Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses

Wroxham Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

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: 14 December 2017

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Schedule of Planning Policy Consultations received

Wroxham Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping

Report

Planning Policy Consultations Received

	Planning Policy Consultations Received
ORGANISATION:	Wroxham Parish Council
DOCUMENT:	Wroxham Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
LINK	Sent to specific stakeholders.
DUE DATE:	5.00pm on Monday 8th January 2018
STATUS:	Scoping Report
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed
NOTES:	The Parish Council has made the decision that a Sustainability Appraisal will help them to address the Basic Conditions for Neighbourhood Planning, namely that the plan contributes to sustainable development and that it complies with European Union obligations relating to the environmental assessment of plans and programmes.
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	 The Scoping Report is well presented and logical in its summaries and conclusions. Page 2, paragraph starting 'The parish of Wroxham'. The Broads is not a National Park for planning purposes – it has the status equivalent to a National Park. Also, throughout the document there is little reference to Hoveton and the close proximity of the settlements and the reliance of one settlement on the other is clear. Is this the section where more can be said about the relationship with Hoveton? Bottom of page 3. There are other documents that should be referred to, similar to the BDC section. These are the Development Management DPD (2011) and the Sites Specifics Local Plan (2014). The latter document has policies relating to Wroxham including a development boundary. Draft vision on page 8 – not all of Wroxham is a conservation area; there are some parts not within the designation. Is the relationship with Hoveton worthy of a mention here? Draft objectives, page 8. Is locally generation traffic an issue to consider as well? Environment objectives page 9. There is no mention of landscape. Also care needs to be taken regarding general statements of promoting access to the river and Broads for recreation – the issue of recreation disturbance of European Protected species is one to consider. Section 2. Is the scoping report of the Greater Norwich most recent Sustainability Appraisal and the Scoping Report, Interim SA, Preferred Options SA and Publication SA of the Broads Local Plan of relevance to this section? These are the most up to date SA documents. Page 11, under district. There is a Flood Risk SPD¹ for the Broads, there is the Broads Plan² which is the key management plan for the Broads Authority Executive Area, there are adopted guides³ as well as much evidence⁴ produced to support the Local Plan. The Broads has a local list which is here:

¹ http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/ data/assets/pdf_file/0006/917844/Broads-Flood-Risk-SPD-Final-March-2017.pdf

² http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/ data/assets/pdf_file/0012/976728/Broads-Plan-2017.pdf

http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/Planning-permission/design-guides

⁴ http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/planning-policies/development/future-local-plan/evidence-base

<u>local-list-of-heritage-assets</u>. There are some waterside bungalows and chalets on the Local List as well. These are not yet on the website, but we can provide information if needed:

- o Southover, Wroxham
- o Closeburn, Wroxham
- o High House, Wroxham
- o Cobwebs and Waterside, Wroxham
- o Greenbanks, Wroxham
- o Ennerdale, Wroxham
- o The Glade, Wroxham
- o Mallards, Wroxham
- o Staithecote, Wroxham
- o Sheerwater, Wroxham
- o Campbell Cottage, Wroxham
- o The Sheriff House, Wroxham
- o Bureside, Wroxham
- The River House, Wroxham
- Page 16 we are not sure what serial views are. Is this a typographical error? If not, please can you explain? SPA designation is missing. It should read Keys Hill house not Keys Jill house.
- Page 18 It is unclear why the Grey Partridge and the Turtle Dove have been selected as the Section 41 (previously known as BAP species) have been selected. An explanation might be useful. These are both farmland species, perhaps a river species such as otter or bats could also be relevant. Reference to the Biodiversity Audit and sensitivity mapping⁵ would be appropriate.
- Page 19 the Broads Authority Landscape Character Assessment⁶ is implied but not quoted specifically. There is no mention of the Landscape Sensitivity Study either⁷.
- Page 20, Water and Flooding and map on page 56. There is now a 2017 SFRA⁸ and there is more detail relating to flood zone 3 in the Wroxham area.
- Page 22. Whilst not disputing what is said, the wording under the Fire and Rescue is different to the thrust of the wording used elsewhere. It is more of a statement rather than an explanation of that particular topic.
- Page 22 when referring to Hoveton as a neighbourhood village should this be neighbouring village?
- Page 23 you can find more up to date economic activity data relating to the
 Parish or Wroxham here: https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/. Page 23 services this list
 is not complete there is the service station and shop, barbers, riverside glass and
 art, the Launderette, the canoe man, the bridge restaurant it either needs to be
 complete or state it is not exhaustive.
- Local water quality is mentioned in P27, however pollution prevention from boat business need to be mentioned. The concentrations of copper in the river sediments are high in Wroxham.
- Page 27 refers to Wroxham area of conservation this should read Wroxham

NB/SAB/rptpc050118/Page 3 of 4/181217

_

⁵ http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/ data/assets/pdf file/0020/412922/Broads-Biodiversity audit report.pdf

 $[\]frac{6}{http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/news-and-publications/publications-and-reports/planning-publications-and-reports-and-r$

⁷ http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/news-and-publications/publications-and-reports/planning-publications-and-reports/pl

⁸ Some maps area here, but other maps might show other parts of Wroxham. Please contact BDC for access to these other maps (if needed). http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/planning-policies/sfra/sfra

conservation area.

- Section 4 the list of key issues is very long. These seem to be copied from other SAs. Are they all applicable to Wroxham? And as mentioned previously, the BA and BDC have more recent SA scoping reports and SAs.
- Section 5 again, there are more recent scoping reports and SAs.
- Page 49 what is the year and source?

General comments

- Something else to consider is the treats posed by invasive non-native species, such as Himalayan Balsam which is a significant threat to the ecology of this area.
- Despite the water quality resulting in failure of nature conservation, there is little
 mention of things that residents can do or ways that plan can connect people to
 the river environment, such as using less water which is abstracted from the river.
- There is no mention of retaining low light and down lighting within the river corridor to create a dark river corridor for wildlife and it is important that this is added to the relevant section.
- The link between health and access to the environment and the quality of the environment could be much more explicit.
- In one part of the report it states there are no staithes on the tithe map but later it says 'Castle Staithe alongside Caen Meadow on the River Bure has moorings, which are owned by the Parish Council'. This may need clarifying.

Comments from Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership

On reading the SA, we contacted the NGP as we were aware of some areas of interest in Wroxham. Contact is Tim Holt Wilson: timholtwilson@myphone.coop.

Hills & Holes Wood at Wroxham is not one of the NGP's audited sites. However that locality is definitely of geological interest. Woodward (1881 memoir) goes into it in some detail including an exposure diagram. He describes 'a pit near Wroxham Park situated to the east of the Hall' showing about 12 ft of Crag over Chalk. Norwich Crag marine sands and clays are apparently conformably overlain by Wroxham Crag sands and gravels (both units marine and fossiliferous). If this exposure is still extant it would be special from a research point of view. Although the Wroxham Crag sediment is similar in type to the Norwich Crag is has a distinctive lithology indicating the fluvial input of pebbles from the Midlands into the Crag basin, and the fossils indicate a definite shift to colder conditions. Any exposure of the contact between the two units is of scientific value for our understanding of the timer period about 1.75 million years ago. The Norwich Crag rests on chalk bedrock and this is another interesting feature for what it tells us about conditions on the Norwich Crag seabed, where the chalk was scoured and eroded by the sea. Interesting vertebrate fossils (terrestrial as well as marine) may sometimes be found in gravels in the basement bed. I have attached a copy of Woodward's diagram. Anything to flag up the potential significance of geological exposures at Hills & Holes and other sites around the farm buildings would be a help to geoconservation.