

Planning Committee

03 March 2023

Agenda item number 11

Consultation responses

Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary

This report informs the Committee of the officer's proposed response to planning policy consultations received recently, and invites members' comments and guidance.

Recommendation

To note the report and endorse the nature of the proposed responses.

1. Introduction

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

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 21 February 2023

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Great Yarmouth Borough Council

Document: Local Plan – Issues [Great Yarmouth New Local Plan \(arcgis.com\)](#) with interactive map here: [Local Plan Options Consultation - 'Call for Sites' Potential Sites for Development \(arcgis.com\)](#)

Due date: 27 February 2023

Status: Issues consultation

Proposed level: Planning Committee Endorsed

Notes

The current Local Plan for Great Yarmouth is split over two documents, the Core Strategy (adopted in 2015) and the Local Plan Part 2 (adopted in 2021).

Great Yarmouth Borough Council is currently progressing a review of the whole Local Plan. The new Local Plan will eventually replace the Core Strategy and the Local Plan Part 2. It is intended the new Local Plan will be a single document, rather than being separate local plans covering strategy, allocations and detailed policies.

The new Local Plan will cover the period to 2041.

This consultation aims to get your views on some of the key matters the new Local Plan will need to address.

Proposed response

Summary of response

Please note that at the time of preparing the report, the comments from the Landscape Architect had not been received and these will be reported verbally at Planning Committee.

Please also note that as the deadline for comments is before the 3 March Planning Committee meeting, the comments have been sent in with a note saying that we will be in touch to confirm the comments once discussed at 3 March Planning Committee.

This is an early stage of plan making. GYBC have included all sites put forward for consideration. We make comments on some sites that are near to or next to our boundary. There are also some other observations and suggestions and areas of support.

Vision

- We would welcome reference to the Broads and setting of the Broads in the vision.

Urban and Waterfront Regeneration

- As part of these sites border with the Broads Authority, please ensure in policy that working at an early stage with the Broads Authority is required.
- There could also be potential for schemes to make appropriate use of the water.
- Is there scope for the water area out of the Broads Authority Executive Area, but next to the allocated areas to have moorings, in particular residential moorings?

Affordable Housing sub areas

- It is not clear why these stop at the BA boundary. You are aware that we have regard to/defer to your affordable housing policies and also that you are the housing authority for the entire borough, including that which is the Broads Authority area. Perhaps for the purposes of your policies maps, the boundaries could stop at the BA boundary, but for your Housing Team and our purposes, is there a map that can be shared that covers the entire Borough, including the Broads Authority area?

Question 32

- Given the impact of travel on carbon emissions, given the cost of car fuel and the cost of living crisis as well as the potential for social isolation, within or close to settlements whereby the services can be walked or cycled to or a bus used, seems logical.

Biodiversity section

- Don't forget Local Nature Recovery Strategies as these are not mentioned in this section.

Landscape section

- Don't forget about the setting of these protected landscapes as that is not mentioned. See NPPF 176.

Question 68

- We would welcome the dark skies of the areas near the Broads being protected. We are happy to work with you on this issue.

Site S62

- This site sits on (relatively) high ground to the north of the low-lying marshes, Breydon Water and the Halvergate Marshes Conservation area beyond. As such it is highly visible across a wide area and acts as an important visual 'buffer' between the marshland and the residential development to the south of Market Road. As such further housing development here would have a significant visual impact and could cause harm to the landscape character of the area to the north.
- The site also immediately adjoins two grade II listed buildings: Bradwell Hall and the Barn at Bradwell Hall Farm. It is characteristic of many historic Norfolk farms that they are

accessed via a long drive between fields and the development of this area would therefore have a detrimental impact on the setting of these buildings. The barn, being located on the northern boundary of the proposed site, could be particularly affected, with its rural setting being essentially lost, which is likely to cause some harm to the building's significance.

Site S65

- I have concerns regarding development on this very significant site. The western half of the site is within the scheduled area and any development on the remainder would affect the setting of the adjoining scheduled monument. A large area to the west is also covered by the scheduling and includes the grade I listed and scheduled Burgh Castle. The site is also immediately adjacent to the grade II listed Old Rectory and grade II* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul.
- The Burgh castle scheduled monument contains the very important Saxon Shore fort, as well as evidence of medieval use of the site as a monastery and the adaptation of the fort for use as a motte and bailey castle by the Normans. It is clearly very significant.
- As well as there being the potential for archaeological remains, the setting of all of the above designated heritage assets need to be taken into consideration and as such I think it is unlikely that development of the site could be considered acceptable. Certainly, housing is very unlikely to be considered an acceptable option.
- It is noted that renewable energy generation is one of the proposed uses and this is likely to be less contentious given that it would presumably be more reversible and would not require excavation. However, this would only be on the eastern, non-scheduled part of the site and the impact on the setting of the SAM would still need to be considered and could potentially be found to be harmful, depending on the scale and details.

