

Planning Committee

13 August 2021

Agenda item number 13

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 July 2021

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Thorpe St Andrew Town Council

Document: Regulation 14 Thorpe St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan

<https://www.thorpestandrew-tc.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan-consultation/>

Due date: 10 August 2021, but we have an extension to 13 August 2021

Status: Regulation 14 stage

Proposed level: Planning Committee Endorsed

Notes

Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. It helps determine where new homes, shops and offices can be built, what those new buildings will look like, and what infrastructure should be provided to meet their community's needs, in alignment with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area.

The Thorpe St Andrew Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group has been developing the Neighbourhood Plan since 2017 and following previous public consultations, now have a final draft which we are again asking our residents' opinions of.

Proposed response

Summary of response

The Plan is welcomed. We offer some comments for consideration. There is one policy (policy 5 relating to residential moorings) that proposes criteria that are slightly different to our policy and it is suggested that such departures will need thorough justification as the next version of the Plan is produced.

Detailed comments

Para 1.3 'the local plan' – which local plan? The previous para identifies a number that are relevant to TSA.

Para 1.7 – what does 'The footprint to amenity ratio' mean? You may want to make it clearer at this early point in the Plan. Indeed, it does not seem to be referred to later in the Plan.

Para 1,7 says 'Provide greater local detail to the design guide issued by Broadland District Council' – what about the design guidance offered by the Broads Authority?

Para 1.8 says 'will be used and acted upon by BDC planning officers'. BA Officers will use the policies as well.

Para 2.5 – as this is Reg 14 consultation, I think there will be a Reg 16 consultation prior to submitting to the Examiner – so another round of consultation.

Para 2,6 'The NDP will only' – space missing

Housing objective a 'Thorpe St Andrew' – space missing

Table 1 could include the policy title?

Map on page 11. You may want to make the black less prominent – maybe increase transparency. May need to make the numbers more prominent and obvious.

Policy 2 uses the word ‘encouraged’. I have seen this in a few NPs. How do you see this actually playing out in terms of discussions with an applicant? What do you want the DM officer to do in this regard? I am presuming that you don’t want all development to do these things, but for some it may be appropriate and relevant. Just trying to think how the ‘encouragement’ would work. Of course, by just saying that something is ‘encouraged’ it may not be done by the applicant.

Policy 2 – did you want to identify these areas on a map, like you do the open/green spaces of the previous policy.

Policy 3 1 – I am not sure how rear on plot parking will orientate development onto pedestrian routes. I think you are saying that there will not be driveways interrupting footways, so no potential for any conflict with vehicles emerging from the driveways and pedestrians walking. If that is the case, I am not sure how it is written necessarily gets that message across.

Policy 3 2 – it seems you are introducing a mode of transport hierarchy with walking and cycling at the top. How does this relate to the design advice given by Norfolk County Council as Highways Authority?

Policy 3 3 – any need for cycle parking standards? Any need to have a meanwhile policy on electric vehicle charging points, until a Government standard comes in?

Policy 4 b states ‘front gardens of similar size to existing houses’ – perhaps re-word to ‘front gardens of a similar size to existing gardens’?

Para 9.6 – query the relevance of PPG13 – would it be better to reference the relevant part of the NPPG? Also, is that 1999 structure plan policy saved or not in place anymore?

Policy 5 / 1) should we ask new moorings should not have a detrimental effect on the natural *and built* environment?

Policy 5 bullet 4 – our policy does not require road access specifically. So, sounds like a bit of a departure. This may be ok, but you need to thoroughly justify it in my view. The other thing is, are you therefore saying that a road next to a river – you would only allow residential moorings on the road side and not on the other side? That might need thinking about

11.1 – our policy refers to being adjacent to settlement limits/development boundaries. So, sounds like a bit of a departure.

11.2 – query the relevance of this to the policy

11.4 – from what were residential areas identified as needing protection?

11.4 – a bit over the place. Query what the relevance of the Gypsy and Traveller wording is to this policy and this section?

11.5 – why refer to ‘Local Plan for the Broads (Draft) 2015 to 2036’? The Local Plan was adopted in 2019.

Could the maps on 19, 20 and 21 have street names? Could the individual areas be numbered and identified to aid use by DM Officers?

Policy 6 and the maps – are any of these areas subject to BDC/GNLP/BA local plan policies? If so, you may wish to refer to that. For example, generally, the retail policies may be of relevance if the land use is retail.

