



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan

Summary of Main Issues

**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 of the LDF Documents can be made
available in Braille, audio, large print or in other languages.
Please contact 01263 516318 to discuss your requirements.**





Contents

1 Introduction	1
2 Summary of Main Issues	9
3 Key Changes: Summary of Main Issues	45



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

1 Introduction

- 1.1** This document reports the representations received and the main issues raised during the public consultation on the North Norfolk Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan and the Schedule of Key Changes. It fulfils the requirements of Regulation 30(e) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and accompanies the Draft Plan which is scheduled for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination on 5 March 2010.
- 1.2** A copy of this document is available on the Council's website (www.northnorfolk.org/ldf), at the Council offices and local libraries.

Site Specific Proposals Development Plan and Schedule of Key Changes

- 1.3** The Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan (incorporating Proposals Map Amendments) was published for public consultation from 15 June to 31 July 2009. During this period copies of the documents were made available for inspection at North Norfolk District Council offices, all local libraries and were also published on the Council's website. In addition, advertisements outlining the consultation were published in local newspapers and many organisations and individuals were either sent copies of the document or notified of the consultation period and how to view the documents and make representations. Site notices were also placed at proposed allocation sites and posters advertising the consultation widely distributed. In total, 916 organisations and individuals made 1,380 representations on the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan within the specified six week period. All representations can be viewed online via the on-line consultation system⁽¹⁾.
- 1.4** The Council has considered the representations that were made and notwithstanding its view that the document is sound it will request that the inspector appointed to examine the Plan makes a number of amendments to the document. These amendments are described in a 'Schedule of Minor Modifications' and a 'Schedule of Key Changes'. Both documents can be viewed on the Council's website. The Schedule of Key Changes was subject to a six week period of public consultation between the 5 January and the 16 February 2010. This document includes details of the number of representations made and the key issues raised in relation to both the Draft Plan and the requested Key Changes documents.

Summary of Main Issues Document

- 1.5** This document has been prepared to comply with the requirements of Regulation 30 (e) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2008, which requires that a local planning authority must send to the Secretary of State when submitting a DPD for examination a statement setting out:
- If representations were made in accordance with regulation 28(2), the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations, or
 - that no such representations were made.
- 1.6** Set out below is a statement of the total number of representations made to the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan and Schedule of Key Changes. The statement reports the number of representations made in relation to the plan, includes a breakdown of which sites these relate to, and provides information on the type of representation.

1 see www.northnorfolk.org/ldf



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

1.7 Section 2 is a summary of the main issues raised in representations on the Draft Plan and who made them. It also provides a cross reference to the Schedules of Minor Modifications and Key Changes where these relate to the issue identified. **Section 3** provides the same information in relation to the consultation on requested Key Changes.

Statement of the Total Number of Representations Made - Regulation 30 (e)

Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan

1.8 In total, 916 organisations and individuals made 1380 representations on the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan within the specified six week period. Of the representations received, 764 considered the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan unsound and 202 considered it sound. A further 414 did not specify whether they considered the document sound or unsound. When asked about Legal Compliance, 146 considered that the document was not legally compliant, with 419 saying it was legally compliant. 815 representations submitted did not specify an answer to this question. The following table shows how these representations were registered against different sections of the document.

Table 1.1 Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan - Summary of Representations Table

Consultation Point (Chapter / Policy)	Legally Compliant	Not Legally Compliant	Compliance Not Specified	Sound	Unsound	Soundness Not Specified
Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan	5	1	14	1	5	14
Foreword	-	-	1	-	1	-
1 Introduction	3	-	1	1	3	-
2 Policy Context	2	-	3	1	4	1
3 Site Selection	3	1	6	1	5	3
4 Proposals for Cromer	49	-	7	50	4	2
Site C01	-	-	3	-	2	1
Site C04	9	9	181	2	191	6
Site C07/8	1	-	3	1	1	2
Site C14	2	-	12	2	5	7
Site C17	3	1	4	2	4	2
Policy ED2	1	2	2	-	3	2
Policy ROS3	1	-	1	1	-	1
Policy ROS4	1	-	4	1	1	3
5 Proposals for Fakenham	-	-	3	-	1	2
Site F01	8	1	10	3	6	10
Site F05/13	-	-	2	-	-	2
Site ROS6/7	2	1	2	1	2	2
6 Proposals for Holt	5	1	9	4	8	3
Site HO9, 12, 21	4	1	8	3	6	4

Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Consultation Point (Chapter / Policy)	Legally Compliant	Not Legally Compliant	Compliance Not Specified	Sound	Unsound	Soundness Not Specified
Site H15	17	-	27	5	29	10
Site CP10	20	2	23	19	6	20
7 Proposals for Hoveton	13	-	6	8	11	-
Site HV03	4	-	85	2	9	78
8 Proposals for North Walsham	10	-	6	1	12	3
Site NW01	3	-	12	-	9	6
Site NW25	5	-	3	1	6	1
Site NW28a	3	-	5	1	6	1
Site NW44	1	7	5		6	7
Site E10	5	-	8	2	7	4
Site ED1	1	1	3	1	3	1
Site ROS8	-	1	7	1	-	7
9 Proposals for Sheringham	5	-	1	2	4	-
Site SH04	8	-	9	2	10	5
Site SH05	6	-	7	2	6	5
Site SH06	10	1	12	3	12	8
Site SH14	8	-	5	1	8	4
Site ROS5	6	-	1	3	3	1
10 Proposals for Stalham	7	-	5	5	4	3
Site ST01	11	53	17	3	65	13
11 Proposals for Wells-next-the-Sea	5	1	2	-	6	2
Site W01	9	-	2	1	9	1
Site CP2	19	7	26	3	33	16
12 Proposals for Service Villages	2	4	3	2	7	-
12.1 Aldborough	3	1	5	2	5	2
Site ALD01/07	-	2	14	-	15	1
12.2 Bacton	-	-	-	-	-	-
Site BACT03	1	-	2	1	-	2
Site BACT05	1	-	3	1	-	3
12.3 Blakeney	-	-	-	-	-	-
Site BLA03	4	2	4	2	6	2
12.4 Briston & Melton Constable	-	-	-	-	-	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Consultation Point (Chapter / Policy)	Legally Compliant	Not Legally Compliant	Compliance Not Specified	Sound	Unsound	Soundness Not Specified
Site BRI01	1	-	3	-	1	3
Site BRI24	-	-	4	-	-	4
Site BRI27	-	-	7	-	-	7
12.5 Catfield	1	-	1	-	1	1
Site CAT01	4	-	38	-	30	12
12.6 Corpusty & Saxthorpe	-	-	-	-	-	-
Site COR01	3	-	8	-	5	6
12.7 Happisburgh	-	-	1	-	-	1
Site HAP07	-	1	3	-	1	3
12.8 Horning	5	1	3	1	8	-
Site HOR06	20	20	16	2	46	8
12.9 Little Snoring	1	-	-	-	1	-
Site SN01	2	5	15	-	19	3
12.10 Ludham	-	-	5	-	2	3
Site LUD01	14	1	17	5	19	7
Site LUD06	10	2	11	1	16	7
12.11 Mundesley	-	-	2	-	1	1
Site MUN06	7	4	8	3	10	6
Site MUN07	6	2	12	1	13	6
12.12 Overstrand	2	-	1	-	2	1
Site OVS03	1	-	2	-	1	2
Site OVS04	2	-	2	-	2	2
12.13 Roughton	6	-	5	5	2	4
Site ROU03/10	24	7	26	21	14	22
12.14 Southrepps	3	1	1	1	3	1
Site SOU02	2	-	10	3	-	9
Site SOU07	2	-	8	2	-	8
12.15 Walsingham	-	-	-	-	-	-
Site WAL01	1	-	2	-	1	2
12.16 Weybourne	1	2	6	-	7	2
Site WEY03	5	-	1	5	-	1
Site WEY09	7	-	7	2	6	6

Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Consultation Point (Chapter / Policy)	Legally Compliant	Not Legally Compliant	Compliance Not Specified	Sound	Unsound	Soundness Not Specified
13 Proposals for Other Areas	-	-	-	-	-	-
Site E7 (Tattersett)	-	-	5	-	2	3
14 Monitoring & Implementation	3	-	1	2	2	-
Sub Totals	419	146	814	202	764	413
Total		1380			1380	

Petitions

1.9 In addition to the above, a further 794 persons signed petitions for or against various proposals in the plan. Many of those who submitted individual representations on the Draft Plan also signed petitions.

Table 1.2 Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan - Summary of Petitions Table

Name	Site	Nature of Petition	Number of Signatories
Grove Guest House – Against C04	C04	Object	90
Residents of Cromer – Against C04	C04	Object	93
Suffield Park Area – Against C04 Development	C04	Object	73
Paston Fields Action Group	ED1	Object	37
Residents Against HOR06	HOR06	Object	18
Summer Drive Residents Association	HV03	Object	13
Willow Way Residents Association	LUD01	Object	302
Please Give Us Our Village Green	ROU03/10	Support	109
N/A	SH06	Object	3
Residents Against Development in Weybourne	Weybourne (Para 12.16.1)	Object	56
Total			794

Schedule of Key Changes

1.10 In total, 56 organisations and individuals made 68 representations on the Schedule of Key Changes within the specified six week period. Of the representations received, 36 considered the Key Changes document unsound and 8 considered it sound. A further 24 did not specify whether they considered the document sound or unsound. When asked about Legal Compliance, 3 considered that the document was not legally compliant, with 20 saying it was legally compliant. 45 representations submitted did not specify an answer to this question. The following table shows how these representations were registered against different sections of the document.



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Table 1.3 Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Schedule of Key Issues - Summary of Representations Table

Consultation Point (Chapter / Key Change / Map / Policy)	Legally Compliant	Not Legally Compliant	Compliance Not Specified	Sound	Unsound	Soundness Not Specified
1 - Schedule of Key Changes	-	-	8	-	-	8
2 - KC01: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD01/07)	1	-	-	-	1	-
2 - KC02: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD01/07)	1	-	1	-	2	-
2 - KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)	1	-	6	1	-	6
2 - KC04: Proposals for Little Snoring	1	-	7	-	8	-
2 - KC05: Land at Junction of Holt Road & Kettlestone Road (SN01)	-	-	-	-	-	-
2 - KC06: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent (SH04)	1	-	1	1	1	-
2 - KC07: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent (SH04)	1	-	-	1	-	-
2 - KC08: Land Rear of Sheringham House (SH06)	2	-	3	1	3	1
2 - KC09: Proposals for Stalham	4	-	13	1	12	4
2 - KC10: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)	1	1	1	-	3	-
2 - KC11: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)	1	2	-	1	2	-
2 - KC12: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)	3	-	5	2	1	5
3 - Aldborough	1	-	-	-	1	-
3 - Map 1: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD01/07)	1	-	-	-	1	-
3 - Policy E12: Land South of Weavers Way, Stalham, Adjacent to A149	1	-	-	-	1	-
	20	3	45	8	36	24
Total		68			68	

Copies of the Representations - Regulation 30 (f)

- 1.11** The full list and content of representations is available on the Council's consultation website (<http://consult.north-norfolk.gov.uk/portal>). A separate document containing summaries of all of the representations made has been placed in local libraries and at the Council offices in Cromer and Fakenham, and the full representations can also be viewed online at those locations.



Submission of the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan

- 1.12** The Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan (incorporating Proposals Map amendments) Development Plan Document is scheduled for formal submission to the Secretary of State on 5 March 2010.



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

2 Summary of Main Issues

Summary of the Main Issues Raised - Regulation 30 (e)

- 2.1** The following is North Norfolk District Council's own summary of the main issues raised by consultees regarding the soundness of the Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan. It is not a comprehensive list of all of the issues raised, nor does it represent the Inspector's view of the key issues or matters for examination. The original representations should be viewed for a complete understanding of all issues raised.
- 2.2** The tables provide a summary of the main issues raised against each Site Specific Proposals allocation, Proposals Map amendment or supporting text, in broadly document order. The tables summarise the comments made, identifies the person or organisation making the comment and provides the unique reference number of the representation. The unique reference number enables individual representations to be located and viewed either via the LDF online Planning Portal or in the Report of Representations paper document. Representations received from members of the public are referred to as 'third party representations' and are referenced by the page number/s on which they appear in the Report of Representations document. Where several consultees have raised similar issues these have been grouped together under a single summary. In addition where a main issue has resulted in the Council requesting that the Inspector considers a minor or key change the relevant modification ID reference is included. The modification references refer to the Schedule of Minor Modifications (MM) and Schedule of Key Changes (KC) documents.

General Issues

Issue	Change ID No.
<p>MI1 - LACK OF GYPSY AND TRAVELLER PROVISION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absence from the Plan provision for permanent sites for Gypsies and Travellers as required by the adopted East of England Plan EERA rep no. 1397 , Go East rep no. 1402, Friends, Families and Travellers rep no. 608. 	-
<p>MI2 - APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT AND THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON SACs/SPAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RSPB and Natural England object to the AA mitigation measures that require monitoring to assess the impact of development on SACs/SPAs. They comment that this is not a valid mitigation measure as it cannot prevent an adverse effect, but only enable such an effect to be detected after the event. They require collection of baseline data on current visitor numbers to designated sites which should determine suitable mitigation measures to limit the impact on designated sites. Natural England rep nos 946, 950, RSPB rep no. 1044. 	-
<p>MI3 - ENVIRONMENTAL CAPACITY FOR GROWTH AND THE NEED FOR A WATER CYCLE STUDY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Environment Agency have raised concerns about the allocations in Stalham and Fakenham due to it not being demonstrated whether the proposals can be accommodated within the existing consent for the relevant sewage treatment works and without detriment to water quality in the receiving watercourses, which are designated SACs. The EA comment that whilst the Draft Plan identifies foul water drainage and environmental capacity limitations, it does not specify a) if these limitations can be overcome to enable the proposed level of growth in Stalham and Fakenham b) if they can be overcome, the delivery mechanisms required to implement them and if they are achievable in the plan period and c) if they cannot be overcome, the consequences and alternatives available. No evidence has been provided to support the assumption that the limitations can be overcome. Need further investigation (ie a Water Cycle Study) into the environmental capacity for 	MM74a-i



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Issue	Change ID No.
<p>growth and to investigate the options for sustainable STW solutions to ensure no detriment to water quality. Alternatively it would need to be demonstrated that there is an alternative location and receiving environment in the district to meet the housing target without detriment to water quality and designated sites. Environment Agency rep no. 509</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England agrees with the conclusions of the Draft AA that allocations F01, F05/13, ROS06/7, ST01, CAT01, HAP07, LUD01, LUD06, SOU02, AND SOU07 should not proceed until water quality issues are resolved and no adverse affect on integrity on the relevant European sites can be concluded. Natural England rep nos 955, 958, 960, 962, 965, 966, 968, 970,972,973. In relation to ST01 Broads Authority raise concern about scale of development/infrastructure needs and impact on water quality above and beyond its significance for Natura 2000 sites. Needs to be resolved before commitment to development is made. Broads Authority rep no. 347 	
<p>MI4 - DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England, CPRE, The Norfolk Coast Partnership, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and number of individuals have objected to all allocations in the AONB, stating that alternative sites should be considered. They say to achieve affordable housing provision in the district the Council over relies on planning gain and the development of large green field sites. The proposals are likely to result in significant development in the AONB without the level of benefits predicted in terms of affordable housing. The proposals are inconsistent with the guidance in paragraph 21-22 of PPS7 relating to national protected landscapes. In addition they say that further biodiversity and landscape assessments of certain sites should be carried out. In the event of sites being included carried forward Natural England have suggested an additional policy requirement : stating 'This site is within the Norfolk Coast AONB, and development proposals should be informed by, and be sympathetic to, the special landscape character of this protected site. Proposals should also be informed by Development Control Policies EN1 and EN2.' <p>Applicable sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C04 - CPRE 971, Natural England 975, Norfolk Coast Partnership 880 C17 - CPRE 974, Natural England 977, Norfolk Coast Partnership 886 SH04 - CPRE 959, Natural England 979, Norfolk Coast Partnership 892, Norfolk Wildlife Trust 695 SH05 - CPRE 961, Natural England 980, Norfolk Coast Partnership 894, SH06 - CPRE 963, Natural England 981, Norfolk Coast Partnership 892, Norfolk Wildlife Trust 703 SH14 - CPRE 967, Natural England 983, Norfolk Coast Partnership 895 W01 - CPRE 957, Norfolk Coast Partnership 897 CP2 - CPRE 951, Norfolk Coast Partnership 888, Norfolk Wildlife Trust 704 BLA 03 - Norfolk Coast Partnership 878 MUN07 - Norfolk Coast Partnership 891 	MM69
<p>MI5 - DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocations fail to make adequate provision for affordable housing in rural area. Allocations promoted at Stibbard STIB01 (Savills rep no. 945) and Great Ryburgh GRYB1 (Savills rep no. 948) Development should be confined to small scale development meeting identified local need in Cromer, Fakenham, Holt and North Walsham . All settlements in the district should be protected and enhanced. Third party representation page 17. Scale of growth and impact on existing settlements unacceptable - option for new town should be considered. Third party representation page 22. 	-
<p>MI6 - DELIVERY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures of 45-50% challenge the delivery of new housing development which is at the heart of central government policy. Holkham Estate rep no. 596 	-

Issues for Cromer

4 Cromer	Change ID No.
<p>MI7 - HAS THE RIGHT AMOUNT OF LAND AND THE RIGHT SITES BEEN ALLOCATED?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites C15 and C16 should be included in order to make proposals for Cromer sound. Sufficient sites have not been allocated to meet the housing need and Core Strategy requirement. Mr Hugh Ivins rep no. 715. Preferable sites in less sensitive location to C04 have been wrongly discounted. Dr Colin Blake rep no. 740. Several representations supporting the non-selection of site C10 (Runton Road). Third party representations pages 24 - 32. 	-
4.1 Residential: Land Adjacent to East Coast Motors (C01)	
<p>MI8 - SCALE AND FORM OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-storey development will not be compatible with the surrounding architecture – neighbouring residential buildings are generally two to three storeys in height. Cromer Preservation Society rep no. 535. 	-
4.2 Residential: Land at Rear of Sutherland House, Overstrand Road (C04)	
<p>MI9 - JUSTIFICATION FOR SITE SELECTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability Appraisal process flawed. Overstated housing land demand Undue emphasis on housing development and not enough emphasis on other needs such as leisure, recreation, open space and energy. Selection of site is not appropriate or justified. Deficiency of open space in Cromer Preferable sites available. <p>Hayes and Storr rep no. 964, on behalf of local residents</p>	-
<p>MI10 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORTH NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL INTEREST (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will result in a significant development in the AONB without the level of benefits predicted in terms of affordable housing - contrary to PPS7 and guidance relating to protected landscapes. Insufficient attention has been given to finding alternative areas for the required housing outside the Norfolk Coast AONB. <p>Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 880, Natural England rep no. 975, CPRE rep no. 971.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the AONB the purpose should be the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty. Adverse landscape impact. Other discounted sites are preferable and would have less landscape impact. High density development on the site inappropriate. <p>Cromer Preservation Society rep no. 607, Residents of Cromer against C04 rep no. 1034, Grove Guest House against C04 rep no. 1037, Suffield Park Area against C04 rep no.1209 and third party representations pages 37 -111.</p>	MM69
<p>MI11 - LOSS OF RECREATIONAL LAND/OPEN SPACE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deficiency of recreational land in the locality. Development will result in increased demand for recreational land in the town. 	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

4 Cromer	Change ID No.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No compensatory provision is proposed. Should be reserved for future recreational use in the event that the cricket club lease is not extended in the future. <p>Sport England rep no. 384, Cromer Preservation Society rep no. 607, Norfolk Cricket Board rep no. 493.</p> <p>Residents of Cromer against C04 rep no. 1034, Grove Guest House against C04 rep no. 1037, Suffield Park Area against C04 rep no.1209 and third party representations pages 37 -111.</p>	
<p>MI12 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety of residents of Sutherland House. Width and suitability of access road. Access on to Overstrand Road - traffic speeds above average/visibility obscured by parked vehicles. <p>Third party representations pages 42 - 46.</p>	-
<p>MI13 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE TOURIST ECONOMY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site will impact on the tourist experience of the town - holiday makers constitute the largest commercial income to the town. <p>Residents of Cromer against C04 rep no. 1034, Grove Guest House against C04 rep no. 1037, Suffield Park Area against C04 rep no.1209 and third party representations pages 37 -111.</p>	-
<p>MI14 - AMENITY IMPACT ON SURROUNDING RESIDENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity and scale of development. Impact of a mixed residential development on elderly residents and tourists staying locally. Occupancy of development should be restricted to the over 55s. <p>Third party representations pages 37 - 46.</p>	-
<p>MI15 - IMPACT ON NATURAL HABITAT AND WILDLIFE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is an open part of the contiguous range of wildlife habitat from the Warren woods across to the Lighthouse hills and along the cliffs and should be protected. Impact on adjacent woodland habitat. <p>Cromer Preservation Society rep no. 607 and third party representations pages 37 - 50.</p>	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY OR ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed comments regarding text and policy requirements. Support for allocation from landowner who wishes to develop the site for C3 retirement housing which will count towards the housing requirement. Allocations in Cromer do not meet the Core Strategy requirement and there is scope to increase housing numbers on the site to 80. The site can accommodate 70dph if flats or apartments are developed in line with surrounding development. There is an ageing population in Cromer and a shortage of sheltered accommodation. Barton Wilmore rep no. 1399. 	-
<p>4.3 Mixed Use: Land at Jubilee Lane / Cromer High Station (C07/08)</p>	
<p>No major issues raised.</p>	-

4 Cromer	Change ID No.
4.4 Residential: Land West of Roughton Road (C14)	
<p>MI16 - LANDSCAPE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about visual impact of development on the countryside and rural setting of Cromer. Provision of infrastructure will have negative impact on the character of the area. <p>Cromer Preservation Society rep no. 609 and third party representations page 113.</p>	-
<p>MI17 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roughton Road cannot cope with the additional traffic. Third party representations page 115 	-
<p>MI18 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON FLOODING AND SURFACE WATER IMPACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern from local residents about flooding and surface water run-off as their properties are much lower than the road and the land at the rear. Needs a full flood risk assessment and wildlife survey. Third party representation page 115. 	-
<p>MI19 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON EXISTING WILDLIFE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of development on bats including Natterer and Daubenton. Third party representations page 115. 	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Norfolk Homes Ltd rep no. 783. 	-
4.5 Residential: Railway Triangle, Norwich Road (C17)	
<p>MI20 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COASTAL AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will result in a significant development in the AONB without the level of benefits predicted in terms of affordable housing - contrary to PPS7 and guidance relating to protected landscapes Insufficient attention has been given to finding alternative areas for the required housing outside the Norfolk Coast AONB. <p>Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 886, CPRE rep no. 974, Natural England rep no. 977.</p>	MM69
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY OR ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed comments regarding text and policy requirements. Bidwells rep no. 976. 	-
4.6 Education: Cromer Football Club, Mill Road (ED2)	
<p>MI21 - FUTURE OF THE FOOTBALL CLUB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sound in principle, but further guidance required in terms of the relocation of the football club. Policy should be amended to require the prior relocation of the football club to provide facilities that are the equivalent or better of the exiting facilities in terms of quantity, quality, accessibility and management arrangements. Sport England rep no. 386. Concern about loss of football club within the town centre. Relocation out of town would encourage car use. Should be retained in current location. Cromer Preservation Society rep no. 610 The original Trust deed for the land charges the Trustees with maintaining the property as open space. Third party representation page 118. 	MM4 & 5