Site S69 and S43

- There are three grade II listed structures position close to the north-east boundary of the site (the ruins of St Peter's Chapel; and the relocated cross base and font from the church). The relatively isolated location of the remains of St Peter's Chapel contributes to its significance and there are views across the fields from the High Road towards the tower.
- I would have some concerns regarding development of this whole site, bounded by High Road to the west and Tower Road to the east. There could perhaps be some scope for limited development fronting the High Road, retaining some substantial gaps in the frontage to allow the open aspect and views of the listed church tower to be retained.
- There are also historic buildings such as The Nest in the south-east corner of the site, that may be considered a locally identified heritage assets, the setting of which would also need to be considered.

South Norfolk District Council

Document: Village Clusters Local Plan [South Norfolk District Council - OpusConsult \(oc2.uk\)](https://www.opusconsult.co.uk) with interactive map being here: [South Norfolk Council – Local Plan: South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan - Reg. 19 Publication \(opus4.co.uk\)](https://www.opus4.co.uk)

Due date: 06 March 2023

Status: Regulation 19

Proposed level: Planning Committee Endorsed

Notes

The South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (The Village Clusters Plan) aims to deliver sustainable growth within the villages of South Norfolk. The Village Clusters Plan has been developed alongside the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) and in accordance with Government's national planning policies and guidance. The Plan allocates a series of smaller sites, typically within the range of 12 to 50 homes, across the 48 Village Clusters in South Norfolk, to accommodate at least 1,200 new homes in total. The Plan also defines the Settlement Limits for the villages within these clusters, making provision for further smaller sites and incorporating revisions to reflect development that has occurred, or has been permitted since the boundaries were last updated.

There are 48 Village Clusters in South Norfolk. Some contain a single parish, whilst others contain multiple parishes. In line with the approach set out in the GNLP, each one is centred around the local primary school. Where that primary school is within a larger settlement outside of a Village Cluster, the remaining rural parishes still form a cluster in the Village Clusters Plan e.g. Brockdish, Needham, Wortwell and Starston are within the catchment of Harleston Primary School, but those four parishes form a cluster in this Plan. The primary school catchment has been taken as a proxy for social sustainability, however the Council also recognises that many other facilities are important to local communities and has therefore undertaken an audit of other facilities and services within the clusters, to inform the Site Assessment process (see details below).

The sites within the Village Clusters are split into two categories

- new Allocations, these are sites typically proposed for between 12 to 50 dwellings, which will go to meeting the 1,200 dwelling requirement in the GNLP, noted above; and
- Settlement Limit Extensions, for sites smaller than 12 dwellings, these will not count towards the 1,200 dwelling requirement, but will help ensure that the 'windfall allowance' in the GNLP is achieved.

The threshold of 12 dwellings is consistent with the GNLP and reflects the fact that sites smaller than this are less likely to achieve the required element of affordable housing. Settlement Limit extensions also offer the opportunity for 'self-build' development, as

required through Government policy, particularly where those sites have been proposed by the site owner who wishes to build or commission their own home.

Proposed response

Summary of response

Please note that at the time of preparing the report, the comments from the Landscape Architect had not been received and these will be reported verbally at Planning Committee.

As written below, there are only a few comments proposed currently. The following identifies sites that are near to or next to the Broads. We await landscape comments which will be fed back verbally at the Committee meeting.

13. **Ditchingham**, Broome, Hedenham and Thwaite

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

14. **Earsham**

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

16. **Gillingham, Geldeston, and Stockton**

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment
- Policy VC GIL1: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way
 - await Landscape comments
 - 5th bullet point needs to mention assessing potential impact on the Broads, as is written in para 16.10.
 - Mention need for LVIA.
- Policy VC GEL1: North of Kell's Way
 - 2nd bullet point of the policy needs to mention assessing potential impact on the Broads, as is written in para 16.17.
 - Mention need for LVIA.

17. **Hales and Heckingham, Langley with Hardley, Carleton St Peter, Claxton, Raveningham and Sisland**

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

22. **Kirby Cane and Ellingham**

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment
- Policy VC ELL1: South of Mill Road. – extending the settlement closer to the Broads
 - await Landscape comments
- Policy VC ELL2: Land at Florence Way – extending the settlement closer to the Broads
 - await Landscape comments.

- ELL2 is very close to ELL1 and therefore needs to include the criterion in ELL1 that refers to the Broads. And also in the relevant supporting text. It is no clear why this wording is in one policy and not the other. It needs to be in both.

29. Rockland St Mary, Hellington and Holverston

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment
- Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill – extending the settlement closer to the Broads
 - await Landscape comments

36. Surlingham, Bramerton and Kirby Bedon

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

40. Thurlton and Norton Subcourse

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

43. Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment