

Planning Committee

14 October 2022

Agenda item number 11

October 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 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: 28 September 2022

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Hemsby Parish Council

Document: Hemsby Neighbourhood Plan: [Hemsby Neighbourhood Plan status - Great Yarmouth Borough Council \(great-yarmouth.gov.uk\)](https://www.great-yarmouth.gov.uk/consultations/hemsby-neighbourhood-plan-status)

Due date: 08 November 2022

Status: Regulation 16 consultation

Proposed level: Planning Committee endorsed

Notes

Hemsby first began its journey with the Neighbourhood Plan in 2017 and the steering group have worked hard on this plan for creating a future for our village. The community have helped contribute to how we can have an influence on protecting important aspects of our village and how we want to shape such things as where residential and employment sites may be suitable in the future and how these should look.

Proposed response

Summary of response

There are many comments proposed. The main thrust of the comments is seeking clarity on what is required as well as thresholds to which policies apply.

Detailed comments

Consultation Statement

It is appreciated that each comment made has a response.

In response to our comment on only focusing on street lighting, there is no reason given for this, there is no explanation of the local stance and this explanation would be welcomed.

Design Codes

No comments as does not apply to the Broads.

Neighbourhood Plan

- 1.7 – Does not read well. Here is a suggestion. This may not be ideal wording, but as written, it was not clear what was meant. ‘The number of homes rented **is 14%** ~~are (14%)~~ which ~~is are~~ significantly less **when** compared to the borough (34%) and much of Hemsby’s housing stock ranges between 2 to 4 bedrooms; with a lack of one-bedroom homes being available (5%) which is lower than the borough and national average (11-12%)’
- Page 6 – ‘H. Protect and preserve those special qualities and features that are valued by the community, such as the sandy beaches and **the** Broads’.
- Para 5.4 – refers to community actions, but says they are policies. I would remove the reference to policies in the last sentence to avoid any confusion.

- Section on Affordable Housing – would seem logical to mention that First Homes cannot come forward in the Broads.
- 6.18 – would including a map help with understanding the locations talked about?
- 6.28 says ‘in this emerging local plan’ – do you mean neighbourhood plan?
- Policy 4 – I am not sure the ands and the ors work as written. Wouldn’t you need to start the review of the plan in order to see if there is a willing land owner (part a). Would it be better worded if the first sentence and the second sentence were joined together? That could be the end of the policy? And the rest be part of text. Just seems to not work as written and the important thing is the thing that triggers the review.
- 87.9 – what evidence is there that the routes are dangerous? Is it more a perceived danger?
- Figure 2 – are any of these in the Broads? The Broads is not shown on the map...
- 8.18 says ‘The main fields of focus are those around Martham Road across to Winterton Road. **The fields between Hemsby and Ormesby.** Both of these would support linking up with set aside field margins in Martham and Ormesby’. The bit in yellow is a random sentence. Should it be linked to the first sentence with an and?
- 8.22 and 8.29 and 13.2 – Is it King’s Way or Kings Way or Kingsway?
- Top of page 25 says ‘designed to accommodate public transport as part of Policy A2: Housing Design Principles. **Norfolk County Council as the Highway Authority**’ – the yellow is an unfinished sentence.
- Policy 8 and 9 – what about cycle parking standards?
- 9.1 – first sentence – think it should be a full stop between appeal and in.
- 9.1 – is there a more recent report to quote than 2019?
- Policy 10 - there is no information on what you actually require in order to address the policy requirements. This needs to be really clear to enable the Development Management Officers from the LPAs to apply the policy.
- Policy 11: What do you mean by ‘area’? What does ‘equal quality’ mean?
- 9.15 – second sentence doesn’t really end or go anywhere. What are you trying to say about these things?
- Policy 12 ‘supported in principle, **subject to other relevant policies in the Development Plan**’ – some proposals may be quite radical and therefore it would be useful to remind applicants that other policies will apply.
- Figure 3 – please add the Broads to the map.
- 10.2 – there is also an adopted Flood Risk SPD.
- 10.6 – rather than saying ‘present day’, perhaps add the actual time period this data applies to.
- 10.12 – or successor documents – that is a usual caveat added to referencing guidance, so the most up to date is used.
- 10.15 seems to be policy wording.
- Policy 13 and 10.7 – firstly, did you want to mention the places in the policy itself. Secondly, a map showing these would be useful.
- Policy 13 – impermeable driveways are not natural SuDS (see Bungay NP Examiner report)
- Policy 13 says ‘Where development is proposed within or partly within the **Internal Drainage District of the Broads the Broads Internal Drainage Board’s** consenting process should be followed prior to determination of any planning application’. The yellow bit reads in a confusing way.

- 11.1 – ‘It is not as simple as planting trees in any space available, careful design and planning to get the right species in the right place will create a positive impact and where possible new planting should be targeted where there are existing trees and hedges’ – yellow might be better if a;
- 11.2 – think BNG will be in place November 2023
- 11.2 – ‘mandatory nationally or **locally** within the Great Yarmouth borough’.
- 11.3 – we have a biodiversity enhancements guide as well (which is referred to in the policy, but could be mentioned here perhaps).
- Policy 14 – it is conceivably that an extension to house could provide biodiversity enhancements – a bat brick or swift brick for example. So, is the threshold used at the start of the policy right? What about replacements dwellings for example, could they be excluded from the policy requirements by the wording and is that what is wanted?
- Policy 14 – the last part about BNG – what development proposals does this apply to? It is not clear what the threshold is. One could guess that the threshold used at the start of the policy is the threshold for the BNG, but I would suggest the threshold (whatever it is and note by previous comment on policy 14) is clearly set out for this part of the policy.
- Policy 14 – the last few words are confusing and not clear. What do you mean by this? 10% net gain is 10% no matter what the size of the site is. Are these words needed? If you keep them in, I would suggest they need explaining.
- 11.10 – I know that C is carbon, but might be best to say carbon.
- Throughout – it would be useful if all parts of policies are numbered or lettered so DM officers can refer to them.
- Figure 5 – please show the Broads.
- Policy 15 and supporting text – figure 5 shows buffers. Buffers are talked about in 11.8 bullet one. But the policy talks about green corridors and does not talk about buffers. Indeed, 11.8 intro does not talk about buffers. What is the point in the identified buffers and what do we LPAs do with them?
- 12.2 – rather than saying ‘the view chosen’, would ‘the views submitted’ be more correct?
- Policy 18 – is there a threshold for the second part – major development perhaps? Or are individual dwellings of 2s or 3s meant to do this?

SEA and HRA Screening

Does not refer to the Broads. But having spoken to GYBC, this has been amended and updated.