

# Planning Committee

04 February 2022

Agenda item number 11

## Consultation responses – February 2022

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 response.

---

## 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 January 2022

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received – Oulton Parish Council

Appendix 2 – Planning Policy consultations received - Worlingham Parish Council

Appendix 3 – Planning Policy consultations received - Transport East

# Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

## Oulton Parish Council

**Document:** Oulton Neighbourhood Plan [Oulton Parish Council | Neighbourhood Plan \(oultonpcsuffolk.info\)](https://oultonpcsuffolk.info)

**Status:** Regulation 14

**Proposed level:** Planning Committee endorsed

### Notes

The actual consultation period has ended, but we were not aware of the consultation so when we did not respond, the consultant contacted me and offered the chance to respond.

### Proposed response

#### Summary of response

The Neighbourhood Plan is welcomed. The following comments are mostly on the detail. Generally, the main issues are:

- the wording of the design policy which try to say that the design guide does not apply to the Broads (which is welcomed) but inadvertently seems to say that good design is not important in the Broads; and
- the need to reflect Written Ministerial Statements and announcements from the Government.

#### Detailed response

- Para 1 – the Plan will be ‘made’ not adopted. Also ‘made’ by the Broads Authority.
- Para 3 – I don’t know what you mean by saying ‘separate planning function’ – the function is the same as ESC, but perhaps you are trying to say that the BA are also the LPA. Might need checking
- Para 6 – there **are** a larger number of events and activities?
- Policy 2 – as worded, the requirement is quite weak - ‘should aim to’. Is this a real instruction or an encouragement/like to do/nice to do?
- Policy 2 - Also, the 50:50 split is in the Local Plan and 25% first homes is in National Policy, but what is the justification or evidence for the other percentages? I don’t necessarily have a comment on them, just suggesting that the evidence is not clear.
- Para 52 and policy 3 – you might want to check and reflect the announcement that the Building Regulations will be changed from June. in December 2021, the Government announced that from June 2022, the Building Regulations will be changed so ‘CO2 emissions from new build homes must be around 30% lower than current standards and emissions from other new buildings, including offices and shops, must be reduced

by 27%'. The link to the press release is here and it also includes the Building Regs: [New homes to produce nearly a third less carbon - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-homes-to-produce-nearly-a-third-less-carbon)

- Para 53 and policy 3 - December 2021, the Government announced<sup>1</sup> that new homes and buildings such as supermarkets and workplaces, as well as those undergoing major renovation, will be required to install electric vehicle charge points from 2022. [PM to announce electric vehicle revolution - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/pm-to-announce-electric-vehicle-revolution)
- Policy 3 – excludes the Broads Authority. As written, it sounds very odd – that design in the Broads Authority should not ‘demonstrate high-quality design and promote a good ‘sense of place’’. I think you are trying to say that the Design Guide does not apply to the Broads and that is because it failed to adequately assess the Broads, but the general principle of good design still applies to the Broads. Maybe something like this: All new development within Oulton ~~outside of the Broads Executive Area~~ must demonstrate high-quality design and promote a good ‘sense of place’. The design principles, taken from Oulton Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidelines and Codes (2021) must be followed with the checklist in Appendix A completed [although the Oulton Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidelines and Codes \(2021\) does not apply to the development in the Broads Authority Executive Area.](#)
- Policy 3 f – A Written Ministerial Statement (<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-statements/detail/2015-03-25/HCWS488>) explains that neighbourhood plans should not set out any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings; instead these must be contained in local plans.
- Policy 3 – last part. I cannot easily tell if any part of the Broads falls in the character areas, particular number 4. Please can you check and confirm if that is the case? If so, then given our concerns about the Design Guide and Code (that it did not adequately reflect or assess the Broads), then the wording needs to say something along the lines that the Guide and Code does not apply in the Broads.
- Policy 3 Design: I also wasn't sure why under point b, it states ‘Any new development in the Broads area must be designed to the highest standard which is fitting with the areas equivalence of National Park Status’. This should perhaps go at the beginning the policy, as it doesn't just apply to point b.
- Figure 4 and 6 – you might want to add to the legend that the light blue is the Broads.
- Para 57 – how does this fit into any established or proposed RAMS covering this area?
- Para 57 – not just recreational pressure (although noted that this is significant); depending on the nature of the ‘development’ and location relative to the protected

