included within Policy ZYX/DSSP-f.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Seeks to have the Ivy House Hotel included within the Waterside Pubs policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Request agreed, and the Ivy House Hotel added to the list of establishments to which the policy applies.

**ZYX/DSSP-f**  Non Settlement Based - Riverside, etc., pubs  *[Successor Policy – PP/XNS 6]*

**Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association Representation:**
In terms of the non-settlement based draft options, the NSBA particularly applauds the Draft Policy relating to riverside, etc, pubs (pp 111-114). It agrees that they are key parts of the network of community, visitor and boating facilities. The comment about pubs in the above policy could equally be made about village shops. In 1980, for example, there were three pubs, a restaurant and four shops (including a sub-post office) in the Neatishead/Barton Turf area. Now there is only one pub. (Without wishing to be pedantic, the NSBA would point out that in the list of pubs the Lord Nelson, Reedham, and the Berney Arms appear twice and that, while there is a Reedcutters at Cantley, the NSBA is not aware of a Rushcutters there.)

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
The NBSA supports the riverside pubs policy, agreeing these are key parts of the network of community, visitor and boating facilities. It also wishes to see similar protection for village shops.
Points out minor errors in the list of pubs included in the Draft Policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The NBSA’s support of the policy is noted. This list of pubs covered by the Policy has been corrected to address the repetition mentioned.

With respect to the protection of village shops, these are recognised as a particularly important part of the network of community and visitor facilities in the Broads. In the light of shifts in patterns of shopping, transport and culture, it will not always be possible to save them, but the Broads Authority is keen to do so wherever possible, and to facilitate developments that help such community facilities adapt and grow. Core Strategy Policy and Development Management Policy DP27 are intended to support and express this. Protection of shops and other community facilities also receives explicit support from the National Planning Policy Framework (Policy 28), but only in cases where these are in villages.

The riverside pubs were considered to need policy emphasis additional to this because of the importance of the complete network of these to the whole of the Broads and its appeal to visitors (including those on boats), an apparent trend of closures, and the particular difficulties of replacing those establishments on river banks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZYX/DSSP-f</th>
<th>Non Settlement Based - Riverside, etc., pubs</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/XNS 6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rockland St Mary with Hellington PC Representation:**
The Parish Council met on 12 March to consider the attached report by the Clerk and resolved to support policy (Ref. ZYX/DSSP-f Riverside, etc., pubs, Map 24) set out on pages 111-114 of the consultation document.

Report for the 12 March Parish Council meeting:
I have read the document in some detail, and while there are a large number of proposals, none actually affects the settlement of Rockland St Mary (being mainly outside the Broads Authority’s area). However there is one non settlement based policy which members may wish to comment on as follows (ZYX/DSSP-f). This is a new policy and has not been addressed before. In view of the loss of many local community amenities such as pubs, village shops and post offices in recent years, and the inability of local planning authorities and others in many cases to resist their loss or conversion to housing, members may agree that a positive policy of this kind can go a long way to helping to retain village amenities through the planning system, while at the same time meeting a tourism need for visitors.

I recommend that members support the proposed policy and inform the Broads Authority accordingly.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the Policy.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Parish Council's support is noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZYX/DSSP-f</th>
<th>Non Settlement Based - Riverside, etc., pubs</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – PP/XNS 6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Waveney District Council Representation:**
Support the protection of the public house uses listed for Waveney and Oulton Broad.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the policy as it relates to Waveney and Oulton Broad.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support noted.

---

**ST. BENET'S**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZYX/DSSP-g</th>
<th>Non Settlement Based - St. Benet's</th>
<th>[Successor Policy – None]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Environment Agency Representation:**
This site is at risk from flooding. It is shown by your SFRA to be within an area of ‘uncertain’ flood risk. However, our Flood Map shows it to fall within Flood Zone 3. Therefore any future planning application on this site will need to give consideration to the issue of flood risk.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Identifies the site as falling within a high flood risk zone, and the need to have regard to this in the determination of any planning application on the site.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted. Policy now deleted, (Note, however, however the Draft Policy supported the continued use of the site for outdoor recreation and as a wildlife habitat, and enhancement to support its appreciation as a heritage asset. These uses are compatible with flood risk zone 3. Planning permission has already been granted for a programme of minor works in support of this.)

**HADDISCOE-BECCLES RAILWAY TRACKWAY**

| XYZ/DSSP-REJ/1 | Provisionally Rejected Option - Haddiscoe-Beccles railway track-bed | [Successor Policy – PP/XNS 7] |

Environment Agency Representation:
Thank you for your email and for giving us the opportunity to comment on previously rejected options which may now be taken forward. In respect of policy ZYX/DSSP-h we have no further comments to make regarding the protection of the disused railway for use as a future pathway. We would however highlight that, should new bridges be required in the future in order to cross a main river, this would require consent from ourselves under the terms of terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Anglian Region land drainage and sea defence byelaws. At this stage, and without further detail, we cannot guarantee that such a consent would necessarily be granted. Therefore should a new bridge be proposed in the future we would recommend that the applicant contacts us at an early stage in the design process to discuss the proposals further.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Notes need for EA’s consent for any new bridge across a main river (which includes the Waveney).

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted, but provision of a new bridge is considered highly unlikely.

| ZYX/DSSP-REJ/1 | Non Settlement Based - Provisionally Rejected Option - Haddiscoe-Beccles railway track-bed | [Successor Policy – PP/XNS 7] |

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Public Rights of Way:
Norfolk County Council are pursuing the creation of Norfolk Trails; its objective is to provide a green infrastructure network (similar to the Scottish Great Trail) that can be used by local people and visitors/tourists to connect to Norwich city, market towns and principle villages by walking, cycling, riding etc. This network will be supported by local transport. It is intended that it should become an economic driver for the county via diversified tourism and may provide the impetus for small businesses and services to
develop, which will not only serve local communities but visitors/tourists also. There is an opportunity via this initiative to collaborate across county boundaries in facilitating movement between visitors/tourists looking for a “countryside” experience. It has been noted that the Haddiscoe - Beccles railway track bed will no longer be protected for its potential as a walking/cycling/horse riding route. It would be helpful if Suffolk County Council could reconsider this in the light of the Norfolk Trails initiative outlined above. Examined as a strategic overview there is potential to link the railway bed to Angles Way; which is jointly managed by Norfolk and Suffolk County Councils. The railway bed lies close to Waveney Forest and a holiday park and also a functioning railway line at Haddiscoe, which provides public transport support. It would also present an opportunity to link up with the existing Suffolk Walks on Beccles Marshes, the Coastal Trail, Wherryman’s Way and Weavers Way thus making connections to Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth and further beyond into Norfolk.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Outlines approach to, and rationale for, creating Norfolk Trails. Suggests reconsideration of the rejection of the Haddiscoe-Beccles Rail Trackway option, on the grounds of its potential to contribute to the wider network of trails and path enhancements.

**Broads Authority Response:**
In the light of the views of both Norfolk and Suffolk County Councils the protection of the railway trackbed is included as a Policy in the Proposed DPD (PP/XNS7).

**Suffolk County Council Representation:**
The Broads Authority is currently proposing to discontinue protection of the Haddiscoe-Beccles rail route from development, as there is no reasonable prospect of these routes being reused in the foreseeable future. Re-opening the Haddiscoe-Beccles rail route is not in the 2011-2031 Suffolk Local Transport Plan and is, as such, not an investment priority for the county council. We would not disagree with the Broads Authority in its assertion that there is no reasonable likelihood that a bridge could be provided across the Waveney to make it into a strategic route. However, we would request that these routes continue to be protected from prejudicial development for their potential value offering access to the Waveney riverbank and Beccles Marshes.

Paragraph 75 of the NPPF says that planning authorities should seek to enhance public rights of way, backed up by paragraph which 114 says that planning authorities should plan ‘positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of…green infrastructure’. The importance of access to the countryside for health and wellbeing purposes is recognised in paragraph 73.
Policy CS17 of the Broads Core Strategy sets out the Broads Authority ambition to improve access by developing rights of way in line with the Suffolk Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This plan, under Objective B, identifies the need to improve access to the countryside via rights of way.

There is good potential for a short circular route from Beccles, improving access to the Beccles Marshes, and the county council would not wish to see that potential diminished. On this basis the county council would wish to see this route protected from prejudicial development and would welcome the opportunity for discussing ways of supporting the establishment of this route as a footpath and, potentially, a bridleway/cycle route.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Wishes to see these routes continue to be protected from prejudicial development for their potential value offering access to the Waveney riverbank and Beccles Marshes; calls national and Broads policies in support of such an approach; and invites discussion of ways to establish foot, cycle or bridle paths using the trackway. Confirms that re-opening this rail route is not an investment priority for Suffolk County Council, and does not disagree that there is little likelihood of a replacement bridge over the Waveney.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The County Council’s support for a Policy to protect the trackway from development for its potential for local foot, cycle or bridle routes is noted. In the light of this the provisional rejection of this policy has been reviewed, and this option now included as a Policy.

**Waveney District Council Representation:**
Disappointed that this is being ruled out as not having a reasonable prospect of delivery. This rejection does not appear to make provision for the possibility of any proposals or opportunities that may arise in the future.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Disappointed by rejection on grounds of unlikely to be delivered, when proposals or opportunities may arise in future.

**Broads Authority Response:**
In the light of the comments received, including this one from the District Council, the provisional rejection has been overturned and a Policy now included.
GENERAL COMMENTS

General comment  Rejected policies

Environment Agency Representation:
We note that the following policies have been rejected by your Authority: ACL/DSSP-REJ/1, CLX/DSSP-REJ/1, DIL/DSSP-REJ/1, FIL/DSSP-REJ/1, HLV/DSSP-REJ/1, NEA/DSSP-REJ/1, ORM/DSSP-REJ/1, ORM/DSSP-REJ/2, ROL/DSSP-REJ/1, SAL/DSSP-REJ/1, SOL/DSSP-REJ/1, SMA/DSSP-REJ/1, STK/DSSP-REJ/1, TSA/DSSP-REJ/1, THU/DSSP-REJ/1, WHI/DSSP-REJ/1, WES/DSSP-REJ/1, WES/DSSP-REJ/2, WES/DSSP-REJ/3, ZYX/DSSP-REJ/1.
Due to time constraints, we are unable to comment on these rejected sites. Should you continue to pursue these sites in the future, please consult us again to allow further comments to be made. It is likely that environmental issues will require consideration.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Notes the provisionally rejected sites. Will not comment on these, but wishes to be advised if they are brought into consideration again.

Broads Authority Response:
Noted. The EA was subsequently consulted on one of the provisionally rejected options which was reconsidered and is now proposed for the DPD (Haddiscoe-Beccles Rail Trackway).

General comment

Environment Agency Representation:
FLOOD RISK:

General Comments:
Given that the majority of the Broads Authority area is at flood risk, this is an issue that requires careful consideration through your local planning documents. We are pleased to note that this has been acknowledged throughout the document.
The NPPF highlights, in paragraph 100, that:
‘Local plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change, by:
• Applying the Sequential Test;
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- If necessary, applying the Exception Test;
- Safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management;
- Using opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding; and
- Where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to facilitate the relocation of development, including housing, to more sustainable locations.

We therefore recommend that the above issues are considered carefully throughout the drafting of this DPD.

Sequential Test:
Paragraph 101 of the NPPF indicates that ‘the aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding…A sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk from any form of flooding.’ Further, paragraph 5 of the Technical Guidance to the NPPF highlights that ‘the overall aim should be to steer new development to Flood Zone 1’.

