

# Planning Committee

11 October 2019

Agenda item number 10

## Consultation documents and proposed response

Report by Planning Policy Officer

---

### Summary

This report outlines the proposed officer response to recently received planning policy consultations, and invites comments or guidance from members.

### Recommendation

To note the report and endorse the proposed response.

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1. Appendix 1 highlights two 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 and guidance are invited.

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 27 September 2019

[Broads Plan](#) objectives

Appendix 1 – Planning policy consultations received

# Appendix 1

## Planning policy consultations received

**Organisation:** Great Yarmouth Borough Council

**Document:** Consultation on the Great Yarmouth Draft Local Plan Part 2 - Further Focused Changes <https://great-yarmouth-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/lpp2/2019>

**Due date:** 6 October 2019 – extension agreed

**Status:** Draft Local Plan focused changes

**Proposed level:** Planning Committee endorsed

### Notes

The current consultation follows an initial consultation that took place between August and September 2018 on the Council's Draft Local Plan Part 2 (Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Revised Housing Target). Following representations received during the 2018 consultation, it has been considered necessary to obtain views on several 'significant' changes to the emerging Draft Local Plan Part 2 before the Council prepares its Proposed Plan, i.e. the one it proposes to adopt.

These 'further focused changes' include a number of additional site allocations, new detailed policies, and some specific significant amendments to previously consulted policies. **Views are being sought on these 'further focused changes' only.** Views are not being sought on the draft policies or allocations included in the 2018 Draft Local Plan Part 2 consultation, other than where they have been identified as significant amendments subject to the 'further focused changes' consultation.

All comments received through this consultation (and alongside those submitted during the 2018 consultation) will inform refinements and amendments to the Local Plan Part 2, before it is finalised by the Council for submission to examination. Once it is completed and adopted, the Local Plan Part 2 will provide the detailed policies to help achieve the general type and distribution of development for the plan period up to 2030 already decided by the Core Strategy (Local Plan Part 1), which the Council adopted in 2015.

### Proposed response

ADP4 (page 56) – criterion 1 – need to weave in impact on setting of heritage assets and also setting of the Broads

Note and support that some sites near or adjacent to the Broads are not allocated – pages 90, 94, 100

**Organisation:** Norfolk County Council

**Document:** Great Yarmouth Transport Strategy

<https://norfolk.citizenspace.com/consultation/great-yarmouth-transport-strategy/>

**Due date:** 11 October 2019

**Status:** Draft

**Proposed level:** Planning Committee endorsed

### **Notes**

Transport improvements are fundamental to achieving sustainable housing and economic growth in Great Yarmouth, tackling inequality, improving health and supporting regeneration. Improving walking, cycling and public transport will enable existing and future, residents, visitors and employees to choose cleaner and healthier ways to travel. Great Yarmouth therefore needs a strategy to enhance existing transport networks that will support existing and new communities.

The Great Yarmouth Transport Strategy sets out the transport vision for Great Yarmouth, highlighting the challenges and opportunities along with the transport infrastructure that needs to be delivered within the short, medium and long-term to enable growth to come forward sustainably as well as supporting existing local communities.

### **Proposed response**

Page 2, right hand column, second box and para 2.2.1 – isn't single occupancy car use the issue? Car sharing is good?

Page 3, left hand column, bullet points – what have the last five bullets got to do with transport?

3.1.2 – say 'Broads' or 'Norfolk and Suffolk Broads'

3.1.14 – why is uptake low?

Page 12 – second column box – tourism is not mentioned – section 3.2.4 quotes it as important to the economy.

Page 13 – the previous section had major employment destinations. What are the destinations that the community go to? Also, what are the major tourist destinations?

3.3.1 – What do you mean: **are** highly attractive or **should be** highly attractive – as in lots of people already walk and cycle or could? Does 3.4.2 data show a very good trend?

3.3.7 – how will the third river crossing affect this?

3.3.11 – I don't think 'amenity' is a great word... what does it actually mean in this instance?

3.3.13 - how will the third river crossing affect this?

Page 28 – what severity of accidents are included and how many make a ‘cluster’? Map could be seen as misleading without some context.

3.3.22 – presentation issue – why is the fourth fatal accident not a square bullet?

3.3.31 – 8 years old – does this need updating?

Page 31 – pie chart is blurry

Page 33 – could say that the Local Plan for the Broads Authority is the other Local Plan relevant to the area, although it has much smaller housing requirement. You could also refer to our adopted policy on Acle Straight SSA47.

Page 39 and 46 and 54 and 65 – the order of the projects is car first. I would have expected that to be last as ideally more people should use active travel as suggested in 3.3.1.

Pag 42 – SC15 – what about retrofitting travel plans to businesses and communities already in place? Think MA2, page 81 might address this?

Some of the actions are further studies and some are actual on-site projects – suggest this is made obvious.

Section 4 has some projects. Section 6 has more projects. What is the difference and why in two different chapters?

Page 58, SS1 – is cost an issue with the trains, as discussed earlier in the document?

Page 62, SA3 – Do you need to do a walking and cycling network first using origins and destinations to determine key routes and then identify changes?

Page 63, SA5 – do all the induction loops pick up cyclists at junctions? If they don’t it leads to cyclists being ignored and leading to jumping red lights

Section 6.5.1 onwards – Not evidenced that increasing capacity of junctions will promote modal shift

Page 74, MS1 – dis-benefit would be impact on protected landscape (Broads) and conservation area and area of good dark skies etc. The Broads Authority need to be identified as a stakeholder.

7.2.1, 7.5.2 – also include the Broads Authority

Work needed to look at measures to address potential conflict between different users – cars, cyclists and pedestrians. Patterns of behaviour can exacerbate this, so there would be scope for education on behaviours or community projects (‘softer’ projects) within the strategy.

Community projects could also address speeding.

No mention of police enforcement of traffic laws.

Changing the way tourists travel to Great Yarmouth would have real impact on greenhouse gas reduction and congestion.