

Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses

Report by Planning Policy Officer and Senior Ecologist

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: 17 March 2017

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Schedule of Planning Policy Consultations received

Planning Policy Consultations Received

ORGANISATION:	Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
DOCUMENT:	Draft Great Yarmouth Borough Natura 2000 Sites Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy
LINK	A stakeholder consultation. Available to members on request.
DUE DATE:	31 March 2017
STATUS:	Draft
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed response
NOTES:	<p>This Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy sets out a plan to implement a programme of monitoring and mitigation measures to address potential adverse effects on European protected wildlife sites (Natura 2000 sites) caused from increased visitor pressures resulting from new planned residential and tourist development.</p> <p>The Strategy recommends a planning contribution of £60 per net new dwelling (including tourist and Sui Generis accommodation uses) located in the main urban area of Great Yarmouth and northern parishes of the Borough. The contribution will provide for the necessary monitoring mitigation measures as required by the Habitat Regulations Assessment for the Core Strategy.</p>
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2 – suggest show the area to which this contribution applies on a map to make it clear, showing the Broads Authority area. • Table 1, first para under ‘other mitigation measures’ – is this relevant to major tourism proposals anywhere in the Borough? This is not clear. Is there a threshold or type? Also under the same title, what is ‘early warning monitoring’? • 3.6 ‘net loss of accommodation’ – is this bedrooms, habitable rooms or dwellings as a whole? • 4.1 – should the Broads Authority be invited to be part of this Advisory Group? • 5.5 – what are the particular existing pressures? <p>Section 5.9 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding equipment cost every three years of £21,870. Is it the case that once you have bought the equipment, you are in possession of it so it can be used rather than buying it each time? • Also, this centres on the Little Tern but the tables later or refer to the Breydon SPA. • Are there any other costs to monitor and mitigate or is this all that the monitoring and mitigation is expected to cost? What about the specific schemes/projects/items in the tables later on in the document – are these included in this overall cost or are they extra? <p>Section 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the £239,642 supposed to pay for everything in this table? • Do the items/projects etc in these tables be costed up individually and then added to the £239,642? <p>Page 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are aware that some paths in the area have been raised recently to enable improved access surface, resulting in users to see over the reeds. As such, suggest

	<p>that the mitigation needs to be integrated into Norfolk County Council's plans now to ensure no regret improvements to existing paths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re the new interpretation board at Breydon Water – who will lead on that? • Regarding the re-routing of the path, that will require public consultation. <p>Page 16</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps dog bins need to be provided at dog-friendly sites? The initiative is generally supported, but as per previous comments, the elements are not costed up. • Suggest that these improvements are already needed. • The interpretation board should also be paid for by developer contributions. • Note that the Broads Authority is down as a funder – can this be clarified as to what is expected? <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the monitoring that of impact of number of people? What are the trigger levels for disturbance? These should be measured in path use – i.e. something that is routinely monitored within the funded monitoring plan. • What if monitoring leads to more significant impacts not budgeted for, for example the re-routing of the path from the top of the flood embankment at Breydon? (we note the 10% contingency - will that be enough?). • Some of the success of these mitigation schemes is dependent on the understanding and engagement of the community and users and we suggest that information signs will alone not be sufficient effective mitigation. • When will the plan be reviewed?
ORGANISATION:	Highways England
DOCUMENT:	A47 Great Yarmouth junction improvements
LINK	https://highwaysengland.citizenspace.com/he/a47-and-a12-junction-enhancement/
DUE DATE:	21 April 2017
STATUS:	Draft
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed response
NOTES:	Highways England is consulting on proposals to improve junctions on the A47 through Great Yarmouth. Vauxhall Roundabout including the Station Approach Junction and Gapton Roundabout are located towards the northern end of Great Yarmouth and has been identified as priority junctions in need of fundamental improvement.
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	<p>Officers at the Broads Authority with various specialism were asked to comment on the proposals.</p> <p><u>Historic Environment Manager comments:</u> The new bridging of the railway to the South of the Vauxhall roundabout will have a visual impact potentially on the Halvergate conservation area - a designated heritage asset, but given that the bridging exists and it is a widening that is proposed this is probably negligible in terms of impact even to the eastern end of the area and certainly would not adversely impact on the significance of the whole of the asset. The visual impact on heritage assets in the broads would otherwise be limited and not adverse given the existing situation.</p> <p>As regards the area around the station we have already commented on improvements</p>

	<p>being proposed to the concourse as part of the overall improvements proposed by the Borough to the approach to the town. Other than to state that any improvements in this area should acknowledge that this terminus is also a primary access point to the broads from the town, we have no further comment.</p> <p>The Gapton improvement scheme is considered to have no adverse visual or physical impact on known HE features of the broads.</p> <p>Both improvements have the potential to impact on unknown archaeology and the broads area has been identified by Historic England as an area of exceptional potential for waterlogged archaeology. The broads authority would therefore expect appropriate Archaeological assessment of the areas to be disturbed and for the appropriate watching brief and mitigation measures to be in place before any work takes place. The County Archaeological service should provide detailed advice.</p> <p>Finally as an observation where has the HE data shown on the maps on pages 10-13 come from – the document refers to Historic England Data is this correct? Or is this sourced from the County historic environment record which seems to be the case.</p> <p><u>Landscape Architect comments</u></p> <p>The proposals appear to be outside of the Broad's Authority area, but are close to the Breydon Water LCA area, which has a number of landscape and habitat/ecology sensitivities. It would be useful if the proposals were shown more clearly in relation to landscape data and designations on plan to fully demonstrate the environmental constraints/considerations.</p> <p>The proposals for Gapton Roundabout are adjacent to the Broad's Authority area but do not appear to include any change to the layout or associated land take within the Settlement Fringe area, and therefore the Broad's Authority has no comments to make regarding this.</p> <p>The proposals present an option for Vauxhall Roundabout which includes an increased size/capacity roundabout and associated road widening on junction arms. As the road is raised in this location on approaching the bridge, retaining structures would be associated with this work. The area of the land between the Broad's Authority area and the A47 to the east may have some landscape value and whilst outside of the Broad's Authority area also provides some buffering function between settlement and urbanisation at the fringe of Great Yarmouth and the Breydon Water Landscape Character Area. Any extension of the carriageway and associated enabling works could have a negative visual impact on the Breydon Water area and increase the sense of encroachment associated with the urban fringe which is already identified as being intrusive.</p> <p>The Authority would want to understand if the required geometry and capacity of the network around the Vauxhall Roundabout junction could be achieved by restricting land take to the east of the A47 which already has a built character (therefore limiting impact visible from Breydon Water and maximising the distance between works and sensitive habitats). If this is not possible the Authority would expect some justification of the choice to position land take to the Breydon Water side of the A47, and mitigation would need to be fully explored to avoid residual impacts.</p>
--	--

	<p>The proposals presented are not detailed in terms of the actual land take and impacts associated with the suggested options. The Authority would suggest that any further development of a scheme considers the potential impacts in more detail so that a greater level of information can be presented on this and the Authority can make a more informed comment. Due to the sensitivity of the adjacent Broads Authority area, it would be useful if assessment includes the landscape and visual impacts that are likely within the area.</p> <p>Chapter 5 of the consultation mentions that the construction will be planned to minimise effects on the environment, but does not suggest how this will be achieved. Again, any further development of the option should explore and explain this more clearly.</p> <p>On page 14 under the local communities and landscape paragraphs, planting is suggested as a method to screen and reduce the visual impact of the proposals. The appropriateness of this should be carefully considered as planting and screening in itself could have a negative visual impact within a landscape that is characterised by openness. There is also mention of noise mitigation barriers and these should be carefully considered for their potential to have a visual impact.</p> <p><u>Senior Waterways, Access and Recreation Officer</u></p> <p>The Authority would like to emphasise that the final schemes should incorporate appropriate designs to improve safety for cyclists and walkers. Additionally one of the main access points to the Wherryman's Way is at Great Yarmouth Station/Asda close to the junctions so any additional enhancements that could be worked into the scheme to make the route more obvious on the ground or with signage would be welcomed.</p> <p>The Authority understands that Norfolk County Council will shortly be launching a Gt Yarmouth Cycle Map along the lines of the Norwich Pedalways scheme so there may be elements of those routes that are in the area of the proposals.</p> <p><u>Senior Ecologist</u></p> <p>The main areas for potential concern are likely to be in relation to the habitat lost as a result of the land take as well as mitigation and monitoring during the construction phase. At this stage, little specific detail is given and the Authority has asked to see any background ecological work. More comments could be provided at the next consultation stage which could provide more detail.</p> <p><u>Detailed comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rather than saying 'National Park' suggest this is replaced with 'Broads Authority Executive Area'. • The Broads is designated for landscape reasons as well – the legend implies only ecological. • With regards to light pollution, the commitment to modern lighting to reduce light trespass and contributions to sky glow is welcomed. <p>The Broads Authority would wish to be consulted on more detailed proposals as they develop.</p>
--	--