In light of this, any site within your document that is within a flood zone should pass the Sequential Test. We recommend that your consideration of the test is reflected within the document. Notwithstanding this, given the nature of many of your draft policies, in that a number of potential uses are often discussed rather than requiring a specific use/number of units, you may consider it difficult to comprehensively apply the Sequential Test at this stage. We recommend that you consider whether you are able to apply the Sequential Test and if so, this should be recognised within the document/supporting evidence. Where you consider that the Sequential Test cannot be applied at this stage, for example due to a lack of detail regarding the future development, this should also be clear within the document so that future developers are aware that the Sequential Test will need to be applied at the planning application stage. Please note however, that in such circumstances the inclusion of the site/area within this policy document could not be necessarily taken to imply that the principle of the development has been established.

As part of the Sequential Test, the appropriateness of a development type should be considered in relation to the Flood Zone in which the site falls. Advice on this is included in the Technical Guidance to the NPPF. Tables 1-3 show where a particular land use may or may not be appropriate. In particular, we highlight the following in relation to Flood Zone 3b:

**Flood Zone 3b:**
Within Table 1 of Technical Guidance to the NPPF, Flood Zone 3b is classified as ‘the functional floodplain’ and is ‘land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood’. Further, it is highlighted that ‘only the water-compatible uses and the essential infrastructure listed in table 2 that has to be there should be permitted’ in Flood Zone 3b. Therefore the Technical Guidance
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indicates that ‘highly vulnerable’, ‘more vulnerable’ and ‘less vulnerable’ land uses would not be appropriate within Flood Zone 3b. Such uses should not therefore be allocated to land classified as functional floodplain. We recommend that this is considered in your site specific policies document and where sites/areas fall wholly/partially within Flood Zone 3b, the land uses that would be acceptable should be detailed within the policy.

In respect of areas of Flood Zone 3b, you may wish to consider the guidance in the PPS 25 Practice Guide, paragraph 4.90, which states that ‘areas which would naturally flood with an annual exceedence probability of 1 in 20 (5 per cent) or greater, but which are prevented from doing so by existing infrastructure or solid building, will not normally be defined as functional floodplain’. This guidance is echoed in your own SPD: Development and Flood Risk. Therefore, you may wish to take this guidance into account when considering areas of Flood Zone 3b and existing/future development. We would however advise that this issue is given very careful consideration. The location of development in areas that would frequently flood, even if existing development is already on the site, could have significant cost and sustainability/safety implications.

**Sequential Approach to site layout:**
Where the Sequential Test is passed, the sequential approach should then be considered on site, to ensure that the most vulnerable land uses are located on the areas of the site at lowest flood risk. This is particularly important where there are multiple flood zones across the site. We advise that development, particularly vulnerable land uses, should be located in lower flood risk areas, and if possible in any areas of Flood Zone 1. You may wish to include this as a requirement within the supporting policy which could detail the area of the site appropriate for development. A site specific Flood Risk Assessment, comparing site levels with flood levels would enable the precise locations of the flood zones to be determined.

**Relocation of existing development:**
Given point 5 of paragraph 100 of the NPPF (highlighted above), we recommend that you consider whether there are opportunities to relocate existing development to areas at a lower flood risk, particularly in areas at high/serious flood risk or where the flood risk is expected to increase with climate change, making existing development unsustainable in the long term. Where there may be opportunities, you may wish to consider whether they can be addressed within your DPD.

**Exception Test:**
Where the Exception Test is required (as set out in the Technical Guidance to the NPPF) we advise that, in allocating the site, your Authority should have confidence that the Test can be passed. This should include confidence that the site can be made safe for the lifetime of the development taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where
possible, reducing flood risk overall (as set out in paragraph 102 of the NPPF). We advise that you should be able to demonstrate your consideration of the Exception Test if required.

**Flood Risk Assessment:**
Both the NPPF and the associated Technical Guidance highlight that where future development is necessary on a site at risk from flooding (Sequential Test has been applied), the development of the site is informed by a Flood Risk Assessment. This is also a requirement of policy DP29 of your Development Management Policies DPD. You may wish to highlight this requirement within the policy associated with any sites allocated in areas at risk from flooding.

Indeed, we note that many of the draft policies require consideration of flood risk and compliance with policies on flood risk. You may wish to consider what information you will require to demonstrate this and what information may be required within flood risk assessments. You may also wish to consider whether it would be helpful to developers to summarize that information within the policy or the supporting text.

In particular, you may wish to develop guidance on what is required to enable a development to remain safe throughout its lifetime. This could include guidance on which development types require safe access and escape routes, and in which flood events. It may also detail what level of residual flood risk would be acceptable and how it can be safely managed for a range of development types and flood events. This could include advice on floor level requirements in relation to flood levels and whether higher refuge is required within the building and, if so, what the height requirements may be. The advice could also specify when the use of Flood Warning and Evacuation Plans might be acceptable to safely manage the residual risk, and what the Flood Evacuation Plans should contain. Details on the required flood resistant/resilient measures to mitigate the impacts of flooding on the building could also be provided.

**Insurance requirements:**

You will be aware that the Government and the insurance industry are in discussion over the issue of the provision of flood insurance. The current commitment to provide flood insurance for domestic properties does not apply to any new property built after 1 January 2009. Failure to obtain insurance for a property could impact the ability to obtain a mortgage, and therefore the ability of the development to be purchased both on completion and in perpetuity.

The Association of British Insurers and the National Flood Forum have published a document entitled ‘Guidance on Insurance and Planning in Flood Risk Areas for Local Planning Authorities in England’, which is for LPAs to use when producing Local Plans or
determining planning applications, in the context of the NPPF. The document has the following five key recommendations for Local Planning Authorities.

1. Ensure strong relationships with technical experts on flood risk, within the Local Authority and further a field;
2. Consider flooding from all sources, taking account of climate change;
3. Take potential impacts on drainage infrastructure seriously;
4. Ensure that flood risk is mitigated to acceptable levels (not more than a 1% annual probability of flooding) for proposed developments, and share information on this;
5. Make sure Local Plans take account of all relevant costs and are regularly reviewed.

The document emphasises that insurers would prefer that, in the 1% annual probability flood event including climate change, the proposed development will not flood internally and that preferably this is achieved through raising the floor level above this flood level. They highlight that Local Plans should take account of all relevant costs including the potential for new developments to face reductions in property values due to high insurance premiums or the inability to obtain insurance at all, if the proposed developments are not protected from flooding to an appropriate standard.

Therefore you may wish to include within the site specific policies a specification that new development is protected from flooding through raised floor levels to above the 1% annual probability flood event including climate change, to ensure that the properties are insurable and therefore sellable.

The ABI document states that raised floors are much more likely to be favoured by insurers over resistant measures that provide a barrier to water entering a property (but which are dependent on timely installation by occupants) and flood resilient measures which do not prevent the water entering the property but reduce the damage. You may therefore want to also provide guidance on the acceptability of using such measures, as it is less certain that affordable insurance would be able to be obtained in these instances.

**Broads Authority SPD: Development and Flood Risk:**
We would highlight that your SPD requires there to be no increase in flooding vulnerability within flood risk zones.

**Surface Water Management:**
We advise that development proposals should give consideration to the management of surface water to ensure that flood risk is not increased as a result of the development. Surface water arising from a developed site should as far as is practicable, be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic the surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development while reducing the flood risk itself and elsewhere, taking climate change into account. Ideally infiltration should be used as a priority.
where feasible. Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management. Developers should consider SuDS options at the earliest design stage, to enable the inclusion of measures which provide multiple benefits in addition to effective drainage for example, amenity enhancements.

**Residential Moorings:**
We note that policies BRU/DSSP-d, HOR/DSSP-g and STA/DSSP-a may allow new residential moorings to be permitted through the application of Development management policy DP25.

Core Strategy policy CS20 and Development Management policy DP29 require the application of national flood risk planning policy. In this respect we would seek further clarification on residential moorings and how they may fulfil this requirement, particularly in terms of safety.

We recommend that you consider the vulnerability classification of this land use and whether it is appropriate in areas of high flood risk. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF states that only ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ land uses are appropriate within Flood zone 3b (functional floodplain). ‘More vulnerable’ land uses are not considered appropriate. You may wish to specify this through the policies.

If the land use is considered to be appropriate, future planning applications would need to pass the Sequential Test, Exception Test and be supported by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment. The flood risk comments set out above provide some useful guidance.

In particular, we consider that the policies should acknowledge the increase in flood risk associated with allowing a residential use within an area at high risk from flooding. We highlight paragraphs 102 and 103 of the NPPF and paragraph 9 of the associated Technical Guidance which require FRAs to be submitted in support of future development and to demonstrate how flood risk will be managed including safety of the inhabitants. We advise that this requirement would apply to residential moorings and it would beneficial for this to be reflected within the policies. A site specific Flood Risk Assessment should demonstrate that any residual flood risk will be appropriately managed so that the future inhabitants will be safe. You may wish to provide advice on what you would deem to be safe in such high flood risk locations.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**

1) **GENERAL COMMENTS:** Highlights the importance of careful consideration of flood risk through the Broads planning documents because the majority of the Broads area is at flood risk. Draws attention to national policy on flood risk and the following issues.

2) **THE SEQUENTIAL TEST**
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States that any site identified in the document and in flood zone should pass the sequential test.

3) FLOOD ZONE 3b
Draws attention to the Technical Appendix to the NPPF, and states that ‘highly vulnerable’, ‘more vulnerable’ and ‘less vulnerable’ uses should not be allocated to land identified as in flood zone 3b. Notes the treatment of existing buildings and infrastructure as excluded from the definition of the zone, but urges caution in exploiting this because of the remaining flood hazards.

4) SEQUENTIAL APPROACH TO SITE LAYOUT.
Draws attention to the national policy presumption that the lowest vulnerable land uses are located in the areas of sites at least flood risk. Suggests consideration of identifying the particular parts of sites suitable for development. Notes site flood risk assessments would identify the precise locations of flood risk zones.

5) RELOCATION OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT.
Recommends consideration of whether there are opportunities for relocation of development to areas at lower risk of flooding, and whether these could be addressed in this DPD.

6) EXCEPTION TEST.
Advises that site allocations should be made only where the Authority is confident and can demonstrate that (where relevant) the exception test can be passed.

7) FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT.
Suggests that policies highlight the requirement of the NPPF and Broads Development Management Policies for flood risk assessment to inform decisions on proposed development; that consideration and explanation is given as to what information will be required where policies refer to consideration of flood risk; and that consideration is given to developing guidance on the details of managing flood risk.

8) INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS.
Draws attention to the issue of availability of insurance for flood risk, and the discussions and documents pursuing this matter. Highlights five key recommendations from the Association of British Insurers and the National Flood Forum, relating to expertise, all sources of flooding (including climate change), potential impacts on drainage infrastructure, ensuring flood mitigation (preferably floor raising) and information sharing, and taking account of relevant costs in local plans. Suggests consideration of a policy requirement of raised floor levels above the 1% annual probability flood level (including climate change) requirement.

9) BROADS AUTHORITY SPD: DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK:
Highlights that the Broads Supplementary Planning Document requires there should be no increase in flooding vulnerability within flood risk zones, and apparent contradiction between this and some Draft Site Specific Policies.

10) SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT:
Advises consideration of surface water management to avoid increased risk of flooding through development. Rehearses the principles of ‘sustainable drainage systems’ (SuDS).
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11) RESIDENTIAL MOORINGS:
Notes mention of residential moorings policy DP25 in relation to marinas in Brundall, Horning and Stalham. Suggests that consideration be given to whether accommodation of this use in areas of high flood risk is compatible with Core Strategy and national policies on flood risk, particularly in terms of safety. Refers to the policies and processes to be followed, and suggests it would be beneficial for these to be reflected in the (site specific) policies.