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

4 Cromer	Change ID No.
4.7 Retail: Land Between Louden Road & Church Street (ROS3)	
No main issues raised.	-
4.8 Retail: Land South of Louden Road (ROS4)	
MI22 - MIX OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is outside the Primary Shopping Area - Residential use would be more appropriate. Exchange House visually attractive building and has an important public function. Appearance and function should be safeguarded. Cromer Preservation Society rep no. 614. 	-

Issues for Fakenham

5 Fakenham	Change ID No.
MI23 - HAS THE RIGHT AMOUNT OF LAND AND THE RIGHT SITES BEEN ALLOCATED?	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of brown field site at Parker Drive (F12), Fakenham - The plan has not adequately considered potential sources of housing supply, in particular previous employment land which is no longer suitable or available for employment use. Extensive detail provided regarding land at Parker Drive. Objection is made to its omission from the plan as a residential allocation. Mr Eric Hall rep no. 513 Promotion of land at Oxborough Lane (F10) to the east of Fakenham town centre as an alternative site to F01. Proposed allocation F01 will require significant new infrastructure and will not make efficient use of existing brownfield land and infrastructure. Mr T C Duffy Ms Louise Cotter rep no. 986 The ability for F01 to deliver the suggested number of houses within the time period of this plan is highly questionable. The number of dwellings proposed in the plan time period should be revised downwards to take into account the potential delays in delivery by the landowners/developers and the acknowledged infrastructure constraints in the town. Norfolk Homes rep no. 810 The amount of housing is not justified. Question the ability of F01 to deliver safer and more convenient access to the town centre. Capacity of existing road structure to cope with the increase in traffic is questioned. The substantial increase in traffic from the proposed number of new dwellings would result in unacceptable levels of congestion and pollution on the access roads to the town centre. Thirty party rep page 124 	
5.1 Mixed Use: Land North of Rudham Stile Lane (F01)	
MI24 - SEWAGE DISPOSAL AND IMPACT ON WATER QUALITY OF THE RIVER WENSUM (see also MI3)	MM74a & MM74b
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern over the soundness of this allocation due to it not being demonstrated whether this proposal can be accommodated within the existing consent for Fakenham sewage treatment works (STW) and without detriment to water quality in the receiving watercourse, the river Wensum. Further information is needed to ensure that there will be no detriment to the water quality of the river Wensum and the designated sites as a result of the proposed allocation. To enable this allocation to proceed we suggest that the inspector requires additional evidence, in the form of a water cycle study (or equivalent), which investigates the options for sustainable STW solutions to ensure no detriment to water quality. Alternatively it would need to be demonstrated that there is an alternative location and receiving environment in the District which would ensure the Council met their housing target without detriment to water quality and designated sites. Natural England agrees with the Appropriate Assessment conclusion that this allocation should not proceed until water quality issues are resolved and no adverse affect on the integrity of the relevant EWS can be concluded. Support the recognition of this constraint within the policies. As 	

5 Fakenham	Change ID No.
<p>there is uncertainty, at present, over whether the mitigation mechanisms outlined will be sufficiently resourced and if there is adequate commitment on behalf of the parties responsible for their implementation, we are unable to conclude that there would be no adverse effect on integrity.</p> <p>Environment Agency rep no. 700, Natural England rep nos 955, 958, Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board rep no. 1123</p>	
<p>MI25 - PROTECTION AND PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE AND SPORTS PROVISION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sport England supports this policy in principle, but would reiterate previous comments that existing sports facilities on this site should be protected, including the potential to expand if necessary. New residential development will require new public open space provision (including playing field provision) and some of this requirement may be met through the expansion of existing sites within the development area, therefore this opportunity shouldn't be prejudiced. Sports England rep no. 510 	-
<p>MI26 - FUTURE OF EXISTING ALLOTMENTS ON THE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing allotments should be protected and if possible more provided and improvements made to existing facilities. Third party representation page 130 	MM6
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY OR ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed comments regarding text and policy requirements. Trinity College Cambridge (landowner) support the allocation but suggest the following changes: Add new criterion in respect of overall phasing of site, advocating development of the central and eastern parts to accommodate development in the period to 2021 to improve the effectiveness of the policy. Delete criteria (d), (e), (f) and (h), so not to repeat the requirements of national, regional and core strategy policies. Clarify the community infrastructure required to support the new development in the town to improve the effectiveness of the policy. Masterplan also submitted. Capita Lovejoy rep no. 611 	-
<p>5.2 Residential: Land Between Holt Road & Greenway Lane (F05/13)</p>	
<p>No main issues raised.</p>	-
<p>5.3 Retail: Land at Fakenham Town Centre (ROS6/7)</p>	
<p>MI27 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirements for the Development Brief do not deal adequately with transportation issues. A more wide ranging investigation is needed including consideration of the impacts of F01, impact on motor traffic and on facilities for pedestrian and cycle movement, and the consequences for public transport in and around the town centre. <p>Third party representation page 134</p>	MM7



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Issues for Holt

6 Holt	Change ID No.
<p>MI28 - HAS THE RIGHT AMOUNT OF LAND AND THE RIGHT SITES BEEN ALLOCATED?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation seeking inclusion of H01 (Woodfield Road) commenting that NNDC have failed to make adequate provision for housing land in the district. Additional site provides flexibility and scores well in the SA. Landform Ltd rep no. 1139 Site selection in Holt for residential development does not meet the requirements of section 1.2.3 of the document. H04 and H14 should be included as allocations for residential development, while deleting H15. Norfolk Homes rep nos. 759, 773, in addition third party representation page 142. Scale of development being proposed excessive given level of facilities and services and the character of the town and its countryside setting. Third party representations pages 135 & 149 Adequacy of infrastructure including roads, sewers, schools, medical centres and dentists to cope with the increase in demand. Third party representations pages 135 & 149 	-
6.1 Residential: Land at Heath Farm / Hempstead Road (H09/12/21)	
<p>MI27 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NATURE CONSERVATION VALUE OF THE SITE AND ADJACENT SITES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Norfolk Wildlife Trust consider that H12 may be of a County Wildlife Site value and should be retained as a buffer to the existing CWS. Norfolk Wildlife Trust rep no. 701 Representation challenging the Appropriate Assessment. Increase in visitor numbers will have adverse impact on Holt Lowes SSSI/SAC. Mr Simon Harrap rep nos 835 and 843. 	-
<p>MI28 - SCALE AND MIX OF USES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation on behalf of landowners seeking increase in the amount of employment land to accord with Core Strategy requirement of 5 ha and the inclusion of broader commercial uses such as care home, hotel and petrol filling station. Chaplin Farrant rep no. 1398 Representation suggesting the need for new employment land has not been justified. Mr Simon Harrap rep no. 824 Mix of development should address proven need for housing and employment development - reference to hotel, care home and petrol station should be removed. Holt Society rep no. 938 Representation on behalf of site owners of adjoining land seeking extension of the allocation to include H10. Scope to provide for an element of development whilst still retaining an undeveloped element adjacent to the A149. NPS Property Consultants Ltd rep no. 350 	MM8
<p>MI29 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON FUTURE RAIL IMPROVEMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation referring to the recent approval to restore a permanent link between the Bittern Railway line and the North Norfolk Railway line. Development should not prejudice the possible extension of the line to serve the town and to link with Melton Constable and Fakenham. Mr Nigel Morgan rep nos 638, 640, 641 	MM9
COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chaplin Farrant Consultants rep no. 1398 	
6.2 Residential: Land South of Cromer Road (H15)	
<p>MI30 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of the development on traffic and pedestrian use of Grove Lane. Grove Lane will become a rat run and is substandard for further pedestrian use. Restricting access on to Cromer will not prevent this. Pedestrian routes along Cromer Road are inadequate – only present on one side and inadequate in width. Will increase traffic on Cromer Road to the detriment of its use by cyclists. 	MM11

6 Holt	Change ID No.
Third party representations pages 144 - 154.	
<p>MI31 - PROXIMITY OF THE SITE TO THE TOWN CENTRE AND OTHER KEY FACILITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representations referring to the distance of the site from the town centre and other key facilities. • Poor pedestrian links to the primary school. • Location will increase car journeys and compound parking congestion problems in the town. <p>Third party representations pages 144 - 154.</p>	-
<p>MI32 - SCALE AND FORM OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High density development will not integrate well with the area and will result in the creation of an isolated community. <p>Third party representations pages 144 - 154.</p>	-
<p>MI33 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON FUTURE RAIL IMPROVEMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representation referring to the recent approval to restore a permanent link between the Bittern Railway line and the North Norfolk Railway line. Text amendment sought (Nigel Morgan rep nos 645, 647). 	MM10
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY OR ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter on behalf of the landowner supporting the allocation confirming the availability of the site and delivery within the early stages of the plan period. Reference made to the studies undertaken to date. Development will allow the school to reinvest capital in the school of benefit to the town as a whole. John Martin and Associates rep no. 1136. 	-
6.3 Car Park: Land at Thornage Road (CP10)	
<p>MI34 - JUSTIFICATION FOR THE NEED FOR A CAR PARK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representations questioning the evidence base. Proposal has not been validated by objective data on supply of, or demand for, off street parking nor evidence that the car park would reduce congestion. <p>The Open Space Society rep no. 763, CPRE rep no. 954 and third party representations pages 155, 168.</p>	-
<p>MI35 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE GLAVEN VALLEY CONSERVATION AREA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation is a greenfield site within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area. • Use as car park would fail to 'preserve or enhance the area' would be inadequately screened and would produce no wildlife benefits. • Other options/sites, do not appear to have been vigorously considered or pursued. <p>The Open Space Society rep no. 763, CPRE rep no. 954 and third party representations pages 161, 162, 164.</p>	-
<p>MI36 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON FUTURE RAIL IMPROVEMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representation referring to the recent approval to restore a permanent link between the Bittern Railway line and the North Norfolk Railway line. Text amendment sought (Nigel Morgan rep no. 649). 	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representation providing supplementary supporting evidence - 'Needs assessment Holt Car Park Proposal'. Mr Graham Chapman rep no. 935. 	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Issues for Hoveton

7 Hoveton	Change ID No.
7.1 Residential: Land Adjacent to Doctors Surgery, Stalham Road (HV03)	
<p>MI37 - SCALE AND FORM OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hoveton is a village and cannot support the scale of growth proposed. Hoveton is located on the boundary of two administration areas (North Norfolk DC and Broadland DC). Significant development is proposed in Broadland at Wroxham and Rackheath Eco town. Proposals should be consulted on jointly so providing better information for people to comment. No evidence of holistic planning. Scale of development inappropriate given level of local employment opportunities and local facilities. Scale of development will impact on the rural character of the village. Urbanisation of the village, loss of open fields and countryside views. Impact on the public footpath between Stalham and Tunstead Road. <p>Comments suggesting the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduce the allocation to 50 dwellings. reposition HV03 to between health centre and Forties Row. split the allocation between HV03 and HV02 in order to spread the impact with Tunstead road which has spare capacity. access to St Peters Lane or Tunstead Road should be investigated. <p>Hoveton Parish Council rep no. 39, Ashmanhaugh Parish Council rep no. 427, Nigel Dixon - County Councillor rep no. 944, Summer Drive Residents Association rep no. 1396 and third party representations pages 170 - 205.</p>	-
<p>MI38 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion is grossly understated in the document and stretches far wider than Wroxham bridge. Causes traffic problems throughout the village. Para 7.0.2 does not reflect the extent or frequency of the congestion. A1151 constraint to further development, by-pass should be built around Wroxham and Hoveton. The combined effect of LDF allocations in Hoveton, Stalham, Bacton, Catfield, Ludham and Horning amounts to 624 new homes, which will add significant traffic volume and congestion to the Stalham road (A1151) and the Wroxham bridge which already have heavy traffic. Pedestrian and cycle links: Adequate provision must be made to encourage pedestrian and cycle use, e.g. links to school, village centre, railway station and along the A1151 to the houses further up Stalham Road. Need a safe crossing over the A1151 from new development to St Johns primary school. <p>Nigel Dixon - County Councillor rep no. 944 and third party representations pages 170 - 205.</p>	-
<p>MI39 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON AIR QUALITY AND POLLUTION LEVELS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over marginal air quality and pollution levels in the centre of Hoveton from traffic congestion. Increased traffic will cause the air quality to fall below minimum standards. An air quality management and improvement plan should be required alongside any large developments. <p>Nigel Dixon - County Councillor rep no. 944.</p>	MM13&14
<p>MI40 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE POSSIBLE FUTURE EXPANSION OF THE MEDICAL CENTRE</p>	MM15

