



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes

**Report of Responses to Public Consultation
5 January - 16 February 2010**

Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes Representations Report

The Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan Schedule of Key Changes was published for 6 weeks public consultation from 5 January to 16 February 2010.

A total of 68 representations were received during that period and this document is a complete record of the representations received and duly made.

The tables in this document show each complete representation, showing the representation number and the name of the person or organisation making the comment. It shows the nature of their representation (support, comment or object) and, if given, a statement of why they feel the document is or is not legally compliant, sound, and the amendment sought to the document.

The column stating the comment type; 'support, object or comment' was not requested as part of the consultation, but is an officer's interpretation of the representation. An indication of soundness and legal compliance was requested from consultees.

Where text states "SEE ATTACHED FILE" please refer to the LDF Consultation Portal at: <http://consult.north-norfolk.gov.uk/portal/planning/ssp/sspkc>

To access the relevant files visit the web address above and opt to 'read document and view comments'. Select the appropriate section from the left-hand menu and browse to locate the comment which you require.

The Council will prepare a summary of the main issues raised through the representations. This report will be sent to the Secretary of State, along with a copy of all representations made, when the document is submitted for Examination. For further information on the Local Development Framework please visit our website at www.northnorfolk.org/ldf

North Norfolk District Council Planning Policy Team

Telephone: 01263 516318

E-Mail: planningpolicy@north-norfolk.gov.uk

Write to: Planning Policy Manager,

North Norfolk District Council,

Holt Road, Cromer, NR27 9EN

www.northnorfolk.org/ldf

**All documents can be made available in
Braille, audio, large print or in other languages.
Please contact 01263 516318 to discuss your requirements.**



Document Reference Point	Name, Organisation & Comment ID	Comment Type, Soundness, Legal Compliance	Why Considered Legally/not Legally Compliant or Sound/Unsound	Changes Considered Necessary for Legal Compliance / Soundness
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan				
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes	SSPKC2 Liz Shaw Administration Highways Agency	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	The Highways Agency does not have any comments to make on the proposed changes as we do not consider that the changes will have an impact on the trunk road network.	
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes	SSPKC7 Philip Hirst Team Leader, Lands & Wayleaves British Pipelines Agency	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	BPA request that the rights of statutory consultation on all planning matters are maintained within our pipeline Area of Interest or easement.	
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes	SSPKC13 G R Dann Planning Officer Water Management Alliance	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	Further to your consultation regarding the above, I do not have any comments to note regarding this document on behalf of either the Broads (2006) Internal Drainage Board or Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board, which are the two Water Management Alliance Boards partly within your Council's area.	
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes	SSPKC21 Rachael Bust Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department Coal Authority	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above. Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.	
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes	SSPKC25 Natalie Blaken East of England Development Agency (EEDA)	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Site Specific Proposals Key Changes for North Norfolk District Council (your letter dated 4th January 2010). EEDA receives a number of requests of this kind, as a statutory consultee. In this instance EEDA have no comments to make.	
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes	SSPKC15 Helen De La Rue Assistant Planning Officer East of England Regional Assembly (EERA)	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	Thank you for consulting the Assembly on this matter. The East of England Regional Assembly submitted a response to the previous stage of consultation on the Council's Site Specific Proposals development plan document in July 2009 (Ref: SSPDP1397). The Assembly has no additional comments to make in relation to the current consultation document as areas of the changed sites fall below Regional thresholds for consideration and do not raise any issues of general conformity against policies of the East of England Plan.	
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes	SSPKC20 Dr Ken Hamilton Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	No specific comments were made, however it was highlighted that the areas identified are of unknown archaeological potential, and may require a programme of archaeological work. Therefore developers would be encouraged to contact NLA before submitting a planning application.	The emerging Site Specific Proposals document ought to refer to this issue and cross-refer to adopted Core Strategy Policy EN8 (Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment).
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Changes	SSPKC31 Ms Sue Bull Planning Liaison Manager Anglian Water	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	Having looked through the Schedule of key changes I do not have any comments to make at this time.	

KC01: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD01/07)				
KC01: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD01/07)	SSPKC43 Mr John Brian Grieves	Object, Unsound, Legally Compliant	Whilst the removal of the meadow land in front of Pipit's Meadow is welcomed the Reasons for Change refer to the Council responding to concerns about the: [SEE SSPKC49] a) Size of Allocation. The Parish Council has over the years consistently recommended to the District Council that any new individual development sites in the village be restricted to 5 or 6 dwellings. The public meeting the Parish Council held to discuss the original proposals supported this. In reducing the allocation to 6 to 8 dwellings the District are only partly "responding to concerns about the size" and are ignoring local opinion specifically restated during The Participation of Local Comment. b) Impact on the Conservation Area. In not reducing the permitted number of dwellings to the level recommended by the Parish Council, the impact at the entrance to the village centre of new build proposed adjacent to the 8 adjacent dwellings constructed in recent years is greater than would be supported by the Parish Council and the local community.	In KC01 The Reasons for Change to be amended to accurately reflect the situation OMIT responds to concerns ADD provides a limited response to concerns
Aldborough	SSPKC47 Mr John Brian Grieves	Object, Unsound, Legally Compliant	a) As I have commented in KC01 and KC02 the Parish Council have consistently informed the District of their recommendation that no new individual development site in the village exceed 5 or 6 dwellings. The District Council have in the Draft Plan consistently chosen to ignore this. The Parish Council through the public meeting specifically called to discuss the Draft Plan have from that meeting a local mandate to state the preferred limit of 5 to 6 dwellings. b) The narrow red strip on the map linking sites ALD07 and ALD01 would appear to be the access to ALD01 and from the map insufficient by itself to accommodate one vehicle. It is not clear If the intention is to include the existing private drive Pipit's Meadow to provide proper and adequate access to dwellings constructed on ALD01. I have spoken with two of the eight Pipit's Meadow residents and neither has received any approach about this nor are they in favour of any access to either site (temporary or permanent) being created. They advise that when built they were told that eight dwellings was the maximum that the drive could cope with and that Highways agreed with. The first half of the drive gives access to all 8 garages the second half in front of Nos. 5 to 8 is only one car wide. Without precise clarification and limitation, access could be created for use for subsequent development beyond ALD01. Access onto the main road for ALD07/01 should be stipulated as Pipit's Meadow already serves 8 dwellings and the adjacent Mill Lane 7. Both are privately maintained.	a) Reduce the allocation of dwellings to 5 or 6 maximum. b) Clarify if access will ever be envisaged from Pipit's Meadow onto any part of ALD07/01, and beyond. Open up dialogue with all 8 residents to inform them and of their options. c) Remove ALD07/01 from the Draft Plan. d) Choose alternative site(s) from the Parish Councils preferred list - max. 5 to 6 dwellings per site.
Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD01/07)	SSPKC48 Mr John Brian Grieves	Comment, Unsound, Legally Compliant	The map fails to make clear that adequate access will be created to ALD01 The red strip inside the black Settlement Boundary line appears too narrow to give proper access without the use of the existing private drive Pipit's Meadow. As I am given to understand Highways say the maximum no. of dwellings that can be served is 8 as now exists. Mill Lane on the south side of ALD07 is also a private access and serves 7 dwellings at present. Both access the public road in close proximity.	Clarify on the map and in Key Changes where access from these 2 sites will be permitted onto the public road and submit it for public consultation once more. Remove ALD07/01 from the Draft Plan. Choose other sites from the Parish Council's preferred list already submitted to the District Council

KC02: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD01/07)				
KC02: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD01/07)	SSPKC46 Mr John Brian Grieves	Object, Unsound, Legally Compliant	KC02 Description of Proposed Changes amends "from 10 dwellings to 6-8 dwellings." The Parish Council has over the years consistently recommended to the District Council that any new individual development sites in the village be restricted to 5 or 6 dwellings. The public meeting the Parish Council held to discuss the original proposals supported this. In reducing the allocation to 6 to 8 dwellings the District are again ignoring local opinion specifically restated during the Participation of Local Community. When consulted the Parish Council submitted to the District a list in order of preference of recommended development sites. The District chose just one site, the last on that list. The site has been subsequently amended, always in the same proximity but dwellings proposed by the District have remained higher than the 5 to 6 max. Recommended for any site by the Parish Council.	a) Reduce the allocation of dwellings to 5 or 6 maximum. b) Substitute other site(s) from the Parish Councils' preferred list - each max 5-6 dwellings, or; c) Remove site ALD01/07 from the Draft Plan.
KC02: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD01/07)	SSPKC40 Mrs Mavis Waite	Comment, Unsound, Not Specified	In proposing these sites the District Council are still ignoring the recommendations made by Aldborough and Thurgaton Parish Council that any development site be restricted to five or six properties. This was discussed at a public meeting on the original proposals and comes under the heading of Community Involvement of which the District Council has taken no account.	1) Remove ALD01 and ALD07 from the document or; 2) Stipulate that no more than five or six residential properties be proposed for the two sites in total.
KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)				
KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)	SSPKC1 Mrs Theresa Serne	Support, Sound, Legally Compliant		
KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)	SSPKC24 Mrs Carol Newman	Support, Not Specified, Not Specified	I completely agree that the land BRI02 is more suitable for a housing development on the west side of the school. Thus taking potential traffic away from the already congested road, the Lanes, at school drop-off and pick-up times.	
KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)	SSPKC22 Mrs S Craske Bristol Parish Council	Support, Not Specified, Not Specified	Bristol Parish Council considers the replacement of BRI01 with BRI02 to be an improvement and supports this proposal.	
KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)	SSPKC27 Mr John Rogers	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified		Whilst I have no objections to building on site BR102, the objection I have is vehicular access via Hillside. The road is not wide enough, or strong enough to take 32 to 44 ton construction and delivery vehicles, and very often the vehicles would not get through due to inconsiderate car parking. I must point out to you that Hillside road is breaking up at the moment just with normal traffic, i.e. dustcart, oil delivery's and library van, probably the heaviest would be the oil tanker at around 25 tons It would also not be feasible to ban parking along Hillside because of access required by Ambulance, Paramedics, Doctors, Nurses, careworkers, homehelps as well as other Emergency Services. From No.1 to No.27 there is no off-street parking area, then two small lay-bys for 4 or 5 vehicles and a small car park next to No.30 for 4 cars for residents. One has to bear in mind that residents on this estate, 90% + are pensioners [including myself].

				<p>KC03 part 3.5 =quote = It say's! In any event the layout of development on the site should not prejudice the possible future development of land to the south and east of the site!; If site BR102 gets built on and using Hillside as an access route; the problem that I can see is if that land south and east gets built on. There is room for between 50 and 80 dwellings, and this would put twice the pressure on Hillside estate road and its residents; The Lanes would be a far better route, the road is far greater in width and strength and all the houses have off-road parking, so there is no problem there, apart from the = not in my backyard syndrome!!! The alternative route, using the lanes up to the sharp left hand bend, put in a mini-roundabout and a road through the old coal yard, that would clear-up a neglected area, and that road would go down to the site leaving the rest of the field to be developed at a later date. The parents that take their children to school to drop off on the new estate and that live in Briston village would not have go on the B1353 Fakenham road and the children that live in Melton Constable would turn left at the mini roundabout, and then left onto B1353 Fakenham road with the flow of traffic. It would also be safer for children walking or cycling to school.</p>
<p>KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)</p>	<p>SSPKC54 Mrs Jeanette Nottage</p>	<p>Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified</p>	<p>I am writing to you with reference to the possibility of Hillside being used as an access road to the new houses that are going to be built on the field at the rear of Hillside which is also adjacent to Astley School. I have no objections to the houses being built there. My main concern is where the road is going to access these houses, it has been mentioned that Hillside will be a contender, this will in my, and also many of the people living here, opinion that this is just not feasible for the reasons that I will state. Firstly the road is not suitable for heavy vehicles and just about copes and really would not sustain any more traffic, also because Hillside is predominately occupied by older people the need for access for ambulances and other NHS vehicles any more traffic would make it very difficult for emergency services to gain access to people in need of attention. Another point is this road was built for older people to have a quiet life style and it has been this way for many years so in making your decision would you please bear in mind the need to keep this road as it is, so that the people can still enjoy living here.</p>	
<p>KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)</p>	<p>SSPKC55 K Sturman</p>	<p>Support, Not Specified, Not Specified</p>	<p>We are very concerned over the planning application for the development of arable land at the Lanes corner field, next to Astley School. The footpath that runs along the lanes, round to the Fakenham Road towards Astley School becomes very busy during school start and finishing times with cars parked the full length of this distance. These cars are parked the full outside diameter of the proposed field of the Lanes corner. If the Lanes corner were developed this would create a much greater hazard and would increase the risk of there being an accident, injury or much worst a death. There are a lot of underlying issues at present with traffic being forced to single file. Larger vehicles mounting footpaths, vehicles meeting head on with no where to go causing road rage, vehicles being knocked into, on top of all this school children heading to and from school, a known problem and headache for the parents. There is no way this development should ever go ahead on such a busy corner it would become a huge nightmare and a great worry to parents. Why not use this site as a car park for the school. In doing so the children can leave their cars and walk within a safe zone marked out on the car park away from busy roads.</p>	<p>I would rather the site of the west side of the school be developed, as this would be a safer option. Tying the development into an existing estate being Hillside, that doesn't have much traffic at all. I do hope that common sense prevails and the Lanes corner site will not go ahead and become a developed site.</p>

<p>KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)</p>	<p>SSPKC56 Mr Craig Lemon</p>	<p>Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified</p>	<p>I am a resident living at Hillside Briston, and it has now come to my attention of the proposal of a housing development beside I school, west side, I would like to air a few concerns that I have about this development, I am not against it (yet) but consideration should be given in my opinion to the following points I feel need addressing. I would like to raise the subject of firstly the effect on elsewhere school, with regard to class sizes as obviously this development would have a increase in children being schooled there, as I believe that class sizes are already large, 45 in a class, I am already seeking to school my children elsewhere as I consider these class sizes to big to offer good teaching. Also as a resident of Hillside I feel that any ideas to access this new estate through it would be disastrous, as there are parking issues here already, broken narrow roads and paths, if I were to park my car outside my property and my neighbour the opposite side no other vehicles would get by, this is already well documented via victory housing, it is used to its fullest due to the addition of the I'm close development, this road would no way cope with possibly the addition of 60 more cars minimum using it, plus the effect of traffic on the residents living here already, I do not wish to have cars roaring past my house at all hours of the day and night and I'm sure other residents wouldn't either. I also feel that this possible extra traffic would have a effect on the value/ saleability of my property, I feel that the route should be via un thought road and parking provided in the plans for parents to pick up there children, other wise they will all be parking up hillside to pick up there children which again would congest it with traffic. I like others do not want to see Hillside ruined via rash un thought out decisions for more urban development to keep bureaucrats happy in the south who simply point their finger on a map with no thought for locals.</p>	
<p>KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring</p>				
<p>KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring</p>	<p>SSPKC28, Mr Henry Cleverly</p>	<p>Comment, Unsound, Legally Compliant</p>	<p>This is a small open green space with mature hedgerows and trees and home to a barn owl. It is integral to the landscaping and general ambience of a rural village. Should the site be developed, these features will be lost forever. I am concerned about road safety at this proposed site as there is already regular use of this road by heavy haulage vehicles from the nearby depot and it is the collection point for the parents of children attending Little Snoring school. What is the proposal for access to the site and where is it? 8-10 houses will considerably increase traffic here and road use. These matters need to be addressed. It is proposed that developing this site will be a means of unifying the village and I question the justification of this notion. I cannot see how more housing can provide a social or physical link. More housing does not equal more "community".</p>	<p>I would like there to be provision of open space adjacent to the properties directly adjoining the site to the east in addition to the proposed site adjacent to the school. A better way to unify or 'link' the village socially and physically would be to use the proposed site for allotments as a place for people to congregate.</p>
<p>KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring</p>	<p>SSPKC63 Miss Tina Billman</p>	<p>Object, Unsound, Not Specified</p>	<p>I think it is not a good idea to build next to the school it will cause even more problems the road is used by lorries and when parents are bringing or picking up their children they are parked everywhere along the road. Building there will just make the problem worse so I am not in favour of new homes being built there.</p>	<p>SSPDP1140</p>

KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring	SSPKC62 Mr & Mrs Robert & Pauline Lloyd	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	The site is on a bend in the road, the road is very narrow, at school times the cars are parked all the way along the side of the road, and on the grass junction, accidents waiting to happen. Any houses built along any of this area would have their access blocked, also notice needs to be taken of the extremely large articulated lorries that use this road during the day and night as previously stated to yourselves. We feel that SN07 is by far the superior choice for this new housing, landscaping and safe access to the school. Note: 11/2/10 another accident on the A148 at site SN01. Please consider not using these sites.	SSPDP921
KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring	SSPKC61 Mrs Deborah Mitchell	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	The site is on a busy narrow road which at school times becomes blocked and children run out and around to their parents cars. To put houses on this site would add to the chaos as large container lorries and tractors use this road frequently. The cars already park (approx 15) along the edge of the road and on the grass junction haphazardly. I would like to suggest SN07 as a more suitable site as it is close to the school and with a new road attached would take the burden off this corner. Adjacent to SN01 another motor vehicle accident occurred last week again proving that this site would also be unsuitable.	SSPDP918
KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring	SSPKC58 Mr & Mrs George & Maureen Cushing	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	Document is unsound because SN05 is unsuitable for development as access to the site will create a danger to vehicles turning right into the site. During school starting and leaving times parents park without restriction on the side of the carriageway of Kettlestone Road causing vehicles passing these parked cars to go onto the opposite carriageway which is a danger as there is a blind bend on this section of Kettlestone Road, in addition parents also park on the small island on the centre of the cross road. The school parents dropping off and picking up causes traffic congestion and restricts the traffic flow. The allocation of SN05 does not provide the school with any off road drop off or pick up parking area. I query whether the working party visited this site during a school drop off or pick up time. The school has been extended and taken up play space which could be replaced with the allocation of SN07. With an allocation of SN05 further traffic of up to 22 / 26 vehicles will be generated onto Kettlestone Road at a dangerous point on this road	The plan ought to identify my client's site SN07 Land off Stevens Road, Lt Snoring which is able to offer a safe access off Kettlestone Road, provide drop off and pick up facilities for the school together with additional sports facilities and tree screening spinney. Site SN07 is available for development, does not raise any of the traffic safety issues of site SN05 and would be an infill development. In the Total Sustainability Score Sheet highways gave SN07 the highest score =10 and a comment that no highway expenditure is needed. Site SN07 is suitable and available for development. There are no known reasons why development on this site cannot be achieved within the plan period. The land amounts to 2.2 hectares of which 0.8 hectares is suitable for residential development. This would see homes built on this site similar to those built off Stevens Road and Cushing Drive. A mixed development of starter, single storey, shared equity and detached properties. 0.4 hectares would be developed for a drop off car park for Little Snoring School for around 22-30 cars. It is our opinion that this link to the school without having to use Kettlestone Road and Holt Road, will make the traffic and pedestrian movements much less dangerous than at present, enabling local pupils to walk safely to school. It is also proposed to incorporate an extension to the play and sporting areas for the school allowing for a greater range of activities benefitting both pupils and staff. 1.0 hectares would be planted with trees to create a spinney and screening for the existing housing, the playing field and village hall. It is anticipated to have input from the schoolchildren by planting and naming their own trees within the woodland. The location of this site provides enhancements and benefits to the village, linking the present two separate areas of the village with Manor Close SN02 together with SN07. The incorporation of large areas of woodland and landscaping form an important part of this proposal. The boundaries to the existing properties will be afforded a high level of privacy; schemes should always consider existing residents, offering the lowest possible environmental impact. The addition of woodland and landscape areas provides a positive enhancement. There are no

				similar areas within the village and the introduction of such a green space will improve the overall feel and appearance of the village. The village at present consists of two clusters, by incorporating Manor Close site SN02 and SN07, the village would become complete and all facilities including the existing playing field and village hall would be within an easy walking distance of all and make the village a cohesive entity.
KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring	SSPKC60 Mrs Rachael Williamson	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	The proposed site is on a very narrow stretch of road that is already heavily congested during School hours with large articulated lorries and tractors using this stretch of road. SN07 is a more suitable site.	
KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring	SSPKC57 Mr Henry Cushing	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	Document is unsound as SNO5 is unsuitable for development as access to the site will create will create a danger to road users as parents dropping off and picking up children at the school park without restriction on the highway of Kettlestone Road and on the island in the centre of the crossroads causing road users to travel on the wrong side of the carriageway at the point where there is a blind bend. I regularly use this road in large farm vehicles and am concerned that it is only a matter of time before a serious road accident occurs.	The LDF working party appear not to have seen or considered the existing traffic congestion caused by the school. Alternative sites put forward would not exacerbate the traffic congestion and in the case of SN07 would help overcome this problem by providing a safe drop off and pick up location for the school.
KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring	SSPKC64 Mrs Jacqueline Williamson	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	Too much traffic on Kettlestone Road. Now dangerous to pedestrians. More cars left on highway making it difficult to get through village. Dangerous part of road on such a sharp bend.	SSPDP 913

KC06: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent (SH04)				
KC06: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent (SH04)	SSPKC42 Mr Michael Meadows Natural England	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	We previously submitted comments on Draft Plan sites within the Norfolk Coast AONB, including SH04, in our letter of 31 July 2009. We welcome the recognition that site SH04 (Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent, Sheringham) requires a lower density of housing for a significant impact on the AONB to be avoided. However, we are of the opinion the proposed change is not justified, as no evidence is presented that would suggest that the range of housing density proposed would minimise impact on the Norfolk Coast AONB or maintain the vista to Morley Hill as the Council intends. In addition, we do not believe that this change would be effective in either reducing impact on the AONB or maintaining the current vista, as the proposed change in the text of the Policy would still allow for development at a high density (45 dwellings). As stated in our previous letter, Natural England advise that this site is not carried forward to the Submission Document for the Site Specific Proposals.	Should this site be taken forward, Natural England agree with point (c) of the original Policy SH04 (landscaping and wildlife mitigation and improvement), and recommend that the supporting text is strengthened to clarify the proportion on the site that should remain undeveloped. Natural England's aspiration is for 40% of new development to be multifunctional greenspace, of which at least 50% must be publicly accessible, and therefore we recommend an additional criteria within the Policy: At least 40% of the site should remain free from built development, with this area allocated as multifunctional greenspace, of which at least 50% must be publicly accessible.
KC06: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent (SH04)	SSPKC66 Mrs Denise Medlar Clerk Sheringham Town Council	Support, Sound, Legally Compliant		To reduce the proposed number of dwellings from 45 to 25-45. Protecting biodiversity interests and retaining a vista to Morley Hill.
KC07: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent (SH04)				
KC07: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent (SH04)	SSPKC67 Mrs Denise Medlar Clerk Sheringham Town Council	Support, Sound, Legally Compliant		That a requirement that the site should only be accessed from Seaview Crescent is deleted.
KC08: Land Rear of Sheringham House (SH06)				
KC08: Land Rear of Sheringham House (SH06)	SSPKC8 Mr John Barker	Object, Unsound, Legally Compliant	The proposed change is unfair and entirely unjustified in that the change seeks to impose years of disruption and stress solely upon the elderly and vulnerable residents, some of whom are disabled, of Willow Grove. This is socially and morally unacceptable. The change is also unjustified in as much that the claim of less disruption is a technical cost based viewpoint applicable only to the infrastructure and does not take into account the cost in human terms. The change is unsound because the format for consultation is entirely unsuited for social groups such as Willow Grove; therefore their views are in effect being ignored.	To make this sound the key change as proposed should be removed. Reversion to multiple access should be reinstated. Willow Grove should be removed as a point of access.

KC08: Land Rear of Sheringham House (SH06)	SSPKC9 Mr Norman Anderson	Object, Not Specified, Not Specified	With regard to access points from the Sheringham house development I feel it would make absolute sense to have at least two exit / entry points thus spreading the traffic load and reducing both the noise and pollution levels for local residents. In relation to the carrying of large amounts of plant, debris etc there is a genuine concern with regard to further deterioration of the Sunway park road infrastructure Which is already damaged by through traffic and will fail to be policed by highways. All in all this proposed plan will have an adverse affect on the quality of life for the mainly elderly residents and whilst I do appreciate that life goes on with additional building, planning etc I would request that for once the wellbeing of your existing council tax payers be taken into account when and if these plans and amendments are discussed prior to implementation.	
KC08: Land Rear of Sheringham House (SH06)	SSPKC23 Mr & Mrs R & K Briggs	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	One access to 70 dwellings is insufficient and unfair to residents of Willow / Juniper Grove. It will cause undue disturbance during construction and ongoing to a largely retired populace who have chosen a quiet / peaceful neighbourhood in which to live. This makes it totally unjustified. Especially in view of site SH04 being downsized to 25-45 properties and having more than one access. The additional traffic will also present a danger at junction of Willow Grove / Woodland Rise and increased vehicle numbers at Common Lane / Cromer Road and Woodland Rise / Holway Road junctions.	Revert to multiple access points and delete Willow Grove as a singular access. A single access can only be considered for a private 'gated' over 55's apartment complex.
KC08: Land Rear of Sheringham House (SH06)	SSPKC59 Mr Arnold Clough	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	The change is not in the interests of the prospective residents of the development or current residents in the Willow Grove area. Traffic movements, noise and congestion will increase beyond reasonable tolerance. Possibly more serious is the fact that if the Willow Grove access should be blocked by bad weather, accident, damage or problems to utilities in Willow Grove, then there would be no access at all for police, fire, ambulance and other medical response services to any serious emergency situation occurring in the new development. The original plan was undoubtedly drawn up following carefully considered professional advice. I am sure that the inspector will wish to probe deeply into whose interests these unexplained and unjustified changes have been made. The reason given for the change does not answer the basic question - why not two access points.	
KC08: Land Rear of Sheringham House (SH06)	SSPKC68 Mrs Denise Medlar Clerk Sheringham Town Council	Support, Sound, Legally Compliant		Delete policy which specifies that access to the site should be from at least two separate points of vehicular access. Members still concerned that Willow Grove, a cul-de-sac of retired residents should be the suitable means of access.
KC09: Proposals for Stalham				
KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC14 Mr Tony Ross-Benham	Support, Sound, Legally Compliant	This site will be better as the commercial traffic associated with the site will not have to travel through the town. This site also provides better access to the road network. I would also like to see the proposed housing development for ST01 moved to this part of the town as well.	To expand on my argument that this proposed change is more beneficial to the town. To expand on my argument that the proposed housing for ST01 is moved to this part of the town.
KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC18 Ms Judith Cantell Senior Landscape Architect Norfolk County Council	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	The development of this site is considered to be more intrusive than E11 or E13 given its gateway position and proximity to Weavers Way. Lighting could also be an issue.	Should the site be taken forward, a well designed scheme of mitigation would be required, to protect the amenity of the property and users of Weavers Way. Whilst a significant landscape scheme has been asked for by the district, along the A149 frontage it is considered that further significant landscaping would be required to protect the amenity of Weavers Way, and that this should be referenced in the brief.

KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC29 Mr Christopher Yardley	Object, Unsound, Legally Compliant	Stalham KC09. The site chosen for the new industrial land is unsuitable as it does not relate well to the existing built structure of the landscape. The site is too removed from the Town of Stalham and will introduce a strongly urban presence into land which is currently undeveloped open agricultural land. The development of this area will encourage further infill development to push the boundary of Stalham outwards towards this area of industrial land creating a ribbon effect. The site is too far from the Town to be likely to be accessed by any means other than vehicles, whereas if it were sited closer to the existing town, walk / cycle to work options (which are proposed) would be more likely to be actually used by workers. The development will be likely to introduce an unwelcome degree of additional light pollution into a currently semi-dark landscape.	The area of industrial allocation should be sited adjacent to or very close to the existing built form of Stalham - separated by a narrow (30m) corridor of tree / shrub planting possibly - or a green link.
KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC16 Mr Michael Baker	Object, Unsound, Legally Compliant	It is using an important national asset, grade 1 agricultural land, for non-food producing purposes.	Withdraw the site. It cannot be morally acceptable for an island to destroy grade 1 food producing land.
KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC30 Mrs Janet Austin	Object, Unsound, Not Specified		SEE ATTACHED FILE If the planning goes ahead (totally against) the site should be moved to the other end of site, where it will not be near any housing. It is on a very busy road, where I have trouble now getting out of my driveway, there will be far too much traffic which may mean people using other routes to get onto main road, i.e. via St. Johns Road, Stalham. There will also have to be screening down Stepping Stone Lane, opposite the houses as on your site map.
KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC49 Mr John Clements Broads Authority	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	The site lies around 275 metres from the boundary of the designated Norfolk and Suffolk Broads, a member of the national parks family and an area accorded the highest degree of landscape protection by Government policy (PPS7). The waterside part of Stalham falls within the Broads, and Stalham more generally both provides a focus and services for this part of the Broads, and benefits from it. The Broads Authority is a special purpose statutory body charged with managing the Broads for the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Broads; promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Broads by the public; and protecting the interests of navigation. The Broads Authority is also the local planning authority for the designated Broads area. The Broads Authority recognises that the District Council has a difficult task in resolving the various considerations involved in promoting the interests of the area, and wishes to ensure that the implications of the proposed development and its location for the quality and character of both Stalham and the wider area, which do not appear to be addressed in the justification and explanation of the proposed allocation, are fully taken into account in making that judgement. The Authority is concerned that this particular very large site is detached from Stalham and represents sporadic development in the open countryside, and may also be contrary to PPS4. There is already almost continuous roadside development from south of Catfield to the north of Stalham, and the proposed allocation would perpetuate an incremental approach, significantly extend this undesirable pattern of development, and tend to erode the landscape and rural character of this part of North Norfolk and the setting of the Broads. The Broads Authority welcomes the sustainable economic development of the area, but remains to be convinced that this particular proposed allocation is the best way to achieve this. Much of the economy in the Broads and North Norfolk more widely is dependent on the beauty and rural character of the landscape and countryside, and the charm of its towns and villages. This Broads Authority strongly supports the Core Strategy's Vision for Stalham, which states: "Stalham will perform a	

			<p>stronger role as a local service centre providing jobs, shops, services and community facilities for residents of the town and nearby villages, as well as for visitors. New investment will have focused on revitalising the town centre, providing job opportunities and achieving high-quality development which improves the image of the town and its attractiveness as a tourist destination". The Broads Authority would wish to see development which contributes, in the round, to all the criteria of providing job opportunities and revitalising the town centre and improving the image of the town and its attractiveness as a tourist destination in a mutually reinforcing way, and for these not to be treated as separate and competing criteria. The Broads Authority hopes these issues will aid consideration as to whether to proceed with this proposed allocation.</p>	
KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC33 Mr Robert Stevens	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	<p>This submission deals only with policy KC09, which is considered to be unsound for the following reasons: 1. The proposal is unsound as there has been an inadequate consideration of it against the alternatives, whilst many of the alternatives have been discounted with little consideration on the basis of landscape and visual impact, little regard has been had to the significant landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This detrimental impact is supported by the objections of Norfolk County Council. The site is highly visible and set in a countryside location separated from the settlement of Stalham. The landscape and visual impacts of the proposal will be significantly adverse and this was not properly and fairly assessed alongside the alternatives. This lack of objective justification makes the allocation unsound. 2. The proposal is unsound because it is not justified by the local planning authority's own sustainability appraisal. The sustainability appraisal itself is crude and inadequate but even on its own limited terms the proposal fails to achieve a satisfactory score. In fact, the proposal does not score a single point in either environmental or economic terms and scores only three points in social terms. Whilst I consider the sustainability appraisal to be inadequate, I agree with its conclusion that the site is unsustainable and accordingly cannot be justified. The site lies in open countryside, unconnected to the town of Stalham, on grade 1 agricultural land. Its development would not only have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, but would also result in loss of precious prime agricultural land and an unsustainable form of development that fails to minimise car usage. The failure to properly consider and address these issues results in the proposal not being properly justified and thus being unsound. 3. The local planning authority is considering a mix of uses including uses within class B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. No justification has been given for the inclusion of such uses in close proximity to residential dwellings along both Stepping Stone Lane and to the south of the A149. The inclusions of uses that are inappropriate in residential areas demonstrate the lack of proper assessment that has been carried out of the impact of the proposal so that it cannot be justified as being sound. 4. No account has been taken of the impact of the proposal on nearby residential properties, further impacting on the adequacy of the justification for and soundness of the proposal. 5. The proposal is also unsound because it fails to comply with national planning policy. The planning system now has a statutory obligation to deliver sustainable development under section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This overriding need to deliver sustainable development is reinforced by PPS1. The development of a major employment site away from the existing settlement on prime agricultural land and with inadequate public transport links fails to deliver sustainable development and cannot comply with this overarching principle. The fact that this proposal involves development on a greenfield site 6. The proposal is also incompatible with PPS4 (in particular Policy EC6), further failing the requirement to comply with national planning policy so as to render the proposal unsound.</p>	<p>Policy KC09 should be deleted from the document. If the policy is to remain, reference to B2 uses should be deleted from (a). In addition (c) should be amended to state that: "proposals will be required to demonstrate that they include sufficient landscaping to protect the landscape and visual amenity of the site and of nearby residential properties, including along Stepping Stone Lane", and a new (f) should be inserted stating that, "proposals will need to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties". If the policy is to remain, I question why the policy should occupy only about half the field in question. What is to become of the other half? It is not practical to farm it, bearing in mind its size, shape and lack of access. If it is genuine that the proposal only needs to occupy the present area, I suggest that the proposal should be situated in the north-east corner of the field. This would have numerous benefits: - 1. There could be a wider landscaping buffer to protect the impact upon Stepping Stone Lane and the main road 2. The pedestrian/cycle access to Weavers Way would be substantially closer 3. Fewer local residential properties would be affected by the proposal.</p>

<p>KC09: Proposals for Stalham</p>	<p>SSPKC41 Mr Robert Stevens</p>	<p>Object, Unsound, Not Specified</p>	<p>This submission deals only with policy KC09, which is considered to be unsound for the following reasons: 1. The proposal is unsound as there has been an inadequate consideration of it against the alternatives, whilst many of the alternatives have been discounted with little consideration on the basis of landscape and visual impact, little regard has been had to the significant landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This detrimental impact is supported by the objections of Norfolk County Council. The site is highly visible and set in a countryside location separated from the settlement of Stalham. The landscape and visual impacts of the proposal will be significantly adverse and this was not properly and fairly assessed alongside the alternatives. This lack of objective justification makes the allocation unsound. 2. The proposal is unsound because it is not justified by the local planning authority's own sustainability appraisal. The sustainability appraisal itself is crude and inadequate but even on its own limited terms the proposal fails to achieve a satisfactory score. In fact, the proposal does not score a single point in either environmental or economic terms and scores only three points in social terms. Whilst I consider the sustainability appraisal to be inadequate, I agree with its conclusion that the site is unsustainable and accordingly cannot be justified. The site lies in open countryside, unconnected to the town of Stalham, on grade 1 agricultural land. Its development would not only have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, but would also result in loss of precious prime agricultural land and an unsustainable form of development that fails to minimise car usage. The failure to properly consider and address these issues results in the proposal not being properly justified and thus being unsound. 3. The local planning authority is considering a mix of uses including uses within class B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. No justification has been given for the inclusion of such uses in close proximity to residential dwellings along both Stepping Stone Lane and to the south of the A149. The inclusions of uses that are inappropriate in residential areas demonstrate the lack of proper assessment that has been carried out of the impact of the proposal so that it cannot be justified as being sound. 4. No account has been taken of the impact of the proposal on nearby residential properties, further impacting on the adequacy of the justification for and soundness of the proposal. 5. The proposal is also unsound because it fails to comply with national planning policy. The planning system now has a statutory obligation to deliver sustainable development under section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This overriding need to deliver sustainable development is reinforced by PPS1. The development of a major employment site away from the existing settlement on prime agricultural land and with inadequate public transport links fails to deliver sustainable development and cannot comply with this overarching principle. The fact that this proposal involves development on a greenfield site 6. The proposal is also incompatible with PPS4 (in particular Policy EC6), further failing the requirement to comply with national planning policy so as to render the proposal unsound.</p>	<p>Policy KC09 should be deleted from the document. If the policy is to remain, reference to B2 uses should be deleted from (a). In addition (c) should be amended to state that, "proposals will be required to demonstrate that they include sufficient landscaping to protect the landscape and visual amenity of the site and of nearby residential properties, including along Stepping Stone Lane", and a new (f) should be inserted stating that, "all proposals will need to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties". If the policy is to remain, I question why the policy should occupy only about half the field in question. What is to become of the other half? It is not practical to farm it, bearing in mind its size, shape and lack of access. If it is genuine that the proposal only needs to occupy the present area, I suggest that the proposal should be situated in the north-east corner of the field. This would have numerous benefits: - 1. There could be a wider landscaping buffer to protect the impact upon Stepping Stone Lane and the main road 2. The pedestrian/cycle access to Weavers Way would be substantially closer 3. Fewer local residential properties would be affected by the proposal.</p>
<p>KC09: Proposals for Stalham</p>	<p>SSPKC35, Mr & Mrs N I Wright</p>	<p>Object, Unsound, Legally Compliant</p>	<p>SEE ATTACHED FILES We are aware of the representations made by third parties on the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan in relation to land at Church Farm. We do not agree with those representations and remain of the view that land at Church Farm is the most suitable and sustainable of the options for accommodating growth at Stalham required by the Core Strategy. Nevertheless our clients seek to take on board suggestions by third parties and to alleviate concerns. There is concern locally relating to traffic generation. One of the advantages of land at Church Farm is its proximity to services, such as</p>	<p>SEE ATTACHED FILES New employment allocation: land at Brumstead Road, Stalham Description The site comprises part of an agricultural field located to the north of Stalham. The site is well-related to the strategic highway network and the urban edge. It could be accessed by commercial vehicles without the need to pass through Stalham and is easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclists from the town. The site is flat and lacks any features worthy of retention.</p>

		<p>education, and to the town centre. This will enable residents to walk and cycle to key facilities and to minimise car journeys. Maximising travel by non-car modes will be a key design consideration in taking the site forward to a planning application. We recognise that local residents are concerned regarding traffic generated by potential employment proposals. At the same time we recognise the need to encourage additional employment opportunities at Stalham. We support therefore the Council's intention to consider alternative employment allocations to Church Farm. However, we object to Key Changes site E12 (KC09) and consider that the employment provision identified as part of ST01 would be better relocated to land at Brumstead Road in the ownership of Mr & Mrs N I Wright (site E11 in the Council's LDF Working Party Report, 14 December 2009, site ST04 in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan). We attach a plan of land at Brumstead Road where there is up to 4.42 hectares of land available. The site is currently farmed. It lies within Flood Zone 1. There are no significant ecological or landscape issues associated with bringing the site forward. The site is available now. We also attach a preliminary access report indicating potential access arrangements, demonstrating that access can be accommodated on land within our clients' control. Core Strategy Policy SS13 designates Stalham as a secondary settlement where development is proposed for approximately 5 hectares of employment generating development, including 3.5 hectares on new allocations in locations with good access to the A149. Brumstead Road has good access to the A149 and is easily accessible by commercial vehicles, via Weavers Way, without commercial vehicles needing to pass through the urban area. At 4.42 hectares (gross) the site has the potential to meet the town's employment needs. KC09 is not sound because it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base nor is it the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives. Land at Brumstead Road is preferable as an allocation to the site proposed at Weavers Way for a number of reasons: - it is better located in terms of access, being located immediately adjacent to the urban area, with a cycle path directly adjacent the site. It is within easy walking and cycling distance of residential areas, whilst and at Weavers Way is located well beyond the urban edge; - the site when viewed is seen against the existing urban edge. Land at Weavers Way would represent a significant intrusion into open countryside and as identified in the Council's own sustainability appraisal have a significant landscape impact. The allocation at Weavers Way is not consistent with national policy. The site is not well located in terms of accessibility by non-car modes and is therefore not consistent with the objectives of PPG13. Paragraph 40 states that the objective should be to ensure that jobs are primarily sited at the most accessible locations. Paragraph 44 states that in determining the appropriate strategy in rural areas it is important to consider scale, impact and likely catchment area of developments. The employment allocation is intended primarily to provide additional employment for residents of Stalham. The Weavers Way allocation is of significant scale and likely to have significant landscape impact. Locating development at Brumstead Road will relate better to its intended catchment, given the scale of allocation is better provided for at the urban edge, and will have a lesser landscape impact. Weavers Way lies in open countryside and its allocation is therefore not consistent with Policy EC6.2a of PPS4 which states that local planning authorities should strictly control economic development in open countryside away from existing settlements. The proposal is also inconsistent with Policy EC6.2b of PPS4 which states that most new development should be located in or on the edge of existing settlements where employment can be provided close to other facilities. The Council's assessment of sites The LDF Working Party 14 December 2009 includes a comparative assessment of sites, although a full SA is not included. We agree with the report that land on the eastern side of Brumstead Road site is visually well-related to the built-up area, that the site has good pedestrian accessibility and no apparent constraints. However, the report includes a number of</p>	<p>The northern, urban edge, of Stalham is clearly visible and development of the site represents and opportunity to provide significant landscape screening to both the adjoining residential area and wider countryside views. The site is suitable for employment development, that is within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 or Sui generis uses which share the characteristics of and are compatible with employment uses. Constraints A landscape buffer will be required to the adjoining existing residential area. The new urban edge will also requiring screening. The site should be served by a new vehicular access from Brumstead Road. Measures, such as routeing agreement or restricted access arrangements, will be implemented to ensure commercial traffic accesses the site via Stepping Stone Lane rather than through residential areas of the town. Deliverability The site is suitable and available for development. It is single ownership and the landowner has indicated a willingness to bring the site forward. There are no known reasons why development can not be achieved within the plan period. Land at Brumstead Road, amounting to approximately 5.16 hectares is allocated for development within Use Classes B1, B2, B8 or Sui generis uses which are compatible with Use Classes B1/B2/B8.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>errors or factual information is absent. There is no evidence to substantiate the claim that Brumstead Road is unlikely to be regarded as suitable for commercial access. Land is under the control of our clients should any improvements to Brumstead Road prove necessary. The site does not have limited road frontage. The enclosed access arrangements demonstrate that it is possible to achieve the necessary junction. There is no evidence to support the contention that the site is unlikely to meet highway requirements. The site is close to residential, that is clearly one of the major benefits of the site. Given the scale of the site it is possible to include landscaping measures to ensure there is no adverse effect on amenity. Conditions on future planning permission can control issues such as noise. There are no potential impacts on amenity. The Council undertook a sustainability appraisal of the site at the Draft Plan stage, albeit for residential purposes. We have re-assessed the site against these criteria for employment purposes and include the revised SA. Proposed changes We propose an alternative to Policy E12 which identifies land at Brumstead Road for employment-generating uses, including Sui generis uses which are compatible with and have the characteristics of employment uses. Enclosed is a revised policy and supporting text. We accept the need to meet detailed requirements of other policies of the development plan, including demonstrating that there is adequate sewage treatment capacity and no adverse effect on European Wildlife Sites. However, we do not propose such wording in our revised policy as this duplicates national policies and/or other of the development plan contrary to PPS12 (para. 5.2 (1)).</p>	
<p>KC09: Proposals for Stalham</p>	<p>SSPKC45 Mr & Mrs Alex & Elizabeth Pelling</p>	<p>Object, Unsound, Not Specified</p>	<p>This submission deals only with policy KC09, which is considered to be unsound for the following reasons: 1. The proposal is unsound as there has been an inadequate consideration of it against the alternatives, whilst many of the alternatives have been discounted with little consideration on the basis of landscape and visual impact, little regard has been had to the significant landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This detrimental impact is supported by the objections of Norfolk County Council. The site is highly visible and set in a countryside location separated from the settlement of Stalham. The landscape and visual impacts of the proposal will be significantly adverse and this was not properly and fairly assessed alongside the alternatives. This lack of objective justification makes the allocation unsound. 2. The proposal is unsound because it is not justified by the local planning authority's own sustainability appraisal. The sustainability appraisal itself is crude and inadequate but even on its own limited terms the proposal fails to achieve a satisfactory score. In fact, the proposal does not score a single point in either environmental or economic terms and scores only three points in social terms. Whilst I consider the sustainability appraisal to be inadequate, I agree with its conclusion that the site is unsustainable and accordingly cannot be justified. The site lies in open countryside, unconnected to the town of Stalham, on grade 1 agricultural land. Its development would not only have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, but would also result in loss of precious prime agricultural land and an unsustainable form of development that fails to minimise car usage. The failure to properly consider and address these issues results in the proposal not being properly justified and thus being unsound. 3. The local planning authority is considering a mix of uses including uses within class B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. No justification has been given for the inclusion of such uses in close proximity to residential dwellings along both Stepping Stone Lane and to the south of the A149. The inclusions of uses that are inappropriate in residential areas demonstrate the lack of proper assessment that has been carried out of the impact of the proposal so that it cannot be justified as being sound. 4. No account has been taken of the impact of the proposal on nearby residential properties, further impacting on the adequacy of the justification for and soundness of the proposal. 5. The proposal is also unsound because it fails to comply with national planning policy. The planning system now has a statutory obligation to</p>	<p>Policy KC09 should be deleted from the document. If the policy is to remain, reference to B2 uses should be deleted from (a). In addition (c) should be amended to state that, "proposals will be required to demonstrate that they include sufficient landscaping to protect the landscape and visual amenity of the site and of nearby residential properties, including along Stepping Stone Lane", and a new (f) should be inserted stating that, "all proposals will need to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties". Also if the policy is to remain, road safety and access issues have to be addressed fully. There are four issues to be addressed: a) Stepping Stone Lane is currently a narrow two lane interlinking road between the A149 and Brumstead Road (the Stalham to Bacton road). Although NCC Highways recognises that Stepping Stone Lane will require widening, also with associated off-site highway improvement works to be carried out, they do not appear in their comments to be convinced whether it would be possible to achieve the highway improvements required. Also at present egress from housing units onto Stepping Stone Lane when turning towards the A149 is often held up due to build up of traffic wishing to join the A149. b) Although NCC Highways describe the junction between Stepping Stone Lane and the A149 as a good junction, it is regarded locally as an accident black spot. An alternative junction is necessary to release the traffic from Stepping Stone Lane safer and quicker. Increased traffic derived from the new industrial estate will compound concerns over the junction. c) On the A149, some 100 metres from the junction between Stepping Stone Lane and the A149, on the right hand side when travelling towards Stalham, there are three entrances to Manor Farm and Horse Barns, a collection of 11 domestic housing and other farming properties. The A149 has appropriate road markings to</p>

			<p>deliver sustainable development under section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This overriding need to deliver sustainable development is reinforced by PPS1. The development of a major employment site away from the existing settlement on prime agricultural land and with inadequate public transport links fails to deliver sustainable development and cannot comply with this overarching principle. The fact that this proposal involves development on a greenfield site 6. The proposal is also incompatible with PPS4 (in particular Policy EC6), further failing the requirement to comply with national planning policy so as to render the proposal unsound.</p>	<p>facilitate a right hand turn into the entrances for traffic travelling towards Stalham from Wroxham and Hoveton. These comprise continuous double white lines and hatching to from a filter lane turn off to the right. However this right turn is fraught with danger, as traffic from Stalham often try and overtake other traffic on the approach to this turn off, leaving the standing vehicle waiting to turn right in a dangerous position. Also impatient drivers travelling towards Stalham have been known to overtake the stationary vehicle waiting to turn right. Increased traffic from Stepping Stone Lane, especially heavy goods vehicles slowly accelerating up to the 50 mph standard speed on the 149 will compound the problem and safety issue. d) The build up of traffic in Stepping Stone Lane waiting to turn onto the A149, also has an impact on Brumstead Road (the Stalham to Bacton Road). At peak periods, especially at shift ends at Bacton Oil Terminal, traffic to Yarmouth would normally use the best road available, i.e. Stepping Stone Lane, for access to the A149. However traffic even now, continues along Brumstead Road into Stalham town itself and uses the narrow roads of the town for alternative access to the A149.</p>
<p>KC09: Proposals for Stalham</p>	<p>SSPKC50 Mr & Mrs Roy & Janet Helms</p>	<p>Object, Unsound, Not Specified</p>	<p>This submission deals only with policy KC09, which is considered to be unsound for the following reasons: 1. The proposal is unsound as there has been an inadequate consideration of it against the alternatives, whilst many of the alternatives have been discounted with little consideration on the basis of landscape and visual impact, little regard has been had to the significant landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This detrimental impact is supported by the objections of Norfolk County Council. The site is highly visible and set in a countryside location separated from the settlement of Stalham. The landscape and visual impacts of the proposal will be significantly adverse and this was not properly and fairly assessed alongside the alternatives. This lack of objective justification makes the allocation unsound. 2. The proposal is unsound because it is not justified by the local planning authority's own sustainability appraisal. The sustainability appraisal itself is crude and inadequate but even on its own limited terms the proposal fails to achieve a satisfactory score. In fact, the proposal does not score a single point in either environmental or economic terms and scores only three points in social terms. Whilst I consider the sustainability appraisal to be inadequate, I agree with its conclusion that the site is unsustainable and accordingly cannot be justified. The site lies in open countryside, unconnected to the town of Stalham, on grade 1 agricultural land. Its development would not only have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, but would also result in loss of precious prime agricultural land and an unsustainable form of development that fails to minimise car usage. The failure to properly consider and address these issues results in the proposal not being properly justified and thus being unsound. 3. The local planning authority is considering a mix of uses including uses within class B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. No justification has been given for the inclusion of such uses in close proximity to residential dwellings along both Stepping Stone Lane and to the south of the A149. The inclusions of uses that are inappropriate in residential areas demonstrate the lack of proper assessment that has been carried out of the impact of the proposal so that it cannot be justified as being sound. 4. No account has been taken of the impact of the proposal on nearby residential properties, further impacting on the adequacy of the justification for and soundness of the proposal. 5. The proposal is also unsound because it fails to comply with national planning policy. The planning system now has a statutory obligation to deliver sustainable development under section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This overriding need to deliver sustainable development is</p>	<p>Policy KC09 should be deleted from the document. If the policy is to remain, reference to B2 uses should be deleted from (a). In addition (c) should be amended to state that, "proposals will be required to demonstrate that they include sufficient landscaping to protect the landscape and visual amenity of the site and of nearby residential properties, including along Stepping Stone Lane", and a new (f) should be inserted stating that, "all proposals will need to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties".</p>

			reinforced by PPS1. The development of a major employment site away from the existing settlement on prime agricultural land and with inadequate public transport links fails to deliver sustainable development and cannot comply with this overarching principle. The fact that this proposal involves development on a greenfield site 6. The proposal is also incompatible with PPS4 (in particular Policy EC6), further failing the requirement to comply with national planning policy so as to render the proposal unsound.	
KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC51 Mr & Mrs David & Jenny Sharp	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	This submission deals only with policy KC09, which is considered to be unsound for the following reasons: 1. The proposal is unsound as there has been an inadequate consideration of it against the alternatives, whilst many of the alternatives have been discounted with little consideration on the basis of landscape and visual impact, little regard has been had to the significant landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This detrimental impact is supported by the objections of Norfolk County Council. The site is highly visible and set in a countryside location separated from the settlement of Stalham. The landscape and visual impacts of the proposal will be significantly adverse and this was not properly and fairly assessed alongside the alternatives. This lack of objective justification makes the allocation unsound. 2. The proposal is unsound because it is not justified by the local planning authority's own sustainability appraisal. The sustainability appraisal itself is crude and inadequate but even on its own limited terms the proposal fails to achieve a satisfactory score. In fact, the proposal does not score a single point in either environmental or economic terms and scores only three points in social terms. Whilst I consider the sustainability appraisal to be inadequate, I agree with its conclusion that the site is unsustainable and accordingly cannot be justified. The site lies in open countryside, unconnected to the town of Stalham, on grade 1 agricultural land. Its development would not only have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, but would also result in loss of precious prime agricultural land and an unsustainable form of development that fails to minimise car usage. The failure to properly consider and address these issues results in the proposal not being properly justified and thus being unsound. 3. The local planning authority is considering a mix of uses including uses within class B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. No justification has been given for the inclusion of such uses in close proximity to residential dwellings along both Stepping Stone Lane and to the south of the A149. The inclusions of uses that are inappropriate in residential areas demonstrate the lack of proper assessment that has been carried out of the impact of the proposal so that it cannot be justified as being sound. 4. No account has been taken of the impact of the proposal on nearby residential properties, further impacting on the adequacy of the justification for and soundness of the proposal. 5. The proposal is also unsound because it fails to comply with national planning policy. The planning system now has a statutory obligation to deliver sustainable development under section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This overriding need to deliver sustainable development is reinforced by PPS1. The development of a major employment site away from the existing settlement on prime agricultural land and with inadequate public transport links fails to deliver sustainable development and cannot comply with this overarching principle. The fact that this proposal involves development on a greenfield site 6. The proposal is also incompatible with PPS4 (in particular Policy EC6), further failing the requirement to comply with national planning policy so as to render the proposal unsound.	Policy KC09 should be deleted from the document. If the policy is to remain, reference to B2 uses should be deleted from (a). In addition (c) should be amended to state that, "proposals will be required to demonstrate that they include sufficient landscaping to protect the landscape and visual amenity of the site and of nearby residential properties, including along Stepping Stone Lane", and a new (f) should be inserted stating that, "all proposals will need to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties".

<p>KC09: Proposals for Stalham</p>	<p>SSPKC52 Ms Patricia Barrie Shevlin</p>	<p>Object, Unsound, Not Specified</p>	<p>LEGAL COMPLIANCE: Legal compliance is not specified in the documents.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS: As residents of the property opposite the proposed site, our objections are to the principle, which we consider to be unsound in planning terms. This submission deals only with policy KC09, which is considered to be unsound for the following reasons: 1. The proposal is unsound as there has been an inadequate consideration of it against the alternatives, whilst many of the alternatives have been discounted with little consideration on the basis of landscape and visual impact, little regard has been had to the significant landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This detrimental impact is supported by the objections of Norfolk County Council. The site is highly visible and set in a countryside location separated from the settlement of Stalham. The landscape and visual impacts of the proposal will be significantly adverse and this was not properly and fairly assessed alongside the alternatives. This lack of objective justification makes the allocation unsound. 2. The proposal is unsound because it is not justified by the local planning authority's own sustainability appraisal. The sustainability appraisal itself is crude and inadequate but even on its own limited terms the proposal fails to achieve a satisfactory score. In fact, the proposal does not score a single point in either environmental or economic terms and scores only three points in social terms. Whilst I consider the sustainability appraisal to be inadequate, I agree with its conclusion that the site is unsustainable and accordingly cannot be justified. The site lies in open countryside, unconnected to the town of Stalham, on grade 1 agricultural land. Its development would not only have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, but would also result in loss of precious prime agricultural land and an unsustainable form of development that fails to minimise car usage. The failure to properly consider and address these issues results in the proposal not being properly justified and thus being unsound. 3. The local planning authority is considering a mix of uses including uses within class B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. No justification has been given for the inclusion of such uses in close proximity to residential dwellings along both Stepping Stone Lane and to the south of the A149. The inclusions of uses that are inappropriate in residential areas demonstrate the lack of proper assessment that has been carried out of the impact of the proposal so that it cannot be justified as being sound. 4. No account has been taken of the impact of the proposal on nearby residential properties, further impacting on the adequacy of the justification for and soundness of the proposal. 5. The proposal is also unsound because it fails to comply with national planning policy. The planning system now has a statutory obligation to deliver sustainable development under section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This overriding need to deliver sustainable development is reinforced by PPS1. The development of a major employment site away from the existing settlement on prime agricultural land and with inadequate public transport links fails to deliver sustainable development and cannot comply with this overarching principle. The fact that this proposal involves development on a greenfield site 6. The proposal is also incompatible with PPS4 (in particular Policy EC6), further failing the requirement to comply with national planning policy so as to render the proposal unsound.</p>	<p>We feel that the whole key change (policy no. KC09) should be removed, if not possible, then, changes to the quantitative implications should be made. Policy KC09 should be deleted from the document. If the policy is to remain, reference to B2 uses should be deleted from (a). In addition (c) should be amended to state that, "proposals will be required to demonstrate that they include sufficient landscaping to protect the landscape and visual amenity of the site and of nearby residential properties, including along Stepping Stone Lane", and a new (f) should be inserted stating that, "all proposals will need to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties".</p>
<p>KC09: Proposals for Stalham</p>	<p>SSPKC53 Ms Yvonne Glass</p>	<p>Object, Unsound, Not Specified</p>	<p>LEGAL COMPLIANCE: Legal compliance is not specified in the documents.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS: As residents of the property opposite the proposed site, our objections are to the principle, which we consider to be unsound in planning terms. This submission deals only with policy KC09, which is considered to be unsound for the following reasons: 1.</p>	<p>We feel that the whole key change (policy no. KC09) should be removed, if not possible, then, changes to the quantitative implications should be made. Policy KC09 should be deleted from the document. If the policy is to remain, reference to B2 uses should be deleted from (a). In addition (c) should be amended to state that, "proposals will be required to demonstrate that they include sufficient landscaping to protect the landscape</p>

			<p>The proposal is unsound as there has been an inadequate consideration of it against the alternatives, whilst many of the alternatives have been discounted with little consideration on the basis of landscape and visual impact, little regard has been had to the significant landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This detrimental impact is supported by the objections of Norfolk County Council. The site is highly visible and set in a countryside location separated from the settlement of Stalham. The landscape and visual impacts of the proposal will be significantly adverse and this was not properly and fairly assessed alongside the alternatives. This lack of objective justification makes the allocation unsound. 2. The proposal is unsound because it is not justified by the local planning authority's own sustainability appraisal. The sustainability appraisal itself is crude and inadequate but even on its own limited terms the proposal fails to achieve a satisfactory score. In fact, the proposal does not score a single point in either environmental or economic terms and scores only three points in social terms. Whilst I consider the sustainability appraisal to be inadequate, I agree with its conclusion that the site is unsustainable and accordingly cannot be justified. The site lies in open countryside, unconnected to the town of Stalham, on grade 1 agricultural land. Its development would not only have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, but would also result in loss of precious prime agricultural land and an unsustainable form of development that fails to minimise car usage. The failure to properly consider and address these issues results in the proposal not being properly justified and thus being unsound. 3. The local planning authority is considering a mix of uses including uses within class B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. No justification has been given for the inclusion of such uses in close proximity to residential dwellings along both Stepping Stone Lane and to the south of the A149. The inclusions of uses that are inappropriate in residential areas demonstrate the lack of proper assessment that has been carried out of the impact of the proposal so that it cannot be justified as being sound. 4. No account has been taken of the impact of the proposal on nearby residential properties, further impacting on the adequacy of the justification for and soundness of the proposal. 5. The proposal is also unsound because it fails to comply with national planning policy. The planning system now has a statutory obligation to deliver sustainable development under section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This overriding need to deliver sustainable development is reinforced by PPS1. The development of a major employment site away from the existing settlement on prime agricultural land and with inadequate public transport links fails to deliver sustainable development and cannot comply with this overarching principle. The fact that this proposal involves development on a greenfield site 6. The proposal is also incompatible with PPS4 (in particular Policy EC6), further failing the requirement to comply with national planning policy so as to render the proposal unsound.</p>	<p>and visual amenity of the site and of nearby residential properties, including along Stepping Stone Lane", and a new (f) should be inserted stating that, "all proposals will need to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties".</p>
KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC34 Mrs Elaine Parsons	Object, Not Specified, Not Specified	<p>I am writing to you to express my concern over the proposed commercial site at Stalham, which will front onto the bypass and will have as access routes, Stepping Stone Lane, Brumstead Road, both of which are unsuitable for heavy traffic use. There are two schools in this area (Brumstead Road) and also one just further up on Yarmouth Road. Traffic is very busy at the moment and I feel it would just be made worse by the proposed development.</p>	

KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC44 Mrs J Nicholson	Object, Not Specified, Not Specified	I'm writing to express my concern at the proposed plans to build an industrial site near to Stepping Stone Lane which I feel would dramatically increase the flow of traffic along Brumstead Road and St Johns Road. These roads are already very busy and many children walk along Brumstead Road on their way to Junior and High School, it would be very hazardous increasing the flow even more not to mention the noise and waiting for breaks in the traffic to cross the road. I'm sure many folk who live along these two busy roads (many are elderly) would be very concerned at your proposals.	
KC09: Proposals for Stalham	SSPKC65 Mr Roger Meynell	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	<p>LEGAL COMPLIANCE: I do not feel qualified to comment on legal compliance.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS: (i) There are numerous examples in neighbouring villages, notably Catfield, where industrial sites exist but are far from being fully occupied/utilized. Provision of this new industrial area will add to this blight and under-use of valuable prime agricultural land. I therefore consider the proposal to be unsound. (ii) When the barns of Manor Farm were converted into dwellings (Horse Barns) stringent planning conditions were imposed by the Planning Authority to ensure that the development was sympathetic with surrounding countryside. An industrial site can hardly be considered complying with the same "sympathetic" conditions, especially as the site is directly opposite Manor Farm/Horse Barns. In other words, the impact on nearby residential properties has been ignored and as a consequence the soundness of the proposal is brought into question.</p>	Policy KC09 should be deleted from the document but, if it must remain, Class B2 should be deleted from sub-paragraph (a) of Policy E12. An additional sub-paragraph (f) should be inserted to the effect "all proposals will need to demonstrate that they have no unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties".
Land South of Weavers Way, Stalham, Adjacent to A149	SSPKC39 Mr & Mrs N I Wright	Comment, Unsound, Legally Compliant	<p>SEE ATTACHED FILES</p> <p>We are aware of the representations made by third parties on the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan in relation to land at Church Farm. We do not agree with those representations and remain of the view that land at Church Farm is the most suitable and sustainable of the options for accommodating growth at Stalham required by the Core Strategy. Nevertheless our clients seek to take on board suggestions by third parties and to alleviate concerns. There is concern locally relating to traffic generation. One of the advantages of land at Church Farm is its proximity to services, such as education, and to the town centre. This will enable residents to walk and cycle to key facilities and to minimise car journeys. Maximising travel by non-car modes will be a key design consideration in taking the site forward to a planning application. We recognise that local residents are concerned regarding traffic generated by potential employment proposals. At the same time we recognise the need to encourage additional employment opportunities at Stalham. We support therefore the Council's intention to consider alternative employment allocations to Church Farm. However, we object to Key Changes site E12 (KC09) and consider that the employment provision identified as part of ST01 would be better relocated to land at Brumstead Road in the ownership of Mr & Mrs N I Wright (site E11 in the Council's LDF Working Party Report, 14 December 2009, site ST04 in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan). We attach a plan of land at Brumstead Road where there is up to 4.42 hectares of land available. The site is currently farmed. It lies within Flood Zone 1. There are no significant ecological or landscape issues associated with bringing the site forward. The site is available now. We also attach a preliminary access report indicating potential access arrangements, demonstrating that access can be accommodated on land within our clients' control. Core Strategy Policy SS13 designates Stalham as a secondary settlement where development is proposed for approximately 5 hectares of employment generating development, including 3.5 hectares on new allocations in locations with good access to the A149. Brumstead Road has good access to the A149 and is easily accessible by commercial vehicles, via Weavers Way, without commercial vehicles needing to pass through the urban</p>	<p>SEE ATTACHED FILES</p> <p>We suggest re-wording the Plan to read: New employment allocation: land at Brumstead Road, Stalham Description The site comprises part of an agricultural field located to the north of Stalham. The site is well-related to the strategic highway network and the urban edge. It could be accessed by commercial vehicles without the need to pass through Stalham and is easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclists from the town. The site is flat and lacks any features worthy of retention. The northern, urban edge, of Stalham is clearly visible and development of the site represents an opportunity to provide significant landscape screening to both the adjoining residential area and wider countryside views. The site is suitable for employment development, that is within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 or Sui generis uses which share the characteristics of and are compatible with employment uses. Constraints A landscape buffer will be required to the adjoining residential area and wider countryside views. The site is suitable for employment development, that is within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 or Sui generis uses which share the characteristics of and are compatible with employment uses. Constraints A landscape buffer will be required to the adjoining residential area. The new urban edge will also require screening. The site should be served by a new vehicular access from Brumstead Road. Measures, such as routeing agreement or restricted access arrangements, will be implemented to ensure commercial traffic accesses the site via Stepping Stone Lane rather than through residential areas of the town. Deliverability The site is suitable and available for development. It is single ownership and the landowner has indicated a willingness to bring the site forward. There are no known reasons why development can not be achieved within the plan period. Land at Brumstead Road, amounting to approximately 5.16 hectares is allocated for development within Use Classes B1, B2, B8 or Sui generis uses which are compatible with Use Classes B1/B2/B8.</p>

area. At 4.42 hectares (gross) the site has the potential to meet the town's employment needs. KC09 is not sound because it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base nor is it the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives. Land at Brumstead Road is preferable as an allocation to the site proposed at Weavers Way for a number of reasons: - it is better located in terms of access, being located immediately adjacent to the urban area, with a cycle path directly adjacent the site. It is within easy walking and cycling distance of residential areas, whilst land at Weavers Way is located well beyond the urban edge; - the site when viewed is seen against the existing urban edge. Land at Weavers Way would represent a significant intrusion into open countryside and as identified in the Council's own sustainability appraisal have a significant landscape impact. The allocation at Weavers Way is not consistent with national policy. The site is not well located in terms of accessibility by non-car modes and is therefore not consistent with the objectives of PPG13. Paragraph 40 states that the objective should be to ensure that jobs are primarily sited at the most accessible locations. Paragraph 44 states that in determining the appropriate strategy in rural areas it is important to consider scale, impact and likely catchment area of developments. The employment allocation is intended primarily to provide additional employment for residents of Stalham. The Weavers Way allocation is of significant scale and likely to have significant landscape impact. Locating development at Brumstead Road will relate better to its intended catchment, given the scale of allocation is better provided for at the urban edge, and will have a lesser landscape impact. Weavers Way lies in open countryside and its allocation is therefore not consistent with Policy EC6.2a of PPS4 which states that local planning authorities should strictly control economic development in open countryside away from existing settlements. The proposal is also inconsistent with Policy EC6.2b of PPS4 which states that most new development should be located in or on the edge of existing settlements where employment can be provided close to other facilities. The Council's assessment of sites The LDF Working Party 14 December 2009 includes a comparative assessment of sites, although a full SA is not included. We agree with the report that land on the eastern side of Brumstead Road site is visually well-related to the built-up area, that the site has good pedestrian accessibility and no apparent constraints. However, the report includes a number of errors or factual information is absent. There is no evidence to substantiate the claim that Brumstead Road is unlikely to be regarded as suitable for commercial access. Land is under the control of our clients should any improvements to Brumstead Road prove necessary. The site does not have limited road frontage. The enclosed access arrangements demonstrate that it is possible to achieve the necessary junction. There is no evidence to support the contention that the site is unlikely to meet highway requirements. The site is close to residential, that is clearly one of the major benefits of the site. Given the scale of the site it is possible to include landscaping measures to ensure there is no adverse effect on amenity. Conditions on future planning permission can control issues such as noise. There are no potential impacts on amenity. The Council undertook a sustainability appraisal of the site at the Draft Plan stage, albeit for residential purposes. We have re-assessed the site against these criteria for employment purposes and include the revised SA. Proposed changes We propose an alternative to Policy E12 which identifies land at Brumstead Road for employment-generating uses, including Sui generis uses which are compatible with and have the characteristics of employment uses. Enclosed is a revised policy and supporting text. We accept the need to meet detailed requirements of other policies of the development plan, including demonstrating that there is adequate sewage treatment capacity and no adverse effect on European Wildlife Sites. However, we do not propose such wording in our revised policy as this duplicates national policies and/or other of the development plan contrary to PPS12 (para. 5.2 (1)).

KC10: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)				
KC10: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)	SSPKC3 Mr Clive Cunningham	Object, Unsound, Not Specified	The low key employment generating uses is too vague and could open the door for heavy to medium industrial use of this site. The reference should be deleted completely.	Remove the reference to low key employment generating uses.
KC10: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)	SSPKC5 Mrs Edna Cunningham	Object, Unsound, Not Legally Compliant	LEGAL COMPLIANCE: The site is not compliant due to the fact that the people of Stalham do not want low key employment in this area. SOUNDNESS: Employment generating uses are not suitable in this residential area.	Remove the low key employment reference from the plan entirely.
KC10: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)	SSPKC36 Messrs N & P Wright & Mrs W Josephs	Comment, Unsound, Legally Compliant	SEE ATTACHED FILE We are aware of the representations made by third parties on the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan in relation to land at Church Farm. We do not agree with those representations and remain of the view that land at Church Farm is the most suitable and sustainable of the options for accommodating growth at Stalham required by the Core Strategy. Nevertheless we seek to take on board suggestions by third parties and to seek to alleviate concerns. A main concern locally appears to relate to traffic, particularly regarding traffic generated by the proposed employment proposals. At the same time we recognise the need to encourage additional employment opportunities at Stalham. Owing to local concerns regarding traffic we support the Council's change to delete reference to "new employment workspace" from 10.1.2 and the second bullet of Policy ST01. However, we object to the proposed replacement text. We suggest that to accommodate local concerns the employment allocation should be relocated to Brumstead Road. We also suggest that the scope of ST01 be widened to enable uses to come forward such as a care home, which generate employment, but retain the residential character of the area. KC10 is unsound in that it is not justified when considered against reasonable alternative of locating the employment uses at Brumstead Road. The wording is also imprecise meaning the plan is unlikely to be effective. Our proposed amendments would provide an effective and justified policy.	SEE ATTACHED FILE Our representations to the Draft Plan proposed amendments to Policy ST01. The Key Changes and our response to them necessitates revisions to our suggested wording to ST01. We propose (taking into account our wording already submitted that Policy ST01 should be re-worded to read: Land amounting to approximately 9 hectares is allocated for a mixed use development of approximately 160 dwellings, 2 hectares of public open space and community facilities. Development of a care home at the site would also be permitted. Development should provide for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> at least 160 dwellings at a net density of not less than 30 dwellings per hectare; a neighbourhood park, incorporating suitable public open space and recreation facilities; a footpath and cycle link joining Ingham Road and Yarmouth Road and suitable footways linking the development to the town centre; at least two separate points of vehicular access, one from Ingham Road and one from Yarmouth Road.
KC11: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)				
KC11: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)	SSPKC4 Mr Clive Cunningham	Comment, Unsound, Not Legally Compliant	LEGAL COMPLIANCE: Reason for change refers to 'the development' - there is no development - it is a proposal only and one of several sites which should still be under consideration. SOUNDNESS: This proposed development seems to be the only site under consideration without the consent of the local Stalham population.	Change the preferred site to one of the others previously identified then the two access requirements do not exist. The housing should be moved to adjacent to the A149, opening up the town.
KC11: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)	SSPKC6 Mrs Edna Cunningham	Object, Unsound, Not Legally Compliant	LEGAL COMPLIANCE: The reason for change section does not refer correctly to the 'proposed development'. As I understand it, no decision has yet been made as to whether the development goes ahead - against the wishes of the people of Stalham. SOUNDNESS: Two separate vehicular access points are not necessary and if given the go ahead would provide a 'rat run' onto Ingham Rd, providing far more traffic than the road can cope with.	Drop the ST01 site and move the proposed development to the site close to A149

KC11: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)	SSPKC37 Messrs N & P Wright & Mrs W Josephs	Comment, Sound, Legally Compliant	We support KC11 which seeks the provision of access from both Ingham and Yarmouth Roads	
KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)				
KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)	SSPKC12 Mr Trevor Bunn	Object, Not Specified, Not Specified	I am once again writing to object to the proposed change to the village boundaries in Weybourne. I find this totally out of order. As you are only looking for a piece of land big enough to build 4 property's there is plenty of room within the village boundaries without having to build in an area of outstanding natural beauty. There is land that was earmarked for development many years ago (Pine Walk). Access is already there. If you can't use that land then please look at other sites that are less prominent. Please let common sense prevail. This village is a major holiday attraction with the windmill, North Norfolk Railway, and one of the largest holiday camps in Norfolk, so don't put a blot on our landscape.	
KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)	SSPKC11 Ms Judy Bunn	Object, Not Specified, Not Specified	I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed plan for housing in Station Road in Weybourne. I have lived in this row all of my life (49 years) and when I wake up in the morning and draw my curtains I have a wonderful view over open fields to Kelling Heath and Weybourne Heath. If you build opposite I will just be looking at someone else's bedroom window. We are in an area of outstanding natural beauty. Why spoil it by putting houses in such a prominent position? We have large volumes of traffic up and down this road from one of the largest holiday parks in Norfolk, and the North Norfolk Railway attraction. As you are only looking to build 4 houses now there is enough land within the village boundaries without having to encroach on an area of outstanding natural beauty. If not use land in a less prominent position. There is land in the village that was earmarked for development many years ago and access is all ready. There is the Pine Walk site; also there is a piece of land next to 16 Station Road that is suitable. Don't forget we have more than one landmark in this village. We also have the old priory and church of which the view would be blocked as you come down Station Road by the proposed new development.	
KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)	SSPKC10 Mr & Mrs D Lemon	Object, Not Specified, Not Specified	We, my wife and I, strongly oppose the situation of dwellings in the field opposite us. We've been in this Council house for 45 years. We have enough problems up and down this road as it is without more dwellings going up the Station Road. When the bungalows were built in Pine Walk the previous planning committee could see there was room for development, that's why an access road was put there. So why go against a planning committee who could see the future development of dwellings in Pine Walk, without making it more dangerous than it is now. PLEASE consider your decision carefully and listen to local residents who know how dangerous Station Road is (even more so when the holiday season starts). We have a wonderful village; please don't spoil it by putting more dwellings up the Station Road. We have many holiday people from the Kelling Park Caravan Site and many with young children in pushchairs coming off the steam train. In the holiday season especially, the Station Road does get busy and dangerous as it is. PLEASE don't make things worse.	

KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)	SSPKC17 Mr Jon Rowling	Support, Sound, Legally Compliant	Support the changes - The reduction of the site area from 0.35ha to 0.2ha, reduction from approx 8 dwellings to approx 4 dwellings in response to concerns of scale and visual impact is an acceptable compromise to meet requests from representations by local residents and Weybourne Parish Council to meet policy requirements. I am co-lead signatory for the 56 Weybourne residents signed submissions of same individual comments presented to NNDC at the last round of public consultation (submitted on official NNDC forms and in accordance with NNDC instructions). I request it be noted that the majority of those 56 Weybourne residents are in agreement with the compromise proposal to the reduced plot site and approx number of affordable houses regarding preferred option site WEY09.	
KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)	SSPKC19 Ms Judith Cantell Senior Landscape Architect Norfolk County Council	Comment, Not Specified, Not Specified	Whilst the proposed allocation is smaller than in the previous consultation, it is still considered to have a significant impact on the AONB.	Should this site be taken forward, a proposal to 'buffer' the edges of the development will be required, to discourage any future 'creep' of development to the south. Furthermore, as the southern edge of Weybourne is quite visible from within the AONB some treatment to improve this boundary should be included in the brief.
KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)	SSPKC26 Mrs Marjorie Martin Weybourne Parish Council	Support, Sound, Legally Compliant		No change needed. Addition needed as per DC vote: "4 Dwellings, maintaining an offset end to the building line".
KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)	SSPKC32, Mr Christopher Yardley	Comment, Unsound, Legally Compliant	Weybourne - KC 12/13. Additional safeguards are necessary to ensure that the development allocation proposed is acceptable within this most sensitive and prominent location of the AONB. The site is a hilltop location which does not relate well to the majority of the built development in Weybourne (relatively modern extensions to the settlement pattern have spread the development out in a ribbon along Station Road with rearwards infill of bungalow developments of a non-vernacular type neither of which contribute successfully to the character of the settlement or its setting). This is by no means an ideal location for any additional housing development as the site is highly visible from the higher land overlooking the village (Kelling Heath and the Ridge particularly). These give some of the finest views of archetypal 'English Coastal Countryside' in Britain.	KC 12/13 - In order to ameliorate the impact of the development, a significant tree belt would be required (at least 15m depth) on the southern and western boundaries of the site. The trees should be low native varieties (Field Maple, Blackthorn and Hawthorn with some Holm Oak). The design of the four properties should be single story or 1 and a 1/2 story only to minimise the height and massing and use of smut tiles to reduce the prominence of roofs should be used (which would accord with the darker tiles of the bungalows nearby).
KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)	SSPKC69 Mr & Mrs F Utting	Object, Not Specified, Not Specified	With regard to WEY09 site, again we are writing to you to stop the housing on this land. First it's 8 houses, now it's 4 houses, this really is a waste of land and time. Surely you will find more convenient land within the village itself, ready for development? I would like the Council to consider this point of view; when families rent your Council houses, is it possible that you can put a clause in the tenancy when your children have left home, and when you have reached the age of seventy, you can then go to a Council bungalow instead of wasting a 3-4 bedroom home? The Council should consider this point of view. Please consider my point of view and others in Station Road.	