Broads Authority Response:
1) The importance of flood risk to the document, and national policy on this, is acknowledged and understood.
2) SEQUENTIAL TEST. Most of the site specific policies are not conventional ‘site allocations’, and do not propose specific new uses. Predominantly they are, in effect, additional guidance about the considerations that should be applied to future change in the specific area. (In most cases these changes are anticipated to be minor and incremental, because of the various constraints, including flood risk and the high level of landscape etc, protection.) Where there are no new uses proposed it is not necessary to apply the sequential test to all conceivable alternative future uses. National policy will require such a test is applied in the (generally unlikely) event that a different use is proposed in future. However, the justification of the Policies has been elaborated to clarify the relevance of the sequential test to each.
3) FLOOD ZONE 3b.
There are no allocations of new vulnerable uses in flood zone 3b. Unless there are site/location specific flood issues it is not considered necessary to repeat or elaborate the national flood risk policy which would be applied in the event that significant changes of use (or operational development) were proposed.
4) SEQUENTIAL APPROACH TO SITE LAYOUT.
National policy on this matter is noted. It is not generally considered necessary to repeat this unless there are site specific issues to address. In the light of the limited pace and scale of development in the Broads (in part due to the risk of flooding), and the nature of most of the Site Specific Policies, it is not considered appropriate to fund and undertake site flood risk assessment in advance of development proposals coming forward.
5) RELOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT.
The Authority has looked without success for opportunities to relocate development to minimise flood risk as part of the preparation of the Site Specific Policies, but did not identify any such opportunities to carry forward at this time. Development Management Policy DP29 facilitates relocation more generally.
6) EXCEPTION TEST. There are no site ‘allocations’ in flood zones requiring the ‘exceptions test’.
7) FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT.
The Proposed DPD will supplement, rather than replace, existing Core Strategy, Development Management and national policies on flood risk. It is not considered necessary to repeat these policies unless there are site specific issues to clarify or highlight.
Consideration will be given to the potential to provide additional guidance on managing flood risk when the Broads Development and Flood Risk SPD is reviewed.

8) INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS.
The Authority is aware of the issues relating to flood risk insurance, and believes the preparation of the Site Specific Policies pays due regard to the five key recommendations of the ABI & NFF. It is considered that raised floor levels are an important tool in minimising flood risk, but that other planning considerations and the scale, nature and extent of flood risk in the Broads require a broader range of flood management measures.

9) BROADS AUTHORITY SPD – FLOOD RISK AND DEVELOPMENT.
It is considered that the Draft Site Specific Policies are in line with national policy in allowing an element of extension. The SPD will be reviewed in due course to take account of the publication of the NPPF.

10) SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT.
These matters are already generally adequately covered by national, Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, and the intention is only to include them in Site Specific Policies where there is a site specific issue of surface water management to be clarified or highlighted.

11) RESIDENTIAL MOORINGS.
The EA’s response in this regard does not really relate to the Draft Site Specific Policies. It questions the existing adopted Development Management Policy DP25, rather than its application to the specific areas covered by the Draft Site Specific Policies mentioned. DP25 was properly adopted only last year, and the national policies on flood risk to which it relates have not changed significantly with the adoption of the NPPF. At that time EA made no objection to the policy and advised that in their view residential moorings were water compatible development.

General comment

Environment Agency Representation:
Development Boundaries BEC/DSSP-a, BUN/DSSP-a, HOR/DSSP-a, OUL/DSSP-a, REE/DSSP-a, TSA/DSSP-e, WRX/DSSP-a, GTY/DSSP-a (in addition, for GTY/DSSP-a, also see comments in later section). The area defined by the proposed development boundary is shown by your SFRA to be partially or wholly at risk of flooding either currently or with the addition of climate change. We wish to highlight that future planning applications within the development boundary will need to have regard to this flood risk and development proposals will need to be in line with current national/local planning policy on flood risk. The general flood risk comments made above provide some useful guidance in relation to future planning applications within the development boundary. We are pleased to note that flood risk has been referenced within some of the policies/supporting text. You should ensure that this
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has occurred for all policies where flood risk is a potential constraint to development so that developers are aware of the need for this to be considered further.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights that parts, in some cases a majority, of areas within Draft development boundaries are at risk of flooding, where the potential for development is constrained by national and local policy. Future planning applications will need to have regard to this. Notes specific reference to flood risk constraints in some cases, and considers this should be included in all areas where there is flood risk.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Most of the Broads designated area is at serious risk of flooding, and much of the existing development characteristic of the area and supportive of the statutory Broads purposes is located in such areas. The development boundaries identified are a component of a suite of policies primarily aimed at protecting the openness and sustainability of the Broads. These development boundaries do not over-ride the national and local policies on flood risk already in place. However, in the light the constraints highlighted in consultation, including those by the EA, the Draft development boundaries have been reviewed and a number omitted.

**General comment**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
WATER ENVIRONMENT: Given the nature of the Broads, the majority of your proposed sites are located adjacent to watercourses/water bodies: BEC/DSSP-a, BUN/DSSP-a, GTY/DSSP-a, HOR/DSSP-a, OUL/DSSP-a, REE/DSSP-a, TSA/DSSP-e, WRX/DSSP-a, BRU/DSSP-a, -b, -c, -d, -e, BUN/DSSP-b, CAN/DSSP-a, GTY/DSSP-a, GTY/DSSP-b, HOR/DSSP-d, HOR/DSSP-e, HOR/DSSP-g, NOR/DSSP-a, NOR/DSSP-b, ORM/DSSP-a, OUL/DSSP-b, OUL/DSSP-c, OUL/DSSP-d, SOL/DSSP-a, SOL/DSSP-b, STA/DSSP-a, TSA/DSSP-b, WHI/DSSP-a, WRX/DSSP-d, POT/DSSP-a, POT/DSSP-b, ZYX/DSSP-g.

The water environment should be protected and enhanced. Where development is necessary on sites adjacent to water bodies, including streams and ditches, the water body should be retained and incorporated into any development proposal and promoted as a positive feature of the development. It is vital that the riverine environment is also protected as it is integral to the sustainability of the watercourse. To this end, suitable buffer zones should be incorporated to protect the watercourse. We are pleased to note that policy BEC/DSSP-a requires an open riverside margin to be retained and that policy BRU/DSSP-a requires buildings to be kept well back from the river frontage. You may wish to consider whether this requirement could be included for any other waterside locations.
Developments which would involve the urbanisation of water bodies should be avoided. Enhancement of water bodies should be encouraged as part of development plans. We would be in support of any proposals which seek to protect/enhance watercourses and their associated riverine environment and which seek to provide ecological improvements. We recommend that this is considered throughout your DPD, wherever possible.

The WFD creates new challenges regarding how we manage the water environment alongside development. The WFD requires us and co-deliverers of the Directive, such as Local Authorities, to ensure that there is no deterioration in river quality in terms of water quality, ecology or hydromorphology (river flows or physical structure) and also for water bodies to improve to ‘Good’ status in the long term. The Regulations set out a general legal duty for all public bodies (including LPAs) to "have regard to the River Basin Management Plan (RBMP)". In some cases, future development proposals will need to give careful consideration to this issue to ensure that the ability to meet WFD objectives is not impacted and WFD assessments may be required. Planning policies should influence the design and location of new development to ensure it does not create adverse pressures on the water environment that could compromise our ability to meet WFD.

We recommend that the requirements of the WFD are highlighted within the DPD either as an overarching statement relating to the development of all sites, or as site specific constraint, where applicable.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Draws attention to the riverside nature of many of the sites included in the DPD; the desirability of maintaining and enhancing existing water bodies and watercourses; urbanisation of water bodies avoided; its support for proposals that protect or enhance water bodies and watercourses; the challenges and requirements in relation to the WFD and the statutory duty to have regard to the River Basin Management Plan; the desirability of highlighting WFD requirements in the DPD.
Is pleased to note that BEC/DSSP-a and BRU/DSSP-a incorporate a protective margin, and suggests consideration of suitable buffer zones elsewhere.

Broads Authority Response:
The Broads Authority is very conscious of the importance of the water environment, and actively involved in protecting and enhancing it on a range of fronts. The policies and SA/SEA have had the benefit of the wetland expertise of the Authority’s ecologists, and regard to the WFD and Anglian River Basin Management Plan. The Broads Core Strategy embodies the principles to which the EA refers here, as do many of the policies in this DPD.
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It is not considered practical or desirable to mention water quality issues, including WFD requirements, in every policy for the Broads. It is the development plan that is applied to any proposed development, not solely an individual Site Specific Policy.

Almost the whole of the designated Broads area might be regarded as a waterside buffer zone, and the relevant planning policies support and maintain this. At the site specific level, waterside buffers are included in some policies, where applicable. However, it is in the nature of much of the existing development in the Broads that it is directly on, or close to, the waterfront (e.g. boatyards, traditional Broads holiday homes, waterside public houses, etc.), so that a blanket application of a waterside buffer is neither always possible nor desirable.

The support for the ‘waterside buffers’ in the BEC/DSSP-a and BRU/DSSP-a is welcomed, although the former is no longer being pursued.

**General comment**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Draft Monitoring Indicators:
We note that many of your draft indicators refer to flood risk. It is not completely clear what will be required by these indicators for example, what would constitute an increase in flood risk and therefore how it will be ensured that this would not occur. However, we understand that it is your intention that flood risk issues are given particular consideration and we are supportive of this objective. We note that your draft sustainability appraisal highlights the potential difficulties in quantifying the results and providing meaningful feedback of the indicators. You may therefore wish to set out some guidelines to accompany the flood risk indicators.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supportive of the intention to give flood risk issues particular attention, but queries the lack of specific detail of how this will be measured. Notes that the SA highlights the difficulty of quantifying the risk. Suggests inclusion of some guidelines to accompany flood risk indicators.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support for the attention given to flood risk noted. The approach to monitoring generally, and flood risk in particular, has been elaborated.

**General comment**
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**Environment Agency Representation:**

Land Contamination:
We note that sites OUL/DSSP-d, NOR/DSSP-a, BUN/DSSP-b may be subject to land contamination as a result of their previous uses. We recommend that you consider whether this may also be the case for any other proposed site. Where land contamination may be an issue, you may wish to highlight the requirements for developers in relation to site investigation and land remediation in line with paragraphs 109, 120 and 121 of the NPPF. This is to ensure that the proposed development does not pollute the water environment. As a minimum, we recommend that a desktop study should be completed. If the desktop study identifies that contamination may be a problem, a full site investigation may also be required along with a risk assessment and remediation Method Statements.

Foul Drainage:
As highlighted within your draft SA, it needs to be ensured that there is adequate foul drainage capacity to serve the development sites. We recommend that Anglian Water are consulted.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights potential for contaminated land on three identified sites (and possibly others), suggests reference to NPPF provisions in relation to this, and recommends methods for addressing these. Also highlights the need to ensure adequate foul drainage if sites identified for development, recommending consultation with Anglian Water to confirm this.

**Broads Authority Response:**
References to the risk of contaminated land added to the Policies for each of the three sites identified. It is not considered that there is a need to repeat national policy, or specify in detail the methods by which these issues are tackled. (Best practice on this may change over the life of the policies, among other considerations.) It is anticipated that EA would be consulted on any relevant development proposals on these sites, and that such detail can be dealt with through the development management process. The availability of foul drainage for each of the sites identified for development has been established in consultation with Anglian Water.