7 Hoveton	Change ID No.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow space for the medical centre to expand and have landscaping around it to protect privacy <p>Hoveton and Wroxham Medical Centre rep no. 770, Hoveton Parish Council rep no. 39.</p>	
<p>MI41 - DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> South eastern part of the site is subject to surface water flooding. Concern that development will increase flooding frequency and severity. <p>Third party representations pages 177- 205.</p>	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY OR ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed representation supporting HV03, documents include reference to:Site Appraisal; Landscape/Ecology studies studies; Highways; Archaeology; Concept Plan; tests of soundness. Persimmon Homes rep no. 871. 	-

Issues for North Walsham

8 North Walsham	Change ID No.
<p>MI42 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITES</p> <p>Numerous representations seeking inclusion of alternative sites on the basis that the proposals for North Walsham cumulatively represent a series of complex sites where deliverability could prove a serious hinderance. The following sites are promoted as being suitable, available/deliverable and able to provide for affordable housing :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NW 17 - Mike Terry rep no. 340. NW 22 - Mike Terry rep no. 341. NW 23 & NW 24 - DLP Planning Ltd rep nos 771, 903 , 907. NW 28 - Savills rep no. 988. NW 33 - Mike Terry rep no. 269. NW 35 - Mike Terry rep no. 339. 	-
8.1 Mixed Use: Land at Norwich Road / Nursery Drive (NW01, 04-07 & 30)	
<p>MI43 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional traffic on Norwich Road , additional carbon footprint. <p>Third party representation page 212.</p>	-
<p>MI44 - LOSS OF GREEN FIELD LAND AND HABITAT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern raised regarding the development of green field land damage to wildlife habitat. <p>Third party representation page 212.</p>	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY OR ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed comments regarding text and policy requirements. <p>Hopkins Homes rep nos 613, 615, 616, 617, 620, 621, 622, 624, 626, 612. Ladbrook Engineering Nigel Morgan rep nos 665, 667, 669.</p>	-
8.2 Mixed Use: Land off Laundry Loke (NW25)	



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

8 North Walsham	Change ID No.
<p>MI45 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON FLOODING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed access route to the residential part of the site is subject to flooding. Third party representation page 217. 	MM21
<p>MI46 - SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial redevelopment supported but inclusion of residential development on open land area considered inappropriate. Concern for breeding birds and wildlife on the site. Site considered too small to be deliverable. Adjacent Bluebird Coaches site should be included to provide a more viable mixed use site. <p>Third party representations pages 215-217.</p>	-
8.3 Residential: North Walsham Football Club (NW28a)	
<p>MI47 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways Authority object to the allocation and seek removal from SSP – Pedestrian links to town centre are unsuitable and there is an unacceptable risk to personal injury with no scope to make improvements. Additional vehicular movements on the local road network with poor footpath links will put pedestrians already using these routes in an unacceptable position of increased danger. Norfolk County Council rep no. 953. Concerns over increase in traffic along Cherry Tree Lane and local road network. Third party representations page 219 & 220. Reference to Transport and Accessibility Report (July 2008) submitted in support of NW28. Representation promotes land directly to the south of the allocation. Savills rep no. 988. 	-
8.4 Mixed Use: Paston College Lawns Site (NW44)	
<p>MI48 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT/LANDSCAPE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full architectural and historic appraisal should be carried out. Scarborough House (Listed) and its setting should be recognised as constraints. Important site within North Walsham Conservation Area. Full account should be taken of biodiversity and landscape factors particularly the stand of mature woodland. <p>Third party representations 221-223.</p>	MM22
8.5 Employment: Land off Cornish Way (E10)	
<p>MI49 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority is concerned about traffic generated from additional development in the area. There is concern that additional development will increase cross-town HGV movements. Highway Authority 952 Additional traffic will be generated on unsuitable roads. Lyngate Road is a quiet lane unsuitable for heavy traffic <p>Third party representations pages 226-229</p>	MM18 MM25b MM25c
<p>MI50 - EXTENSION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND INTO THE COUNTRYSIDE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representations highlighting that the allocation represents a major extension of employment land into the countryside. The site has always been previously designated as Countryside and the allocation has not been justified. representation raised regarding the visual appearance of the existing employment development and adequacy of existing planting schemes. Major part of allocation subject to S106 Obligation 	-

8 North Walsham	Change ID No.
<p>Landscape Planting Agreement. Existing tree planting subject to this agreement not well tended and need attention. Further planting necessary involving more mature specimens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise and light pollution in the countryside. <p>Third party representations pages 226 - 228.</p>	
<p>MI51 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE AMENITIES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity concerns - proximity of allocation to residential properties. <p>Third party representations pages 226 - 228</p>	MM24
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY OR ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments submitted in relation to supporting text and policy requirements rep. nos 678, 683, 685, 689. 	
8.6 Education: Paston College Relocation (ED1)	
<p>MI52 - LOSS OF OPEN RECREATION LAND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of 3.8 hectares of open space, green space and uplifting vista. No adequate social, environmental or recreational compensation. <p>Paston Fields Action Group rep nos 680 and third party representations page 230-231.</p>	-
<p>MI53 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate local highway network to cater for the additional vehicle and pedestrian traffic. <p>Paston Fields Action Group rep nos 680 and third party representations page 230-231.</p>	-
<p>MI54 - ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVE SITES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan does not consider alternative brownfield sites. <p>Paston Fields Action Group rep nos 680 and third party representations page 230-231.</p>	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY OR ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paston College rep no. 688 	
8.7 Retail: Vicarage Street Car Park (ROS8)	
<p>MI55 - LOSS OF PUBLIC CAR PARK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a very important area for parking and if it were to be developed it would make it very difficult for people attending St Nicholas Church and other establishments in the area. Particularly important for traders parking on market day. The car park is much used and quite frequently full and its loss will adversely impact on town centre businesses. <p>Third party representations pages 232 & 233.</p>	MM27
<p>MI56 - JUSTIFICATION FOR ADDITIONAL RETAIL PREMISES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no need for more retail premises including eating, drinking or financial services premises in North Walsham. There are several empty shops in town. <p>Third party representations pages 232 & 233.</p>	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Issues for Sheringham

9 Sheringham	Change ID No.
<p>MI57 - ADDITIONAL EMPLOYMENT/COMMERCIAL ALLOCATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed representation seeking allocation of 1.6ha of land adjacent to Splash for employment/retail use. The case is made that there is insufficient flexibility in employment/commercial land provision and that the one proposed retail opportunity site will be difficult to deliver. The representation is made in support of the current planning application for the Greenhouse Community Project and would provide an enabling policy context for such a proposal. Bidwells rep no. 978. 	-
<p>MI58 - AVAILABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE SITES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation seeking the inclusion of SH13 (land south of Woodfields School) SA score higher than other allocations. Site is considered suitable, readily available and deliverable. Mr Mike Terry rep no. 266. 	-
9.1 Residential: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent (SH04)	
<p>MI59 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE WILDLIFE VALUE OF THE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question regarding the SA score and whether the AONB designation has been considered. Criteria of the policy insufficient to protect the biodiversity value of the site. Recommend site should not be zoned for development or the policy should seek mitigation through lower housing density leaving at least 40% of the site as public open space. Norfolk Wildlife Trust rep no. 695 & Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 892. 	KC06
<p>MI60 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site together with others that are proposed in Sheringham concentrate developments within the AONB and further attention should be given to alternative non AONB sites. Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 892, CPRE rep no. 959, Natural England rep no. 979, Norfolk Wildlife Trust rep no. 695. 	MM69
<p>MI61 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy requirement that development of this site should derive vehicular access from Seaview Crescent rather than direct to Holway Road will result in unacceptable highway safety and inconvenience existing road users. Seaview Crescent is inadequate for more traffic. <p>Third party reps pages 238 - 241.</p>	KC07
<p>MI62 - PUBLIC ACCESS TO MORLEY HILL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site and others in the vicinity of Morley Hill should not merely require access to Morley Hill but should also require contributions towards establishing the Hill as an area of Public Open Space. <p>Third party representations pages 240 & 241.</p>	-
<p>COMMENTS MADE ON BEHALF OF THE LANDOWNER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stead Sutton Associates rep no. 904 	-
9.2 Residential: Land Adjoining Morley Hill (SH05)	
<p>MI63 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site together with others that are proposed in Sheringham concentrate developments within the AONB and further attention should be given to alternative non AONB sites. 	MM69

9 Sheringham	Change ID No.
<p>Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 893, CPRE rep no. 961, Natural England rep no. 980.</p>	
<p>MI64 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be no vehicular or pedestrian access to Snafell Park as this would reduce security, privacy and amenity. <p>Third party representation pages 242-243.</p>	-
<p>MI65 - PUBLIC ACCESS TO MORLEY HILL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That development of this site and others in the vicinity of Morley Hill should not merely require access to Morley Hill but should also require contributions towards establishing the Hill as an area of Public Open Space. <p>Third party representations page 243.</p>	-
9.3 Residential: Land Rear of Sheringham House (SH06)	
<p>MI66 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site together with others that are proposed in Sheringham concentrate developments within the AONB and further attention should be given to alternative non AONB sites. <p>Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 894, CPRE rep no. 963, Natural England rep no. 981, Norfolk Wildlife Trust rep no. 703.</p>	MM69
<p>MI67 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE WILDLIFE VALUE OF THE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The allocation and policy requirements do not adequately reflect the potential biodiversity interests on the site and the contribution it makes to the ecological network. Norfolk Wildlife Trust rep no. 703. North-east of the site should be designated as open and wooded amenity land - it is important for wildlife and is an important wildlife corridor. Third party representation page 246. 	MM29
<p>MI68 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation endorsing the requirement that the site should be served by two access points. Other representations suggestions two points of access will result in the use of narrow roads with no visibility splays and will require the removal of trees covered by a tree preservation order. Site can be adequately served by single point of access. <p>Third party representations pages 245 - 253.</p>	-
<p>MI69 - QUANTITY AND TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicular activity associated with the quantity of development proposed will impact on the amenity of existing residents. Existing neighbours to the site are primarily retired residents and family housing/social housing would not be compatible. In addition site is some distance from the primary school and is likely to mean additional crossing of a busy main road by young children. Dwellings for over 55s would be more acceptable. 70 dwellings should be considered the maximum. <p>Third party representations pages 245 - 253.</p>	KC08
<p>MI70 - PUBLIC ACCESS TO MORLEY HILL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That development of this site and others in the vicinity of Morley Hill should not merely require access to Morley Hill but should also require contributions towards establishing the Hill as an area of Public Open Space. Third party representation pages 249 & 250. 	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

