

Planning Committee

11 September 2020

Agenda item number 13

Filby Neighbourhood 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.

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 24 August 2020

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Organisation: Filby Parish Council

Document: Filby Neighbourhood Plan <http://www.filbyparishcouncil.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/4594998144>

Due date: 20 September 2020

Status: Draft Plan – pre-submission

Proposed level: Planning Committee endorsed

Notes

Filby Parish Council are now consulting on their Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. This consultation is in line with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012) and will run for a period of just over eight weeks from 27 July to 20 September.

The consultation offers a final opportunity for you to influence Filby's Neighbourhood Plan before it is submitted to Great Yarmouth Borough Council.

All comments received by 20 September will be considered by the Parish Council and may be used to amend this draft. A Consultation Statement, including a summary of all comments received and how these were considered, will be made available alongside the amended Neighbourhood Plan at a future date.

The full draft Neighbourhood Plan contains policies on the following topics:

- Housing and Design
- The Natural Environment
- The Built Environment
- Access and Transport

Proposed response

The authors have given good consideration and a comprehensive assessment of the environment, with ecological corridor opportunities mapped out which is exemplary.

The reference to the need to provide safe horse riding routes for the riding businesses in the Broads, benefiting hundreds of riders is useful.

Para 9 – Local Plan for the Broads does not allocate land for development in Filby, but does have a policy on the Trinity Broads. It is appropriate to mention that.

Para 14 – and the Local Plan for the Broads does not allocate land for housing.

Para 26 - and the Local Plan for the Broads does not allocate land for housing.

H1 – why five dwelling threshold? Seems housing in the area will be in 1s and 2s going by permissions in the past, so will many schemes trigger this threshold? Also, the M4(2) standard is only a ‘should’ so it is not a set requirement so it might be difficult for the Local Planning Authorities to require. I see what you said in response to previous comment on this saying that elsewhere an Examiner said to be flexible, but you need to decide if it is something you really want and need as opposed to something that is not an absolute requirement. The policy also says ‘For the whole of this policy, separate proposals on contiguous sites that are in the same ownership and/or control, or have a planning history indicating that they have been considered together, will be considered as single proposal.’ I do not understand this part of the policy. What does it actually mean in practice?

Para 34 – and the Broads Authority has a policy on M4(2) as well, as mentioned before. You might want to mention that.

Paragraph 35 – when the report says ‘timber panels’ do you mean timber cladding? And ‘sloping dormers’ perhaps pitched-roof dormers? And a minor thing – perhaps they should have the list of materials and then put ‘use of hedges for boundary treatments’, as otherwise it sounds a bit like hedges are another building material.

H2 – again, how many electric charging spaces per dwelling? You say in your response to our comments, 1 per dwelling, and it says that in para 38. But the policy does not say that. Strongly recommend that the information in para 38 is included in the policy.

E1 starts using the word should. See previous about using firmer wording.

Para 48 - There may be some TPOd trees in the BA area so please can this be amended to say that the BA can also be contacted for a TPO check.

Community Policy 1 - Protection of Trees – again it states ‘the protection of trees through the Borough Council but should read ‘or the Broads Authority’.

Figure 7 – some views do not have images – is that intentional?

Policy BE1- Heritage Assets – the first line should perhaps be changed to state ‘Development should preserve’ rather than ‘conserve’ so that the wording is in accordance with other national policies. Also, rather than stating in policy b) ‘to make up for the loss of a heritage asset’, they could perhaps change it to ‘mitigate the harm caused by the loss of a heritage asset’? In terms of the related text to BE1 and its context, the NPPF would require a Heritage Statement to be submitted for an application for works to any heritage asset including a locally designated one, and again in both the Local Plan DM11 and the NPPF the presumption is in favour of the retention and protection of heritage assets (including locally listed ones) and ‘putting them to uses consistent with their conservation’.

As and when this is adopted/made then please can you make sure you send over the GIS layers that are important for example Local Green space and non-designated heritage assets?

Para 73 – as this is a planning document, best not to say ‘Broads National Park’. Just say ‘the Broads’.

Para 74 – peak hour bus services? Provide some detail about the bus services to higher order settlements I suggest.