**General comment**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
Pollution Control:
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Waterside sites should also carefully consider pollution control. Our pollution prevention guidance note 5 (works and maintenance in or near water) provides guidance on this issue. This is particularly important for potentially polluting land uses (for example boatyard industrial uses), such as those proposed within policies BRU/DSSP-b, BRU/DSSP-d, BUN/DSSP-b, CAN/DSSP-a, GTY/DSSP-b, HOR/DSSP-g, NOR/DSSP-a, OUL/DSSP-d, STA/DSSP-a, TSA/DSSP-b.

It is also important in areas where the groundwater may be particularly vulnerable. There are many aspects to consider in determining groundwater vulnerability. This can include whether a site lies over a principle or secondary aquifer or whether a site falls within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ) designated to protect public water drinking supplies.

Future development proposals will therefore need to incorporate pollution control measures which are protective of the water environment and, as a minimum, best practice pollution control techniques should be employed. In particular, for sites located within a SPZ1 (TSA/DSSP-b, NOR/DSSP-a, TSA/DSSP-3), where pollutants entering the groundwater below the site could contaminate the public water drinking supply and be abstracted within 50 days, only clean roof water (through sealed downpipes) should be discharged to an infiltration device such as a soak away.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:

Highlights the importance of pollution control for waterside sites; the EA’s guidance note 5; groundwater vulnerability; and the relevance of these matters to the sites listed.

Broads Authority Response:

The importance of the protection and enhancement of water quality is already addressed by adopted Development Management Policy DP3. However, the particular relevance to the two sets of sites identified by the EA is accepted, and the Policies for these have been amended accordingly.

General comment

Environment Agency Representation:

Flood Defence Consent:

Any development within nine metres of a main river or flood defence will need to obtain Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency prior to undertaking the works. This is a requirement under the Water Resources Act 1991 and Anglian Region Land Drainage Byelaws. You may wish to highlight this within the document so that future developers are made aware. We would want to ensure that any proposed works do not compromise our access to maintain the river or defences, and does not adversely affect any existing defences or damage the bed and banks of the river itself. We would also want to ensure that there are no flood risk, ecological or WFD impacts. Until an application is submitted and determined, we are unfortunately unable to guarantee that such a consent would be granted. The requirement for our prior consent applies to any waterside development (as
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highlighted above). In particular, we note that through policy NOR/DSSP-a your Authority may seek a pedestrian/cycle link across the Wensum. Policy NOR/DSSP-b also requires that a riverside walk is maintained. Any trees that are planted would also require our consent. It will need to be ensured that access for our maintenance machinery is maintained.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights the need for Flood Defence Consent for works within 9 metres of a main river or flood defence, and suggests this might be highlighted within the document to bring this to the attention of future developers.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The requirement for Flood Defence Consent is noted, but it is not considered appropriate to mention this in relation to every waterside site mentioned in the DPD, and no cases have been identified where the need for such consent would prejudice the implementation of a policy or vice versa.

**General comment**

**Highways Agency Representation:**
Having examined the documents on your web site I can find no site specific allocations or policies which are likely to have a detrimental affect of the Strategic Road Network for which the Highways Agency, on behalf of the Secretary of State, is responsible. The Highways Agency therefore has no comment to make on the consultation document.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Proposals judged unlikely to have a detrimental impact on Strategic Road Network, thus no comment on the document.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.

**General comment**

**Natural England Representation:**
The comments of Natural England are made following a desk based assessment. Natural England is unable to comment in significant detail where, for example, a visual appreciation of the site might be required and is therefore reliant upon the material presented in the consultation documents. Given these limitations, it is difficult for Natural England to offer detailed comment on the merits of each site. As such, the following comments are formed from a generalist, rather than a detailed, perspective.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights that its assessment is desk based and does not attempt a detailed assessment of each site.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted, and understood as such.

**General comment**

**Natural England Representation:**
The consultation response is formulated in the context of paragraph 1.1.2. Natural England is aware that the Site Specific Policies must be in conformity with the Broads Core Strategy (2007). The Core Strategy identifies assets which are important to Natural England and which provide a focus for comment, most notably:

- Natura 2000 network sites – the Broads Special Area of Conservation; Broadland SPA and Ramsar; Breydon Water SPA
- Protected landscapes – The Norfolk Coast and Suffolk Coast and Heaths Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; the Broads National Park;
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (28 SSSIs within the Broads);
- Protected species
- Regionally Important Geological Sites, County Wildlife Sites etc.;
- Landscape scale ecological considerations – adaptation by species to climate change, and the need for BAP habitat recreation to compensate for losses elsewhere;
- Natural processes and systems, particularly coastal, flooding and surface water drainage;
- National Trails and recreational assets.

It is noted that the Broads Authority Local Development Framework is at an advanced stage, with the current Site Specific Policies following the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2007 and the Development Management Policies in 2011. This latter document contains Policy DP1, relating to the natural environment. This policy is crucial as it establishes an important element of the decision making framework of the sites identified in the Site Specific Policies document. That is, Policy DP1 will form part of the consideration of any planning application submitted on the sites identified within the Site Specific Policies. Whilst some of the assets (listed above) are identified in the commentary of individual sites, some consistency is required in carrying through into the policy. For example, the policy relating to Horning Sailing Club (Ref. HOR/DSSP-e) highlights the importance of nature conservation (including designated Natura 2000 sites), but the majority of other policies do not highlight those assets in the Policy wording, despite those assets commonly being identified within the supporting text to those policies as a ‘constraint and feature’. To ensure a consistency of approach is achieved across all sites, Natural England recommends that the Policy relating to each site be cross referenced to Policy DP1 of the Development Management Policies where that asset is identified as a constraint and feature.
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It is noted that the geographic extent of the Site Specific Policies are presented on black and white maps. Ideally, the maps ought to identify other features (flood zones, SSSI, NNRS etc), as the Core Strategy maps are not at a helpful scale.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Notes the importance of the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies, especially DP1, to the production and context of the Site Specific Policies and the consideration of planning applications on those sites.
Seeks a greater consistency of the carrying through of consideration of nature conservation assets into individual policies.
Seeks cross-reference to Policy DP1 in each policy.
Suggests that the maps showing the policies identify other features such as flood risk zones and designated nature conservation sites, etc., as the Core Strategy maps do not readily allow scaling.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Natural England’s appreciation of the development plan context of the Site Specific Policies is noted.

The inclusion of references to nearby nature conservation assets in every policy is not considered appropriate. The consistency is in the approach to the development of each policy, not in its eventual content. The nature conservation assets in the vicinity of each policy option were identified as part of the policy development and sustainability process, and are identified as such. Where that appraisal identified a specific need to include reference to such assets in a policy, this has been done. If every consideration and nearby feature were included in every policy it would be unmanageable and, more important, obscure the focus on those considerations which have been identified as being particularly important to the specific policy proposal in the location identified.

It is not considered necessary or desirable to include reference to Development Management Policy DP1 in every Site Specific Policy. This would be contrary to Government advice, and also to the approach to the Site Specific Policies, which is to have such policies only where there is an identified need to say something additional to, or different from, the policies in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies. Those policies will continue to form part of the development plan and thus the starting point for the determination of planning applications. Policy DP1 does not need repetition to ‘bite’ on proposals coming forward in relation to the Site Specific Policies.

The maps produced illustrate the location and extent of the individual draft policies for the purposes of consulting on their development. Limited resources (and a need to emphasise the provisional nature of the proposals) militated against producing these on full colour maps with Broads-wide coverage and full identification of geographical constraints and features. Once adopted, such policy areas will be identified on the Adopted Policies Map, which will be presented along with mapping of the flood
risk areas, nature conservation designations, etc. (The Core Strategy ‘maps’ mentioned (properly the ‘key diagram’) are, by regulation, not supposed to allow scaling.)

General comment

Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association Representation:
By way of a general observation, the NSBA considers that too much of Broadland is scruffy, for example, derelict buildings and pot-holed car parks. Development control is only one way of conserving and enhancing the spatial environment. The NSBA encourages the Authority to think holistically about the spatial environment in conjunction with the relevant local authorities.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Suggests that much of the ‘Broadland’ area is scruffy, and that development control is but one aspect of conserving and enhancing the area. Encourages the Broads Authority to take a holistic approach to the area in conjunction with the relevant local authorities.

Broads Authority Response:
The Authority agrees that the control of development is but one aspect of conserving and enhancing the area, and that a holistic, spatial approach, and coordination and partnership with local councils, are important in conserving and enhancing the Broads environment.

The Authority's development control (or ‘development management’) function is but one aspect of its approach to the care and improvement of the area. The Authority’s planning policies sit within an overall management plan (the ‘Broads Plan’) for the Broads area, which involves a wide range of partners in delivering the sort of holistic approach the Association promotes.

The Authority works with the local councils on a range of both strategic matters and small scale projects providing environmental improvements and local facilities.
Almost half of the Authority’s membership comprises councillors appointed by each of the eight constituent local authorities, so there is a direct involvement in guiding the Authority from those quarters.

The Authority has been engaged in providing and maintaining some of the car parks in the area, often in partnership with parish councils, but in the main this is a district council responsibility. The Authority has worked with district and county councils on a range of projects to remedy dereliction, and to restore or bring back into use historic buildings. That is not to say there is not much
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more to be done, or that coordination with the eight local authorities could not be stronger, but increasingly limited resources, and other priorities, mean that it is not possible to achieve all that the Authority, and the Boating Association, would like.

General comment

Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association Representation:
The NSBA supports the provisional rejection of the other options considered, printed in red in the document. (Again, at the risk of being pedantic, it would point out, in respect of Neatishead (p 60), that the convenience store has been closed since 2011 and that, as indicated in respect of Barton Turf (p 23) which shares the same service, there is a limited local bus service at Neatishead, contrary to what is said on p 60.)

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Supports the rejection of the identified options.
Points out an update and a correction to the background information on Neatishead.

Broads Authority Response:
Support for the rejection of the unfavoured options noted.
Updated/corrected information noted. (NB: Previous text based on information provided in 2011 by the Parish Council.)

General comment

Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association Representation:
The NSBA is in broad agreement with the choice and detail of the listed Draft Site Specific Policies and with the range and assessment of issues considered in the Draft Site Specific Policies Document. It does, however, make the following comments for consideration by the Authority; all page references are to pages in the Document. Not all parishes in the Authority’s area have been accorded Site Specific Policies, including: Hickling CP, Sutton CP, Rockland CP, Carleton St Peter CP, Bramerton CP, Somerleyton, Ashby and Herringfleet CP. The reason for these omissions is not apparent in the document. The NSBA notes that some of the parishes without Site Specific Policies are referred to in respect of non-settlement based draft options.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Expresses broad agreement with the choice and detail of the Draft Policies, and the identification and assessment of issues. Comments that the reasons for absence of site specific policies for six named parishes is not apparent.
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Broads Authority Response:
The broad support for the Draft Policies and the identification and assessment of issues informing them is noted.

The Site Specific Policies have been generated on the basis of perceived need, rather than one or more for each parish. All parishes in the designated Broads area are only partly so, and part of each parish is outside the Broads. In some cases the part in the Broads includes a sizeable settlement with a range of site specific issues, in other cases not (one Broads parish has no dwellings at all in the Broads part).

All six parishes mentioned have site specific policies: it just so happens, because of the local geography or issues, that they are not listed by settlement. The Site Specific Policies are mainly set out in the document by settlement, for convenience and coherence. A small number of policies do not fit well into this arrangement and are listed as ‘non-settlement based policies’. There is no other significance or difference in importance between the two categories.

General comment

Norfolk County Council Representation:
Mineral and Waste Issues
Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy CS16 provides safeguarding for

- existing, permitted and allocated mineral extraction sites,
- existing, permitted and allocated waste management facilities,
- mineral resources,
- key wastewater treatment facilities, and
- mineral infrastructure.

