

**Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses
Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Joint Core Strategy Update
and Proposed Responses to Consultation on Marine Management Plan**
Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary: This report informs the Committee of the officers' proposed response to planning policy consultations recently received, and invites any comments or guidance the Committee may have.

Recommendation: That the report be noted and the nature of proposed response be endorsed.

1 Introduction

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

2 Financial Implications

- 2.1 There are no financial implications.

Background papers: None

Author: Natalie Beal
Date of report: 25 September

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Schedule of Planning Policy Consultations received

Planning Policy Consultations Received

ORGANISATION:	GNDP
DOCUMENT:	Joint Core Strategy – Main Modifications consultation.
LINK	http://www.gndp.org.uk/our-work/joint-core-strategy
RECEIVED:	9 September 2013
DUE DATE:	21 October 2013
STATUS:	Main Modification consultation
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Noted by Planning Committee
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	None proposed. See below for summary of Main Modifications.
NOTES:	<p>The Main Modifications suggested to the JCS are out for consultation. Whilst it is not proposed that the Broads Authority respond to the consultation, the following provides a summary.</p> <p>Of importance to note is that two of the changes are proposed by the Planning Inspector and as such the Councils who make up the GNDP are able to respond to the consultation with comments regarding these two proposed Main Modifications.</p> <p>A summary of the Main Modifications:</p> <p>Adds clarity re NDR and Postwick Hub and what development can come forward prior to these traffic management schemes. No comment as the BA has not previously objected to 10,000 dwellings in the Growth Triangle.</p> <p><u>7.16 Pending clarity on Postwick Hub's and the NDR's delivery, the table below summarises the current understanding of development potential offered by the strategic locations in the Broadland NPA as at 2013. The delivery of the smaller sites allowance in the Broadland NPA will be dealt with on a site by site basis as the dependence on Postwick junction and the NDR will vary with location.</u></p>

<u>Development that can come forward in advance of improvements to Postwick Junction:</u>	
<u>Growth Triangle</u>	<u>1440 committed dwellings in the Sprowston Fringe</u>
<u>Rackheath</u>	<u>200 dwellings on the proposed exemplar development at Rackheath (in addition to 94 existing consented dwellings)</u>
<u>Further development that can come forward following improvements to Postwick Junction and in advance of confirmation of delivery of the NDR:</u>	
<u>Growth Triangle</u>	<u>At least 1600 dwellings</u>
<u>Broadland Business Park</u>	<u>Development of existing allocation and new allocation (approx. 18ha including c50,000m2 B1)</u>
<u>Development that cannot come forward until confirmation of delivery of the NDR:</u>	
<u>Growth Triangle</u>	<u>All remaining housing in the Growth Triangle and new employment allocation at Rackheath</u>
<u>Airport Area</u>	<u>New employment allocation</u>

There are two new policies. Policy 21 is the PINS model policy (similar to what we have in the Sites Specifics). Policy 22 refers to a specific local plan if housing delivery is 90% of what expected to be. No comment as the Broads Authority would be involved to some extent on a specific Local Plan as well as consulted.

Policy 21: Implementation of proposals in the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area

When considering development proposals in their part of the Norwich Policy Area Broadland District Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

- Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or
- Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

Policy 22: Action to ensure the delivery of housing land in the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area

In addition to the JCS review "trigger" set out in paragraph 7.18, if any Monitoring Report (MR) produced after two full years from the adoption of this part-JCS Local Plan demonstrates that there is a significant shortfall (as defined below) in the 5-year supply of housing land (plus the "additional buffer" required in current national policy) affecting the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) as set out in the whole JCS, then the Councils will take the course of action specified below to address the identified shortfall.

The Councils will consider that a significant shortfall has arisen if the MR (produced annually) shows there to be less than 90% of the required deliverable housing land (as defined in current national policy).