---

<sup>1</sup> [PM to announce electric vehicle revolution - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/pm-to-announce-electric-vehicle-revolution)

site, other issues may arise and need to be assessed through HRA, e.g. pollution, light, noise, adjacent habitat fragmentation etc

- Para 58 to 67 – there is an opportunity here to link to spatial mapping & opportunities that will become available through Local Nature Recovery Strategies. You do go on to talk about spatial identification of important habitats, so it is present in the plan, but this could be a good opportunity to link to formal funding options that will be open to landowners.
- Para 60 – the Bill is now an Act, so this para could be updated.
- Para 61 – not sure about wording “.....unless new opportunities to enhance green infrastructure can be provided to mitigate or compensate for the loss.” If proposals are not supported where there is a direct or indirect impact on locally recognised sites (CWS & BAP habitat) I would suggest the mitigation/compensation would need to be above and beyond green infrastructure. A stronger statement would be to add ‘creation or enhancement of habitat’ AND green infrastructure.
- Policy 4a – could the net gain be on site? So a development may be in the corridor, but be designed to provide a net gain on site?
- Policy 4d – I think you are trying to say that in the Parish, if a development, following through the metric related to biodiversity net gain as required by the Environment Act 2021, needs to deliver the net gain off site, then the preference (requirement?) will be to deliver that net gain in the identified green corridors, working with the landowners? If I am right, whilst my explanation is very wordy, I think what is written is not 100% clear. If I am wrong about interpreting 4d then it might need clarification to explain what is meant.
- Figure 5 and 6 and 7 and 11 – as and when the Plan is made, please can you send these ‘allocations’ to us as GIS files to go on our system?
- Para 78 and 79 – you could probably link to the landscape character policies of the local plans as well? Did you want to give examples of how a view could be harmed?
- Policy 7, last bit – you might want to weave ‘setting of the Broads’ in there as well, to reflect the NPPF.
- Policy 8: Heritage Assets – I would suggest that in the first sentence ‘significance’ should replace ‘integrity’ and instead of historic assets it should state heritage assets, so that there is consistency in the terminology used. I’m not entirely sure about part a of this policy, relating to proposals *adjacent to* non-designated heritage assets. If a proposal is for a site adjacent to a non-designated heritage asset it is unlikely that it will affect the non-designated asset directly and the impact on the setting is covered by parts b and c of the policy. Is ‘part a’ required?
- Para 101 will need an update.

- Throughout - perhaps you want to set a threshold for the policies? Perhaps new residential and commercial development? By saying all development, it could apply to new windows!
- Appendix 1: Design checklist – this is very thorough and I think covers everything. I would have no objection to it being used for new development within the BA Executive Area. However, it is a little repetitive. For example, points 1.3; 1.5; 3.5; 3.8 and 3.9 all cover views. I appreciate that some of them have a slightly different emphasis but I wonder if some of the points could be consolidated.
- Non-Designated Heritage Assets Assessment Document – The Old Workhouse – it states that ‘There now stands in its place Oulton Park Care Centre’, which makes it sound like the workhouse has been demolished and this is a new building in its place. Perhaps it should be re-worded?

## Appendix 2 – Planning Policy consultations received

### Worlingham Parish Council

**Document:** Worlingham Neighbourhood Plan [Worlingham neighbourhood area » East Suffolk Council](#)

**Due date:** 21 February 2022

**Status:** Regulation 16

**Proposed level:** Planning Committee Endorsed

#### Notes

The purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan is to guide development within the parish and provide guidance to any interested parties wishing to submit planning applications for development within the parish. The process of producing a plan has sought to involve the community as widely as possible and the topic areas are reflective of matters that are of considerable importance to the residents of Worlingham.

#### Proposed response

##### Summary of response

There are only a few comments as Worlingham Neighbourhood Plan Group have taken on board the comments made as part of the health check.

##### Detailed response

- It is a good idea to put a date on the front page of the document – the next version, if adopted, would therefore say ‘adopted xxx 2022’.
- Vision: **A mix of housing needs has been met across the private and affordable housing sectors and much of the green spaces between Worlingham and Beccles has been retained.** Should it say ‘have’?
- Section 8, landscaping, refers to the landscape in the area, but does not mention the Broads, which has a status equivalent to a National Park. The Broads is mentioned in the policy, but a mention in the supporting text seems prudent.
- Are the wildlife corridors identified in a map? That would help in delivering this policy.

## Appendix 3 – Planning Policy consultations received

### Transport East

**Document:** Transport Strategy [Public Consultation - Transport East](#)

**Due date:** 30 January 2022

**Status:** Draft

**Proposed level:** Planning Committee Endorsed

#### Notes

An improved transport network can bring about much-needed change to the region, connecting people to opportunities for work, education and leisure, and supporting local economies. An improved transport network would also reduce emissions and improve the health of our residents. Key to this is a regional Transport Strategy to guide investment in the East over the next 30 years. Through this strategy, we aim to overcome some of the transport challenges experienced, while also delivering a fit for purpose, high quality, inclusive and sustainable transport network that will be able to accommodate future growth in the area.

#### Proposed response

##### Summary of response

In general, there are comments relating to including or considering the ecological impacts of transport improvements, clarification in how this Strategy will fit with other strategies, general observations about consistency and querying how the strategy seems to consider all coast settlements the same.

##### Detailed response

##### General comments

- The focus is on growth, development and carbon reduction transport improvements with very little mention of ecological impacts other than brief references to the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal and paragraph 6.6 'Delivering for our environment'. The points below highlight some considerable concerns about environmental and biodiversity impacts; these are not considered in any depth. For example, has there been any thought around how new transport links might further fragment/degrade habitats? How does this fit with environmental spatial priorities? Are they considering how biodiversity net gain can be planned in from the beginning to make it meaningful, worthwhile and integrated?
- There does not seem to be consideration of the knock-on effects of improving the transport links for the ecology and biodiversity of the region. We appreciate that there is a climate crisis but there is also a biodiversity crisis. If you improve transport links, you get development around hubs, how will this impact biodiversity/climate? Has there been any thought given to future-proofing all these new transport links we're going to get?

- The detailed plan is a little lost within the words & format.
- A lot of the towns and villages don't have their own off-street parking so without public charging points, electric vehicles don't seem to be a real option. Whilst admirable, getting people to switch to electric vehicles might not be practical without the installation of public charging points.
- How does this strategy fit with the county local transport plans? I don't see this explained.
- How will the New Anglia LEP's alternative fuels strategy fit with this work and vice versa?
- Beyond a target for net-Zero by 2040, there doesn't seem to be any meaningful sub-targets. For instance, target for "reduce demand for carbon intensive trips". What is the baseline, and do they aim to be over, under or at the recommended 2035 and 2050 reduction in miles driven in the Committee on Climate Change Balanced Net-Zero pathway? A net-zero 2040 target would imply a faster rate of electrification than the current government target, but this doesn't seem to be reflected anywhere.
- Linked to this, I am unsure what the pathway is to net-zero 2040? What is the 2030 reduction target?
- What is the scope of Net-Zero? The Broads Net-Zero definition, in line with National Parks, is working on the assumption we count travel to the Broads as well as travel within it. Given the large tourism sectors in these counties, that would seem a sensible approach, but means counting the aviation emissions from airports, for instance. As a comparison, transport emissions from people coming to and from the Broads are likely to be equivalent to about 1/5<sup>th</sup> of overall transport emissions from within Norfolk.