Where a site specific allocation is located within the consultation area of one of these safeguarded minerals and/or waste sites then the requirements of CS16 will need to be complied with by the local authority/developer.
The consultation areas are 250 metres from the boundaries of mineral extraction sites, waste management facilities and mineral infrastructure sites, and 400 metres from the boundaries of key wastewater treatment works.
The consultation area for mineral resources conforms to the boundary of the resource.

A duty is placed upon Mineral Planning Authorities to ensure that mineral resources are not needlessly sterilised. The County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) would object to any planning application on these sites unless:
1. the applicant carries out investigations to identify whether the resource is viable for mineral extraction, and
2. if the mineral resource is viable, the applicant considers whether it could be extracted economically prior to development taking place.
Appendix 4 – Draft Policies stage representations and how these were taken into account

It is the view of the MPA that an Environmental Statement in support of any future planning application on these sites should address the issues above, and that this should be reflected in any site allocation policies. A list of exemptions to this policy is contained within Appendix C of the adopted Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. Where it is considered that a site is exempt from CS16 by virtue of its location, size, or the nature of the proposed allocation this is noted in the response, if the site area or proposed use were to be amended, this may alter the exemption status of the site. A spreadsheet showing the comments on the draft sites is attached. Norfolk County Council as the statutory authority for Mineral Planning in Norfolk wishes to be kept informed as these proposals progress.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Sets out the context for, and approach to, minerals and waste safeguarding areas in Norfolk. (NB. The identification of whether draft policy sites are within a safeguarding area is noted against the individual Draft Policies.)

**Broads Authority Response:**
The advice concerning minerals and waste safeguarding is noted. (The implications for particular sites are considered under the individual Draft Policies.)

---

**General comment**

**Norfolk County Council Representation:**
The officer-level comments below are made on a without prejudice basis and the County Council reserves the right to make further comments on the emerging DPD. The County Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the DPD and considers that it is consistent with the sustainable aims and objectives set out in the adopted Core Strategy (2007) and Development Management DPD (2011). In light of the recent publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), further amendments to the supporting text (section 2.1) and policies may be needed.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Highlights the officer level and non-prejudicial status of the comments provided. Considers the document is consistent with the sustainable aims and objectives of the Core Strategy. Notes the potential need for further amendments arising from the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.
**RSPB Representation:**
The RSPB welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft Site Specific Policies DPD and associated documents. Whilst the RSPB does not consider the policy approaches outlined unsound in principle, we do consider that improvements are required to: 1. strengthen the biodiversity protection afforded by certain policies (e.g. Whitlingham Country Park – WHI/DSSP-a), 2. to provide greater guidance on appropriate landscaping/planting in specific policies (e.g. Brundall – BRU/DSSP-b), 3. to provide SMARTER Monitoring Indicators for policies that could impact on Natura 2000 sites (the Broadland Special Protection Area, The Broads Special Area of Conservation and The Broads Ramsar site) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (e.g. Brundall – BRU/DSSP-a).

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Welcomes the opportunity to comment. Does not consider policy approaches unsound, but considers improvements required to strengthen some policies’ biodiversity protection or landscaping guidance, and provide ‘SMART’ monitoring of potential impacts on Natura 2000 sites.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Further discussion with RSPB was undertaken to better understand their concerns and suggestions. The specific proposals for individual policies’ treatment of biodiversity and landscaping is addressed under those policies. The approach to monitoring in general, and in relation to Natura 2000 sites in particular, has been elaborated, and it is hoped that this goes a considerable way to satisfying the RSPB’s concerns.

**General comment**

**Salhouse Parish Council Representation:**
Salhouse Parish Council have perused the consultation documents and confirm that they have no comments to make.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
No comment.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.

**General comment**

**Suffolk County Council Representation:**
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Suffolk County Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on these draft policies. In doing so, we make our comments in the interest of the delivery of the Transforming Suffolk Sustainable Community Strategy and in support of our role in delivering key public services throughout the county. Our key interests in relation to the planning system, and this consultation, include: Education, Social care, Highways and transport, Minerals and waste planning. Our comments refer only to those policies which cover Suffolk and are as follows:

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Welcomes opportunity to comment on the Draft Policies. Highlights the Suffolk Sustainable Community Strategy and the delivery of key public services as the basis for its comments, which refer only to Suffolk sites.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walpole, Mr R Representation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The clearly set out Policies are most informative to all concerned with improving public access to the areas. As it is Broads Authority’s strategy to promote land-based access, would it be practicable to include mention of the Broads Local Access Forum in para.2.27(page13)? The Forum’s Right of Way Improvement Programme is designed to show how it is planned to develop and improve routes along the Authority’s river valleys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Finds the Draft Policies clear and informative in relation to improving public access. Suggests reference to the Broads Local Access Forum at a particular point in the text.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Comments on clarity and informativeness noted. Much as the importance of the work of the Broads Access Forum is understood and appreciated, insertion of reference to it at the point suggested would muddy an already complex argument about the rationale for the selection of settlements for development boundaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Management Alliance Representation:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Further to your consultation below, I do not have any comments or objections to note regarding your proposed site allocations and policies.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Confirms no comments or objections.

**Broads Authority Response:** Noted.

---

**General comment**

**Waveney District Council Representation:**
The Broads Authority Administrative Area overlaps Waveney District along the northern border. Within this area the Broads Authority is responsible for making planning decisions despite any proposed development being located within Waveney District. Therefore, the Council has a vested interest in planning proposals and approaches taken through planning policies that come forward in this area. The draft Site Specific Policies proposed are most relevant around the built up areas of Beccles with Worlingham, Bungay, Barnby/North Cove and Oulton Broad. The Council is generally supportive of the proposals put forward, however, there are several issues that relate to Waveney and these are discussed in the comments attached.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Generally supportive of the proposals within the Waveney District Council area, but a number of comments are made on specific issues.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The District Council's general support noted. (The Council's comments on individual issues are reported and dealt with under the relevant heading/Draft Policy.)

---

**General comment**

**Wroxham Parish Council Representation:**
Wroxham Parish Council have perused these documents and feel that the Authorities Drafters have completed a sustainable readable document. They have looked at Wroxham, Hoveton and Horning sections in particular and have no adverse comments, other than, we believe that there is one omission at WRX/DSSP-b (PAGES 102-103).
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**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Praises the sustainability and readability of the document, and has (with one exception) no adverse comments.

**Broads Authority Response:**
The Parish Council's compliments and general satisfaction are noted. (The single comment is dealt with under the relevant Draft Policy.)

---

**DRAFT HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**Habitats Regulation Assessment**

**Environment Agency Representation:**
We note that Natural England have provided detailed comments on this document.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Notes that detailed comments have been submitted by Natural England.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Noted.

---

**Habitats Regulation Assessment**

**Natural England Representation:**
**General Comments:**
The document is very thorough in its consideration of the potential for the Site Specific Policies of the DPD to result in likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites. However, Natural England is concerned that there is no detailed consideration of potential in-combination effects resulting from other plans or policies. Further consideration of in-combination effects is therefore required before the HRA can be signed off.

**Considered Impacts:**
Section 5.1 of the report lists potential impacts that policies within the site specific DPD could have on the Natura 2000 sites. Whilst the potential impact of increased construction traffic has been identified, there has not been any consideration to the potential increase in traffic from residents due to the housing allocation. Such changes may cause air quality impacts that could potentially result in effects on the Natura 2000 sites e.g. increased nitrogen deposition altering floral assemblages and changing species’
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abundances. It may be possible to scope out air quality impacts given the distances of the DPD sites from Natura 2000 sites, but at present insufficient evidence has been presented in the assessment. It is also that the section considers the potential effects of the risk of introducing and spreading invasive species, which is a particularly relevant consideration in light of the recent discovery of Dikerogammaurus villosus ('killer shrimp') in Broadland. This species has the potential to be introduced/ spread through recreational boating and angling activities.

Task 1 Screening for Likely Significant Effects:
The Table presented in Section 6 of the report provides detailed justification for the conclusion that the site specific policies will not result in likely significant effects on the Natura 2000 sites. It is noted that the initial screening task identified nine policies for which the conclusion of no likely significant effect was uncertain, and Natural England supports the subsequent amendments that were made to the relevant policy wordings to remove uncertainty.

In-combination Effects:
The need for consideration of impacts arising in-combination from other plans or projects is identified in Section 4.5 of the report and a list of the relevant plans or projects is provided, although there is no subsequent assessment. At present, Natural England is concerned that a full in-combination assessment has not been undertaken, and therefore sufficient evidence has not been provided to enable a conclusion of no likely significant effects on the Broads Natura 2000 sites due to in combination effects. It is likely that some of the identified plan or policy documents will themselves have been subject to HRA screening as part of their development, and these findings will form part of the evidence base for the in-combination assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commends the thoroughness of the consideration of potential effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerned that consideration of in-combination effects with other plans and polices has not received detailed consideration, and considers that this requires further evidence and consideration before completion of the HRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No consideration or evidence of potential impacts of traffic from housing allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommends potential effects/risks of introducing invasive species through boating and angling addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supports the Task 1 amendments that were made to eliminate uncertainty of absence of significant effects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Comment on the consideration of potential effects being generally ‘very thorough’ is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further work on and explanation of potential in-combination effects will be included in the final HRA, as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is not clear that there could be additional traffic-related impacts from the draft housing allocation, as there are existing use rights for both housing and industrial use of the site, but this will be further clarified and evidenced in the final HRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consideration will be given to potential invasive species effects, as suggested, and included in final HRA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Habitats Regulation Assessment**

**PURE Architecture Representation:**
An observation that we made during our review of the Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment Report is that provisionally rejected options of the Draft Site Specific Policies have not been assessed. Our opinion is that the assessment should include the provisionally rejected options. This would demonstrate whether or not the provisionally rejected options would have any impact on habitats, instead of leaving it as an unknown matter during the consultation period.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Is of the opinion that the draft Habitats Assessment should have included the rejected options, so that the potential impact of the options could have informed consultation.

**Broads Authority Response:**
A sustainability appraisal was made of each of the rejected options (and informed the rejection of them), and this included, at a more general level, the likely impacts on protected habitats. The Habitats Directive and Regulations require habitats assessment only of actual plans, and not all possibilities considered in the process of formulating plans. It is considered that the sustainability appraisal and planning summary assessments provide adequate information for the purposes of the consultation carried out, and that the resources involved in producing such additional habitats assessments is not warranted in this case.

**Habitats Regulation Assessment**

**RSPB Representation:**
Section 2.2.2 - Task 2: Appropriate Assessment (p. 6):
There are two distinct stages to the assessment process set out in regulation 102 of the Habitats Regulations. The first stage is intended to ensure that the impacts of the scheme or policy are examined more closely if there are concerns about the significance of its potential impacts on a Natura 2000 site (regulation 102(1)). The second stage, the appropriate assessment itself, looks at those identified impacts in more detail and is concerned with ensuring that the plan avoids harm to the Natura 2000 sites (regulation 102(4)).

The Habitats Regulations Assessment of the DPD refers to a “significant adverse effect”. This does not correctly reflect the test in the Regulations. Regulation 102(4) states that the plan can be adopted “only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the European site”. By referring to a “significant” adverse effect, this incorrectly sets a higher threshold for ruling out a damaging scheme than the Regulations. The High Court Judgement of ADT Auctions Ltd v Secretary of State Environment,
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Transport and the Regions and Hart District Council 2000 (quoted in the HRA as a footnote to the use of the term significant) simply recognises that the significance of the effect is implicit in the term adverse effect. This does not justify the use of the term “significant adverse effect.”