9 Sheringham	Change ID No.
<p>COMMENTS MADE ON BEHALF OF THE LANDOWNER</p> <p>Representations on behalf of land owner supporting the allocation but making a number of submissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested number of dwellings should be increased to 90 reflecting that the site is suitable for flats and could accommodate this higher number. That there should be no requirement for two points of access as the one (Willow Grove) has been shown to be acceptable. That there is no need to refer to 45% affordable housing as this is already required by other elements of the Development Plan (Core Strategy Policy H02). There is an aging population in North Norfolk and a shortage of sheltered accommodation. Barton Wilmore rep no. 1399. 	KC08
9.4 Residential: Land at Holway Road, Opposite Hazel Ave (SH14)	
<p>MI71 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site together with others that are proposed in Sheringham concentrate developments within the AONB and further attention should be given to alternative non AONB sites. Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 895, CPRE rep no. 967, Natural England rep no. 983. Sheringham Town Council object to the inclusion of this site. It is outside of the town boundary which should not be moved to allow development. Sheringham Town Council rep no. 162. 	MM69
<p>MI72 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE AMENITIES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the proposals will result in an unacceptable loss of amenity, potential overlooking, and residents were advised when they bought their homes that this site would not be built on. <p>Third party representations pages 251.</p>	MM30
<p>COMMENTS MADE ON BEHALF OF THE LANDOWNER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Mike Terry rep no. 215 	-
9.5 Retail: Site Adjacent Clock Tower (ROS5)	
<p>MI73 - DELIVERABILITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation questioning if this proposal is deliverable within the plan period, there are a number of ownerships, existing uses to be retained or displaced, no evidence of demand for further shop/commercial uses and consequently significant parts of the site are unlikely to come forward within the plan period. The proposal recognises these constraints but offers no solution hence there must be doubts about deliverability. Allocation should be reduced in size and residential use supported as the primary use. <p>Mr N Wright /Mr John Clark Central Garage rep nos 623, 627, 717.</p>	-

Issues for Stalham

10 Stalham	Change ID No.
<p>MI74 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representations challenging the SA scoring in relation to sites ST01 and ST16/17: particularly in relation to drainage, visual impact, distance to schools and access. Promotion of ST16 as a preferred site for the mix of development proposed. Development would avoid the negative impacts of developing ST01 and would meet the needs of the community. <p>Stalham Town Council rep no. 213 and third party representations on pages 258 - 280.</p>	KC09 & KC10

10 Stalham	Change ID No.
<p>MI75 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON CONGESTION LEVELS ON THE A1151</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the scale proposed will increase in levels of commuting into Norwich. The A1151 and congestion levels in Wroxham & Hoveton have not been identified as adverse infrastructure factors. Mr Anthony Cornell rep no. 579. 	-
<p>10.1 Mixed Use: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road (ST01)</p>	
<p>MI76 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON FOUL AND SURFACE WATER DISPOSAL AND WATER QUALITY (see also MI3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns raised regarding whether the proposal at Stalham can be accommodated within the existing consent for Stalham Sewage Treatment, without detriment to the water quality in the receiving watercourse, the River Ant System and associated Broads which area a designated SAC. Stalham STW and the Ant System are 'at capacity' in terms of phosphorus concentrations. No evidence has been provided capacity of the STW can be increased without detriment to water quality. Environment Agency rep no. 782, Broads Authority rep no 347 and Natural England rep no. 962. Other comments relating to sewage and rainwater infrastructure. This part of town is subject to flooding as a result of the inadequacy of existing sewer system. Stalham Sewage treatment works at capacity. Development of ST01 will require either connection into existing system or pumping around the town. Cost likely to be high with the result the site is less deliverable (than ST16/17). <p>Stalham Town Council rep nos. 213, 258 and third party reps on pages 258 - 280.</p>	MM74d & MM74f
<p>MI77 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development will result in increased traffic through the town which is already congested and adversely impact on pedestrian safety. The 2 x mini roundabouts are not capable of the increased use, particularly by commercial vehicles accessing the new employment development. Roundabouts often hit by vehicles negotiating them. Increase in traffic will further increase risk of accidents and injury. All existing footpaths close to the site heavily used given the proximity of Stalham Junior and High School and Surestart Centre. Potential to cause a 'rat run' through Sutton. <p>Stalham Town Council rep no. 213 and third party reps on pages 258 - 280.</p>	KC10 & KC11 MM31 & MM32
<p>MI78 - INVOLVEMENT OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY IN THE PLAN MAKING PROCESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest there has been no proper local consultation and insufficient information in relation to other sites has not been made available. Community comments have been ignored. Site Allocation signs were not displayed prominently. <p>Stalham Town Council rep no. 213 and third party reps on pages 258 - 280.</p>	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LAND OWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed submissions supporting the allocation and seeking amendment of the policy requirements. Savills rep nos.1089, 779, 780, 802, 794, 788, 804, 796, 797, 799. 	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Issues for Wells-next-the-Sea

11 Wells-next-the-Sea	Change ID No.
11.1 Residential: Land at Market Lane (W01)	
<p>MI79 - LOCAL HOUSING NEED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should provide low cost housing for local people, not second homes. (53, 151, 346) The land to the immediate south of the site should be gifted to the charity "Homes for Wells" before any other homes are sold or otherwise disposed of to guarantee that local people benefit from the additional house building in that area. <p>Wells Town Council rep no. 249 and third party representations pages 282, 285, 286, 290.</p>	-
<p>MI80 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AONBs are equivalent in terms of landscape quality and protection to national parks and the guidance states that the conservation of the natural beauty of their landscape and countryside should be given great weight in planning policies, and that major developments should not take place in these designated areas, except in exceptional circumstances. Will result in a significant development in the AONB without the level of benefits predicted in terms of affordable housing - contrary to PPS7 and guidance relating to protected landscapes. <p>Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 897, CPRE rep no. 957 and third party representation page 290.</p>	MM69
<p>MI81 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonal traffic on the B1105 will prevent safe ingress / egress from the site. Access to the site should be via Market Lane and not Two Furlong Hill which will have a seriously suburbanising effect upon the AONB and gateway into Wells. <p>Third party representations pages 285, 290.</p>	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY LANDOWNER Comments submitted by landowners relating to the site and policy requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site owners support the allocation but feel the plan is unsound due to the reduction of site size since the preferred options consultation. The site should extend southwards to the existing hedge line at the right of way. They regard the southern boundary of the allocation and this "residual land" being identified for "exceptional" housing as an example of poor planning due to the lack of a coherent reason for the change and the resulting implications for the delivery, design and layout of the residual land and the allocated land. The rectangular shape of this residual land, not based on any physical marker on the ground, can only produce a linear form of development on a sensitive edge to the settlement. <p>Savills rep nos. 600, 602, 604.</p>	-
11.2 Car Park: Land North of Freeman Street (CP2)	
<p>MI82 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL INTEREST (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA does not appear to take account of the AONB designation. Para 21 of PPS7 states AONBs should have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty and that the conservation of wildlife should be an important consideration in these areas. Proposal is 	MM69

11 Wells-next-the-Sea	Change ID No.
<p>inconsistent with this guidance. CPRE rep no. 951, Norfolk Wildlife Trust rep no. 704, Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 888 and third party representations 293 - 308.</p>	
<p>MI83 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NATURE CONSERVATION VALUE OF THE SITE AND SURROUNDING LAND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SA states ‘medium’ impact on biodiversity which only appears to relate to improved grassland and does not take account of the value of the site to other species. The results of the Norfolk Wildlife Services survey suggest that paragraph “e” of proposed Policy CP2 will not be sufficient to protect the biodiversity interest of the site. The assessment also found that wintering brent geese were grazing on the site at the time of the visit. The current level of evidence is not sufficient to assess the importance of this site for wintering birds, as part of the whole suite of adjacent areas of Floodplain Grazing Marsh. Norfolk Wildlife Trust rep no. 704 • The RSPB is concerned that this site is an important feeding area for Brent Geese and other qualifying features of the North Norfolk Coast SPA. As this site is functionally linked to the SPA, the impacts of the construction of the car park will need to be carefully investigated before it can go ahead. Alternative location for a car park should be identified. RSPB rep no. 1043 • This site is part of the AONB, a highly sensitive area with abundant wildlife and wild flowers. Barn owls hunt over the area. Reptiles and other species. • Site is in a flood risk zone and drainage would need to be improved. <p>Third party representations pages 281 and 293-308.</p>	-
<p>MI84 - JUSTIFICATION FOR THE SCALE OF THE ALLOCATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal for a net addition of 220 car parking spaces is not enough to meet peak demand. Proposal should provide enough spaces for current and future demand. Wells Town Council rep nos 249, 348. <p>Counter argument that the proposal will not solve the parking problem or reduce traffic congestion and is out of proportion with the need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient attention has been given to identifying alternative means of providing the required amount of parking, or to alternative facilities that encourage more sustainable forms of tourism than visiting by car. Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 888. • There are only 6 weeks of intense car parking need in the year. Therefore the current temporary seasonal arrangements are sufficient. • Addressing inconsiderate and illegal parking, or upgrading signs to increase use of existing car parks, would remove the need for additional parking. The need has not been proven. • The proposal is too far from the town centre for the elderly, infirm and young to walk. Does not provide convenient pedestrian access to town centre. <p>Third party representations pages 281 and 293 - 308.</p>	-
<p>MI85 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE SITE AND ON THE AMENITY OF EXISTING RESIDENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of traffic flow, visitor numbers and pedestrian access on the natural beauty of the site and surrounding area • The proposal will create noise, light, litter and air pollution. • Surfacing, lighting, road signs and other paraphernalia will be incompatible with the status of this area. 	MM38



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

11 Wells-next-the-Sea	Change ID No.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will create loss of privacy, security (especially with the footpath between the reed beds and the houses) and view to properties on Freeman Street. No details provided regarding security measures to deter criminal activity. • Require provision of a landscaped buffer on all sides of the proposed car parking to shield homes to the south and minimise the visual intrusion of parked vehicles into the landscape. <p>Third party representations pages 281 and 293 - 308.</p>	
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments relating to the supporting text and policy requirements. Holkham Estate (Savills) rep nos. 602, 605, 606. 	

Issues for Aldborough

12.1 Aldborough	Change ID No.
<p>MI86 - SCALE AND FORM OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan does not properly reflect the Parish Council views and public consultation, which supports new housing, but only in small groups. The development, plus the 8 relatively new houses in that location, would be well in excess of a small group. Parish Council prefers the following sites, in ranked order: ALD29, ALD26, ALD22, ALD09, 11 & 12, ALD01 & ALD16. <p>Aldborough and Thurgarton Parish Council rep no. 536.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment that the appraisal process is flawed as it favours centrally located sites. Suggest other sites are more preferable and that the views of the community have been ignored. Detailed comments relating to a number of alternative sites and their merits, and querying the SA score. Third party representations page 313 - 317. 	KC01 & KC02
Mixed Use: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow (ALD 01/07)	
<p>MI87 - VISUAL IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that development will not 'enhance the form and character' of the Conservation Area and will conflict with the Landscape Character Assessment. Any benefits of re-development of the garage would be negated by the provision of 10 houses. <p>Third party representations pages 318 -322.</p>	KC01 & KC02
<p>MI88 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of safe access has not been fully researched. Existing access to Pipits Meadow is a private drive, part-owned by the existing residents, who are unlikely to co-operate with the proposed combined access. The 8 dwellings that are already served are the maximum that can be served from a private drive – if another is proposed, it is difficult to conceive how 3 accesses to Thurgarton Road can be achieved in this short distance. There is only a short length of pavement into the village and there is a blind sharp corner coming off the Green where traffic can't see pedestrians. Concerns about traffic implications and the costs of relocation of the garage and development on what may be contaminated land. <p>Aldborough and Thurgarton Parish Council rep no. 536 and third party representations pages 313 - 322.</p>	-
<p>MI89 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE AMENITIES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will have a detrimental effect on existing residents. <p>Third party representations pages 318 -322.</p>	MM41

Issues for Bacton

12.2 Bacton	Change ID No.
Residential & Public Open Space: Land Adjacent to Beach Road (BACT03)	
<p>MI90 - DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface water flooding of Beach Road and property. Beach Road subject to regular flooding as a result of runoff. 	MM44



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

12.2 Bacton	Change ID No.
Third party representation page 324.	
Residential: Land to Rear of Duke of Edinburgh Public House (BACT05)	
MI91 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor visibility at the proposed point of access on to the Coast Road given existing wall on the boundary. <p>Third party representation page 325.</p>	-
MI92 - LOSS OF TOURIST FACILITY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site provides a very good camping and caravan site increasing summer trade for existing businesses. <p>Third party representation page 325.</p>	-
MI 93 - DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface water flooding of Beach Road and property. <p>Third party representation page 325.</p>	-

Issues for Blakeney

12.3 Blakeney	Change ID No.
MI94 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representations seeking the substitution of site BLA03 with BLA07 on grounds that it would avoid further encroachment into the AONB and the loss of Open Land Area associated with the development of BLA07 could be compensated for by re-provision elsewhere. NPS Property Consultants rep no. 361. <p>Third party representations pages 327 & 328.</p>	-
(BLA03) Residential: Land West of Langham Road	
MI95 - LOCAL HOUSING NEED IN BLAKENEY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to the allocation of land for a mixed scheme including both market housing and affordable dwellings which are not subject to local lettings. The village should be designated as a Coastal Service Village but development should be limited to infill development and Rural Exceptions schemes. As proposed the plan will not address 'local needs' and is therefore unsound. <p>Blakeney Parish Council rep no. 315 and third party representations page 327.</p>	-

12.3 Blakeney	Change ID No.
<p>MI96 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will likely result in significant development in the AONB without the level of benefits predicted in terms of affordable housing. Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 878. That the proposal would be intrusive in the landscape, impact on views across the village to the coast, extend development beyond the existing development boundary into the AONB, Green belt which would damage the character of the village. Urbanising the edge of the village which would be difficult to screen. Third party representations pages 327 & 328. 	MM69
<p>MI97 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will result in increased congestion in the town and increased demand for parking within the town. <p>Third party representations pages 327 & 328.</p>	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grounds & Co rep no. 141 	-

Issues for Briston & Melton Constable

12.4 Briston & Melton Constable	Change ID No.
<p>Residential: Land East of Astley Primary School (BRI01)</p> <p>MI98 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That further access to The Lane will make a dangerous situation worse due to conflicts with parked cars and congested road junction. The Lane is congested at school dropping off and pick up times and the junction of The Lane with Fakenham Road is dangerous for pedestrians. Developing land to the west of Astley School would be better. Third party representations page 329. 	KC03
<p>Residential: Land at Rear of Holly House (BRI24)</p> <p>MI99 - SCALE AND FORM OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is a narrow strip of land and development would have the characteristics of backland development. Does not appear suitable for 10 dwellings. <p>Third party representations page 330.</p>	-
<p>MI100 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would add further traffic to the Lanes which is unsuitable for additional traffic. <p>Third party representations page 330.</p>	-
<p>Residential: Land at Church Street (BRI27)</p> <p>MI101 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE AMENITIES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS</p>	MM45



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

12.4 Briston & Melton Constable	Change ID No.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation from a number of residents of the adjacent development which is a scheme of small bungalows in an open plan layout expressing concerns about impacts on amenity levels particularly if two storey dwellings are proposed. <p>Third party representations page 331.</p>	
<p>MI102 - SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That more development than is suggested should be built on this site as it is central, close to facilities and has good footpath links to the school. <p>Third party representation page 331.</p>	-

Issues for Catfield

12.5 Catfield	Change ID No.
<p>MI103 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of CAT09 as a preferable site. It is brown field centrally located with good access. Although it would result in the loss of employment land there is a large amount of vacant employment land in the village and little prospect that this site will be developed for employment purposes. <p>Catfield Parish Council rep no. 874 and third party representations pages 335 - 341</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation seeking the enlargement of CAT01 to include CAT07 on the grounds that inclusion of an additional area would bring the number of dwellings up to that required in the Core Strategy, it would provide an opportunity for more affordable housing, there are no access or highway safety issues and the extra site scores well in the Sustainability Appraisal process. Mr Hugh Ivins rep no. 830. 	-
<p>Residential: Land off Lea Road (CAT01)</p>	
<p>MI104 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Representations referring to highways safety matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Junction of New Road with the A149 is an accident black spot. New Road and Lea Road would both require improvement to provide for safe pedestrian access to village services. New Road used by heavy vehicles accessing adjacent industrial premises, associated manoeuvring causes highway safety problems. Impact of traffic on the amenity of residents of Lea Road. <p>Third party representation pages 335 -341.</p>	-
<p>MI105 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON FLOOD RISK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representations referring to local flooding problems - particularly along New Road/Lea Road. <p>Third party representations pages 335 - 341.</p>	-
<p>MI106 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE WILDLIFE VALUE OF THE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representations referring to the wildlife value of the site. Development will result in the loss of habitat and rural character. <p>Third party representations pages 335, 337, 340-341.</p>	-

Issues for Corpusty & Saxthorpe

12.6 Corpusty & Saxthorpe	Change ID No.
(COR01) Residential: Land Between Norwich Road & Adams Lane	
<p>MI107 - SCALE AND EXTENT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unhappy with the late stage changes to COR01 incorporating further land. Development should be confined to original site boundaries. Proposal excessive for the area, 18 houses is too many for the site. Proposal is unnecessary. Employment opportunities are limited and public transport is poor. Inappropriate to increase housing densities, should maintain existing density levels. <p>Corpusty Parish Council rep. no. 890 and third party representations page 342 - 343.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contrary representing indicating that site owners are supportive of increased numbers on the site. 18 dwellings represents under provision given the Core Strategy allows for up to 26 new dwellings in Service Villages. Hugh Ivins rep. no 511. 	-
<p>MI108 - BIODIVERSITY VALUE OF THE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA score does not appear to take account of the evidence from the NWS assessment which sets out potential constraints relating to protected and Biodiversity Action Plan species and habitats. The results of that survey suggest that paragraph "c" of proposed Policy COR01 will not be sufficient to protect the biodiversity interest of the site. Area should not be zoned for development owing to biodiversity constraints. However, if a decision is made that other sustainability factors outweigh the biodiversity value of the site then the policy should recognise that biodiversity constraints could be partially mitigated for with a lower level of housing density leaving at least 40% of the area as public open space. Norfolk Wildlife Trust: rep no. 705. Objections to loss of orchard which is home to wildlife such as squirrels, owls, woodpeckers and deer. Concern for the type of apples that may be present as many Norfolk varieties are nearing extinction and should be protected. Require protection for the larger tree to the west of the site and the old varieties of fruit trees in the orchard. Third party representations pages 342 & 344. 	-
<p>MI109 - PROXIMITY OF THE SITES TO THE SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cordon Sanitare for STW. Whilst Anglian Water takes all reasonably practicable steps to prevent any nuisance arising from the site, it is nevertheless prudent that there should be no development within 400 metres if the development is potentially sensitive to odour or other nuisance that might give rise to complaints from the occupiers regarding the location of the Sewage Treatment Works. Approximately half of the proposed allocation (as enlarged) lies within 400 metres of the sewage treatment works. Anglian Water rep no.1158. 	-
<p>MI110 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to any vehicle access onto Adams Lane. Policy should include provision that access should not be provided via Adams Lane. Also support for the site but with the provision of bullet point a) to be amended to make the Norwich Road 'safe access' to be the only access to the site. <p>Third party representations pages 342-344.</p>	MM46
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments submitted on behalf of landowner in support of the allocation. Includes request for modest increase in numbers of dwellings proposed for the site. Mr Hugh Ivins rep no. 511 & 718. 	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Issues for Happisburgh

12.7 Happisburgh	Change ID No.
(HAP07) Residential: Land West of Whimpwell Street	
No main issues raised.	

Issues for Horning

12.8 Horning	Change ID No.
MI111 - SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about capacity of drainage/sewerage and power supply as indicated in the Core Strategy. Third party representations pages 347 - 349. 	-
MI112 - SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ON THE A1151	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any additional housing in Horning, Hoveton, Stalham etc will generate further traffic on already busy roads in Hoveton and Wroxham. It is already difficult to access the A1151 from Horning Road due to the continuous stream of traffic along Stalham Road. Third party representation page 347. 	-
MI113 - INVOLVEMENT OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY IN THE PLAN MAKING PROCESS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments relating to the lack of consultation and advance notice of the proposal. Third party representations pages 349-369. 	-
MI114 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions that HOR11 is a more suitable site as it is closer to village shops, is screened, has a footpath and is adjacent to the bus stops. Third party representations pages 347 - 369. Suggestion that HOR08 is more suitable. Third party representations pages 352-353. 	-
Residential: Land East of Abbott Road (HOR06)	
MI115 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicle access to site from A1062 will be hazardous due to poor sight lines caused by a series of bends in the road. This is made worse by the road having no footpaths and tall boundary hedges. The costs of providing access to Norwich Road cannot be justified for this site and will threaten provision of affordable housing. <p>Third party representations pages 348 - 369.</p>	-
MI116 - VEHICULAR ACCESS TO ABBOT ROAD	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to suggestion that the site could provide vehicle access to Abbot Road. Hillside Road, Abbot Road and Parkland Crescent are not wide enough to allow two-way traffic to link into Lower Street which would have difficulty coping with through traffic which could include buses, boat trailers etc. They are only 4.9m wide and the 'local authority road safety officers association guidelines' state that a roadway carrying two-way traffic of up to 240 vehicles an hour should be 5.5 m wide. <p>Third party representations pages 348 - 369.</p>	MM49
MI117 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON EXISTING DRAINAGE PROBLEMS	
	MM50

12.8 Horning	Change ID No.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface water drainage in Abbot Road and Parkland Crescent is close to capacity resulting in flooding and sewage spill over after heavy rainfall. Concerns over sewerage discharge into River Ant. <p>Third party representations pages 348 - 369.</p>	
<p>OBJECTION TO ALLOCATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents against HOR06 rep no. 1067 	-
<p>COMMENTS MADE ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <p>Detailed comments submitted on behalf of landowners relating to the site and policy requirements. Smiths Gore rep no.156.</p>	-

Issues for Little Snoring

12.9 Little Snoring	Change ID No.
<p>MI118 - AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL SUITABLE SITES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation from the Parish Council - consider that the 26 dwellings should be provided for on two sites SN01 (nos.13) and SN05 (nos.12/13). Development of SN05 would help link the two halves of the village. Little Snoring Parish Council rep no. 423. Dwellings should be provided on dispersed on other sites. Russell Wright County Councillor rep no. 1006. A number of representations suggest SN01 is only suitable for small scale development and that additional sites SN07 (and in some cases SN02) should also be allocated to provide for housing numbers. These additional allocations could provide a mix of house types, a drop off car park and additional sports facilities for the school, woodland planting and landscaping. The allocations would link the village as a whole giving the village unity and character and scored highest SA score. Third party representations pages 371 - 375. 	KC04
<p>Residential: Land at Junction of Holt Road & Kettlestone Road (SN01)</p>	
<p>MI119 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representations referring to highway safety issues – the site is situated at the junction of two busy roads. A148 has a fatal accident record. Development will generate additional traffic along this section of Kettlestone Road where there is an existing on road parking problem. Traffic speeds would need to be reduced in order that the additional development can be safely accommodated (A148, 30mph & Thursford and Kettlestone Roads, 20mph). <p>Third party representations pages 371 -375.</p>	KC05 & MM53
<p>MI120 - SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of dwellings proposed on SN01 excessive for the location and for the village. <p>Third party representations pages 371 - 375.</p>	KC05
<p>MI121 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE WILDLIFE VALUE OF THE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation referring to the presence of wildlife on the site. 	KC05 & MM53



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

12.9 Little Snoring	Change ID No.
Third party representations pages 372-375.	

Issues for Ludham

12.10 Ludham	Change ID No.
MI122 - LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation from the Parish Council suggesting the original option of a single allocation for the village at LUD01 remains preferable. Development in this location would be well related to the school and village services and offer the scope to address current drainage problems. Ludham Parish Council rep no. 58. LUD06 was not included in the Preferred Options consultation. Third party representations pages 376 386 - 389. Representation suggesting LUD06 not available and consideration should be given to increasing numbers on LUD01. Mr James C Lang & Mrs Lorna Lang rep nos. 252, 254 - 257. 	-
MI123 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation promoting a 2 hectare site at the corner of Norwich Road and Pound Lane as a preferable and available site. Mr Godfrey Wise rep nos 856/858. Number of representations promoting LUD02 and LUD09 as a preferable site. Third party representations pages 379 - 384. 	-
(LUD01) Residential: Land South of School Road	
MI124 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON EXISTING FLOODING PROBLEMS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During periods of heavy rain gardens and homes in the Willow Way area are subject to flooding. Drainage for Sewage and surface water drainage is inadequate and further development will exacerbate the situation and problems for existing residents. No reference to drainage/flooding as a constraint. <p>Ludham Parish Council rep no. 323, Willow Way Residents Association rep no. 387 and third party representations pages 379 - 383</p>	MM54 & MM55
MI125 - LANDSCAPE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representations regarding the landscape impact of the proposal. Present settlement boundary represents good division between village and countryside. The site is elevated and housing development would be visually dominant in this part of the village and would impact on Willow Way. No amount of landscaping would disguise. The development will impact on important views from School Road to the church. <p>The Ludham Society rep no. 599, Willow Way Residents Association rep no. 387 and third party representations pages 379 - 383.</p>	MM56
MI126 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased traffic on local road network . School Road and Pound lane are narrow with constrained visibility at associated junctions. Pedestrian access to and from the centre of the village is adequate but not necessarily safe. Any road widening or pedestrian improvements would result in the loss of hedgerows. <p>Willow Way Residents Association Rep no. 387 and third party representations pages 379 - 383.</p>	-

12.10 Ludham	Change ID No.
COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY LANDOWNERS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments submitted in support of the allocation rep nos. 570, 575, 577, 834. 	-
(LUD06) Residential: Land at Eastern End of Grange Close	
MI127 - IMPACT OF PROPOSED ACCESS ON PROTECTED TREES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of vehicular access from Grange Close would result in the loss of mature oak trees the subject of a group Tree Preservation Order. <p>Third party representations pages 385-389.</p>	MM58
MI128 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE WILDLIFE VALUE OF THE SITE AND RURAL CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field haven for wildlife and bordering hedges and trees are important for nesting birds. Impact on rural lane of this part of the village. Malthouse Lane is an attractive quite rural lane and a popular route for walkers. <p>Third party representations pages 376, 385-389.</p>	MM59

Issues for Mundesley

12.11 Mundesley	Change ID No.
Residential & Public Open Space: Land at Grange Cottage / Water Lane (MUN06)	
MI129 - LANDSCAPE/WILDLIFE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of views of the windmill and loss of agricultural land. Concern about estate style development. Impact on attractive aspect of village from Water Lane. Impact on wildlife. <p>Third party representations pages 392 - 397.</p>	-
MI130 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access is too narrow to accommodate the traffic and service vehicles for the development. There should be a footpath along at least one side of the road. The access from the field to High Street is on a steep slope, causing erratic entries into the main road. High street narrows to the right of the exit and traffic speeds past the site entrance. There is no direct access to the village centre or school by footpath along the east side of High Street – pedestrians have to cross over. <p>Third party representations pages 391 - 397.</p>	-
MI131 - DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of the site is in flood risk zone – concern that any development will compound problems that already exist with flooding. The site becomes waterlogged after heavy rain. <p>Third party representations pages 391 - 397.</p>	MM60
MI132 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITE	
	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

12.11 Mundesley	Change ID No.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to site selection process - the site was not included as a preferred option in the previous consultation. Object to change from previous decision of site MUN04. Comments that MUN03/MUN04 are preferable sites, better access to the village, less prominent in the landscape, not adjacent to a flood zone or Conservation Area etc. <p>Third party representations pages 392 - 397.</p>	
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Mike Terry, rep no. 88. 	-
<p>(MUN07) Residential & School Traffic Management Scheme: Land South of Trunch Road</p>	
<p>MI133 - IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AONB (see also MI4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about impact on AONB. Insufficient attention has been given to finding sites outside of the AONB. <p>The Open Spaces Society rep no. 758, Norfolk Coast Partnership rep no. 891 and third party representations pages 398, 400, 401</p>	-
<p>MI134 - ADDRESSING PARKING PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE SCHOOL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While residential development can be supported on this site, the proposal for the provision of off-site carriageway parking is opposed. The wording is inconsistent with NCC policy and the wording should reflect the fact that solutions to any problems should be identified through the school travel plan process. Proposed alternative wording: 'Measures should be taken as part of the development to address on-street car parking outside the school. This might include a number of measures including encouraging walking and cycling to school but should facilitate the removal of parked cars within the carriageway on Trunch Road. The developer should engage with the School Travel Plan Advisors at the school to come up with the most appropriate solution for the area. Mrs Amy Hanner Norfolk County Council (Highways) rep no. 956. Provision of a car park for the school will encourage people to use their cars for the journey. Children will have to cross a busy road to get from the car park to the school. Parents will not use the car park as it will be too time consuming to queue. <p>Third party representations pages 399, 400, 402.</p>	MM62
<p>MI135 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of additional traffic on the road past the school and children's centre. This area is already very busy at school times. <p>Third party representations 399, 400, 401.</p>	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Mike Terry, rep no. 90. 	-

Issues for Overstrand

12.12 Overstrand	Change ID No.
<p>MI136 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITE</p>	-

12.12 Overstrand	Change ID No.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed representation making the case for the residential allocation of OVS09 – Ivy Farm Holiday Park linked to the allocation of site CS1 as a replacement Holiday Park. Mr W Reynolds rep no. 149. 	
Residential: Land at Rear of 36 Bracken Avenue (OVS03)	
MI137 - SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is small, it will not make a significant contribution to housing provision and will require the demolition of an existing property and possible felling of trees. <p>Third party representation page 406.</p>	-
MI138 - IMPACT ON AMENITIES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That any proposal will impact on the amenity of adjacent residents particularly as a result of providing a new vehicular access which will inevitably pass close to neighbouring properties, increased overlooking, and increased traffic on local roads. <p>Third party representations page 406.</p>	-
Residential: Land South of Mundesley Road (OVS04)	
MI139 - VISUAL IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse impact on the Conservation Area and the adjacent AONB. Destruction of trees and local wildlife. <p>Third party representations page 407.</p>	-
COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNER	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation on behalf of the land owner pointing out that this is a large site which is capable of accommodating a larger number of dwellings if developed at the national minimum target of 30 dwellings per hectare. Mr Hugh Ivins rep no. 533. 	-

Issues for Roughton

12.13 Roughton	Change ID No.
MI140 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITES	
<p>Support for ROU02 from site agent (Allied Earth Developments Ltd rep nos 1118) raising several issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROU02 scores higher in the SA than site ROU03. Sites ROU03 and ROU10 were joined as a combined development proposal at a very late stage in the selection process and have not been subject to full consultation or Appropriate Assessment. Dispute Cons & Design comments that ROU02 would constitute an 'undesirably large extension into the countryside.' as only part of ROU02 would be developed. The LPA has taken no account of the thriving retail outlet, butchers, bakery etc at Groveland shopping complex, located less than 500 metres east of the settlement boundary. Allocating ROU02 would ensure support for the complex and enable residents to access it via a cycle/pedestrian route. The susceptibility to flooding of the open space proposed in ROU03/10 demeans its quality as no-one can use it when it is flooded. The acknowledged wetland nature of sites ROU03/10 raises questions over deliverability of development. The flood and drainage works will be disproportionately expensive to a scheme comprising 26 dwellings. 	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

12.13 Roughton	Change ID No.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROU02 is no further from village facilities than 03/10 and provides scope for linking the village so all residents can access the Groveland complex by pedestrian means. Recent highway improvements to the A140 at the junction with Thorpe Market Road contribute to pedestrian safety. Ecological studies for site ROU02 demonstrate that development would have virtually no impact on existing biodiversity and would include measures to encourage greater biodiversity. Comment that the existing vehicle access to Hilltop will be re-located to through the development site, therefore enabling pedestrian and cycle only access to the site from Thorpe Market Road. <p>Suggestion that site ROU1 be included to enable a more comprehensive and inclusive scheme. Roughton Parish Council rep no. 1063, Mrs Clare Wilson rep no. 97, GD Moore rep no. 123.</p> <p>Support for inclusion of ROU07 as an allocation. G D Moore rep no. 116.</p>	
Residential & Public Open Space: Land at Back Lane (ROU03/10)	
<p>MI141 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT County Highways objection to the allocation (Norfolk County Council rep no. 949):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will increase the traffic on Back Lane with an expected 86% increase in peak hour traffic movements. This is unacceptable due to Back Lane's poor junction arrangements with both the A140 and Metton Road/B1146 Felbrigg Road, its restricted carriageway width and a lack of pedestrian facilities. Additional traffic will place pedestrians who already use this route in an unacceptable position of increased danger. The propensity for personal injury is considered to be unacceptable and Back Lane is deemed to be inadequate for the scale of development proposed. It is recommended that the site is removed from North Norfolk's Site Specific Proposals Plan or a requirement is imposed on the site to provide access from the north via Chapel Road. Back Lane is a narrow, rural road with a typical carriageway width of 3.9m along its entire length with only a few informal passing places along its length. 4.1m is necessary to allow two cars to pass each other in safety, with a width of 4.8m being required for a car and service vehicle to pass. The County Council could not find an appropriate access solution to the proposal for development on this site. <p>Public concerns about the suitability of Back Lane and Old Turnpike Road to accommodate additional traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Back Lane is a narrow lane with no footpaths and is already heavily used as a rat-run. Pathway or road widening between Old Turnpike Road and the A140 cannot be carried out as there are protected walled areas – leading to a bottleneck for any traffic entering or leaving. Concern that drivers will use Old Turnpike Road and this increased traffic will lead to greater risk for pedestrians and children walking to school. The suggested footpath link to Old Turnpike Road will increase pedestrians using the road. <p>Third party representations pages 412 - 427.</p>	-
<p>MI142 - DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about flooding – the field has poor drainage and is regularly waterlogged. Development would reduce space for natural soakaway. Comments that the land where Orchard Close was built had to be drained onto ROU03 to enable housing to be built where a large pond had previously existed and that the new bungalows at the bottom of Old Turnpike Road had to be piled and have rafted footings. These are at a higher level than the adjoining land which could be subject to subsidence and flooding. The gardens are regularly flooded in winter. Drainage system in Old Turnpike Road already has difficulty coping with heavy rainfall. 	MM64 & MM65

12.13 Roughton	Change ID No.
Environment Agency rep no. 523, Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board rep no. 1127 and third party representations pages 412 - 427.	
<p>MI143 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE WILDLIFE VALUE OF THE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a number of endangered wetland wetlands birds and animals that live on the marsh land and the site is a haven for other wildlife including bats, barn owls etc <p>Third party representations 412 - 427.</p>	-
<p>MI144 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE AMENITIES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern over noise and disturbance from proposed footpath along boundaries of properties, village hall and sports pitch. <p>Third party representations pages 415 - 416.</p>	-
<p>SUPPORT FOR ALLOCATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petition submitted in support of allocation 'Please give us Our Village Green' - rep no. 1283 	-
<p>COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY THE LANDOWNER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed submissions by the landowner relating to: Masterplan, including highway works, Transport Report Biodiversity survey, Land Drainage, deliverability of community benefits. James Mermagen rep nos 836, 1149, 1272-1283. 	-

Issues for Southrepps

12.14 Southrepps	Change ID No.
<p>MI145 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITE</p> <p>Several comments that site SOU03 is more appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has good access to Long Lane, is more centrally placed and relates well to the open space. Is also better integrated within the natural form of the village. Is already bounded by mature hedgerows. Better pedestrian access through the recreation ground to the centre of the village. Within the existing pattern of development and looks like a natural extension of the village. <p>Reps suggesting sites SOU05 and SOU06 more appropriate.</p> <p>Third party representations pages 429 - 434.</p>	-
<p>Residential: Land West of Long Lane (SOU02)</p>	
<p>MI146 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 'proposed rounding off' protrudes into an AONB and will detract from the setting of the village. <p>Third party representations pages 430 - 432.</p>	MM69



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

12.14 Southrepps	Change ID No.
<p>MI147 - DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land is higher than surrounding development. There is a historical rainwater flooding problem for the houses off Greenways which will be exacerbated by any new development.. <p>Third party representations pages 430 - 432.</p>	-
<p>MI148 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access is unsuitable with existing parking problem on Long Lane. Could be alleviated by the provision of a small parking area available for general use at the entrance to the new site. <p>Third party representations pages 430 - 432.</p>	-
<p>MI149 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE AMENITIES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land is higher than surrounding development which will be overlooked. <p>Third party representations pages 430 - 432.</p>	MM66
Residential: Land North of Thorpe Road (SOU07)	
<p>MI150 - LOSS OF VILLAGE EMPLOYMENT LAND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object as is in commercial use, with good access to the A149 and A140, which can bring employment to the village. <p>Third party representations pages 433-434.</p>	-
<p>MI151 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE RURAL SETTING OF THE VILLAGE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developers will be looking to create the densest development possible. 20-30 houses or flats are possible which would be an unsightly landmark on the entrance to the village. <p>Third party representations pages 433-434.</p>	-

Issues for Walsingham

12.15 Walsingham	Change ID No.
Residential: Land East of Wells Road (WAL01)	
<p>MI152 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion that WAL06, to the north of Mount Pleasant, would be more appropriate. Walsingham Parish Council rep no. 987. 	-
<p>MI153 - IMPACT ON HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about impact on St. Peter's Church, an important Grade 1 medieval listed building, which currently sits in tranquil surroundings. Walsingham Parish Council rep no. 987. 	-

Issues for Weybourne

12.16 Weybourne	Change ID No.
<p>MI154 - INCLUSION OF WEYBOURNE AS A LOCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several letters challenging the designation of Weybourne as a Coastal Service Village and seeking its removal from the document. Consider the settlement does not meet the Service Village Methodology requirements as it does not have a school within a convenient walking distance. Weybourne is not a sustainable location and development will not provide better jobs and prospects for local residents. <p>Weybourne Parish Council rep no. 1031, Residents Against Development in Weybourne rep no. 576 and third party representations pages 436-437.</p>	-
<p>MI155 - INVOLVEMENT OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY IN THE PLAN MAKING PROCESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several letters regarding the consultation process suggesting NNDC has failed to encourage, organise, or monitor involvement of local community and failed to comply with NNDC Statement of Community Involvement.. <p>Residents Against Development in Weybourne rep no. 576 and third party representations pages 436-437.</p>	-
<p>MI156 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several comments suggesting other more suitable sites, in boundary sites should be sought and / or querying the removal of WEY04 (Pine Walk) suggesting road and landscape impact would be less significant.. Single letter seeking reinstatement of WEY01, a brownfield site within the settlement boundary (rep no. 1007). <p>Third party representation pages 437- 441.</p>	-
<p>Residential: Land at the Street, Opposite the Malting's Hotel (WEY03)</p>	
<p>MI157 - SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information submitted regarding the front of the site and its parking use. Site no longer used as overflow parking by the Malting's Hotel. Local bowls club use the site for parking when they have events, rarely for more than 12 vehicles. Extension of the residential allocation is sought to allow six dwellings not four as suggested in the document. Parking area for local bowls club to be retained as part of redevelopment of the site. Mr Steven Mears rep no. 539. 	-
<p>Residential: Land South of Beck Close (WEY09)</p>	
<p>MI158 - VISUAL IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORFOLK COAST AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several comments consider the development will be highly visible in the landscape within the AONB due to the topography of the area and the curvature of the road. <p>Third party representations 439 - 442.</p>	KC12, KC13 & MM69
<p>MI159 - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic conditions – several comments refer to heavy farm, local, and holiday traffic and consider additional development will result in conflict with other road users. <p>Third party representations 439 - 442.</p>	-



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

Issues for Other Areas

13 Proposals for Other Areas	Change ID No.
Employment: Land at Tattersett Business Park (E7)	
MI160 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE SCULTHORPE STONE CURLEW POPULATION	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns raised about the impact of development on the use of the adjacent Sculthorpe airfield by stone-curlew. Consider that the proposal is likely to disturb a protected species of European importance and damage its habitat. RSPB rep nos 1071, 1042, Natural England rep no. 984. 	MM67
COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed comments made in relation to the proposed type and quantity of development. The land owner considers that a larger development area should be identified and that other uses should be regarded as acceptable. Specifically the owner believes the site is suitable for large scale waste recycling and biomass power generation and that elements of retail and community uses, some of which already occur on the site, would assist with development viability. Limiting development to specific areas and limiting development to the same footprint area of demolished buildings is argued to be too constraining. Denis Tuttle Architecture Ltd rep no. 940. 	-

Issues for Monitoring & Implementation

14 Monitoring & Implementation	Change ID No.
No main issues raised.	

3 Key Changes: Summary of Main Issues

Summary of the Main Issues Raised - Regulation 30 (e)

- 3.1** The following is the District Council's own summary of the main issues raised by consultees regarding the soundness of the Schedule of Key Changes. It is not a comprehensive list of all of the issues raised, nor does it represent the Inspector's view of the key issues or matters for examination. The original representations should be viewed for a complete understanding of all issues raised.
- 3.2** The table provide a summary of the main issues raised against each of the Key Changes in broadly document order. The table summarises the comments made, identifies the person or organisation making the comment and provides the unique reference number of the representation. Representations received from members of the public are referred to as 'third party representations'. The unique reference number enables individual representations to be located and viewed either via the LDF online Planning Portal or in the Key Changes Report of Representations paper document. Where several consultees have raised similar issues these have been grouped together under a single summary.

2 Schedule of Key Changes

KC01/02: Garage Site / Pipit's Meadow, Aldborough (ALD01/07)

KCMI 1 - SCALE AND LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT

- Number of dwellings proposed is still excessive and above the 5-6 dwellings the Parish Council consider appropriate on new individual sites in the village. Third party representations nos. 40, 43, 46 & 47.
- Access details unclear. Narrow strip indicated linking ALD07 and ALD01 insufficient width to accommodate one vehicle. Both sites should have access on to Thurgarton Road since Pipit's Meadow already serves 8 dwellings. Third party representations nos. 47,48
- Preferable sites are available. Third party representation no. 46

KC03: Land East of Astley Primary School, Briston (BRI01)

KCMI 2 -ACCESS TO THE SITE

- Hillside is of insufficient width and strength to provide satisfactory access to the site. In addition there are existing parking problems on Hillside making access difficult. Many elderly residents live on Hillside, extra traffic may cause access problems for emergency vehicles and disturbance. Third party representations nos 27, 54 & 56.

KC04: Land Adjacent to Little Snoring Primary School, Kettlestone Road, Little Snoring (SN05)

KCMI 3 - LOSS OF OPEN SPACE

- Site integral to the landscape and general ambiance of the rural village. If developed open space should be retained adjacent to existing houses as well as school. Third party representations no. 28.

KCMI 4 - VEHICULAR ACCESS TO THE SITE

- Concern over road safety. Road is narrow, has a bad bend, in regular use by heavy haulage vehicles and used as a collection point for parents picking up school children. Third party representations nos. 28, 57, 58, 60-64.

KCMI 5 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITE

- Number of representations promoting SN07 as a preferable site. Provides safe access on to Kettlestone Road, has highest SA score and is available. Third party representations nos. 57, 58, 61, 62.



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues

2 Schedule of Key Changes

KC06/07: Land Adjoining Seaview Crescent, Sheringham (SH04)

KCMI 6 - LANDSCAPE IMPACT

- Proposed change insufficient to minimise the impact of development on the AONB or maintain a vista to Morley Hill. Policy should require 40% of the site to be retained as multi functional green space of which at least 50% must be publicly accessible. Natural England rep no. 42.

KC08: Land Rear of Sheringham House, Sheringham (SN06)

KCMI 7 - IMPACT OF TRAFFIC ON THE AMENITIES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS

- Single point of access will result in an unacceptable level of disturbance to residents of Willow Grove. Will have an adverse impact on the quality of life of residents who are predominantly elderly.
- In the case of Willow Grove being blocked emergency access to the site would be impossible.
- Requirement to provide two points of access should be retained so spreading traffic flow and associated disturbance.

Third party representations nos. 8, 9 and 23 & 59.

KC09: Land South of Weavers Way, Stalham (E12)

KCMI8 - LANDSCAPE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT

- The site consists of open agricultural land unconnected to the town unsuitable for industrial development.
- Introduces an urban presence and could perpetuate an undesirable pattern of infill development.
- Development will have an adverse landscape impact and its selection is unsound
- Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land
- Form of development contrary to PPS 4 particularly Policy EC6
- 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.

Broads Authority rep no. 49, Norfolk County Council (Judith Cantell) rep no. 18 and third party representations nos. 29, 33, 41, 45, 50 - 53 & 65

KCMI 9 - SUITABILITY OF THE LOCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

- Site is unconnected to the town and unlikely to encourage travel by means other than by car
- SA process inadequate and insufficient consideration of alternative sites. A site better related to the town would be preferable.
- Site is in close proximity to residential property on Stepping Lane. The inclusion of B2 uses has not been justified and impact on residential amenity has not been assessed
- Stepping Stone Lane unsuitable for heavy traffic use and development is likely to increase traffic elsewhere in the town.

Third party representations nos 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 41, 44, 45, 50 - 53.

KCMI 10 - AVAILABILITY OF PREFERABLE SITES

- Representation promoting ST01 as the most suitable and sustainable location for a mixed allocation. In the event of a additional employment allocation being sought E11 is promoted as preferable to E12 and is available and suitable. Third party representations nos. 35, 39

KC10/11: Land Adjacent to Church Farm, Ingham Road, Stalham (ST01)

KCMI 11 - IMPACT OF PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT USES

2 Schedule of Key Changes

- Reference to 'low key' employment uses is too vague. Employment uses unsuitable in residential area and not supported.

Third party representations nos. 3 - 6

COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNER

- Representation promoting ST01 as the most suitable and sustainable location for a mixed allocation. In the event of an employment allocation being made elsewhere policy requirement for ST01 should be revised to delete reference to 'low key employment uses' and to specify uses compatible with the residential character such as care homes. Rep no. 36

KC12/13: Land South of Beck Close, Weybourne (WEY09)

KCMI 12 - IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE AONB

- Reduced allocation will still have a significant and adverse landscape impact. Policy would require strengthening if site was to be allocated. Need for a significant landscape buffer on the southern and western boundaries of the site (e.g. tree belt, min 15m in depth).
- Scale of development should be restricted to 1 - 1.5 storey.

Norfolk County Council (Judith Cantell) rep no. 19 and third party representations nos. 11, 12 & 32.



Site Specific Proposals Draft Plan: Summary of Main Issues