### Detailed comments

- Page 15, second para of column 2 starts by saying 'Many of these journeys are difficult to take other than by car'. It is very early on in the document and already it seems to have given up on modal shift. It would be better to say that many of these journeys are currently made by the car – that is probably a fact. That way the strategy does not admit defeat in the introduction. Also, how does this stance, that sets the tone for the rest of the strategy, fit with what is said at the start of page 21, column 1, second para – 'in some areas the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in a shift to more sustainable forms of transport, with 30% of people likely or very likely to walk more in the future'. In fact, how does this stance fit with the results of the survey as set out in 1.4.1?
- Page 16, first column, para 1 – of all the initiatives to mention, the first is the Roads Investment Strategy. Are there no other initiatives that are to do with walking, cycling or public transport that could be mentioned?



- Page 16, first column, para 2 – what about the health and wellbeing of the community? What about respecting/protecting the environment? Will the strategy address those things?
- Page 18, column one, first para – when will the further 247,000 new homes be in place? What is the time period?
- Early in the document you say net zero by 2040, but then at the top of page 20, by 2050. May need clarifying.
- Page 20, column 2, para starting ‘while we’, last few words – what about the negative impacts on the environment?
- Page 24 – the title does not match the figure title. I was going to say that this should show the AONBs and the Broads as they are significant features of the East, but going by what the figure title is, it is about economy – might be better to amend the main title to make this clear.
- Figure 2.1.2 – needs to show the AONBs and the Broads - you mention them throughout and they are key features of the area.
- Page 27, second column, second para says ‘First, partly due to its dispersed geography and low population density, the region is dependent on private transport’. This is quite a sweeping statement. What about internal journeys in cities, towns and larger villages? Public transport, walking and cycling are possible.
- Page 28, column 3, para 1 – what about air quality? Road safety? Health impacts as a result of not being active? This just talks about congestion.
- Page 28, column 3, para 1 - then goes on with the general tone of the document, by saying that it is difficult to walk and cycle/admits defeat, yet table 1.4.1 indicates a willingness to be more active and use the car less and cities, towns and large villages have the potential for journeys to be made by walking and cycling and public transport. Does Norwich not have a strong walking, cycling and public transport network for example?
- Page 28, column 3, para 2 – says ‘these towns and cities’ – which ones? Birmingham and Nottingham? Or do you mean the ones in the East?
- Page 29, first bit and page 55, para 1 – why have you chosen 500m? And this is saying that 72% of people do – 72% is quite high. Why have you focussed on the 28% rather than the 72%?
- Page 29, para 2 refers to ‘the county’ – what county? Or do you mean region?
- Page 29, column 1, last para and page 50, second full para – is 11.3 seconds really significantly higher than 9.5 seconds?
- Page 30, second column, para 1. Does the 21% who live on the coast, live in rural areas on the coast? Or do some of the 21% live in coastal towns? There are quite a few

coastal towns where walking and cycling and public transport may be convenient and, for example, Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth are connected to higher order settlements by train.

- Figure 2.4.1 – could this case study box talk of what is being done to tackle the issues in the area? Presumably, given the issues, there is much work ongoing in the area?
- Page 39 – typo, middle column, last para. ‘businesses-groups’
- Page 40, missing word – first para ‘in the Transport East **area**’
- Page 40, para 3 in central column – if people walk and cycle rather than drive, that will result in less money spent on fuel. How does cost of charging an EV car fully compare to a full tank of petrol and diesel? The point being, that saving money is attractive. Later on, you talk about the fuel duty on diesel and petrol for example.
- Page 41, blue circle – typo – ‘the regio’s surface’
- Page 42, column 2, last para – what about EVs for deliveries like Amazon do?
- Page 43, under furthest right column, para 1 – why only long trips? What about medium and even short trips? What do you define as ‘long’?
- Page 44, first column, para 2 -really good, but nothing to do with reducing the demand. That seems to belong in net zero – not travelling at peak, results in less stand still traffic and wasted emissions.
- What is missing, in terms of reducing the need to travel, is the role of deliveries – such as grocery deliveries. Why is that not mentioned in this section?
- Page 45, column 1, first para – seems to down play the role car sharing can have. I would suggest that car sharing is an important mode that can be made more of.
- Page 45, first column, para 2 – shouldn’t we all do our bit? I am not sure of the message in here – if you cycle, I can still use my car as you have made it easier for me.
- Page 45 and Figure 4.3.3 – is there a workstream about respect between modes of transport? And about enforcing traffic laws – motor vehicles jumping red lights and cyclists not having lights? There is also no mention of electric scooters and cycle hire schemes like the BERYL scheme in Norwich.
- Page 48, green box, bullet 1, typo: ‘the sub-regional actions needed to unblock and speed delivery’
- Page 49 – is there anything in the strategy about using the water more?
- Page 53, column 1, first para – it may sound cynical, but what about laziness and habit and just not caring for walking or cycling? Also, bad weather.
- Page 55, column 2, para 2 – ends in a , rather than a .
- Page 59, first para, typo: ‘delivery bodies’

- Page 60, para 1 – why use ‘as the crow flies’ distances? That is not really meaningful.
- Goal 6 and rail – I think the thing that puts people off trains is the cost and that the cost goes up each year.
- Page 61, roads section – Wales have stopped building roads in response to the climate crisis. What makes the East different to Wales?
- Page 61, roads section – isn’t this the place to talk about addressing the peak hours? It is talked about at page 44, first column, para 2.
- Page 66, point 4 – what about training for car, van, HGV and bus drivers as well as pedestrians?
- Page 65 – what about respect between road users?
- Page 67 and 68, 74 and throughout – you seem to include those on the coast who live in urban areas as well as those who live in rural coastal areas as one. What is the transport situation like in Great Yarmouth when compared to a small village on the coast? Is it right to combine urban and rural coastal areas in one category? Indeed, page 74, column 2, second para quotes Great Yarmouth as a success.
- Page 71, first paragraph – last part – think there is a word or some words missing as it does not read right.
- Page 74, second column, third para is the first mention of using the water, but is related only to coastal areas. There are lots of navigable waterways in the area as a whole, not just on the coast.
- Page 75, second column, first para – missing full stop: ‘...containerised freight. Stansted...’
- Page 80, second column, top para – missing full stop ‘Battery powered HGVs remain a potential solution. Our strategy for rolling out EV charging infrastructure across the region must not overlook charging requirements for larger vehicles.’
- Page 81, third column, first para – random bracket - catalyst for shifting ]freight to rail,
- Page 84 – the last para of the second column ends with a half-written sentence and it seems the green box is covering text.
- Page 100 - Paragraph 6.6 states that “...we will support promoters to optimise designs for climate change resilience, biodiversity net gain.....” these statements need quantifying and more detail. Biodiversity net gain will be a legal requirement for development come 2023, including nationally significant infrastructure projects so this statement is rather weak in its intent. The Environment Act brings into force many other initiatives (Local Nature Recovery strategies etc) that will require strategic partnership working to identify important areas for biodiversity that should be protected from development. How does Transport East intend to work with other

authorities to deliver these strategic, multi-disciplined aims & ensure that plans with differing priorities are compatible?

### **ISA**

- Page 84 – biodiversity – no mention of net gain or potential to create biodiversity enhancements.
- Tables in section 8 from page 130 – what do you mean by ‘pre’ and ‘post’? I can’t see that explained anywhere.
- The ISA includes and assesses lots of specific schemes, but these specific schemes are not in the Transport Strategy. Why is this?

### **Draft investment and delivery programme**

- The Draft investment and delivery programme includes and assesses lots of specific schemes, but these specific schemes are not in the Transport Strategy. Why is this?