Section 4.4.4 Vulnerability [of Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA] (p. 20): The wardenning at Great Yarmouth North Denes is undertaken by the RSPB’s seasonal little tern wardens (by permission of Great Yarmouth Borough Council), not Natural England as currently stated. Natural England manage the little tern colony at Winterton.

Section 5.1.5 Effects from Increased Recreation and Leisure Pressures (p. 24): The RSPB understands that visitor surveys have been conducted within the Broads. If such information exists this should enable the potential increase in recreational pressure to be quantified. The number of new homes proposed for the Broads and surrounding area is listed. Understanding the likely increase in visitor numbers would enable a more precise assessment of likely impacts arising from the proposed Site Specific Policies.

Section 6 Task 1: Screening for Likely Significant Effects (pp. 25-42): The Task 1 assessment has concluded that none of the Site Specific Policies will result in a Likely Significant Effect on the Broads Natura 2000 sites. This conclusion has been reached because it has been considered that there are “...no mechanisms for negative effects on Natura 2000 sites”. In some instances there is potential for increased boating to occur (e.g. Policies GTY/DSSP-b and STA/DSSP-a) or impacts on water quality from new development (e.g. BUN/DSSP-b and LUD/DSSP-a). The Stage 1 assessment should consider the potential for such impacts to occur. Where potential mechanisms exist and uncertainty exists over the scale of development that may take place such policies should be progressed to the Stage 2 AA assessment. If at the Stage 2 assessment it can be shown that impacts arising from the proposed policies can be avoided or minimised then a conclusion of no adverse effect could be made and the policy considered acceptable. The RSPB therefore considers the Task 1 process alone insufficient to reach conclusions of no adverse effect on the Broads Natura 2000.

If it has been concluded that there are no LSEs from any policies then this should be concluded at the end of the Task 1 assessment. However, the current text states that nine policies could not be concluded as having no adverse effect on Broads Natura 2000 sites, but changes are made to the policies without progression to an identified Task 2 assessment. This is confusing and highlights the need for Task 2 assessment of certain policies to have been presented. As a minimum the conclusions should be updated to reflect any updates and not present both previous and current conclusions.

8 Summary (p. 44): The second paragraph states that development would not be permitted if they would result in “any likely adverse effect on Natura 2000 sites”. This should be amended to read “no likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites”. The penultimate paragraph states that there will be “no likely adverse impacts on Natura 2000 sites” arising from the proposed policies. This should be amended to read “no likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites”.

Footnotes:
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1 Regulation 102(1) Where a land use plan— (a) is likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), and (b) is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site, the plan-making authority for that plan must, before the plan is given effect, make an appropriate assessment of the implications for the site in view of that site’s conservation objectives.

2 Regulation 102(4) In the light of the conclusions of the assessment, and subject to regulation 103 (considerations of overriding public interest), the plan-making authority or, in the case of a regional strategy, the Secretary of State must give effect to the land use plan only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the European site or the European offshore marine site (as the case may be). [Emphasis added]

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:

SECTION 2.2.2
Is concerned that the use of the phrase ‘significant adverse effects’ suggests a more relaxed approach to potential harm to Natura 2000 sites than required by the Regulations.

SECTION 4.4.4
Points out that the wardening of North Denes SPA is wardened by RSPB, not Natural England as stated.

SECTION 5.1.5
Suggests that Visitor Survey data may be available for sites in the Broads, and that if so this could be used to quantify the increase in visitor pressure, and likely impacts arising from planned housing growth in the Broads and surrounding areas.

SECTION 6 TASK 1
Considers that the Draft Habitats Assessment does not correctly examine the full range of potential effects on Natura 2000 sites, and in particular suggests that where there are both potential effects and uncertainty over future development, then a Stage 2 appropriate assessment is required. It further suggests instances of Draft Policies where the RSPB considers this situation exists, therefore a Stage 1 assessment is insufficient to reach the necessary conclusions.

Considers current text confusing, because text refers to changes to policies to allow a conclusion of no likely significant effects to be reached. Suggests this highlights need for a Stage 2 process, or at least revision of text to present only final conclusions.

Broads Authority Response:

SECTION 2.2.2
The Habitats Assessment Report does not need to reiterate repeatedly and comprehensively the precise and full wording of the Directive and Regulations. It is clear from the context in which the phrase ‘significant effects’ is used that this relates to the test in the Regulations (i.e. the significance is whether there is an adverse effect on the integrity of designated sites). There is therefore
no higher threshold being applied or implied. It is notable that the RSPB uses the phrase ‘significant effects’ elsewhere in its representation.

SECTION 4.4.4
Reference to wardening of North Denes SPA corrected.

SECTION 5.1.5
Visitor surveys are understood to have been undertaken relatively recently for a limited number of sites within and around the Broads. The Broads Authority is seeking to obtain copies of the results and methodologies of these surveys, but does not have this at present. Even if it were, moving from this to a robust prediction of likely future impacts of new housing in various locations is highly problematic. There is, in fact, no housing growth planned for the Broads area (although it is likely a handful of dwellings, predominantly holiday homes, will continue to come forward on unallocated sites most years through the planning application process). At present it is judged that the principal risks to Natura 2000 sites in the Broads from the development growth planned nearby come not from visitor pressure, but from potential changes in water quality and flows. The Broads Authority seeks to develop increased understanding of the visitor pressures and potential across planning authority boundaries. However, it is not considered necessary or desirable to delay the adoption of the Broads Site Specific Policies DPD until this or other similar work has been completed.

SECTION 6 TASK 1
The Authority considers that the Regulations require a Stage 2 assessment only where there is a significant effect that is likely: it does not have to examine every potential effect regardless of likelihood. That said, the Authority and its consultants have paid very keen regard to the protection and enhancement of the environment and wildlife in general, and Natura 2000 and other designated sites in particular, and the Habitats Assessment Report is revised to highlight the changes that were made in the evolution of policies to avoid any likelihood of adverse effects.

In relation to Marina Quays, Great Yarmouth, and Richardson’s Boatyard, Stalham, the RSPB identifies a theoretical ‘potential’ increase in boating, and considers that the Stage 1 assessment should consider the ‘potential’ for such an ‘impact’ to occur. This is not required by the Regulations. An increase in boating does not necessarily equate to a significant effect on a Natura 2000 site (though the Broads Authority is obviously alive to potential links between the two). Further, given the historical levels of boating associated with these two sites, and their lawful planning uses, an increase in boating from them is highly unlikely. Similar considerations apply in respect of Ditchingham Maltings and the Ludham development boundary: here, theoretical potential impacts on water quality are not the same as an impact on Natura 2000 sites, and development under the policy for either location is unlikely to result in adverse water impacts, and may well result in an improvement in water quality over and above the historical and lawful uses of these policy areas.

Having identified no likely effects, the Authority believes it is entitled to conclude that no Stage 2 process is required.
The Authority also believes that some of the RSPB’s stated concerns turn on semantics, rather than substance. However, the final Habitats Assessment Report is revised to clarify that the assessment was complete and thorough.

DRAFT SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Sustainability Appraisal

Environment Agency Representation:
We refer to the baseline data on water. We highlight that the water quality information used is no longer the most up to date information. We recommend that this section is updated to reflect the new classification system introduced under the Water Framework Directive.

With regard to paragraph 4 on page 23 of your draft SA, we would prefer that the last 4 sentences are not included or are amended. Currently the Broadland Flood Alleviation Strategy is in place to maintain existing defences and their levels throughout the system in order to maintain the existing pattern of water levels and overtopping, as far as practicable. This project will run until 2021 at which time a new strategy will need to be in place. At this time, we cannot pre-empt what this may involve.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Highlights that the baseline data on water should be updated to reflect newer classifications. Does not favour inclusion of the last four sentences on page 23 of the draft, and would prefer these were omitted or amended.

Broads Authority Response:
The baseline data on water will be updated at the earliest opportunity. Clarification was sought on the EA’s concerns, and the wording of the policy has been amended following its suggestion.

Natural England Representation:
Natural England notes that the Site Specific Policies have been developed to give further effect to the Broads Core Strategy. The Core Strategy was the subject of an earlier Sustainability Appraisal, which listed twelve sustainability objectives subsequently used for the Development Management Policies DPD and the Development and Flood Risk SPD and formed the sustainability framework for testing the Site Specific Policies. Natural England welcomes identification of the checklist listed on pages 38 and 39.
This checklist contains 35 topics and issues which might be of relevance to each site. This provides an additional layer of consideration to the twelve sustainability objectives and provides depth to the appraisal. Natural England welcomes the coherent and legible form of the document and the attention given to the sustainability baseline. However, one area requires improvement. The four objectives of the Site Specific Policies are set out on page 39 of the Site Specific Policies Sustainability Appraisal. Those objectives are not stated anywhere else in the Site Specific Policies or its associated Sustainability Appraisals. The objectives would typically form part of the beginning of those documents, so it does create some confusion when they are highlighted mid-way through the Sustainability Appraisal. It is understood from discussions with John Clements (Planning Policy Officer, Broads Authority) that the Site Specific Policies objectives have their origins in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. Currently, this is not clear and will need to be addressed in both documents. Development Management Policies, such as DP1 could expand the fourth Site Specific Policy objective, particularly if any of the assets (identified under DP1, such as SPAs, SACs, SSSIs etc) are to be identified on the Site Specific Policy maps. It is recommended that ‘enhancement’ be included within the fourth objective as follows: ‘Avoiding harm to interests identified in the Core Strategy through the application to specific sites or areas of policies promoting conservation and enhancement of their existing features, uses or other value’.

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Commends the ‘coherent and legible form of the document and the attention given to the sustainability baseline’. Welcomes the ‘site sustainability checklist’ as providing depth to the sustainability appraisal. Highlights that the four Site Specific Policies DPD Objectives referred to in the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report are omitted from the Draft Site Specific Policies document itself. Suggests the addition of ‘enhancement’ to conservation in the fourth of these Objectives.

Broads Authority Response:
Notes that Natural England finds the document coherent and legible, and that it welcomes the attention given to the sustainability baseline and the depth provided by the site sustainability checklist. The four Site Specific Policies Objectives, while referred to in the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report, were inadvertently omitted from the Draft Site Specific Policies document itself, but are shown in the Proposed Site Specific Policies DPD. The fourth of these Objectives will be amended, as suggested by Natural England, by the addition of the explicit reference to enhancement.

Sustainability Appraisal Filby Broad

PURE Architecture Representation:
Our response to the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report concerns the area of Filby, reference: HLV/DSSP-REJ/1. With reference to the LDF SA Objectives, we have the following comments:
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SA1: Given that your comments indicate that the development boundary away from the water’s edge would be likely to improve the protection of the landscape setting and habitat margins, we believe that the assessment should be a tick.

SA3: We believe that the drainage issues identified in the comments could be controlled adequately by existing Development Management Policy DP3. Moreover, we believe that there is opportunity for the adoption of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to be used and these could mitigate the current drainage issues. We believe that a proactive approach of improving the existing drainage system would be a more appropriate alternative to simply accepting the problems and writing-off future prospects for Filby. Acknowledging that this system is subject to additional load from the Great Yarmouth Borough Council Planning area, we believe that the assessment should be a hash (#) as opposed to a cross (X), as development using SuDS should not have a detrimental impact on the existing drainage system.

SA4: Proposed development is already subject to a flood risk assessment in accordance with Development Management Policy DP29. Thus, by virtue of this existing control that the Broads Authority have, vulnerability to climate change and flooding is reduced. Therefore we believe that this assessment should be changed from a hash (#) to a tick.

SA5: Further development within Filby could provide an opportunity for highway enhancement that would in turn provide safer highway access to all.