In the event of an identified shortfall, the Councils will produce a short, focussed Local Plan which will have the objective of identifying and allocating additional locations within the whole NPA area for immediately deliverable housing land to remedy that shortfall, in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in paragraph 6.2 of the JCS. The Local Plan will cover such a time period as may reasonably be considered necessary for the delivery delay or shortfall (however caused) to be resolved.

A new updated housing trajectory is proposed. No comment.

Appendix 6a

Trajectory of delivery of Homes expected from previously remitted Growth Locations in Broadland part of NPA

	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	TOTAL	Av build
Rackheath	77	77	70	185	230	230	230	230	230	230	230	230	2249	187
Remainder of Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle (inside NDR)	20	163	234	373	435	440	515	590	530	530	530	497	4857	405
Additional small sites around Broadland NPA	98	148	161	266	328	300	225	150	150	150	25	0	2001	167
Total	195	388	465	824	993	970	970	970	910	910	785	727	9107	759

This trajectory illustrates delivery anticipated at July 2013. It should not be summed with figures produced in Appendix 6. For up to date information please see the Annual Monitoring Report.

ORGANISATION:	Marine Management Organisation
DOCUMENT:	Draft East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan
LINK	https://www.connect.marinemanagement.org.uk/consultations/consult-draft-east-marine-plans
RECEIVED:	16 July
DUE DATE:	8 October (we have submitted comments as draft to be finalised when ratified by Planning Committee)
STATUS:	Draft
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed comments.
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	The Broads Authority has been consulted on the MMO plan for the East Inshore and Offshore area. The East Inshore Marine Plan Area includes the coastline stretching from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe, extending from mean high water out to 12 nautical miles, including inland areas such as the Broads and other waters subject to tidal influence, and covers an area of 6,000 square

kilometres. The East Offshore Marine Plan Area covers the marine area from 12 nautical miles out to the maritime borders with the Netherlands, Belgium and France, a total of approximately 49,000 square kilometres of sea.

These marine plans will inform and guide marine users and regulators, managing the sustainable development of marine industries - such as wind farms, shipping, aggregates and fishing – whilst considering the environment at an early stage, encouraging developments to enhance the benefits for marine ecology and biodiversity.

A short animated film is available to explain Marine Planning:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cFn0buPVU6A>

It is considered that the MMO Marine Plans will have a limited impact on the Broads area, due to its having a very short stretch of coastline which is dealt with the existing development plan. The majority of the issues in the MMO Marine Plans are offshore and there are no significant issues for the Broads currently.

There are, however, a number of matters of detail in the Plan which should be raised with the MMO, as follows:

Detailed comments:

- Paragraph 30: Broads Plan is the management plan for the Broads.
- Paragraph 53: the landscape impacts of transmission infrastructure could be considered.
- Policy EC1: could refer to landscape impacts to AONB and the Broads.
- Policy SCO2: objective is positive and uses ‘conserve’ but policy is negative and uses ‘not compromise’.
- Paragraph 138, last sentence has strong wording which appears worthy of a policy.
- Paragraph 171: Perhaps the Grey Seal colony between Horsey and Winterton is worthy of mention.
- Policy BIO1: the policy uses the term ‘appropriate weight’. It is not clear how the policy, with this wording, can be implemented. Perhaps some of the stronger wording in Paragraph 177 could be considered?
- Policy BIO2 seems weaker than the supporting text in Paragraph 178
- Figure 6: inset boxes could help show greater detail on this important map.
- Policy MPA1: This is quite confusing as drafted. The intent is not clear.
- Policy GOV1: The landscape impacts of transmission infrastructure are worthy of consideration, especially on the AONB and Broads.
- Figure 10: Perhaps an inset could show the Broads Authority boundary?

Throughout:

- Norfolk and Suffolk Broads a better term.
- Strength of wording of some policies: ‘should’ v ‘could’ v ‘will’ v ‘must’. How strong does the MMO want the wording to be?