Policy 7 – we had something similar in our submission Local Plan, but the Inspector said it was too permissive and required changes. Please check our policy DM44. Also, is it bullet point 1 **and** 2 or 3 need to be met? If so, maybe add the ‘and’ to make it clearer.

Policy 7 – do you want to define what you mean by ‘community uses’ to make it clear for applicants and DM officers?

I am not sure of the relevance of 13.3 and 13.4 to this policy/text.

Policy 8 – do you mean within the curtilage of a scheduled monument, with the curtilage of a non-designated **heritage** asset? Because as written, it is not clear. Also, what about development proposals to listed buildings, scheduled monuments and to non-designated heritage assets? Should it go further and say within the setting (rather than curtilage) of the CA, LBs, SMs, NDAs?

Not sure what you mean by ‘including elements of design to enhance enjoyment of the historic environment’? Do you mean, seating, interpretation, sculpture?

Map on page 26 – please show the Broads.

Pag 29, 30 and 31 – suggest add street names to aid context.

Other areas to consider in the Neighbourhood Plan

- Electric Charging points – Both for boating and cars could be included. If the plan were to result in residential moorings then an electric hook up would be essential. I believe they could do something similar with the homes they want built. Could they not include outdoor charging provision for cars?
- Cycle parking – I didn’t see any mention of cycle parking or cycleways being created.
- Access to water – Enhance existing slipways or create new infrastructure to allow SUPS, Canoes, Kayaks to launch and get out of the water.

Appendix A –Character Statement

- Maybe this should be re-worked to be more about new developments responding appropriately to their local context? There isn’t actually a Design Policy, so perhaps a

Design policy is required that make reference to different character areas and requires new development to respond to their context appropriately? If it still felt necessary to have a Character Statement, perhaps it should outline the different character areas – probably in more detail than this one does, with smaller character areas where appropriate and rather than stating ‘any new development should have’ and a list of features, it should just describe the character of each area.

- Thorpe St Andrew South - the list of key features to be included in new development appears to be based on historic properties on Thorpe Road near River Green. I think the appendix (not policy so how much weight will this have?) needs to allow new development to respond to its more immediate context, as there are actually some distinct character areas within this large area. For example, this area also includes large areas of 1930s bungalows and housing (e.g. the east side of Harvey Lane, Gordon Avenue, the south side of St Williams Way etc). A new building with elaborate chimneys and timber framing would look very out of place in this area!
- Thorpe St Andrew East – not sure you could say St Andrew’s Park was built in 2002. Perhaps St Andrew’s Park was established in 2002 on the site of the historic St Andrew’s Hospital, many of the buildings are listed and were converted to housing. It seems a bit odd that the East area doesn’t have any defining characteristics.

Appendix B

- Should this be titled ‘Heritage Assets’ and include scheduled monuments and a map showing the conservation area boundary?

Great Yarmouth Borough Council

Document: Local Plan Modifications Consultation <https://www.great-yarmouth.gov.uk/LPP2-modifications-consultation>

Due date: 3 September 2021

Status: Modifications Consultation

Proposed level: Planning Committee Endorsed

Notes

The Local Plan Part 2 is currently being examined by an independent Planning Inspector, Gareth Wildgoose BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI. Following the close of the public hearings the Inspector has written to the Council advising that 'Main Modifications' will be required to the plan in order for it to be found sound. Comments are now being invited on these modifications alongside other potential minor changes to the plan and the policies map. The potential modifications are put forward without prejudice to the Inspector's final conclusions on the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2. Comments will be passed to the Inspector via the Programme Officer following the conclusion of the consultation period.

Proposed response

Summary of response

Some of the comments we made at the Regulation 19 consultation stage have been taken on board, mainly through the production of a [Statement of Common Ground](#) that we produced with GYBC during the examination, but some comments have not been and we raise these again.

Detailed comments

Soundness concerns

The following were raised at the Regulation 19 stage. They were highlighted as areas that we did not agree on in our Statement of Common Ground. Following the hearings, they do not seem to have been discussed and therefore have not been included in the modifications consultation.

We request the following changes for the following reasons.

GY9 - Great Yarmouth North Denes Airfield

- This policy must reference that the site is immediately next to the Broads. As the site is on the boundary of the BA area, development has potential to affect the setting of the Broads. Whilst we recognise that the policy is a *safeguarding policy*, there is wording within the policy that relates to development and change. So, whilst the policy does not promote change, **it allows for change**. It will be the go to policy to assess any proposals for change in this area. It allows certain things to be developed in this area as set out in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th sentences of the policy. Therefore, the necessary considerations that schemes must address must be highlighted in the criteria. Furthermore, to have supporting text is one thing, but supporting text does not have

the same weight as policy wording and if there is supporting text that highlights an issue, it is logical to have reference to that issue in the policy.

- Relevant soundness test: **effective** as the Broads is a key cross boundary strategic matter and consistent with national policy, namely the NPPF at paragraph 176 in particular where national policy now refers to setting.
- We request this change to make the policy sound: 'Any new built development proposals will need to be accompanied with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. Any new built development will need to ensure there are no negative impacts on the setting of the Broads and any application for such development needs to be accompanied by a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment'.
- We support the thrust of MM20 which includes some supporting text, as agreed in the Statement of Common Ground, as well as reference to a landscape visual impact assessment. However, the wording as proposed in this representation will make the policy sound.

L1: Holiday accommodation areas

- The policy doesn't fully acknowledge the impacts of additional visitors on the Broads, and sensitive sites, which could result from development of accommodation. Some of the sites are on the edge of the BA area. To be sound, the policy needs to refer to the need for development of these sites to be sensitive to the Broads. Whilst we recognise that the policy is a *safeguarding policy*, there is wording within the policy that relates to development and change. So, whilst the policy does not promote change, **it allows for change**. It will be the go to policy to assess any proposals for change in these areas. It allows certain things to be developed there as set out in bullet points e to m. Therefore, the necessary considerations that schemes must address must be highlighted in the criteria. Furthermore, to have supporting text is one thing, but supporting text does not have the same weight as policy wording and if there is supporting text that highlights an issue, it is logical to have reference to that issue in the policy.
- Relevant soundness test: **effective** as the Broads is a key cross boundary strategic matter and consistent with national policy, namely the NPPF at paragraph 176 in particular where national policy now refers to setting.
- We request this change to make the policy sound: 'In order to achieve those aims, the following tourist uses will be generally encouraged within the Holiday Accommodation Areas, subject to consideration of compatibility with the existing surrounding uses and the potential impacts on the landscape and character of the immediate local area and the setting of the Broads'.
- We support the thrust of MM56, which includes some supporting text, as agreed in the Statement of Common Ground. However, the wording as proposed in this representation will make the policy sound.

Policy I2: Telecommunications

- This policy fails to mention landscape impact, in particular on the Broads and its setting. This could easily be added to criterion a. I note that it says 'character and appearance of the area where it would be sited' but that is not strong enough in our opinion. GYBC have said that there is already a policy that can be used in relation to landscape impacts and impacts on the Broads, but that reasoning could equally be applied to where the policy refers to amenity, highway safety and historic landscapes (criterion a). Those important considerations also have their own related policies, yet are deemed important enough to also feature in the proposed policy I2 as well. We still believe the changes we propose are needed.
- Relevant soundness test: **consistent with national policy**, namely the NPPF at paragraph 176 in particular where national policy now refers to setting.
- We recommend this change: a. The installation and any associated apparatus is sited and designed to minimise any unacceptable impact on visual and residential amenity, highway safety, the historic environment, [protected landscapes](#) and the character and appearance of the area and where it would be sites. [Schemes must not negatively impact the Broads or its setting.](#)

Non-soundness issues – observations, queries and comments

- I see that this Local Plan amends policies in the Core Strategy. Not a soundness issue, but one of usability. We have all experienced how one Government Act alters another and we have all had to follow through the legislation to try to figure this out. Is there merit in maybe changing the Core Strategy that is on line to include the changes with appropriate explanation? Or maybe even copying the entire policy over to this version of the Local Plan and crossing out the Core Strategy? Just thinking from a usability point of view – something to prevent the need for a paper trail.
- Policy UCS4: Amendments to CS4 - Delivering affordable housing, table 7. What about the part of the Borough that is in the AONB? The NPPG says 'In designated rural areas local planning authorities may instead choose to set their own lower threshold in plans and seek affordable housing contributions from developments above that threshold. Designated rural areas applies to rural areas described under [section 157\(1\) of the Housing Act 1985](#), which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty'.
- Para after 3.193 – you write Natura 2000 sites, but that term seems to have been replaced elsewhere with 'National Site Network designated habitat sites'