SA11: The assessment here seems to contradict with the comments of SA5, in that it is suggested that there are facilities that can be reached by cycling and walking. Furthermore, at the time of writing there are three bus-stops in, or immediately adjacent to the Broads Authority Planning area, located on Thrigby Road and Main Road. Thus on the basis that some services can be reached by cycling and walking; acknowledging the statement in SA5 “Most employment and higher services would be further afield”, we believe that this assessment should be a tick and a cross.

Based on our assessment and comments above, we believe that the development boundary for Filby would provide sustainable prospects and opportunity and therefore should be reconsidered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggests that the SA of the Filby Broad part of the Trinities should be undertaken in respect of smaller, distinct areas. Disagrees with the sustainability assessment of the potential for continuation of a development boundary for Filby, and considers a development boundary for Filby Broad area would have a neutral effect in terms of the LDF Sustainability Objectives SA1, SA3 and SA7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broads Authority Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The scoring of the SA of this rejected option has been reviewed in the light of these comments, but the Authority is unconvinced that its original assessment is misguided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainability Appraisal | Filby Broad |
PURE Architecture Representation:
Our response to the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report concerns the Trinity Broads Area, reference: ZYX/DSSP-a. Our review focuses on the Filby Broad area of Trinity Broads, and demonstrates that individual areas of Trinity Broads may be better reviewed separately. With reference to the LDF SA Objectives (focusing on Filby Broad), we have the following comments:
SA1: The Broadside of Filby Broad is already protected by the limited encroachment towards the water of the existing development boundary. The existing properties that surround Trinity Broads will remain, and therefore the Broad will still be subject to their presence. We therefore do not see how removal of the development boundary surrounding Trinity Broads can have a positive affect; instead we assess this to be neutral and therefore suggest that the assessment should be a hash (#).
SA3: We believe that residential use of the land from the existing development boundary would pose little risk to the water quality of Trinity Broads by way of run-off. We understand that there are issues with the existing drainage system capacity, however these will still be subject to a potential additional load from the Great Yarmouth Planning area. Furthermore, the Broads Authority have existing control by Development Management Policy DP3 to limit future load from development within the development boundary on the drainage system. We therefore think that development within the development boundary will have neutral affects and our assessment is that this should be a hash (#).
SA7: Filby Broad is already subject to the presence of dwellings on its eastside. There is also limited opportunity for further development within the existing development boundary; moreover this is set back from the water’s edge to limit impact. Therefore our assessment is that removal of the development boundary will have a neutral impact, and in this instance our assessment is that there should be a hash (#).

Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:
Suggests that the SA of the Filby Broad part of the Trinities should be undertaken in respect of smaller, distinct areas. Disagrees with the sustainability assessment of the potential for continuation of a development boundary for Filby, and considers a development boundary for Filby Broad area would have a neutral effect in terms of the LDF Sustainability Objectives SA1, SA3 and SA7.

Broads Authority Response:
Though referring to Policy ZYX/DSSP-a, Trinity Broads, this appears to relate primarily to rejected option FIL/DSSP-REJ/1, Filby Development Boundary.
The scoring of the SA of this rejected option has been reviewed in the light of these comments, but the Authority is unconvinced that its original assessment is misguided.
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**Sustainability Appraisal**

**Suffolk County Council Representation:**
Page 20: The historic environment plays an important role in the lives of individuals and communities – from contributing to a sense of place to benefiting local communities through tourism. This is recognised in the Draft Sustainability Report and, we consider, justifiable. However, we would recommend that the wording of the first sentence is altered on p.20 Cultural Heritage. ‘Sites and Monuments Register’ should be altered to ‘Historic Environment Record’, to reflect the varied categories of Historic Environment data contained in the Record.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Draws attention to the importance of the historic environment. Suggests a revised wording to widen the heritage included.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Comments on importance noted. Revised wording incorporated in SA as suggested.

**Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Representation:**
The historic environment plays an important role in the lives of individuals and communities – from contributing to a sense of place to benefiting local communities through tourism. This is recognised in the Draft Sustainability Report and, we consider, justifiable. However, we would recommend that the wording of the first sentence is altered on p.20 Cultural Heritage. ‘Sites and Monuments Register’ should be altered to ‘Historic Environment Record’, to reflect the varied categories of Historic Environment data contained in the Record.

**Broads Authority Officer Summary of Representation:**
Supports the recognition in the Draft Sustainability Appraisal of the importance of the historic environment. Suggests change in terminology for the record of heritage assets.

**Broads Authority Response:**
Support noted.
Wording amended as suggested.
To the Occupier

14th May 2012

Dear Occupier,

**Future planning policy for land at Staithe Road, West Somerton.**

The Broads Authority is undertaking this survey of all households within the Broads part of West Somerton, in order to provide additional information to help the Authority decide on potential future planning policy for the Staithe Road area of land shown on the attached plan.\(^1\)

Somerton Parish Council supports this survey, and the information is being delivered by the Parish Council to the 56 properties in the Parish and within the designated Broads area.

---

\(^1\) This is a supplementary consultation to inform the Broads Authority’s preparation of a Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document, and issued under Regulation 25 of the The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended.
The Parish Council has, since 1997, supported the inclusion of the land shown on the attached plan as coming within the natural boundary of the village in that location, and therefore as having the potential for some housing development. The 1997 Local Plan, however, drew the village development boundary across the garden of one property on Staithe Road as shown by a dashed line on the attached extract from that Local Plan. Subsequently, in 2008, the development of a bungalow at the same location was refused planning permission on the grounds that it was outside the village boundary. The Parish Council have, since 1997, taken the view that the dyke opposite the kissing gate at the end of Staithe Road forms the natural boundary of the village in this part of Somerton as shown by the western boundary of the area marked on the attached plan.

The Broads Authority is now preparing a new plan which no longer proposes a village development boundary for West Somerton, so the present issue is whether the area shown on the attached plan should be accepted as having the potential for development as would have been the case if the village boundary had been drawn as the Parish Council proposed in 1997. Any subsequent detailed planning application would be the subject of normal planning application procedures, including consultation with the Parish Council and with occupiers of adjoining dwellings.

The Broads Authority has, by law, to balance a number of competing interests in its planning decisions and no commitment can be given that the Authority’s final proposals will necessarily accord with the results of this survey. Nevertheless, the survey will help the Authority to gauge the level of local support for the proposal including the views of the Parish Council, which will be important factors to be considered in reaching a decision.

The Broads Authority and Somerton Parish Council would therefore be grateful if you would complete the enclosed form and return it in the pre-paid envelope.

For any further information please contact:

**Broads Authority**: John Clements, Planning Policy Officer,
Tel: 01603 756050, email john.clements@broads-authority.gov.uk
Somerton Parish Council: Richard Starling 393823 or Trevor Jones 393715.

Yours faithfully,

John Clements
Planning Policy Officer
Dear Occupier,

Re: Survey about potential development of houses in Staithe Road, West Somerton.

Thank you for your cooperation in responding to the recent survey. I am writing to advise you of the results of that survey, respond to some of the queries and comments received, and advise what will happen next.

a) Results of Survey
60 forms were distributed by Somerton Parish Council, one to each household in that part of Somerton Parish within the designated Broads area. (56 properties were originally identified by the Parish Council, but it later requested an additional four forms to deal with particular oversights or anomalies.)

41 forms were returned, a response rate of 68%. This is a very high response rate for a questionnaire survey, and is assumed to represent the degree of interest in the matter among local households. The balance of responses supporting or not
supporting some housing development on the land shown are set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Proportion of responses received</th>
<th>Proportion of households asked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RECEIVED</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that a small number of respondents added notes to qualify their responses. In particular, of those who did not support some development on the indicated land, one said they would, however, support a single dwelling adjacent to The Firs, and another said they might do so.

**b) Queries and Comments Received.**

A small number of respondents added comments or queries to their forms, and the following is intended to provide responses or clarifications to some of these. They are set out in no particular order.

1. **A large proportion of those included in the survey will not be affected, either in visual or traffic terms, and thus are more likely to support it.**
2. **It is clear from conversations that some of those who responded did not really understand what was being asked.**
3. **By surveying by property, rather than by individuals on the electoral role, some people's opinion may not be heard.**
4. **Requirement for names and addresses may deter some, especially in a small community, from expressing their views.**

**BA Response:** The survey is only intended to provide a general, 'broad brush', gauge of opinion in the locality. The Broads Authority does not have either the resources, or the access to the full electoral register, to carry out a more detailed survey. Names and addresses were requested in order to give the results credibility and avoid any suggestion that the responses were fraudulent. It is understood that there will always be a degree of misunderstanding by those participating, it is also always difficult to decide how far to extend a survey, and that as a consequence of issues like these the results of any such survey need to be treated with a degree of caution.
The Parish Council does now have powers to make development plans and to grant planning permissions, and use of these powers would require Great Yarmouth Borough Council to undertake a referendum of local voters using the electoral register to decide whether a plan should be adopted. However, the procedures involved are rather onerous, and likely to be expensive and time consuming for the Parish Council, the Broads Authority and the Borough Council, at a time when resources are very tightly constrained.

5. **How much, and what sort of housing are we being asked to support or not support?** BA response: This was deliberately left unstated, as it is views on the principle of extending the village in the Staithe Road area to accommodate some houses as suggested by the Parish Council, that is being sought. It is considered unlikely that either the Parish Council or the Broads Authority would wish to see a large number of houses or a dense development.

6. **As the land falls within a conservation area, would there be strict controls on the appearance and materials of any buildings at the planning application stage?** BA response: The land is actually outside the West Somerton Conservation Area, but it is within the designated Broads area, which has the highest national degree of protection for its landscape and scenic beauty, etc. In the event this land were allocated for development there would be control of the appearance and materials of any new houses through the planning application process, but these might best be described as ‘careful’, rather than ‘strict’.

7. **Is the Broads Authority looking at other potential housing sites in West Somerton? Why are we not being asked our opinion on other potential housing sites in the village?** Broads Authority response: The Broads Authority is not looking for sites to accommodate housing in West Somerton. It is only re-examining this particular potential site (which the Authority had previously provisionally rejected) at the request of the Parish Council.

8. **Why is the Parish Council supporting housing here? What does the Parish Council envisage? What benefit does this provide for the village? Do they have a view on potential development elsewhere in the village?** BA response: These are questions for the Parish Council.

9. **Will widening of Staithe Road, better drainage of the road, and additional parking provision be a requirement for any development?** BA Response: In the event the land were allocated for development, these matters would be addressed and decided at the planning application stage.
10. I own part of the land indicated, and do not wish to see it developed. BA Response: Views noted.

11. I am concerned that this special village will be overdeveloped, and the lane will not be able to cope with the traffic (n.b. already permission for 6 houses on the farm site). BA Response: Views noted.

c) What happens next?
The Broads Authority has to decide whether or not to propose some or all of the land in question for houses in its Proposed Site Specific Policies plan document. It is likely it will make this decision at the Broads Authority Meeting on September 21st 2012. The results of this survey will be reported to the Authority Members, and taken into account before a decision is reached.

As was highlighted before, by law the Authority must balance a number of competing planning considerations in reaching its decisions, and no undertaking can be given that its decision will necessarily follow the results of this survey. However, no doubt the Authority will wish to attach significant weight to the local community’s views on this matter, including the results of the survey.

I hope the above is clear. Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

John Clements
Appendix 4 – West Somerton Additional (Draft Policies Stage) Consultation Letters

Planning Policy Officer

Tel. 01603 756050

Email: john.clements@braods-authority.gov.uk
Appendix 5 – Press Notices

Broads Authority


Preparation of Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document

Call for sites and suggestions

The Broads Authority is about to prepare a new planning policy document for its Local Development Framework. This will identify development boundaries for selected settlements, and promote specific types of development or protection for a limited number of sites. Suggestions as to local sites or issues the document should address are invited. Note that the Authority can only include policies which are in accordance with the Broads Core Strategy and national planning policy.

Comments and suggestions sent in writing to the Broads Authority, Norwich, NR3 1UB or by email to LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk to be received by 5pm Tuesday 3rd May 2011.

For further Information visit http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk, email LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk, or tel. 01603 756050

Andrea Long, Director of Planning and Strategy, Broads Authority, Norwich NR3 1UB

---
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**Broads Authority**

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended)
Preparation of Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document

**Consultation on Draft Site Specific Policies (Issues, Options and Preferred Options)**

The Broads Authority is preparing a new planning policy document for its Local Development Framework. This will identify development boundaries for selected settlements, promote specific types of development or protection for a limited number of sites, and replace the remaining policies of the Broads Local Plan. Following earlier consultation the Authority has assessed a range of policy options and now invites comments on its provisional choice of Draft Site Specific Policies before it finalizes a Proposed Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document.

The consultation documents are available on the Authority’s website, and copies are available to view during office hours at its head office (address below) and various other locations.

Comments should be sent in writing to the Broads Authority, Norwich, NR3 1UB or by email to LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk to be received no later than 5pm Thursday 5th April 2012.

For further information visit [http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk](http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk), email LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk or tel. 01603 756050.

Andrea Long, Director of Planning and Strategy, Broads Authority

---
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Initial Stage letter to Consultees (note slight variations were sent tailored to different classes of consultee)

11 March 2011

Dear Sir or Madam,


I am writing to notify you of a Development Plan Document (DPD) the Broads Authority proposes to prepare, and to invite suggestions as to what a plan document on the subject of 'site specific policies' should contain.

In particular the Authority would be pleased to receive suggestions of sites or areas that need special treatment, allocation or protection, or any local issues that would be helped by having such site specific policies. Please note that the Authority can only include policies that are in accordance with the Broads Core Strategy and national planning policies. Details of how to make suggestions are listed below.

The closing date is **5pm Tuesday 3rd May 2011**.

**About this proposed Development Plan Document (DPD)**

The subject of the proposed DPD is site specific policies, i.e. those that apply to a particular site or area, within the designated Broads area. The DPD will cover the whole of the designated Broads area, and replace the remaining ‘Local Settlement Policies’ in the 1997 Broads Local Plan, continuing or updating any of these as appropriate. The purpose of the DPD is to give effect to the adopted Broads Core
Strategy DPD and the proposed Broads Development Management DPD (recently submitted to Government).

The precise contents of the Site Specific Policies DPD are yet to be determined, but it is envisaged that these will include:

- Identification of settlements suitable (at least in part) for designation for general development;
- Designation of development boundaries for such settlements;
- Identification of sites or areas where
  - particular types of development will be encouraged, or
  - particular considerations will be taken into account in judging planning applications, or,
  - or particular protections applied to the existing use or features of the site

These contents will be shaped through a process involving consultation and sustainability appraisal (see below for more detail).

Once the Development Plan is adopted it will form part of the Development Plan for the Broads, and will be used to guide development, including informing decisions on any planning applications for the sites or areas included.

Preparation process for the proposed Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document

The proposed DPD builds upon the policies already set out in the Core Strategy DPD and Development Management Policies DPD. These in turn reflect the Broads’ national designation as an area with the highest level of landscape protection and equivalent status to a national park, and the Broads Plan (a management plan for the area) which gives effect to the Broads’ statutory purposes of

(a) conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Broads;
(b) promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Broads by the public; and
(c) protecting the interests of navigation.

The policies in this DPD will not, then, fundamentally alter the general approach to developing and caring for the Broads, but show how this is to be achieved in particular localities.

This initial phase of consultation invites interested individuals and organisations to suggest sites or areas they consider would benefit from specific policies.
These suggestions, together with others already known or under consideration (e.g. those remaining in the Broads Local Plan) will be assessed for conformity with the Broads Core Strategy and national planning policies, etc., and subject to a sustainability appraisal. This will inform the Authority's provisional selection of sites and policies.

There will then be consultation (anticipated January 2012) on the Draft Site Specific Policies. This document will identify the issues and options that have been under consideration, and the Authority’s preferred options (i.e. sites/policies the Authority provisionally intends to progress) and the reasons for the choices.

The Authority will consider the responses to this consultation before finalising its Proposed Site Specific Policies DPD. This document will be published for comment before it is submitted to government, and the responses considered by an independent planning inspector who will conduct an examination to decide whether the DPD is ‘sound’ and can be adopted.

Opportunities to make comments and suggestions

**CONSULTATION:** Call for suggestions for sites and area policies (March- April 2011)

An opportunity for the public and various bodies to suggest sites or areas which need special planning treatment, or to raise related issues.

All relevant suggestions and comments will be considered by the Broads Authority before the next stage. Site suggestions assessed; sustainability appraisal of the various options; consideration of comments and issues; preferred options identified; document produced.

**CONSULTATION:** on ‘Draft Site Specific Policies’ document, including site specific issues, options and preferences (anticipated Jan-Feb 2012)

An opportunity for the public and various bodies to comment on the sites, areas and policies under consideration, and on the Authority’s provisional choice of which ones to in the final document.
Appendix 6 – Sample Consultee Notification Letters

All relevant comments will be considered by the Broads Authority before the next stage: Preferred options reviewed in light of consultation responses; firm choices made; formal proposed DPD document produced.

---

**PUBLICATION** of proposed ‘Site Specific Policies DPD’ (anticipated July 2012).

An opportunity for the public and various bodies to comment to an Inspector on the Authority’s proposed planning document.

The comments will be considered by an independent planning inspector who will examine the ‘soundness’ of the document, to see whether it should be adopted by the Authority.

---

How to make comments and suggestions for the Site Specific Policies DPD

Suggestions and comments can be made in writing (by post or e-mail) to the Broads Authority at the addresses below and be **received by 5pm Tuesday 3rd May 2011**. Please include a map if you are suggesting a site or area, and mark the boundaries.

**BY POST:** Planning Policy, Broads Authority, Dragonfly House, 2 Gilders Way, Norwich, NR3 1UB

**BY EMAIL:** LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk

Information on this consultation is available on the Authority’s website at [http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/future-planning-and-policies/site-specific-policies-dpd.html](http://www.boads-authority.gov.uk/planning/future-planning-and-policies/site-specific-policies-dpd.html)

Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to email on LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk or telephone me on 01603 756050.

Yours faithfully

John Clements
Planning Policy Officer
Dear

Preparation of Broads Site Specific Policies DPD: Consultation on Broads Draft Site Specific Policies (Issues, Options and Preferred Options)

The Broads Authority is preparing a new development plan document (DPD) of site specific polices, to give effect and more detail to the already adopted Broads Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPDs. It will also replace the remaining policies of the 1997 Broads Local Plan.

The Authority invites interested organisations and individuals to comment on:

- Its identification and assessment of issues and options;
- Its selection of draft site specific policies (preferred options) and provisionally rejected options;
- The supporting Draft Sustainability Appraisal and Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment.

The consultation documents can be viewed on the Broads Authority’s website where there is also further information about the consultation:


The consultation documents can also be viewed at the Broads Authority’s head office (Dragonfly House, 2 Gilders Way, Norwich, NR3 1UB) and various local libraries and council offices. Paper copies of the consultation documents are available to purchase from this office at a price of £5 (including p&p) for the main consultation documents (3 volumes), and £5 (including p&p) for the supporting
sustainability and habitats appraisals. These charges may be waived for community groups and not-for-profit organisations supporting Broads statutory purposes.

Please send comments and suggestions by email or post (addresses below) to be received by 5pm Thursday 5th April 2012 at the latest.

The suggestions received in response to this consultation will be considered by the Broads Authority before it ‘finalises’ its forthcoming Proposed Site Specific Policies DPD. There will be an opportunity later (anticipated Autumn 2012) to make comments on this Proposed DPD to the independent planning inspector who will decide if it can be adopted by the Broads Authority.

Once the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document is finally adopted (anticipated Summer 2013) it will form part of the Development Plan for the Broads, and will be used to guide development, including informing decisions on any planning applications for the sites or areas included. It will also replace the last remaining policies still in force from the 1997 Broads Local Plan.

Send your comments to be received no later than 5pm Thursday 5th April 2012:

BY POST: Planning Policy, Broads Authority, Dragonfly House, 2 Gilders Way, Norwich, NR3 1UB

BY EMAIL: LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk

Should you have any further queries please email me at LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk or telephone 01603 756050.

Yours sincerely

John Clements
Planning Policy Officer, Broads Authority

Tel: +44 (0)1603 610734 (Switchboard)
Tel: +44 (0)1603 756050 (Direct Dial)
Fax: +44 (0)1603 765710

Website: www.boads-authority.gov.uk
Website: www.enjoythebroads.com
Got something in mind for your area?

The Broads Authority is calling for suggestions for sites and areas that need special planning treatment.

The Broads already has planning policies which apply to the whole area. The Broads Authority is about to prepare a new planning document which will identify a limited number of sites or areas for individual planning policies. The exact content is yet to be decided, but it is expected that it will include:

- sites or areas where particular types of development or change will be encouraged (e.g. site allocations), or discouraged, or subject to special considerations;
- development boundaries for settlements suitable for general development.

Note that the Authority can only include sites within the designated Broads area, and policies for them which are in line with the current Broads Core Strategy.

The suggestions received will be considered in preparing draft site specific polices. There will be another round of consultation (currently scheduled for January 2012) to enable all to comment on the Authority’s assessment of the suggestions received and its provisional choice of policies before they are finalised.

Send your suggestions (closing date Tuesday 3 May 2011 5pm):
Planning Policy, Broads Authority, Dragonfly House, 2 Gilders Way, Norwich, NR3 1UB
email: LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk

For more information
www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/future-planning-and-policies/site-specific-policies-dpd.html
email: LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk  Tel: 01603 756050

This is a consultation on the ‘Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document’ which the Broads Authority intends to prepare for its Local Development Framework, and issued under Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended).
Do you care about the Broads?

Riverside pubs • Housing sites • Windmills • Car parking • Quiet areas
Development boundaries • Villages • Open spaces • Riverside chalets
Redevelopment sites • The Coast • St Benet’s • Mooring basins
Beccles waterside • Wroxham / Hoveton waterside • Horning waterside
Thorpe St Andrew waterside and Island • Potter Heigham waterside
Brundall Riverside • Oulton Broad waterside

The Broads Authority is seeking comment on its suggestions for planning policies for sites and areas that need special treatment.

Following on from earlier public consultation, the Authority has now considered a wide range of views and options, and is inviting comment on its provisional choice of future policies. These include:

• sites or areas where particular types of development or change will be encouraged, discouraged, or subject to special considerations;
• development boundaries for settlements suitable for general development.

These policies will sit alongside and elaborate existing policies in the already adopted Broads Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.

The consultation documents are available for inspection in a range of local council offices and libraries, as well as the on Broads Authority website and at its Norwich headquarters.

The comments received will be considered by the Authority before it finalises its proposals for the ‘Broads Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document’.

Send your comments in writing to (closing date 5pm, 5 April 2012):
Planning Policy, Broads Authority, Dragonfly House, 2 Gilders Way, Norwich NR3 1UB
day email LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk
For more information
www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/future-planning-and-policies/site-specific-policies-dpd.html
day email LDF@broads-authority.gov.uk. tel 01603 756050

This is a consultation about preparation by Broads Authority of a Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document for its Local Development Framework, and issued under Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended).