

**First Draft Local Plan (Part 1)**

Regulation 18 Stage Public Consultation

**Appendix D: Schedule of Representations -  
Comments on Alternative Policies & Sites**

BLANK

# Appendix D: Comments on Alternative Policies & Sites

## Table of Contents

<b>Comments on Alternative Policy Options</b> .....	5
<b>Sustainable Development Policies</b> .....	6
<b>Environment Policies</b> .....	19
<b>Housing Policies</b> .....	23
<b>Economy Policies</b> .....	27
<b>Vision, Aims &amp; Objectives</b> .....	29
<b>Comments on Alternative Site Options</b> .....	30
<b>Cromer</b> .....	32
<b>Fakenham</b> .....	42
<b>Holt</b> .....	46
<b>Hoveton</b> .....	49
<b>North Walsham</b> .....	54
<b>Sheringham</b> .....	68
<b>Stalham</b> .....	71
<b>Wells-next-the-Sea</b> .....	72
<b>Blakeney</b> .....	81
<b>Briston</b> .....	91
<b>Ludham</b> .....	94
<b>Mundesley</b> .....	97
<b>Other Areas</b> .....	98

## Notes

The Council undertook a major consultation exercise on the emerging First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) and a range of supporting documents between 7 May and 28 June 2019. The responses received were related to multiple proposed policies and sites in the Plan and the Council has therefore, through this document, attributed part, or all of the response to its relevant Local Plan policy, section, or other consultation document as relevant. The original consultation responses can be viewed in full on the [Consultation Portal](https://consult.north-norfolk.gov.uk)<sup>1</sup>. All consultation and other supporting documents can be viewed in the [Document Library](http://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/documentlibrary)<sup>2</sup>.

The following tables provide a summary of the comments submitted to the Council as part of the **First Draft Local Plan (Part 1)** document consultation. These comments were submitted by a variety of consultees against a variety of proposed Local Plan policies. An additional table at the end of each policy/site provides a combined summary of the comments.

Five separate appendices have been published in total: Appendix A (Individuals), Appendix B (Parish & Town Councils), Appendix C (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations), **Appendix D (Alternatives Considered)**, and Appendix E (SA & HRA). These documents should be read together in order to gain a full understanding of the feedback received.

**‘OFFICER SUMMARY - SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:’** This wording is used throughout the document. It applies in two scenarios where either:

1. An officer has typed a summary based on their interpretation of the comments; or,
2. An officer has inserted part of a comment and therefore the text is a summary of this particular part of the original representation.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://consult.north-norfolk.gov.uk>

<sup>2</sup> [www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/documentlibrary](http://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/documentlibrary)

**First Draft Local Plan (Part 1)**

# **Comments on Alternative Policy Options**

# Sustainable Development Policies

## Alternatives Considered (Sustainable Development)

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative policy options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Options', e.g. the policies favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred policy option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative policy option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative policy option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
SD1	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A
SD2	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC010	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Support SD2 - Community led development should be subject to the same scrutiny as any development for compliance with planning law and stated policy aims of the Council. Consideration in favour of these developments rather than those of external developers would be appropriate and inclusive of the local community but should not be at the expense of quality, compliance, sustainability or other aspects of the councils stated policy.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the objection SD2 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) consultation document giving communities a greater say and control in planning is a central aim of government policy. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
SD2	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC026	Support	Supports Assessment SD2 - Agree	Comments noted: Supports Assessment SD2
SD3	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC011	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Support SD3 - Development in rural locations with little employment or few services only serves to generate additional car journeys. This is not sustainable and causes additional traffic, congestion, pollution.	Comments noted: The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. In North Norfolk this necessitates the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
					are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2.
SD3	Smith, Mr Mark (1209582)	LP038	General Comments	Against the preferred approach of NNDC the alternative SD3A could have been preferred but used to satisfy the allocation of more than one council and minimise if not avoid altogether the need to extend villages, small towns and in some cases large towns. A more strategic plan to mitigate congestion could have been utilised that would have less impact on established settlements in all factors from pollution to safety. Publish any document that corresponds to cooperating with neighbouring councils.	Comments noted: The proposed approach which allows small scale infill development in selected small growth villages which contain some but limited services, the allocation of small scale housing sites and the provision for rural exception sites in areas of designated countryside will be reviewed in line with feedback and evidence of need. The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. In North Norfolk this necessitates the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2.
SD3	Mr Bacon (1217300)	AC065	General Comments	1. Items in Home Policy SS2 which prejudices against those wishing single, small or in fill development for reasons which I cannot find or have not been published. By consultation I was told that one of the reasons being was to restrict the additional commuting within the countryside area, yet it is permissible to build affordable housing, commercial development, development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers, recreation and tourism, renewable energy projects, mineral extraction and waste management facilities, sites for Gypsies and Travellers and travelling show people and ironically transport. Do not ANY of these involve the use of transport within the countryside? 2. Area's of the	Comments noted: The proposed approach which allows small scale infill development in selected small growth villages which contain some but limited services, the allocation of small scale housing sites and the provision for rural exception sites in areas of designated countryside will be reviewed in line with feedback and evidence of need. The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				<p>countryside are littered with unkempt and unsightly plots which would benefit from additional and much needed housing. 3. Freedom of choice is also being restricted to those wishing to live in a countryside location. 4. Protecting Special Character - The ongoing mass development in permitted areas has had a bigger blight on the area than any individual or small countryside development would ever have. Countryside development is more in keeping with the surrounding buildings and areas than most of the mass developments. An example being the Lovell development off the Holt bypass which has put a blot on the landscape with uniform houses matching all those of all Lovell developments across the country and none of these large developments bring jobs for hardly any local tradesmen as they use the cheapest viable options giving rise to poor quality build. 5. Could you please give a definitive answer as to whether the restriction of not allowing the construction of standard new build housing within the countryside is going to be permanent and if not when is the restriction to be lifted and what you have gained from the restriction if they reinstate the permission to build in the future all be it the loss of millions in council tax. 6. How is "countryside" actually designated? From my POV for example Edgefield couldn't more in the countryside than the Houses of Parliament are in London! Yet a new development is currently raising itself? 7. How can the Local Planning Consultation cover planning from 2016 when we are now in 2019?</p>	<p>services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. In North Norfolk this necessitates the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2.</p>
SD3A	Mr Adams (1215905)	AC076	Object	<p>Distribution. I would prefer to see the development of new settlement / settlements rather than the continued expansion of existing settlements. The continued drive towards increasing urbanisation has a detrimental effect on existing settlements and the character of the district as a whole and once its done it cannot be undone. I do not believe that this drive will result in improvements in the quality of life, sustainability and resilience of communities and the people that live there. . This plan is looking into the future but making assumptions based on the present. It is most likely that local travel by car will be environmentally neutral and remote access to both goods &amp; services will increase. . D3A Build a single large new settlement somewhere in the District. ."In order to address the housing needs of the District around 4,500 will need to be built on allocated sites. Such a scale of growth is too small to support the range of services necessary to render a new settlement sustainable. Such a settlement is highly likely to rely on services and jobs elsewhere in the District so would substantially increase commuting, probably by car. A new settlement is</p>	<p>Comments noted: Support for alternative option D3A to build a single large new settlement. Consider whether the approach in regard to the distribution of growth is justified through the preparation of the plan.</p>



Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				<p>not justified by the scale of housing growth requirement.". This statement seems to assert that a settlement of 4500 dwellings is too small to be sustainable. Using figures from NNDC Village Assessment &amp; Settlement Profiles Topic Paper 2018 the number of dwellings in Cromer is 4615, in Holt is 2088, Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe 354 and Aldborough 297. This means Cromer may just about be sustainable Holt has a lot of problems and Aldborough and Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe are lost causes. However the paper shows that the smallest of these, Aldborough, has all the key services. All settlements rely to a greater or lesser extent on services provided elsewhere but this is not a justification to dismiss this alternative especially in the knowledge that the introduction of electric vehicles will mean that the occasional need to travel small distances will not conflict with sustainability considerations. . There is no examination of the possibility of providing some of the governments required increase in housing through a number of new small settlements. As illustrated above communities of 300 or 500 dwelling can be thriving and vibrant. It does not have to be all or nothing, there can be a mix and looking at creating a few new villages could reduce the pressure to over develop existing larger settlements. Housing is a bit like manure, too much in one place causes problems but spread it about a bit and everything thrives! . There are many other advantages to this approach which I would be happy to argue, for instance, providing a new small settlement may enable a village school in another nearby small settlement remain viable whereas locating this additional housing in a larger settlement may require a new school to be built and the children from the existing small settlement to be bussed in. . There are also many statements in the plan which should be challenged but time does not permit but here are a few- . Allowing development within the built up areas of the Selected Settlements will prioritise the development of previously developed land. What proportion of developments in Fakenham, Cromer &amp; Holt are brownfield? . Are the elderly at greater risk of isolation in a village rather than a town? . Are journey times in the district more unreliable than getting through Norwich or round the M25?</p>	
SD3B	Mr Hall (1215856)	AC052	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY -</b>  Partially Supports Assessment of the site: Object to SD3. Partially support SD3B. The statement regarding major growth in large settlements (Towns) I agree with but your statement about moderate growth in Villages I object to.</p>	<p>Comments noted: Object to preferred Policy SD3, making clear growth should not be allocated in villages. The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPFF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable</p>

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
					communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. In North Norfolk this necessitates the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2.
SD3B	Mr Hall (1215856)	AC053	Support	I agree with the arguments against rural dispersal. However, the arguments given must apply to preferred policy SD3 which is allowing 'Moderate' Growth within Villages. Therefore this is contradictory.	Comments noted: Object to preferred Policy SD3, making clear growth should not be allocated in villages. The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. In North Norfolk this necessitates the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2.
SD3B	Mr Rice (1210475)	AC009	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Objecting to the Assessment. By concentrating all new development (with few exceptions) in designated 'growth settlements', the preferred approach takes an overly simplistic, black and white approach. The optimum is a blend of SD3B (Rural Dispersal) and the preferred approach, in which certainly larger scale development is encouraged in the larger settlements, but development (particularly new dwellings) in the rural areas is not so completely restricted. This approach is in line with NPPF paragraph 68(c): 'to promote the development of a good mix of sites LPAs should support development of windfall sites through policy and decisions giving great weight to the benefits of suitable sites which existing	Comments noted: Object to the distribution of growth and supports more rural dispersal of growth. The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. In North Norfolk this necessitates

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				settlements'. It does not say that small settlements should be allowed to whither and die: paragraph 78 'Rural Housing' requires that 'planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive'. Paragraph 2.1 of the June 2018 Interim statement of housing land supply notes that 75% of the dwellings built in the previous period occurred in larger settlements, i.e. as a matter of course meeting the proposed new policy of housing being restricted to "growth settlements", and therefore undermines the proposed black and white policy of so absolutely restricting development in the "countryside settlements. Alternative SD3A - all growth in a single new settlement - represents a most extreme solution that patently is wrong.	the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2.
SD3B	Mr Adams (1215905)	AC076	Object	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p> <p>Objecting to the Assessment. Distribution . I would prefer to see the development of new settlement / settlements rather than the continued expansion of existing settlements. The increasing urbanisation has a detrimental effect on existing settlements and the character of the district as a whole and will not result in improvements in the quality of life, sustainability and resilience of communities and the people that live there. This plan is making assumptions based on the present. It is most likely that local travel by car will be environmentally neutral and remote access to both goods &amp; services will increase. D3A Build a single large new settlement somewhere in the District. In order to address the housing needs of the District around 4,500 will need to be built on allocated sites. Such a scale of growth is too small to support the range of services necessary to render a new settlement sustainable. Such a settlement is highly likely to rely on services and jobs elsewhere in the District increasing commuting. A new settlement is not justified by the scale of housing growth requirement.. This statement seems to assert that a settlement of 4500 dwellings is too small to be sustainable. Using figures from NNDC Village Assessment &amp; Settlement Profiles Topic Paper 2018 the number of dwellings in Cromer is 4615, in Holt is 2088, Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe 354 and Aldborough 297. However the paper shows that the smallest of these, Aldborough, has all the key services. All settlements rely to a greater or lesser extent on services provided elsewhere - not a justification to dismiss this alternative especially if the introduction of electric vehicles means that the occasional small distances travel will not conflict with sustainability. There is no examination of the possibility of providing some of the governments required increase in housing through a number of new small settlements. It does not have to be all or nothing, there can be a mix and looking at creating a few new villages. There are many other advantages to this approach, for instance, providing a new</p>	Comments noted: Object to preferred Policy SD3, making clear growth should not be allocated in villages. The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPFF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. In North Norfolk this necessitates the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2.

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				small settlement may enable a village school in another nearby small settlement remain viable whereas locating this additional housing in a larger settlement may require a new school to be built and the children from the existing small settlement to be bussed in. Allowing development within the built up areas of the Selected Settlements will prioritise the development of previously developed land.	
SD4	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC012	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Support decisions made in respect of SD4A. The preservation of rural economy is essential. Development appropriate for this is necessary and should positively favour those working in the rural economy	Comments noted: The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. In North Norfolk this necessitates the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2.
SD4	Mr Bacon (1217300)	AC065	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Objecting to SD4. 1. Items in Home Policy SS2 which prejudices against those wishing single, small or in fill development for reasons which I cannot find or have not been published. By consultation I was told that one of the reasons being was to restrict the additional commuting within the countryside area, yet it is permissible to build affordable housing, commercial development, development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers, recreation and tourism, renewable energy projects, mineral extraction and waste management facilities, sites for Gypsies and Travellers and travelling show people and ironically transport. Do not ANY of these involve the use of transport within the countryside? 2. Area's of the countryside are littered with unkempt and unsightly plots which would benefit from additional and much needed housing. 3. Freedom of choice is also being restricted to those wishing to live in a countryside location. 4. Protecting Special Character - The ongoing mass development in permitted areas has had a bigger blight on the area than any individual or small countryside development would ever have. Countryside development is more in keeping with the surrounding buildings and areas	Comments noted: The proposed approach which allows small scale infill development in selected small growth villages which contain some but limited services, the allocation of small scale housing sites and the provision for rural exception sites in areas of designated countryside will be reviewed in line with feedback and evidence of need. The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including that of supporting rural economy, including the level of services and facilities, the recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and the overall objective of sustainable communities by locating housing, jobs and services closer together in order to reduce the need to travel. In North Norfolk this necessitates the majority of housing growth is concentrated in those settlements that have a range of services

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				<p>than most of the mass developments. An example being the Lovell development off the Holt bypass which has put a blot on the landscape with uniform houses matching all those of all Lovell developments across the country and none of these large developments bring jobs for hardly any local tradesmen as they use the cheapest viable options giving rise to poor quality build. 5. Could you please give a definitive answer as to whether the restriction of not allowing the construction of standard new build housing within the countryside is going to be permanent and if not when is the restriction to be lifted and what you have gained from the restriction if they reinstate the permission to build in the future all be it the loss of millions in council tax. 6. How is "countryside" actually designated? From my POV for example Edgefield couldn't more in the countryside than the Houses of Parliament are in London! Yet a new development is currently raising itself? 7. How can the Local Planning Consultation cover planning from 2016 when we are now in 2019?</p>	<p>are well connected and have the potential to meet local needs, as well as seeking to deliver more limited growth to the dispersed rural villages of the District. Overall numbers are influenced by local factors including environment constraints. Further detail is published in background paper 2.</p>
SD4A	Mr Rayner (1204056)	AC062	Support	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. CPRE Norfolk is strongly opposed to the alternative option SD4A which would allow for more growth in the Countryside Policy Area, as this would undermine the rural character of the District, and endanger the positive actions taken elsewhere in the draft Plan to combat climate change. In particular the alternative option SD4A would lead to an increase in the number of vehicle journeys to and from places of work, schools and for shopping and leisure, as well as through a greater number of delivery journeys.</p>	<p>Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.</p>
SD4A	Cromer (1218420)	LP732	Support	<p>The alternative option SD4A would lead to an increase in the number of vehicle journeys to and from places of work, schools and for shopping and leisure, as well as through a greater number of delivery journeys - .strongly opposed to the alternative option SD4A (rejected option) which would allow for more growth in the Countryside Policy Area, as this would undermine the rural character of the District, and endanger the positive actions taken elsewhere in the draft Plan to combat climate change.</p>	<p>Agree: The Alternative option SD4a is not the preferred approach and is considered to undermine the sustainability of the District and could lead to increased growth in rural areas.</p>
SD5	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC013	Support	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Support SD5 - additionally developer contributions &amp; evidence to support development should include environmental impact, traffic generation, disruption to residents and traffic during development, and sustainability. Prevent developers seeking planning permission purely to increase the value of their land / assets with no intention of going to construction stage. Work on site should start within 6 years or planning permission should be rescinded. To ensure allocated sites come forward and contribute to housing supply. Ensure fulfilment of any section 106 agreements in full as a minimum.</p>	<p>Comment Noted: One of the tests of soundness for the purposes of Local Plan Examination is the test of deliverability. All sites within the plan must be demonstrably deliverable and will therefore come forward through the plan period.</p>

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
SD6	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC014	General Comments	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> The retention of local facilities can only be sustainable if their costs and outgoings are sustainable and their customer base is retained. High taxes for businesses and the discouragement of their customers through high parking charges or lack of accessibility will erode sustainability of businesses and facilities.	Comments noted: Criterion 2 of Policy SD 6 caveats this to set out that "the loss of premises will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of retention of the facility or service; and if it is a commercial operation it has been marketed for a period of at least 12 months, a viability test has demonstrated that the use is no longer viable and that all reasonable efforts have been made to sell or let the property at a realistic market price".
SD7	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC015	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment of SD7 - Norfolk already makes a large contribution to renewable energy through the offshore wind farms along the coast- more than inland counties. The building of land based turbines and their inherent impact on the appearance and character of the countryside should be discouraged whilst there remains the ability to construct turbines offshore. Solar farms are also unsightly and completely uncharacteristic of the county. Steps should be taken to limit their development, particularly as land is required for agriculture. Reduction in the amount of land available for agriculture puts more pressure on the land that is remaining and encourages intensive farming to maintain yields. This results in poor environment and bio diversity and loss of habitat for wildlife. Solar farms should have surrounding hedges and appropriate wildlife (insect) friendly planting. They should not just be grassed over. Rain water run-off from the panels should be used for agriculture.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD7 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
SD8	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC016	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> The introduction of broadband and fibre across the county is important. Reliable broadband is essential in order to reduce traffic journeys and congestion through commuting as employees could work remotely from areas of employment. Unfortunately where broadband has been introduced the nature of the broadband is inappropriate. Download speeds for recreational activities are good but upload speeds that are required by those working remotely continue to be poor. A policy of appropriate broadband should be encouraged so that employment and commercial use is prioritised through better upload speeds and not frivolous use. Providers of broadband infrastructure need to be made to do this.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD8 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
SD9	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC017	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> See also comments on SD8 re appropriate upload and download speeds for remote employment working. Provision of broadband alone may meet the policy but will not best serve the population if it is merely for entertainment use and does not prioritise business, employment and education. The siting of masts and infrastructure must be controlled whether they are necessary or not. It is possible to provide appropriate masts and infrastructure disguised as necessary to mitigate impact (there are good examples of this elsewhere in the country.)	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD9 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
SD10	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC018	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment of SD7 - The policy should discourage building on flood plains.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD10 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
SD11	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC019	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> It is pointless building homes on the coast to serve the local community if they are all snapped up by second home owners. That does not address the needs of the local community. That will just lead to continued demand for more housing. Second home ownership pushes up costs and demand for affordable housing. Second home ownership should be discouraged by charging full council tax, business rates where appropriate and by local occupancy clauses in developments. The acquisition of development sites by individuals for the purpose of second homes should be positively discouraged. There are many examples of homes of this nature on the coast built with inappropriate materials, out of character detailing and inappropriate size. Also too many overdeveloped sites are changing the character of the villages.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD11 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
SD12	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC020	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> There are now many second homes in coastal villages. Allowing development to allow roll back and people to move because of erosion is fine for local residents. Development and gradual using up of the rural countryside to allow second home owners to relocate is not a good use of limited resources. Local occupiers affected by erosion should be given priority.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD12 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
SD13	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC021	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of SD13 - Development itself causes pollution. All developments should have an environmental impact statement considered as part of the planning process. Noise in particular and effect on adjacent occupants, traffic disruption, dust and emissions, use of appropriate materials should all be considered. Noise from completed development (whether existing or new) should be rigorously controlled. The inconvenience of adjacent occupiers should be prevented. Developments that could potentially cause noise should have appropriate planning conditions attached to prevent that occurring. North Norfolk is	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD13 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				one of the least light polluted counties in England. Long may this continue and a gradual erosion of this by inappropriate lighting schemes should be prevented. LED lighting with downward lighting only should be used. Schemes that allow uplighting and unnecessary light spillage should be rejected.	
SD14	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC022	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment SD14. Development should take place in areas where there is access to facilities and employment in order to limit road use. The impact of additional junctions, traffic lights and roundabouts on the flow of existing traffic should be considered. There are many examples – not necessarily in Norfolk- where a large development such as a supermarket or retail park has been allowed to have a traffic light controlled junction onto a major route causing long delays in through traffic. Inconvenience for many people on a daily basis result - all so that one business can make a profit.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD14 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
SD15	Mr Hall (1215856)	AC054	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Object to SD15 - The provision of parking in residential areas needs to be increased. The exact thing you are trying to avoid, parking on Highways, footpaths will happen with your existing policy. Therefore it is possible a 3 bed house could have 3 cars and only 1 external parking space. This will be more relevant in rural areas where sustainable transport options are not realistic or available.	Comments noted: Objects to Assessment of 15A. The local plan seeks to promote sustainable development and is reflective of the rural nature of the District where there is an overreliance on the private car. It is considered that poorly designed schemes can lead to inappropriate parking and highway issues and appropriate provision alongside new development to minimum standards and above is necessary. The approach adopts the County Council standards.
SD15	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC023	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially supports assessment SD15. Parking on rural roads in villages should be discouraged. Narrow roads which fall short of current design standards for width, sightlines, footways and alignment can become dangerous if partially blocked or narrowed or sightlines are blocked by inappropriate parking. Access for residents and emergency vehicles in particular can become difficult. Parking that does not impact on access roads should be encouraged and built into the development.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD15 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
SD16	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC024	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> It is a fallacy that electric vehicles are the cure for traffic pollution and carbon dioxide emissions. Electricity has to be generated and all electric cars do is move the point at which CO2 is generated from car engines to a central location in the form of a power station. There is a failure at central Government level to provide sufficient future power generation capacity to meet the predicted demand from electric cars or for phone charging, smart devices and home computers Windfarms are not enough and the	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD16 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).



Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				government has failed to make provision for the additional power generation needed. It is nevertheless important to provide appropriate connection for when the real problem of future power generation is resolved. The way to reduce pollution is to reduce traffic. That can be done by making sure housing development takes place near areas of employment and broadband is suitable for home working.	
SD17	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

	Objection	Support	General Comments	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Policies)
SD1	0	0	0	No comments received.
SD2	0	2	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
SD3	1	0	2	A mixed set of responses. Support was repeated for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). Limited support for the alternative options to disperse growth through the district and to provide for the planned growth through the provision of a new settlement.
SD3A	1	0	0	
SD3B	3	1	0	
SD4	2	0	0	Limited objection to the proposed approach on the basis that this would not allow for further growth in the countryside. These limited objections offer support to the alternative approach to distribute more growth in the countryside.
SD4A	0	2	0	CPRE and one Town Council set out that more growth in the countryside would undermine the rural character of the district and lead to more journeys by car. This objection offers support to the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
SD5	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
SD6	0	0	1	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
SD7	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.

SD8	0	0	1	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
SD9	0	0	1	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
SD10	0	0	0	No comments received.
SD11	0	0	0	No comments received.
SD12	0	0	0	No comments received.
SD13	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
SD14	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
SD15	1	1	0	No comments were made in support of a viable alternative option to the preferred approach.
SD16	0	0	1	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
SD17	0	0	0	No comments received.

# Environment Policies

## Alternative Policies (Environment)

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative policy options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Options', e.g. the policies favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred policy option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative policy option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative policy option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
ENV1	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC025	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment ENV1. There are many other really important areas within the county that should also be given similar priority. It is a fact that the current coastal habitat and AONB will be lost due to erosion in the future. If biodiversity is to be preserved then wildlife must have other areas to move to. Unless inland areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity are similarly protected from inappropriate development there will be a gradual reduction in the county's biodiversity and important wildlife habitat. Inland wildlife habitat is also a natural resource that enhances the lives and physical and mental well-being of residents, promotes tourism and associated businesses and adds to the character of the area.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV1 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ENV2	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A
ENV3	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC027	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment ENV3. - There are many other really important areas within the county that should also be given similar priority. It is a fact that the current coastal habitat and AONB will be lost due to erosion in the future. If biodiversity is to be preserved then wildlife must have other areas to move to. Unless inland areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity are similarly protected from inappropriate development there will be a gradual reduction in the county's biodiversity and important wildlife habitat. Inland wildlife habitat is also a natural resource that enhances the lives and physical and mental well-being of residents, promotes tourism and associated businesses and adds to the	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV1 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				character of the area.	
ENV4	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC028	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment ENV4. - Norfolk is generally agricultural. The intensive nature of farming can have a negative impact on biodiversity and habitat if hedgerows are removed, field margins are planted, and insecticides are used. Developing land currently used for farming would have less impact environmentally and on biodiversity than the development of woodland, pasture land or dormant farmland .The development of land that currently provides biodiversity and its associated beneficial effects should be avoided	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV4 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ENV5	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC029	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment ENV5. - Green infrastructure should be considered in terms of its overall contribution as wildlife corridors and prevent isolation of green areas in order to encourage biodiversity.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV5 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ENV6	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC030	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment ENV6. - This is absolutely necessary to prevent the erosion of biodiversity, and to provide a network of wildlife habitat across the county and not just isolated areas. See comments on ENV1. As many trees, hedgerows, coppices, ponds and mature areas of woodland as possible should be retained. On any developed land trees and hedges should be retained and protected by planning conditions wherever possible.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV6 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ENV7	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC031	General Comments	Policy SD13 should not be compromised by this.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV7 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ENV8	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC032	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment ENV8. - Recent issues surrounding access to the coast as a result of some national policy have caused concern. There are issues regarding access in certain areas of wildlife habitat and disturbance by inappropriate behaviour, noise and dogs. Organisations such as National Trust and NWT try to strike a balance between access for all at certain times of year and restricted access at other times to prevent wildlife disturbance or habitat erosion, especially where endangered species are concerned. Consultation with these and other	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV8 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).

Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				experienced organisations or bodies is essential in developing a policy.	
ENV9	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC033	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment ENV9. - Larger properties and/or second homes built by individuals along the NN coast on infill sites are in many cases very poorly conceived and detailed, use inappropriate materials, are of unsympathetic character, too large and in no way serve to enhance the character or appearance of the area. We would welcome a policy to prevent the proliferation of such unsympathetic development.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV9 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ENV10	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC034	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment ENV10. - Essential. Particularly in respect of noise, disturbance, and erosion of the character of a place.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV10 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ENV11A	Norfolk County Council: Historic Environment (931093)	LP739	Support	The County Council agree with the Preferred Approach which identifies the need for a policy to ensure a positive approach to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. The Alternative Approach (no policy) would not be acceptable.	Support for the preferred approach and dismissal of the alternative is noted

	Objection	Support	General Comments	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Policies)
ENV1	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
ENV2	0	0	0	No comments received.
ENV3	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
ENV4	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
ENV5	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
ENV6	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.

ENV7	0	0	1	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
ENV8	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
ENV9	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
ENV10	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
ENV11A	1	0	0	County Council object to the alternative approach and in doing so support the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).

DRAFT

# Housing Policies

## Alternative Policies (Housing)

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative policy options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Options', e.g. the policies favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred policy option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative policy option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative policy option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
HOU1	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC035	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment HOU1. - Evidence of how the original figure of 8000 new homes was arrived at should be included. In the interests of transparency the strategic housing market assessment should be appended to show how the council has arrived at this figure. Should the uptake of sites not be fully realised but at least 8000 (your figure) be built thereby meeting the Government's target would the council review the target and determine at that time whether it is appropriate to continue to the figure of 11000, whether the uplift is still appropriate or needed, or re assess the figure and lower it in order to avoid over development? Is there provision in the plan / policy to do so or is the county locked into building 11000 houses regardless of changes in demographic or demand? HOU1a and HOU1b are definitely inappropriate. .Any policy should be capable of review during its life and not have a target simply set for 20 years	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support HOU1 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
HOU2	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC036	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment HOU2. - In some areas provision of houses of a certain type / size will encourage second home owners. These types of property should have local occupancy rules to prevent lack of this type for local people.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support HOU2 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
HOU3	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
HOU4	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC037	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment HOU4. - The policy must stop these homes being subsequently sold for other purposes or for second homes.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support HOU4 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
HOU5	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A
HOU6	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC038	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment HOU6 - Larger properties and/or second homes built by individuals along the NN coast on infill sites are in many cases very poorly conceived and detailed, use inappropriate materials, are of unsympathetic character, too large and in no way serve to enhance the character or appearance of the area. A similar problem occurs with owners of larger gardens selling off part of the garden for development. In many cases this alters the character of the village / town by gradual urbanisation and constitutes a loss of green space / habitat and would contravene several of the ENV policies. We would like to think that this policy would prevent the proliferation of unsympathetic development.	
HOU7	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC039	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Would be best if used under policy HOU4 as a priority	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support HOU7 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
HOU8	Miss Foster (1210042)	AC001	General Comments	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> There is a lack of attention being paid to the effects on younger disabled people of the refusal to allow extra (suitable) housing to be built in most villages. My personal situation is this. I have a wide range of neurological problems, including visual impairment and noise sensitivity. I am unable to drive and not particularly mobile. I moved to Norfolk to an area where I already have friends, without whom I would not have coped at all. It is not easy for a visually impaired person to learn a new area, and I am starting to do freelance work locally. For all these reasons, moving to a different village which is on the plan, or to one of the main settlements€ is not possible. It should not be assumed that disabled people can be provided for by moving them to a different area, which any plan of allowing housing to be built only in specific places unintentionally does. I am living in a very	Comments noted: Policy HOU8 introduces the requirement to ensure homes are built to adaptable and accessible standards. The Council's allocation (occupation policy) is a housing strategy document and not subject to consultation in this local plan.



Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
				isolated place about three miles from my support network in rented housing which is unsuitable for my physical needs in more than one way. I have been on the council housing lists for two and a half years, and am in the top priority bracket. However, it is my belief that there is no suitable council housing in the area, as, due to noise sensitivity problems, I need any non-detached dwelling to have extremely good sound insulation, plus I have problems with steep stairs. Suitable commercial rentals are beyond my budget, and in any case, as I am on housing benefit, most landlords won't take me as a tenant.	
HOU9	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC040	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Not at the expense of HOU6 or ENV policies.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support HOU9 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
HOU10	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A
HOU11	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC041	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> BUT not if the materials used are inappropriate under policy HOU6. Not if materials provide poor durability or high maintenance as that may affect uptake and older people in particular.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support HOU11 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).

	Objection	Support	General Comments	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Policies)
HOU1	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
HOU2	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
HOU3	0	0	0	No comments received.
HOU4	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
HOU5	0	0	0	No comments received.

HOU6	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
HOU7	0	0	1	General comment does not raise support for any of the alternative options or question the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
HOU8	0	0	1	General comment does not raise support for any of the alternative options or question the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
HOU9	0	0	1	General comment does not raise support for any of the alternative options or question the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
HOU10	0	0	0	No comments received.
HOU11	0	0	1	General comment does not raise support for any of the alternative options or question the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).

# Economy Policies

## Alternative Policies (Economy)

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative policy options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Options', e.g. the policies favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred policy option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative policy option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative policy option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
ECN1	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC042	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Employment areas should consider the availability of local workforce and not encourage commuting and travel of long distances.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ECN1 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ECN2	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A
ECN3	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC043	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Should not be implemented at the expense of HOU6 which should also apply as far as possible to employment development.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ECN3 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ECN4	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC044	General Comments	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> The sustainability of local centres of facilities such as shops and businesses depends upon those businesses having trade. Excessive parking charges and lack of parking for users and operators discourages use of such businesses. This should be borne in mind when setting rates.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ECN4 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ECN5	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A
ECN6	Mr & Mrs Johnson	AC045	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Partially Supports Assessment ECN6 - Development should not be at the expense of any ENV policies and	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ECN6 made

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
	(1215700)			subject to similar requirements to HOU6.	against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ECN7	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A
ECN8	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A
ECN9	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

	Objection	Support	General Comments	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Policies)
ECN1	0	0	1	General comment does not raise support for any of the alternative options or question the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ECN2	0	0	0	No comments received.
ECN3	0	0	1	General comment does not raise support for any of the alternative options or question the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ECN4	0	0	1	General comment does not raise support for any of the alternative options or question the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
ECN5	0	0	0	No comments received.
ECN6	0	1	0	This comment repeats the support for the preferred option made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1). No comments were received on the alternatives.
ECN7	0	0	0	No comments received.
ECN8	0	0	0	No comments received.
ECN9	0	0	0	No comments received.

# Vision, Aims & Objectives

## Vision, Aims & Objectives

Vision & Aims	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Policies)	Council's Response
Vision & Aims	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Vision & Aims)
Objection	0	None received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

DRAFT

**First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) Comments**

# **Comments on Alternative Site Options**

DRAFT

DRAFT

BLANK

# Cromer

## Alternative Sites in Cromer

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Cromer	C10/1	Mrs Cole (1209821)	AC003	Object	In line with other proposed sites that have been deemed unsuitable for development this site is beyond the current confines of the Cromer Town and would impact on the special qualities it affords being an area of such longstanding natural beauty. Development at this location would have an adverse impact on the important character of the border area between East Runton Village and Cromer Town and it has always been considered important to retain the open character of this land and current use for the local and holiday community as well as the historic Runton Gap. There are concerns about the local road network via East Runton Village, Mill Lane etc., to access this site which will cause much disruption to the local community and directly impact on the access to the many holiday park sites along this coast road. This site provides an important open space which is accessed daily by the local community of East Runton and Cromer Town and has great recreational value. I note the site RUN076 Land at Mill Lane was not considered to be suitable as the site is located in East Runton which is not a selected settlement - this land is also in East Runton and I would have thought the same reasons for exclusion applies - if not why not?	Comments noted: Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.
Cromer	C18	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1217309)	LP419	Object	1. Site is described as having "some mature trees along eastern boundary". In fact it has the Becketts Plantation – which also forms part of the edge of site C22/1, where it is described as "woodland". Inaccurate description and inconsistency. 2. Furthermore, the site is well contained not only by Becketts Plantation but also by roadside hedgerow. 3. Site is described as wrapping behind existing housing	Comments noted: Support for alternative site C18. Consider amendments to the wording of the assessment. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.



Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>and also protruding beyond “into the open countryside”. This is also true of Site C22/1 (which is identified as Preferred), which is identified as being visible from the south, yet “shouldn’t have a detrimental impact on the landscape and wider countryside” .There is therefore no justification for the statement that if C18 was developed it would have an “adverse impact on the special qualities of the AONB, landscape and townscape” and inconsistency between site assessments.</p> <p>4. The conclusion suggests there would be “a negative effect on the quality of the landscape by reducing the rural character and extending into the open countryside and would have a greater material impact on the AONB than the preferred sites.” There is no evidence for this, particularly as Site C22/1 extends further south than C18; and both C22/1 and C18 sites share the Becketts Plantation boundary. 5. The conclusion states C18 has poorer access to services and facilities, but there is no reasoning given, and this does not take account of C18 being within walking distance to schools and services, with bus stops nearby, and one of the closest sites to Roughton Road station. 6. The Sustainability Appraisal scores for C18 are the same as or better than C22/1. This is not acknowledged.</p>	
Cromer	C18	Innova Property Ltd (1217373)	LP364	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> 1. Site is described as having “some mature trees along eastern boundary”. In fact it has the Becketts Plantation – which also forms part of the edge of site C22/1, where it is described as “woodland”. Inaccurate description and inconsistency. 2. Furthermore, the site is well contained not only by Becketts Plantation but also by roadside hedgerow. 3. Site is described as wrapping behind existing housing and also protruding beyond “into the open countryside”. This is also true of Site C22/1 (which is identified as Preferred), which is identified as being visible from the south, yet “shouldn’t have a detrimental impact on the landscape and wider countryside” .There is therefore no justification for the statement that if C18 was developed it would have an “adverse impact on the special qualities of the AONB, landscape and townscape” and inconsistency between site assessments.4. The conclusion suggests there would be “a negative effect on the quality of the landscape by reducing the rural character and extending into the open countryside and would have a greater material impact on the AONB than the preferred sites.” There is no evidence for this, particularly as Site C22/1 extends</p>	Comments noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					further south than C18; and both C22/1 and C18 sites share the Becketts Plantation boundary. 5. The conclusion states C18 has poorer access to services and facilities, but there is no reasoning given, and this does not take account of C18 being within walking distance to schools and services, with bus stops nearby, and one of the closest sites to Roughton Road station. 6. The Sustainability Appraisal scores for C18 are the same as or better than C22/1. This is not acknowledged.	
Cromer	C19	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1217309)	LP419	Object	1. Inaccurate information used in the assessment: a) The “informal path” identified in the C19 assessment is in fact a Public Right of Way; b) Site owner confirms there are no water mains crossing the site. A water main follows the line of the PROW; c) The site is not located off Metton Road 2. Site is identified as having “No flooding, utilities or contamination issues” . This does not apply to any of the sites identified as Preferred Sites.	Comments noted: Consider amendments to the wording of the assessment. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.
Cromer	C19	Innova Property Ltd (1217373)	LP364	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> 1. Inaccurate information used in the assessment: a) The “informal path” identified in the C19 assessment is in fact a Public Right of Way; b) Site owner confirms there are no water mains crossing the site. A water main follows the line of the PROW; c) The site is not located off Metton Road 2. Site is identified as having “No flooding, utilities or contamination issues” . This does not apply to any of the sites identified as Preferred Sites.	Comments noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy.
Cromer	C19/1	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1217309)	LP419	Object	1. Inaccurate information used in the assessment: a) The “informal path” identified in the C19/1 assessment is in fact a Public Right of Way; b) Site owner confirms there are no water mains crossing the site. A water main follows the line of the PROW; 2. Site is identified as having “No flooding, utilities or contamination issues” . This does not apply to any of the sites identified as Preferred Sites.	Comments noted: Consider amendments to the wording of the assessment. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.
Cromer	C19/1	Innova Property Ltd (1217373)	LP364	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> 1. Inaccurate information used in the assessment: a) The “informal path” identified in the C19/1 assessment is in fact a Public Right of Way; b) Site owner confirms there are no water mains crossing the site. A water main follows the line of the PROW; 2. Site is identified as having “No flooding, utilities or contamination issues” . This does not apply to any of the sites identified as Preferred Sites.	Comments noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy.
Cromer	C22/1	Innova Property Ltd	LP364	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> 1. Proposed use is described as “housing” yet the conclusion identifies	Comments noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
		(1217373)			<p>it as preferred for sports pitches and facilities. There is no explanation or evidence for this. 2. Site is “considered unsuitable for development” yet is identified as a Preferred Option. Inconsistent and therefore unjustifiable as a Preferred Option. 3. No evidence for the statement “development on this site shouldn’t have a detrimental impact on the landscape and wider countryside”, particularly as it requires a footbridge and roundabout, and is “visible from the south and immediate surrounding area. 4. The topography of the site is not significantly different from the topography of other sites proposed. 5. Inconsistency in the description that the site has “no contamination issues” yet the SA records it has “potential for remediation of contamination” 6. The conclusion suggests The site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal. This statement applies to many other Cromer sites, including those not identified as Preferred Options, for example: C11; C18; C19; C19/1; C34; C44. Furthermore, the summary assessment in the SA is inconsistent – see detailed comments on SA. 7. The conclusion suggests “This is considered to be one of the most sustainable and suitable of the Cromer alternatives”. There is no evidence for this conclusion, particularly as it is visible; requires construction of a new footbridge and a new roundabout in order to be considered suitable; and the presence of large mature trees along the road from which access is proposed and has risk of flooding. 8. NCC Highways has recently expressed fundamental concerns about the proposed site access 9. The assessment suggests No utilities issues. However, there are limited utilities available on the site, and ownership issues restrict access for at least two essential services.</p>	
Cromer	C25	Hannant, B (1216654)	LP210	SupportuppObjectrt	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> The Alternatives Considered document states that C25 is not considered to be suitable for development on its own. Wish for it to be included as part of the site allocation reference C22/1 and feels that this would be a sensible and workable solution. Or to be included as a separate site allocation as the land in question forms a reasonable sized infill plot between Pine Tree Farm and the run of houses stretching south along the A149. The question of accessibility is also mentioned but with a suitably positioned access this is feasible with suitable visibility.</p>	Comments noted: Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.
Cromer	C41	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1217309)	LP419	Object	<p>1. A link road is sought by NCC highways 2. The potential for a link road appears to have been inappropriately assessed with a suggestion of proof being required regarding the benefit of a link</p>	Comments noted: Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>road. We have recently received confirmation from Norfolk County Council that there would be significant benefits in the delivery of a new link road and it would support such a proposal. It could be developer funded if a larger site were allocated, and would release opportunities for the town including other necessary infrastructure and community improvements.</p> <p>3. Allocation of this would enable strategic development of Cromer to provide relief from existing traffic problems in the centre of town; ending rat running along unsuitable roads such as Carr Lane. 4. It would also enable a planned and phased approach, enabling requisite infrastructure and housing over the plan period – an overall masterplan approach rather than piecemeal development.</p>	
Cromer	C41	Innova Property Ltd (1217373)	LP364	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> 1. A link road is sought by NCC highways 2. The potential for a link road appears to have been inappropriately assessed with a suggestion of proof being required regarding the benefit of a link road. We have recently received confirmation from Norfolk County Council that there would be significant benefits in the delivery of a new link road and it would support such a proposal. It could be developer funded if a larger site were allocated, and would release opportunities for the town including other necessary infrastructure and community improvements. 3. Allocation of this would enable strategic development of Cromer to provide relief from existing traffic problems in the centre of town; ending rat running along unsuitable roads such as Carr Lane. 4. It would also enable a planned and phased approach, enabling requisite infrastructure and housing over the plan period – an overall masterplan approach rather than piecemeal development.</p>	Comments noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy.
Cromer	C41	Innova Property Ltd (1217373)	LP364	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> 1. Inconsistency. This site is labelled as “Norwich Road” but the map in the Alternative sites document considered shows C44 it as located off the Roughton Road – but without any clear boundaries. It is assumed from other references to be the site subject to planning application PO/18/1551. 2. Inaccurate information used in the assessment: a) The “informal path” identified in the C19/1 assessment is in fact a Public Right of Way b) Site owner confirms there are is no drain running through part of the site 3. Site description “There are mature trees on the western boundary” ignores the fact that part of the western boundary is the woodland known as Larners Plantation. Furthermore, there is no mention of</p>	Comments noted: Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites. References to Norwich road will be updated to Roughton Road site (C44)

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>the roadside and other field boundary hedgerows or of Becketts Plantation on the Eastern boundary (described in C22/1 assessment as woodland). 4. Site is described as wrapping behind existing housing and also protruding beyond “into the open countryside”. This is also true of Site C22/1 (which is identified as Preferred), which is identified as being visible from the south, yet “shouldn’t have a detrimental impact on the landscape and wider countryside” .There is therefore inconsistency between site assessments. 5. The conclusion suggests that the site has a number of constraints but this is inconsistent with the site description. 6. There is no reasoning or justification for the statement in the conclusion that the site would adversely affect the settlement. The site adjoins existing development 7. The conclusion suggests there would be “a negative effect on the quality of the landscape by reducing the rural character and extending into the open countryside and would have a greater material impact on the AONB than the preferred sites.” There is no evidence for this, particularly as it is acknowledged that the western part of site C44 is “visually well screened”; both C22/1 and C44 sites share the Becketts Plantation boundary; and Site C22/1 extends further south than C44. 8. The conclusion states C44 has poorer access to services and facilities (than what?), but there is no reasoning given, and this does not take account of C44 being within walking distance of infant, junior and high school and to the town centre with a range of services and facilities available; with bus stop nearby, and the site being one of the closest sites to Roughton Road station. 9. Site is identified as having “No flooding, utilities or contamination issues” . This does not apply to any of the sites identified as Preferred Sites.</p>	
Cromer	C42	Northrepps Parish Council (1218479)	LP789	Support	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative site - Land at Roughton Road Northrepps Parish Council object to this application and stand by their original concerns: • Concern re the number and density of the housing. • Concern re the impact of the increased traffic movements on the surrounding road network. • Concern re the impact on the infrastructure including health services, care in the community, schools. • The necessary infrastructure must be in place before any developments are considered. • Concern re the loss of agricultural land. • Concern re the impact on the AONB.</p>	Support noted: This site has been identified as being affected by a number of constraints and is considered unsuitable for allocation at this time . The Council has fully engaged with key service providers to identify the likely impacts of development for local highways, water, and sewerage and energy networks. These issues along with wider constraints have been taken into account in site assessment.
Cromer	C44	Mr Duncan	AC071	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p>	Comments noted. Consider feedback in

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
		(1217039)			<p>Alternatives considered The map of sites does not clearly identify site boundaries. There are inconsistencies, for example Site C44 is described as Norwich Road but is labelled on the plan of Alternative sites as somewhere in the vicinity of Roughton Road. Regarding the Preferred Site Options C07/2; C10/1; C16 and C22/1, all are identified as being preferred because: a) The site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, in the Sustainability Appraisal, scoring positively applies to many other Cromer sites, including those not identified as Preferred Options. However, detailed analysis of the Development Site Methodology Background Paper shows all of the Preferred Sites have sustainability issues, and therefore there is no justification for this statement. Site ref C22/1 is identified in the Alternatives for housing only. The Background Paper 6 also identifies the Proposed Use as Housing. However in the Methodology Paper Conclusion site C22/1 is identified a suitable for allocation for sports pitches and facilities. If a need for sports pitches and facilities has been established, this should have been considered for other sites. There is, however, no such consideration shown in the Draft LP: Alternatives Considered. The comments made in the Why it is preferred and Why it is not preferred columns reflect the comments made in Site Methodology Background Paper. We suggest that C44 offers an available and deliverable mixed use site offering housing, sporting and care facilities for Cromer, and that it has not been appropriately assessed in the LP process.</p>	the finalisation of preferred sites. References to Norwich road will be updated to Roughton Road site (C44)
Cromer	C44	Mr Duncan (1217309)	AC070 AC071	Object	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b>  Objecting to the Assessment C44. Draft Local Plan: Alternatives considered The map of sites does not clearly identify site boundaries. There are inconsistencies, for example Site C44 is described as Norwich Road but is labelled on the plan of Alternative sites as somewhere in the vicinity of Roughton Road.  Draft Local Plan: Regarding the Preferred Site Options C07/2; C10/1; C16 and C22/1, all are identified as being preferred because: a) The site scores positively in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, in the Sustainability Appraisal, scoring positively applies to many other Cromer sites, including those not identified as Preferred Options, for example: C11; C18; C19; C19/1; C34; C44. As well as the scoring positively being frequent in the SA, the summary assessment of positive etc. in the SA is not always consistent with the colour bars shown see detailed comments on SA above. b) This is considered to</p>	Comments noted: Support for alternative site C44. Consider the assessment of alternative sites through the plan making process. Amend the site name within Background Paper 6.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>be one of the most sustainable and suitable of the Cromer alternatives. However, detailed analysis of the Development Site Methodology Background Paper shows all of the Preferred Sites have sustainability issues, and therefore there is no justification for this statement. Issues include:</p> <p>Site 10/1 not in walking distance of schools and has flooding risk  Site C16 is over 1.3 km from train station; is closest to the SAC/SSSI; and has risk of flooding and contamination  Site C22/1 requires construction of new footbridge and roundabout in order to be considered suitable; and there are large mature trees along the road from which access is proposed; is visible from the south and immediate surrounding area; and risk of surface water flooding.</p> <p>Site ref C22/1 is identified in the Alternatives for housing only. The Background Paper 6 also identifies the Proposed Use as Housing. However in the Methodology Paper Conclusion site C22/1 is identified a suitable for allocation for sports pitches and facilities. If a need for sports pitches and facilities has been established, this should have been considered for other sites. There is, however, no such consideration shown in the Draft LP: Alternatives Considered. The comments made in the Why it is preferred and Why it is not preferred columns reflect the comments made in Site Methodology Background Paper. We have attached detailed comment on the Site Methodology which identifies inaccurate information; unjustified statements; and inconsistencies. Therefore these comments apply also to the Alternatives Considered, and raise doubt about the site selection process and outcome.</p> <p>Site C44 provides an example of these issues. It is described as having a number of constraints, however our detailed analysis of the Site Selection Background Paper 6 shows this not to be the case. The Background Paper 6 suggested the site name as Norwich Road yet identifies it as being off Roughton Road. Development is suggested as extending into the open countryside, yet the site does not extend as far south as the site C22/1 which is identified as a preferred option. The statements regarding the effect on the quality of the landscape, rural character and AONB are shown to be unjustified. The site is in walking distance to a range of schools, services and facilities and in close proximity to Roughton Road railway station. Furthermore, we note that site C44 was proposed for mixed use yet the assessment does not refer to any other uses than housing on the</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>site. The Alternatives merely comments that The preferred sites can deliver sufficient housing for Cromer. • There is no consideration of the other uses for which the site has specifically been proposed in the site nominations. We suggest that C44 offers an available and deliverable mixed use site offering housing, sporting and care facilities for Cromer, and that it has not been appropriately assessed in the LP process.</p>	
Cromer	C44	Duncan, Mr Phillip (1217309)	LP419	Object	<p>1. Inconsistency. This site is labelled as “Norwich Road” but the map in the Alternative sites document considered shows C44 it as located off the Roughton Road – but without any clear boundaries. It is assumed from other references to be the site subject to planning application PO/18/1551.</p> <p>2. Inaccurate information used in the assessment: a) The “informal path” identified in the C19/1 assessment is in fact a Public Right of Way b) Site owner confirms there are is no drain running through part of the site 3. Site description “There are mature trees on the western boundary” ignores the fact that part of the western boundary is the woodland known as Larners Plantation. Furthermore, there is no mention of the roadside and other field boundary hedgerows or of Becketts Plantation on the Eastern boundary (described in C22/1 assessment as woodland). 4. Site is described as wrapping behind existing housing and also protruding beyond “into the open countryside”. This is also true of Site C22/1 (which is identified as Preferred), which is identified as being visible from the south, yet “shouldn’t have a detrimental impact on the landscape and wider countryside” .There is therefore inconsistency between site assessments. 5. The conclusion suggests that the site has a number of constraints but this is inconsistent with the site description. 6. There is no reasoning or justification for the statement in the conclusion that the site would adversely affect the settlement. The site adjoins existing development 7. The conclusion suggests there would be “a negative effect on the quality of the landscape by reducing the rural character and extending into the open countryside and would have a greater material impact on the AONB than the preferred sites.” There is no evidence for this, particularly as it is acknowledged that the western part of site C44 is “visually well screened”; both C22/1</p>	<p>Comments noted: Consider amendments to the wording of key development considerations. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.</p>



Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					and C44 sites share the Becketts Plantation boundary; and Site C22/1 extends further south than C44. 8. The conclusion states C44 has poorer access to services and facilities (than what?), but there is no reasoning given, and this does not take account of C44 being within walking distance of infant, junior and high school and to the town centre with a range of services and facilities available; with bus stop nearby, and the site being one of the closest sites to Roughton Road station. 9. Site is identified as having "No flooding, utilities or contamination issues" . This does not apply to any of the sites identified as Preferred Sites.	

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Cromer)
<b>Objection</b>	15	A number of comments raised/repeated objections to the preferred sites being within the Local Plan due to the potential impact on the landscape and the coalescence between Cromer and Runton. Limited support is put forward for a number of the alternative sites, which are considered to be more suitable for development as they would not have the same negative impacts as the preferred sites. A number of objections are simply correcting information within the assessments.
<b>Support</b>	1	
<b>General Comments</b>	1	

# Fakenham

## Alternative Sites in Fakenham

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Fakenham	F02	Mr Olliffe & Shell Ltd (1216246 1216247)	AC051	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported F02. - Land Rear of Shell Garage, Creake Road has been assessed as being inappropriate for development as it cannot be satisfactorily accessed. This statement is simply not true. Shell Ltd has instructed TPA (Transport consultants) to undertake formal assessment of a new access into the site. It is clear that a suitable and safe access and egress can be delivered to the site and this has been discussed with North Norfolk Council through previous correspondence. Land Rear of Shell Garage would represent an appropriate rounding of the settlement and as with strategic allocation F03 (Land at Junction of A148 and B1146) there are no constraints to development of the site. As acknowledged within the Alternatives Considered consultation document, the only perceived constraint to suitability of the site is access. As this is not the case and can be proven to accommodate a safe and deliverable access (as per the supporting information prepared by TPA), it is considered the site is suitable, available and deliverable within the first 5 years of the Plan and should be included in the next consultation draft as a proposed allocation.	Comments noted: Support for alternative site F02. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.
Fakenham	F07	Ms Clifton (1210087 1210089)	AC078	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported F07. - Site F07 Land East of Clipbush Lane relates to land controlled by Trinity College that was put forward for mixed use development in conjunction with the Call for Sites in 2016. It is noted that this site has been discounted on the basis that the preferred allocations (predominantly F01/B, plus two further sites providing a	Comments noted: Support for alternative site F07. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>further estimated 120 dwellings) will meet the town's housing requirements for the plan period. The report also states that the site is poorly integrated with the existing town and is very prominent within the landscape, with potential development resulting in a significant extension into the open countryside adversely affecting the character of the area. As noted above, the site immediately adjoins existing employment and residential areas (to the west and south respectively), and with the proposed significant expansion of the town to the north through the development of sites F01/A and subsequently F01/B, Site F07 has a clear and robust physical relationship with the existing settlement that makes it suitable for development. As such, the site is considered to offer the potential for development, including employment generating and retail uses, and those uses deemed acceptable within the countryside (as referred to in draft Policy Policy SD 4). It also offers potential for future residential development, should that be required in the longer term, given its physical relationship to existing residential areas and existing and proposed services and facilities to the west of the site. In considering the constraints to development noted in the consideration of alternatives report, it is also proposed that any visual and landscape impact resulting from development of the site (which is limited to specific locations rather than relevant to the overall site) could be appropriately addressed through careful consideration of the layout of development and associated landscaping.</p>	
Fakenham	F11	A & B Management Ltd Lanpro Services, Wilkinson, Ms Claire (1219336 1218057)	LP827	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Request that this site is allocated for residential use (from its current designated use as employment). A &amp; B Management Services Limited have embarked on a comprehensive asset management strategy to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability. Looking at feasibility of development options for the site following the proposed relocation of the existing Aldiss Distribution Centre to another part of the town. The provision of housing in this location, within walking distance of the town centre, key services and facilities in Fakenham has the propensity to support existing uses and deliver a sustainable residential scheme to meet North Norfolk's local housing needs. Paragraph 68 of the Framework confirms that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out relatively quickly. Paragraph 121 states local planning authorities should take a positive</p>	Comments noted: Consider alternative site proposed in finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>approach in supporting proposals to use retail and employment land for homes in areas of high housing demand, provided this would not undermine key economic sectors or sites or the viability of town centres, and would be compatible with other policies in this Framework. The Council's Local Plan Background Paper 3, confirms that there is little employment land available within towns, with the exception of Fakenham (para 3.5). And confirms there is 9.44ha of available undeveloped land on designated employment areas and enterprise zones in Fakenham, demonstrating an overprovision of employment land. The Site is poorly related to the employment area (i.e. Fakenham Industrial Estate) to the north east and is located amongst residential areas. The entirety of the Site is under sole ownership and is considered to be deliverable within the next 5 years. The site has limited constraints. Access to healthcare opportunities and extensive range of comparison and convenience goods shopping in the town. Easy access to the national road network and good public transport links. The planning application for F01 has still not been determined and is unlikely to come forward and deliver 950 dwellings in the next 5-10 years to meet North Norfolk's local housing needs. Paper 2 states that there were 1,125 people on the housing waiting list who expressed a preference for living in Fakenham. This pressing need for new affordable homes can be addressed through the provision of a meaningful number of new dwellings at the proposed allocation site.</p>	
Fakenham	F07	Trinity College Cambridge Define Planning & Design Clifton, Ms Kirstie (1210089 1210087)	LP591	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> The policy identifies a relatively limited area of existing employment land (under 10ha) that has yet to be development within Fakenham and proposes no new allocations. Table 3 clearly indicates that Fakenham has delivered the highest quantum of employment development within the District and, as such, the town evidently attracts and supports employment growth in the District. This is reinforced in paragraph 13.5 of the draft Local Plan (Proposals for Fakenham), which notes that Fakenham has seen one of the strongest take-up rates of employment land within the District in recent years. Given the emphasis on the town to accommodate a large proportion of growth to reflect its status within the settlement hierarchy, and the scale of housing growth proposed within the draft Local Plan, there is a clear need to identify further employment land within or adjoining the town to support that growth potential. This could be accommodated through the broader development parameters for mixed</p>	Comments noted: Alternative site suggestions put forward will be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					use development on Land North of Rudham Stile Lane (Proposed Allocation F01/B that lies to the west of Water Moor Lane) and/or on Land East of Clipbush Lane (Site F07), which is currently discounted as one of the alternative sites considered for mixed use by the Council. Site F07 to the east of the town is particularly well located, being immediately adjacent to existing employment land. This site offers an opportunity to deliver employment generating uses, either as a single use or as part of a more extensive mixed use development and should be reconsidered in conjunction with a more detailed review of potential new employment land allocations for Fakenham. (Refer also to representations in response to Policy DS 6 and Alternatives Considered).	

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Fakenham)
<b>Objection</b>	4	A limited number of comments raised/repeated objections to the preferred site being within the Local Plan. Limited support is put forward for a number of the alternative sites, which are considered to be more suitable for development, primarily for reasons of deliverability. In some cases further information has been provided in order to seek to overcome the known constraints regarding the alternative sites.
<b>Support</b>	0	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

# Holt

## Alternative Sites in Holt

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Holt	H10	Norfolk County Council: Norfolk Property Services (931093)	LP793	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Holt – Land off Swan Grove The site has not been included as a potential site for development within the draft Local Plan and has been allocated as an Open Land Area. NCC object to the open land area allocation as there would appear to be no demonstrably special justification for its inclusion and this would prejudice the potential to develop the site for a mixed-use scheme with both housing, formal open space and informal link to the town centre. NCC would therefore object to the Amenity Green Space allocation and would request it be deleted. The site has not been included as a potential site for residential development within the draft Local Plan. The site had been put forward by NCC for residential development following NNDC's 'Call for Sites' exercise, undertaken by the District Council in May 2016. Following this exercise, NNDC published its Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) June 2007. As outlined in Appendix 4, NNDC HELAA (Part 1 Assessment of Housing Land) highlights that 'the site is considered suitable and available' for development. Furthermore, it states;</p> <p>'The site is well related to Holt, has access to facilities and utilities. No major constraints have been identified at this stage. However, development on the site would result in the loss of Open Space and replacement would be required. The site also falls within a moderate sensitive landscape on the edge of town and development proposals should reflect this (avoiding development, which affect or impinge on skyline views). Limited visibility of site from main road due to mature</p>	Comments noted: the site has been assessed as part of the potential sites for Holt and is not a preferred site. The site is currently designated as open land area in the adopted Core Strategy. Full details of the methodology used can be found in Background paper 2

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>hedgerow along boundary'.</p> <p>Whilst the HELAA does not allocate land for development, it does clearly identify land that has strong potential for allocation. In view of the above, the site continues to offer strong development potential. A mixed development could be provided which provides a mix of housing in a sustainable location, retains the woodland screen to north and east, provides part as a formal amenity use and includes a formal footpath route. The site is available for development with no significant constraints and could be delivered within the next five years.</p> <p>NCC would request that the land be reconsidered for residential development.</p>	
Holt	H27/1	Adams, Mr (1218558)	LP592	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> H27 The larger proposed site for mixed development at 14.15 Ha was considered unsuitable because."The site is not considered to be in a suitable location for residential development. The site would be a pronounced and obvious extension into the countryside and development of the whole site could have an adverse impact on the landscape. The site is adjacent to a Listed Building. The site is considered to have unsuitable highways access and network connections unless it is access via the new roundabout and spine road. The preferred sites can deliver sufficient housing for Holt.". H27/1 is the proposed use of the same reduced sized site for employment land and was considered a preferred option. - The same site has unsuitable highway access for private vehicles but not for commercial vehicles through a residential area. Housing is a pronounced and obvious extension into the countryside whereas industrial units are not. The development of the whole site could have an adverse impact on the landscape but it is actually very well screened and nowhere near as intrusive as the existing Heath Farm site. It's just how you spin it!. If the reduced site (H27/1 at 6 Ha) or even a slightly larger site to match H20 at 7.11 Ha was assessed for mixed use then the access to the A148 would be the same but would not include commercial vehicles. The extension into the countryside would be the same as for the employment land and no more of an extension than H20 which I consider to be equally an extension into the countryside. . The use of H27/1 or even a slightly enlarged area to match H20 as housing would bring all the benefits listed above. I cannot see any planning negatives to the swap</p>	Comments noted: Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

	<b>Number Received</b>	<b>Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Holt)</b>
<b>Objection</b>	2	Norfolk County Council object to the lack of inclusion of site H10 due to the open land designation. A member of the public raises support for site H27/1 and sets out that the reasons for the site not being preferred should be the same for site H27, which is preferred.
<b>Support</b>	0	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

DRAFT



# Hoveton

## Alternative Sites in Hoveton

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Hoveton	HV05	Norfolk Land Ltd Presslee, Mr A (1216618 1216614)	LP531	Object	Hoveton is identified as a 'Small Growth Town' in the proposed settlement Hierarchy, in which the Plan proposes "a more limited amount of additional development", together with Holt, Sheringham, Stalham and Wells-next-the-Sea. The draft Plan proposes just one new residential allocation of 150 dwellings (site HV01B). It is our contention that Hoveton is capable of sustainably accommodating additional housing growth through the emerging Local Plan, to which end Norfolk Land Ltd. puts forward a site on Horning Road, Hoveton for approximately 150 dwellings (including a possible Car Home) and public open space, in addition to that already identified in the draft Local Plan (HV01B), thereby increasing the overall housing allocation in Hoveton to approximately 300. The current Core Strategy – at Policy SS1 – identifies Hoveton as a secondary settlement, along with Sheringham, Stalham and Wells-next-the-Sea. Hoveton is acknowledged (in the current and draft Plans) as a sustainable settlement, and whilst it may be realistic to continue its position in the settlement hierarchy as a Secondary Settlement (now Small Growth Town) within an emerging North Norfolk Local Plan, in at least planning/cross-boundary/cooperation terms it ought to be considered in conjunction with Wroxham, with which it is physically, economically and socially 'conjoined'. Hoveton sits on the border of the Greater Norwich Housing Market Area (as identified in the Central Norfolk Strategic Housing Market Assessment) - in which Wroxham is located - and ought therefore to be more realistically considered in that context, or at least being given regard to insofar as the relative Housing Market Areas and OAN are concerned. Put	Noted. Alternative site suggestions put forward will be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>simply, Hoveton demands additional scrutiny given its somewhat different context – in these respects – than perhaps other similar settlements in North Norfolk, and ought to be accommodating a greater share of housing to meet identified needs, than is indicated in the Working Party report. Hoveton particularly promotes itself having: a substantial employment base; an excellent range of shops (including a supermarket); a primary school and high school; railway station with services to Norwich and Sheringham/Cromer; a newly constructed medical centre; and well placed for recreation. Combined with Wroxham and its significant employment, retail, recreation and other services/facilities, they offer significant economic and social dimensions to sustainably supporting a good level of new growth. Environmentally it is acknowledged that the area of the Broads is highly sensitive; however, our site is detached from this and sufficiently distant from the Broads area and its designations so as to avoid any material impacts (the HELAA acknowledges this). Other parts of Hoveton (and indeed Wroxham) are more environmentally constrained, and those (of the sites put forward in the respective Calls for Sites and discarded in the Alternatives Considered volume of the Draft Local Plan) which are not, are more distant from the centre and from other services/facilities, and thereby less sustainable in that respect. Compared with the Draft Plan's focus for development in North Walsham and Fakenham, Hoveton is very much closer to Norwich and has excellent public transport links thereto (including a regular - hourly - train service, of 15 minutes duration). That proximity makes Hoveton an excellent housing market, with un-met demand. There is also excellent housing market demand in Hoveton, where strong/sustained demand will ensure early and continued delivery of housing to meet identified needs. We see considerable merit in having more than one site identified for allocation in Hoveton. The highways related work (and which we have submitted previously) identifies technical capacity for at least 350 additional dwellings at the Stalham Road/Horning Road mini-roundabout junction, subject to some minor engineering alterations. We strongly believe that the intended limited growth for Hoveton merits, indeed warrants, re-assessment, in light of the above/below, and where the settlement scores well in any sustainability and services matrix. Norfolk County Council Education Department has confirmed that the additional housing we propose in Hoveton is achievable with regard to school places: St John's</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>Primary has scope for an additional form of entry and NCC has plans for expansion of Broadland High School. This is acknowledged in the Draft Local Plan (paragraph 15.10). Norfolk Land Ltd. has a legal agreement with the landowner to promote and develop the site in question for housing and related uses. Norfolk Land has a track record in this regard and has a clear intention to seek planning permission for the site and to provide houses at the earliest opportunity, assisting North Norfolk District Council in meeting its housing delivery obligations. Given the clear intention to provide sufficient land in the Local Plan together with sufficient flexibility to provide additional land concurrent with and/or thereafter, it makes greater sense to 'build in' said flexibility/choice into the Plan-making process through the allocation of housing sites. Our site - when viewed in the context of combined accessibility to services/facilities – ought to be the most favourably located. It is a short walk to St John's Primary School, the Medical Centre and Recreation Ground/Village Hall and a shorter walk to shopping and related facilities than the draft allocated site (HV01/B). The proximity of the site to St John's Primary School (just 75 metres at the nearest point) increases the likelihood - compared to the other sites - of residents/children walking rather than driving to school, thus minimising or at least reducing the prospect of exacerbating the existing, well-documented parking/drop off/pick up problems thereof. Furthermore, it appears that insufficient consideration has been made – in undertaking the relative assessments of sustainability - of the recent grant of planning permission for commercial development immediately to the north (PF/16/0733), or that to grant planning permission for construction of 25 no. dwellings, church car park and graveyard extension on land to the south of Horning Road (PF/17/1802). These developments will change the context of our site – in landscape and other sustainability terms, not least the setting of the heritage assets – and ought to be given proper consideration and amended Sustainability Appraisal scoring accordingly. The Indicative Masterplan accompanying this representation illustrates how the site can be developed for approximately 150 dwellings (possibly including a care home) and public open space in a way so as to address the particular 'negative' scoring relating to landscape and heritage assets. It also illustrates how development of the site would be undertaken in relation to existing and approved development – notably the FW Properties developments south of Horning Road (25 houses) and extension</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					to Stalham Road Industrial estate (employment) (see above). In addition, it shows how the landscape, heritage and ecological resources can be protected/enhanced through design and proposed extensive landscaping and new woodland planting, as well as more formal public open space.	

DRAFT

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Hoveton)
<b>Objection</b>	1	It is argued that Hoveton can take more development and a new site is proposed as an alternative to the preferred site within the Local Plan. This alternative site can be delivered in conjunction with the existing preferred site.
<b>Support</b>	0	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

DRAFT

# North Walsham

## Alternative Sites in North Walsham

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
North Walsham	NW15	Mr Ditch Mr Lambert (Bidwells) (1217212 1217147)	AC063	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported - Object to the exclusion of the site. This response seeks to promote a smaller element of the site, as identified by the attached site location plan, for residential development. The site is well suited for a proportionate residential development, and provides a unique opportunity to deliver much-needed single-storey housing. The principal amendment is that the scale of the site has been reduced to 2.2ha so that it is more congruous with the surrounding area, and can be delivered from Bradfield Road, using land within our client's ownership	Comments Noted: Support for alternative site NW15. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.
North Walsham	NW16	Mr Collins & Richborough Estates (1217387 1217389)	AC080	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported NW16. The Paston Gateway site (ref. NW16) comprises 14.13 hectares of agricultural land located on the northern edge of North Walsham in between Mundesley Road, Swafield Rise, Acorn Road and Wharton Drive to the south and Little London Road to the north. To the south-west there is Mundesley Road with the Paston Way public footpath to the north-west and agricultural fields to the east. The site is in single ownership, other than a strip of Norfolk County Council-owned land on the western boundary which is required to facilitate access. Discussions regarding use of this land are ongoing between the parties. The Illustrative Masterplan (drawing ref. n1143.006.C) which accompanies these representations details the following in respect of the proposed layout of the site: Approximately 330 new dwellings; Primary access via a new roundabout junction off the B1145 with a secondary	Comments noted: Support for alternative site NW16. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>access from Mundesley Road and a pedestrian, cycle and emergency access from Acorn Road; Creation of 5 hectares of public open space within the northern part of the site which will include new public footpaths and areas of play for older and younger children; Landscaping buffer for properties to the south; Opportunities for a community-use focused building plus a cadet facility within the site; Balancing ponds for the management of surface water drainage; Partial restoration of historic hedgerows. The evolution of this Illustrative Masterplan is discussed in detail in the Vision Document which accompanies these representations, and is informed by detailed surveys and assessments in respect of landscape and visual matters, arboricultural impacts, flood risk, drainage and utilities, transport and access, heritage, archaeology and ecology. This sets out not only the deliverability of the proposed development, but also its suitability to accommodate the scale of housing proposed and the potential benefits it would deliver to the local community. Paston Gateway is one of the alternatives which were considered by the LPA in the preparation of LPP1 and within the "Alternatives Considered" document (ref. NW16), page 68.</p> <p>In view of the reasons given by the LPA for excluding the site from LPP1, each point is taken in turn below, with additional information provided in respect of potential impacts on trees and heritage matters: The site is reasonably remote from the town centre and services. The site is less than 1 mile from Market Place which is the centre of the town centre and is accessible within a 5-minute car journey, a 20-minute walk or a 6-minute bus ride via the CH2 service from Lyngate Road which is itself a 6-minute walk from the site. Furthermore, the Sainsbury's supermarket on Mundesley Road is only 0.6 miles from the site which can be accessed via a 2-minute car journey or an 11-minute walk. In the Interim Sustainability Appraisal for LPP1 the site was accessed and in respect of social and economic factors the appraisal states: Social scores positively; edge of settlement, good access to local healthcare service, education facilities, peak time public transport links, leisure and cultural opportunities. Economic scores positively, edge of settlement, good access to employment, services/facilities, transport links, access to educational facilities, high speed broadband in vicinity. Town centre easily accessible from the site. (page 415) It is therefore evident from the Council's own</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>evidence base that the site is not remote from the town centre or services and is indeed easily accessible to the town centre and services necessary for a development of this scale and nature. This is supported further by the Access Appraisal prepared by Hub Transport in support of these representations, which provides an overview of the local highway network, suitability of the proposed access arrangements and accessibility of the site to a wide range of local services and facilities see in particular Table 2 on page 10 of the Access Appraisal. It should also be noted that the proposed development, due to its close proximity, would support the existing services, facilities and businesses in the town centre and would therefore help sustain the long-term viability of the town centre. Accordingly, and as supported by the LPA's own evidence base, this is not a reason which can be used to justify the site not being included in LPP1. It would be an extension into open countryside and could have an adverse impact on the landscape. The site, by the nature of the proposed development, would extend the settlement boundary of North Walsham, but it should be noted the extent of development would be less than is proposed at the Norwich Road and Nursery Drive site and significantly less than at the North Walsham Western Extension. Indeed, development of greenfield sites will inevitably be required in order to meet development needs for both the town and the District. In order to consider the specific impacts of development on this site, a detailed Landscape and Visual Overview has been prepared by Tyler Grange, and is submitted with these representations. It concludes that the development of the site has the potential to respond to the policy aspirations of the North Norfolk adopted local plan, published landscape character assessment and site specific analysis through the retention of characteristic boundary planting, enhancements to internal landscape structure and a soft transition to the wider countryside to the north of the site. The development of the site would see the retention and enhancement of the majority of the existing landscape structure within the site with opportunities to reinstate historic internal hedgelines and increased green corridors across the site. Limited areas of existing tree planting found at the site's western boundary would require removal to accommodate for the new access into the site. Where tree loss cannot be avoided, replacement trees would be planted within the site to provide suitable mitigation, and existing tree belts strengthened. These proposed</p>	



Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>trees would be deciduous and would include specimen Oak parkland trees proposed in the northern open space to mitigate for any potential losses, with the potential to provide a net increase in tree cover.</p> <p>Retention of open space at the northern part of the site would provide a soft transition to the north and a softer settlement edge than currently exists, which would assist in retaining a transitional landscape between the settlement edge of North Walsham and the wider landscape to the north. A softer edge will improve the existing abrupt settlement edge and improve its current harsh character and appearance. Additional footpath routes through this landscape to link to the wider network of footpaths and the Paston Way will also assist in increasing recreational opportunities, as well as providing increased provision for green infrastructure. Visually, the development of the site is likely to have localised impacts, with short distance views possible from the surrounding network of roads, the existing residential development to the south, and the existing network of public footpaths. The site will, however, be viewed in the context of the existing settlement edge and the treatment of the new settlement edge should provide a soft transition to the wider more rural land to the north of the site and would be beneficial to the character and appearance of the area. Overall, the site has capacity to absorb development with a landscape-led response which will comply with the adopted policies found in the North Norfolk Adopted Local Plan and will respond positively to the landscape character and visual matters without causing undue harm to the character and visual amenity of the site and its surroundings. Accordingly, this is not a reason which can be used to justify the site not being included in LPP1. Highways access and the local network are considered to be unsuitable. The Illustrative Layout (drawing ref. n1143.006.C) which accompanies these representations demonstrates that a new primary access from the B1145 is feasible with secondary access from an extension to Mundesley Road. The primary access would significantly reduce the volume of traffic using the Mundesley Road route into the town centre with the B1145 route a similar travel time (1 or 2 minutes difference). In addition, the proposed roundabout access onto the B1145 would be used to travel beyond North Walsham to Cromer or Norwich. This new access solution has been prepared to address concerns raised previously, particularly during the public consultation exercise undertaken by Richborough Estates, and is</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>considered in detail in the Access Appraisal from Hub Transport which accompanies these representations. The preferred sites can deliver sufficient housing for North Walsham As detailed in these representations, the preferred North Walsham Western Extension site is not anticipated to deliver a sufficient proportion of its potential 1,800 dwellings within the plan period to meet housing requirements. In particular, any reductions or delays to the delivery of the North Walsham Western Extension or other allocations would leave the LPA with either no flexibility, or even a shortfall, in delivering the OAN requirement for 10,860 new homes in the District over the Plan period. The LPA are therefore in need of additional sites to deliver the homes required for the District over the Plan period. Arboricultural impacts An Arboricultural Technical Note has been prepared by Tyler Grange and is submitted with these representations. It confirms that there are currently no Tree Preservation Orders administrated that could be affected by development on the site and none of the trees surveyed are considered to be ancient or veteran in terms of age class. The removal of several moderate value trees will be unavoidable, including some from two higher value tree groups, to accommodate the access requirements and facilitate the improved access to the Paston Way recreational route. The development area itself is unconstrained by existing trees as they are contained to the site's boundaries. The expected losses to accommodate the overall development are therefore localised at the access, which allows for the development to provide a proportionate degree of new tree planting to compensate for the expected tree loss. A large area of Open Space to the north of the development will deliver substantial new tree planting and historic hedgerows no longer present will be partly reinstated. It is therefore reasonable to expect that a net-gain in tree cover could be achieved through this scheme in the long-term. Assuming the delivery of appropriate compensatory planting in response to the proposed western boundary tree loss, and the safeguarding of retained high quality trees at the site boundaries, the principle of development on the Paston Gateway site is considered feasible on arboricultural terms and demonstrates accordance with local planning policy where it relates to existing trees. Heritage impacts Subject to the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures, there are no built heritage constraints to the development of the site. There is also no suggestion that the site is likely to contain</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					archaeological remains that are nationally important, that would prohibit development or require to be designed around, and there are no archaeological constraints to development of the site that would need to be resolved in advance of allocation. Any future planning application would be supported by an updated archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey, followed by intrusive evaluation, if required. Summary It is clear from the above that the reasons given by the LPA in the "Alternatives Considered" document cannot be used to justify the exclusion of the site from LPP1. The site is accessible to town centre and services, will mitigate impacts on the landscape, is suitably accessible from the main highway and will help deliver homes needed to meet the OAN of the District over the Plan period. In order to be sound in accordance with paragraph 35 of the Framework, the LPA should include the Paston Gateway site as an allocation for around 330 new dwellings during the Plan period.	
North Walsham	NW20	Mr Gleeson (1215806)	AC008	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> I would like to express the support of my family and I for the decisions made in respect of sites NW20, NW21, NW22, NW33, NW34, NW50 and NW54. Any development of these sites would clearly represent an extension into open countryside as they are outside the settlement boundary. The decisions made, in respect to these sites, are very sensible and, I believe, would have the support of all residents of Spa Common save for those who would propose to tear up the fabric of our natural environment for the sole purpose of personal enrichment whilst ensuring that their own habitat remains unaffected.	Comments noted. The response supports the identification of NW20 as a non preferred site
North Walsham	NW20	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC069	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. The draft is correct to exclude these sites. These sites are indeed remote from, and poorly linked to, the town centre, and each would pose damaging intrusions into the open countryside surrounding this market town.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
North Walsham	NW21	Mr Gleeson (1215806)	AC008	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> I would like to express the support of my family and I for the decisions made in respect of sites NW20, NW21, NW22, NW33, NW34, NW50 and NW54. Any development of these sites would clearly represent an extension into open countryside as they are outside the settlement	Comments noted. The response supports the identification of NW 21 as a non preferred site

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					boundary. The decisions made, in respect to these sites, are very sensible and, I believe, would have the support of all residents of Spa Common save for those who would propose to tear up the fabric of our natural environment for the sole purpose of personal enrichment whilst ensuring that their own habitat remains unaffected.	
North Walsham	NW21	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC069	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. The draft is correct to exclude these sites. These sites are indeed remote from, and poorly linked to, the town centre, and each would pose damaging intrusions into the open countryside surrounding this market town.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
North Walsham	NW22	Mr Gleeson (1215806)	AC008	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> I would like to express the support of my family and I for the decisions made in respect of sites NW20, NW21, NW22, NW33, NW34, NW50 and NW54. Any development of these sites would clearly represent an extension into open countryside as they are outside the settlement boundary. The decisions made, in respect to these sites, are very sensible and, I believe, would have the support of all residents of Spa Common save for those who would propose to tear up the fabric of our natural environment for the sole purpose of personal enrichment whilst ensuring that their own habitat remains unaffected.	Comments noted. The response supports the identification of NW22 as a non preferred site
North Walsham	NW22	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC069	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. The draft is correct to exclude these sites. These sites are indeed remote from, and poorly linked to, the town centre, and each would pose damaging intrusions into the open countryside surrounding this market town.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
North Walsham	NW23	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC068	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. The draft is correct to exclude these sites. These sites are indeed remote from, and poorly linked to, the town centre, and each would pose damaging intrusions into the open countryside surrounding this market town.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
North Walsham	NW23	Mr Hewett (1210813)	AC058 AC059	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported NW23. We object to the exclusion of this site. Taylor Wimpey are actively seeking to promote the land for	Comments noted: Support for alternative site NW23. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>residential allocation. It is considered that the allocation of this site for development would have a number of positive benefits, including the provision of much needed housing. With appropriate masterplanning and design, the site is capable of delivering a sensitively designed, but comprehensive and well-connected sustainable development that could contribute to the local development needs of the District in the early part of the plan period. A Concept Masterplan is attached which illustrates how the following can be delivered: The Site Boundary measures 18.35ha which would accommodate up to 420 dwellings at 35dph. One indicative vehicular access point has been shown off Yarmouth Road, providing access to the potential development parcels. A potential emergency vehicular access point has been shown off Thirlby Road. An opportunity for new tree and/or woodland planting has been shown along the southern boundary of the Site in order to create a soft landscaped edge. Due to the number of dwelling proposed in total on Site's NW23, NW24 and 43, we have indicated the potential for a number of new community facilities, which may be required to support a development of this size: 1. Land for a primary school - Whilst not specifically referenced on the plan, it is understood that this is required to mitigate the growth planned for the town. 2. A convenience store 2. A community hall 3. New allotments 4. Tennis courts (in order to fulfil an element of sporting provision) 5. A MUGA This site should be included as an allocation to provide a better range of sites in the town as currently the bulk of future growth is dependent on the delivery of the western relief road. Delays to housing delivery is frequently caused by the need to deliver large infrastructure and the associated cost burden that these major projects bring. This is further complicated by the added uncertainty of bringing together multiple sites in several ownerships. The growth strategy and the soundness of the Plan is put at risk without the flexibility of other allocated sites in North Walsham which can deliver early housing completions. This has been seen elsewhere in Norfolk, such as at Attleborough where the delays to bringing forward the SUE for 4,000 homes and link road to the south of the town has resulted in the Council being unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply for many years.</p>	
North Walsham	NW24	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC068	Support	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. The draft is correct to exclude these sites. These sites are indeed remote from, and poorly linked to, the town</p>	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					centre, and each would pose damaging intrusions into the open countryside surrounding this market town.	
North Walsham	NW24 & NW43	Mr Hewett (1210813)	AC058 AC059	Object	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p> <p>Alternative Site is supported NW24 &amp; NW43. We object to the exclusion of this site. Taylor Wimpey are actively seeking to promote the land for residential allocation. It is considered that the allocation of this site for development would have a number of positive benefits, including the provision of much needed housing. With appropriate masterplanning and design, the site is capable of delivering a sensitively designed, but comprehensive and well-connected sustainable development that could contribute to the local development needs of the District in the early part of the plan period. A Concept Masterplan is attached which illustrates how the following can be delivered: The Site Boundary measures 18.35ha which would accommodate up to 420 dwellings at 35dph. One indicative vehicular access point has been shown off Yarmouth Road, providing access to the potential development parcels. A potential emergency vehicular access point has been shown off Thirlby Road. An opportunity for new tree and/or woodland planting has been shown along the southern boundary of the Site in order to create a soft landscaped edge. Due to the number of dwelling proposed in total on Site's NW23, NW24 and 43, we have indicated the potential for a number of new community facilities, which may be required to support a development of this size: 1. Land for a primary school - Whilst not specifically referenced on the plan, it is understood that this is required to mitigate the growth planned for the town. 2. A convenience store 2. A community hall 3. New allotments 4. Tennis courts (in order to fulfil an element of sporting provision) 5. A MUGA This site should be included as an allocation to provide a better range of sites in the town as currently the bulk of future growth is dependent on the delivery of the western relief road. Delays to housing delivery is frequently caused by the need to deliver large infrastructure and the associated cost burden that these major projects bring. This is further complicated by the added uncertainty of bringing together multiple sites in several ownerships. The growth strategy and the soundness of the Plan is put at risk without the flexibility of other allocated sites in North Walsham which can deliver early housing completions. This has been seen elsewhere in Norfolk, such as at Attleborough where the delays to bringing forward the SUE for 4,000</p>	Comments noted: Support for alternative site NW24 & NW43. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					homes and link road to the south of the town has resulted in the Council being unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply for many years.	
North Walsham	NW33	Mr Gleeson (1215806)	AC008	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> I would like to express the support of my family and I for the decisions made in respect of sites NW20, NW21, NW22, NW33, NW34, NW50 and NW54. Any development of these sites would clearly represent an extension into open countryside as they are outside the settlement boundary. The decisions made, in respect to these sites, are very sensible and, I believe, would have the support of all residents of Spa Common save for those who would propose to tear up the fabric of our natural environment for the sole purpose of personal enrichment whilst ensuring that their own habitat remains unaffected.	Comments noted. The response supports the identification of NW33 as a non preferred site
North Walsham	NW33	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC069	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. The draft is correct to exclude these sites. These sites are indeed remote from, and poorly linked to, the town centre, and each would pose damaging intrusions into the open countryside surrounding this market town.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
North Walsham	NW34	Mr Gleeson (1215806)	AC008	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> I would like to express the support of my family and I for the decisions made in respect of sites NW20, NW21, NW22, NW33, NW34, NW50 and NW54. Any development of these sites would clearly represent an extension into open countryside as they are outside the settlement boundary. The decisions made, in respect to these sites, are very sensible and, I believe, would have the support of all residents of Spa Common save for those who would propose to tear up the fabric of our natural environment for the sole purpose of personal enrichment whilst ensuring that their own habitat remains unaffected.	Comments noted. The response supports the identification of NW34 as a non preferred site
North Walsham	NW34	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC069	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. The draft is correct to exclude these sites. These sites are indeed remote from, and poorly linked to, the town centre, and each would pose damaging intrusions into the open countryside surrounding this market town.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
North	NW42	Miss Philcox	AC002	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b>	Comments noted: Supports the

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Walsham		(1210047)			Supports Assessment of the site. I support the Council's apparent rejection of proposals for housing development in the above areas of North Walsham and the immediate surroundings. This area is not the easiest from which to access the town by road, and is rich in environmental value, quiet, beautiful, and with a real sense of community. Sadler's Wood and its surrounding area of farmland is a real asset for the town, and widely used by walkers. To improve facilities for walkers, cyclists and visitors, the area of Manor Road south of Anchor Road and up to the junction with the Happisburgh Road at White Horse Common might even be designated a Quiet Lane to link with Holgate Road and the Weavers' Way. This could reduce the risks for pedestrians currently walking into or from the town along the busy/dangerous Happisburgh Road by offering an alternative route. To extend this, a permissible footpath might be created on farmland adjoining the Happisburgh Road, from the junction with Meeting Hill Lane, to link through to Ebridge Mill, the canal and Witton Woods, thereby improving the amenity/tourism value of the area by creating a safe circular route for walkers, and linking in with the many other footpaths in the area.	assessment of the proposed preferred sites in the Local Plan.
North Walsham	NW43	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC068	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. The draft is correct to exclude these sites. These sites are indeed remote from, and poorly linked to, the town centre, and each would pose damaging intrusions into the open countryside surrounding this market town.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
North Walsham	NW50	Mr Gleeson (1215806)	AC008	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> I would like to express the support of my family and I for the decisions made in respect of sites NW20, NW21, NW22, NW33, NW34, NW50 and NW54. Any development of these sites would clearly represent an extension into open countryside as they are outside the settlement boundary. The decisions made, in respect to these sites, are very sensible and, I believe, would have the support of all residents of Spa Common save for those who would propose to tear up the fabric of our natural environment for the sole purpose of personal enrichment whilst ensuring that their own habitat remains unaffected.	Comments noted. The response supports the identification of NW50 as a non preferred site
North	NW50	Miss Philcox	AC002	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. I support the Council's apparent	Comments noted: Supports the assessment of the proposed preferred



Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Walsham		(1210047)			rejection of proposals for housing development in the above areas of North Walsham and the immediate surroundings. This area is not the easiest from which to access the town by road, and is rich in environmental value, quiet, beautiful, and with a real sense of community. Sadler's Wood and its surrounding area of farmland is a real asset for the town, and widely used by walkers. To improve facilities for walkers, cyclists and visitors, the area of Manor Road south of Anchor Road and up to the junction with the Happisburgh Road at White Horse Common might even be designated a Quiet Lane to link with Holgate Road and the Weavers' Way. This could reduce the risks for pedestrians currently walking into or from the town along the busy/dangerous Happisburgh Road by offering an alternative route. To extend this, a permissible footpath might be created on farmland adjoining the Happisburgh Road, from the junction with Meeting Hill Lane, to link through to Ebridge Mill, the canal and Witton Woods, thereby improving the amenity/tourism value of the area by creating a safe circular route for walkers, and linking in with the many other footpaths in the area.	sites in the Local Plan.
North Walsham	NW50	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC067	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. I agree with the proposal to exclude these sites	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
North Walsham	NW52	Mr Robotham (1210285)	AC004	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported NW52. Although this site has not been given allocation for mixed use we consider it is still suitable for employment use only and would like this to be considered. With regard to highways concerns access can be provided through our adjoining land off the existing Cornish Way Business Park roadway avoiding the issue with Bradfield Road and creating a natural extension to the existing land used for employment purposes.	Comments noted: Support for alternative site NW52. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.
North Walsham	NW54	Mr Gleeson (1215806)	AC008	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> I would like to express the support of my family and I for the decisions made in respect of sites NW20, NW21, NW22, NW33, NW34, NW50 and NW54. Any development of these sites would clearly represent an extension into open countryside as they are outside the settlement boundary. The decisions made, in respect to these sites, are very sensible and, I believe, would have the support of all residents of Spa Common	Comments noted: The response supports the identification of NW54 as a non preferred site

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					save for those who would propose to tear up the fabric of our natural environment for the sole purpose of personal enrichment whilst ensuring that their own habitat remains unaffected.	
North Walsham	NW54	Miss Philcox (1210047)	AC002	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. I support the Council's apparent rejection of proposals for housing development in the above areas of North Walsham and the immediate surroundings. This area is not the easiest from which to access the town by road, and is rich in environmental value, quiet, beautiful, and with a real sense of community. Sadler's Wood and its surrounding area of farmland is a real asset for the town, and widely used by walkers. To improve facilities for walkers, cyclists and visitors, the area of Manor Road south of Anchor Road and up to the junction with the Happisburgh Road at White Horse Common might even be designated a Quiet Lane to link with Holgate Road and the Weavers' Way. This could reduce the risks for pedestrians currently walking into or from the town along the busy/dangerous Happisburgh Road by offering an alternative route. To extend this, a permissible footpath might be created on farmland adjoining the Happisburgh Road, from the junction with Meeting Hill Lane, to link through to Ebridge Mill, the canal and Witton Woods, thereby improving the amenity/tourism value of the area by creating a safe circular route for walkers, and linking in with the many other footpaths in the area.	Comments noted: Supports the assessment of the proposed preferred sites in the Local Plan.
North Walsham	NW55	Miss Philcox (1210047)	AC002	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. I support the Council's apparent rejection of proposals for housing development in the above areas of North Walsham and the immediate surroundings. This area is not the easiest from which to access the town by road, and is rich in environmental value, quiet, beautiful, and with a real sense of community. Sadler's Wood and its surrounding area of farmland is a real asset for the town, and widely used by walkers. To improve facilities for walkers, cyclists and visitors, the area of Manor Road south of Anchor Road and up to the junction with the Happisburgh Road at White Horse Common might even be designated a Quiet Lane to link with Holgate Road and the Weavers' Way. This could reduce the risks for pedestrians currently walking into or from the town along the busy/dangerous Happisburgh Road by offering an alternative route. To extend this, a	Comments noted: Supports the assessment of the proposed preferred sites in the Local Plan.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					permissible footpath might be created on farmland adjoining the Happisburgh Road, from the junction with Meeting Hill Lane, to link through to Ebridge Mill, the canal and Witton Woods, thereby improving the amenity/tourism value of the area by creating a safe circular route for walkers, and linking in with the many other footpaths in the area.	
North Walsham	NW60	Mr Witham (1216498)	AC067	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. I agree with the proposal to exclude these sites	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in North Walsham)
<b>Objection</b>	6	A limited number of comments have been made in regard to alternative sites NW15, NW16, NW23, NW24, NW43, and NW52. It is proposed that site NW15 should be reduced in size and re-assessed accordingly and that site NW52 should be re-assessed on the basis of being employment only. Sites NW23, NW24 and NW43 have all been put forward by Taylor Wimpey who set out that if the sites were to be delivered collectively a number of community benefits could be offered including a shop, community hall, allotments, tennis courts and a MUGA. The argument is also made that these sites are available, deliverable and achievable and would come forward in a much shorter time than the proposed western extension. The assessment of NW16 is disputed and additional information has been submitted to demonstrate that the site is a sustainable option. The majority of comments are in support of the assessment of alternative sites that have not been selected as proposed preferred sites in the Local Plan.
<b>Support</b>	21	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

# Sheringham

## Alternative Sites in Sheringham

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Sheringham	SH16/1	Norfolk County Council: Norfolk Property Services (931093)	LP739	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p> <p>Disagree with assessment and non-inclusion as a preferred site. NPS consider that the site is located in a sustainable location in close proximity to the town centre. The provision of residential development would allow a logical extension of the settlement boundary to allow growth in the town. There is also potential to provide a housing development with a notable care focus in this location. Although the site was identified in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) June 2017 as a less constrained site for residential use with no significant site constraints, the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) Alternatives Considered did not consider the site suitable for development as the site is in an;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elevated position which is visible in the landscape;</li> <li>• Development would extend into the countryside and have a negative effect upon the quality of the landscape;</li> <li>• It could have an impact on the heritage assets to the south of the site.</li> </ul> <p>Having reviewed the site appraisal, NPS do not believe the site context has been fully considered in relation to landscape impact. Although the site is in an elevated position with a moderate fall in height from north to south, the land has residential development to the west and north boundary and a railway line to the south. Therefore, any new housing development would not result in a significant break out into the open countryside or have a negative impact upon the landscape, as there would be more elevated development to the north of the site. The proposal would allow a logical extension of the settlement boundary and could provide much-needed</p>	Comments noted: The site has been assessed as part of the potential sites for Sheringham and is not a preferred site.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					housing development with a care focus. With regard to heritage assets to the south of the site, these are located on the opposite side of the railway line and would not be affected by residential development. The land off Nelson Road SH16/1 is also considered more suitable for development than NNDC proposed site, on land South of Butts Lane SH18/1B. Land South of Butts Lane SH18/1B is located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and forms part of the setting of Sheringham Park and Conservation Area (see Core Strategy Proposals Map). The development of this land would have a greater impact upon an important landscape area in comparison to land off Nelson Road, which has no environmental or landscape designations. It would also result in a significant break out into the open countryside with existing development on only one boundary. The land South of Butts Lane also appears to have a constrained access and is likely to result in more ecological impacts as it would remove an agricultural land buffer between residential development and a large woodland area. Although land south of Butts Lane is considered to be well located to services and schools, the site is on the edge of Sheringham and a considerable distance from services and facilities in the town centre. Land off Nelson Road is much closer to the town centre and more sustainable. NCC would, therefore, object to site allocation Land South of Butts Lane SH18/1B and request land off Nelson Road SH16/1 be reconsidered for development	
Sheringham	SH18/1A	Ms Gill (1215702)	AC007	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. Alternative sites SH18/1A, SH18/2, SH19, these would be highly visible in the landscape, development would encroach into the countryside and reduce rural character and any development would greatly impact within an AONB. Please note sites SH18/1A and SH18/2 are in the Parish of Upper Sheringham	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site. Please note sites SH18/1A and SH18/2 are in the Parish of Upper Sheringham
Sheringham	SH18/2	Ms Gill (1215702)	AC007	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. Alternative sites SH18/1A, SH18/2, SH19, these would be highly visible in the landscape, development would encroach into the countryside and reduce rural character and any development would greatly impact within an AONB. Please note sites SH18/1A and SH18/2 are in the Parish of Upper Sheringham	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site. Please note sites SH18/1A and SH18/2 are in the Parish of Upper Sheringham

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Sheringham	SH19	Ms Gill (1215702)	AC007	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. Alternative sites SH18/1A, SH18/2, SH19, these would be highly visible in the landscape, development would encroach into the countryside and reduce rural character and any development would greatly impact within an AONB. Please note sites SH18/1A and SH18/2 are in the Parish of Upper Sheringham	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site. Please note sites SH18/1A and SH18/2 are in the Parish of Upper Sheringham
Sheringham	SH23	Mr Wright (1216657)	AC060	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Objecting to the Assessment. I would like to support this alternative site. This site is rightly proposed as housing. The site is located within the town centre of Sheringham and is therefore located in a highly accessible location. A significant number of services and national transport links are located within walking distance of the site. Local businesses will also benefit economically as much daily shopping/services will be in the town. The central theme of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, described as the 'golden thread' running through both plan making and decision-taking and local authorities should recognise that residential development can play an important role in ensuring the vitality of town centres and encourage development on appropriate sites. The site utilises a brownfield site which is one of the principles which sits at the heart of the NPPF. NB: Contrary to what is stated in the Draft Local Plan the site is available during the plan period.	Comments noted: Support for alternative site. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Sheringham)
<b>Objection</b>	3	A number of comments have been made in support of the assessment of alternative sites that have not been selected as proposed preferred sites in the Local Plan. The assessment of SH16/1 is disputed and the site is considered to be in a sustainable location than the preferred sites. Site SH23 is supported as a brownfield site that is well located to the town. SH07 should be re-assessed for residential use.
<b>Support</b>	3	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

# Stalham

## Alternative Sites in Stalham

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Stalham	ST17	Broads Authority (321326)	LP806	Support	We support the reasons for not taking this site forward.	Comments noted.

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Stalham)
<b>Objection</b>	0	Support for the assessment of the site as an alternative within the plan.
<b>Support</b>	1	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

# Wells-next-the-Sea

## Alternative Sites in Wells-next-the-Sea

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Wells	W05	Mr Fennell (1217420)	AC073	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site W05. Homes for Wells agrees with the reasoning behind the decisions not to prefer any of the alternative sites.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
Wells	W06	Mr Fennell (1217420)	AC073	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site W06. Homes for Wells agrees with the reasoning behind the decisions not to prefer any of the alternative sites.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
Wells	W06/1	Dr Griffiths (1210766)	AC005	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> I wish to add my support and additional comments to the opinion made by the planning team for proposed alternative site W06/1. I was reassured to see that this site was not considered appropriate and strongly agree that any housing development would be detrimental to the town. Any development would compromise the important business of the port and local fishing industry. As part of the open countryside and important area of outstanding natural beauty, the mix of industrial port and fishing activities, with leisure boats and yachts is a key aspect of the heritage and charm of Wells-next-the-sea. Locals and visitors alike would be adversely impacted by any new development in this special place right at the interface of East Quay and the beautiful open countryside of the coast path	Comments noted: The response supports the identification of W06/1 as a non-preferred site



Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					beyond.	
Wells	W06/1	Mrs Griffiths (1210796)	AC006	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Support decisions made in respect of sites W06/1. In addition to the obvious flood risk, it would interfere with the important local businesses of the fishing industry and harbour. It would also put at risk pedestrians and users of the slipways, particularly with the inevitable additional traffic congestion. As part of the open countryside and an important area of outstanding natural beauty, the mix of industrial port and leisure boats forms an important part of the heritage of the town. Building houses in this small area would be of significant detriment to the environment. It is also outside the current settlement boundary.	Comments noted. The response supports the identification of W06/1 as a non-preferred site
Wells	W07	Mr Fennell (1217420)	AC073	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site W07. Homes for Wells agrees with the reasoning behind the decisions not to prefer any of the alternative sites.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
Wells	W08	Mr Fennell (1217420)	AC073	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site W08. Homes for Wells agrees with the reasoning behind the decisions not to prefer any of the alternative sites.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
Wells	W09	Mr Fennell (1217420)	AC073	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site W09. Homes for Wells agrees with the reasoning behind the decisions not to prefer any of the alternative sites.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
Wells	W10	Mr Fennell (1217420)	AC073	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site W10. Homes for Wells agrees with the reasoning behind the decisions not to prefer any of the alternative sites.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
Wells	W11	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098,LP108	General Comments	The Council wishes to draw to the attention of the District Council the possible use of an inner northern strip, adjacent to the High School playing fields, of the Warham Road site". (W11).	Supported for part of alternative site W11 noted.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Wells	W11	Mr Ashby (1216926)	AC066	Support	I would like to support Miss Cheryl Crawford's points, along with the planners in the unsuitability any kind of development on this site. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty and is home to many species of rare birds, as well as fauna. It would be a detriment to Wells as a whole of this site was developed, when there are more suitable sites available, developing this site would encourage urban sprawl. Due to parking congestion from the junction between Warham Rd and the Coast Rd would make it a more dangerous stretch of road to have access on.	Comments noted: The response supports the identification of W11 as a non preferred site
Wells	W11	Ms Crawford (1216649)	AC057/AC082	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY;</b> This comment supports the view that this site is not a preferred option for the reasons given: It is remote from the town and its services, such that any development would significantly increase the use of cars requiring access to the town centre. It is external to the development area, within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and building on it would permanently negatively impact on flora, fauna and aesthetics Access to a highway is unsuitable/dangerous. Sufficient housing can be provided using other sites; even using a small strip of this site would open it up for further levels of development in the future which would be completely unsustainable and would also permanently impact flora, fauna and aesthetics	Comments noted: The response supports the identification of W11 as a non preferred site.
Wells	W11	Mr Curtis (1217497)	AC079	Support	In my view the proposed site W11 should not be considered due to the following issues. Any development on this elevated position will have a seriously detrimental effect on drainage and potential flooding to dwellings located north of the development. The out of town location will encourage the use of vehicles to and from the site thus increasing the already dangerous congestion that occurs during the summer months. Walking into town, especially for the elderly, will not be an option. The elevated position will create an urban skyline at the same time destroying the natural, local habitat Light pollution will be increased to the detriment of the rural aspect. I also question the need for speculative housing. It does not solve the needs of local people. The recent development to the west of the town has demonstrated that only a few of the properties have permanent residents.	Comments noted: The response supports the identification of W11 as a non preferred site

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Wells	W11	Mrs Moore (1217480)	AC077	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. Security - this very large development area would change the nature of Wells which is a low crime area. I would feel very less secure with such a large development so nearby. Noise pollution coupled with excessive speed already insupportable. Vastly increased traffic on such a narrow road combined with very limited access is sure to increase congestion. Loss of natural habitat for endangered wild life species and flora	Comments noted: Supports the assessment of the site as - not preferred.
Wells	W11	Dr Wilson (1217163)	AC064	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. W11 is indeed remote from the town and services, so residents on the site would use cars to access the main town. there is already insufficient parking provision for residents and tourists, so building on this site would add considerably to traffic problems and congestion. The site, in the countryside and on a slope, would impinge on the landscape affecting the AOB. The sloping nature of the site would lead to drainage and run off problems, possibly affecting the nearby chalk Ares. Water pressure is low in this part of town, and increasing it here would create problems in other parts of the town. Being in the countryside it is part of the important access to a network of bridle and footpaths allowing recreational and exercise and wildlife pursuits. It is productive farming land which is becoming increasingly important The site itself is home and also pathways for wildlife, including hedgehogs, tawny owls, barn owls, frogs, toads and diverse newts. The nearby light railway is a Nature Reserve and development on W11 would impact on this. So the site would not seem to be best placed to facilitate development.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
Wells	W11	Mr Ashby (1216926)	AC066	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. The fact that this area is open countryside. support Miss Cheryl Crawford's points, along with the planners in the unsuitability any kind of development on this site. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty and is home to many species of rare birds, as well as fauna. It would be a detriment to Wells as a whole of this site was developed, when there are more suitable sites available, developing this site would encourage urban sprawl. Due to	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					parking congestion from the junction between Warham Rd and the Coast Rd would make it a more dangerous stretch of road to have access on.	
Wells	W11	Ms Crawford (1216649)	AC057	Support	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p> <p>Supports Assessment of the site.- I support the proposal that W11 is not a preferred site and suggest it should not be considered at all for the following reasons: 1. The junction between Warham Road and the Coast Road is already congested and extremely difficult to cross during busy periods. Any increase in cars from Warham Road will exacerbate an already potentially dangerous situation, and increasingly discourage use of cycles or travelling by foot into town. This is particularly true when there is parking for local businesses and residents of California Row. 2. W11 is outside of the current residential and development area so the distance between the town centre and any development on Warham Road will encourage use of a car, further congesting an already very congested town with all the parking problems already encountered. 3. Development of this site would be a pronounced and obvious extension to the built environment, adversely affecting the landscape and AoNB. The LDP describes North Norfolk as characterised by rolling arable farmland which is exactly what W11 is. The LDP vision is to support this landscape character. The view from the sensitive Saltmarsh, a SSSI and National Nature Reserve, would be immeasurably spoiled particularly as the fields slope up from Warham Road, which would also influence the aesthetics as one enters the town from both the Coast Road and Warham Road. 4. The area is blessed with dark skies, something the LDP wants to promote, which would be impossible to rekindle once lost. 5. The town already suffers surface water flooding such that it drains down towards Warham Road from overflow both from Burnt Street and Market Lane. During heavy storms (which are becoming increasingly common) the flow of water running down the track within W11 can be torrential. The farmland is currently able to soak up much of the rainfall such that houses along Warham Road have never been flooded. However, during heavy storms any reduction in farmland in favour of development would place Warham Road residents at high risk of flooding. 5. The site has potential for far more homes than the town can sustain. The High</p>	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>School is already full with a waiting list, the health care provision listed in the document suggested Clark PM Dental Care is available but this service closed. Such a site would support ever increasing numbers of second homes and holiday lets which are affecting shopping provision such that the wide range of retail outlets mentioned in the LDP is actually is on the decline, while gift and card shops together with cafes are increasing. This is amplified by the recent loss of the only bank in Wells. The LDP suggested the range of employment opportunities is broad for the potential new inhabitants but the majority of employment is within lower income brackets, while public transport systems have been revised and do not readily lend themselves to transport to work elsewhere. 6. Again linked with the numbers of houses which could be built: The town has experiences of investors, buying off plan and selling at an increased value later, thereby fuelling yet more increases in house prices, preventing local people from being able to buy. It is argued that some second homes are bought for retirement so that later in life they become permanent homes. However, the reality is that at the end of retirement the home is again available for purchase as a second home so that the percentage of permanent residents changes little. This is within a background of houses recently built in Holt still being empty. 6. The LDP vision is to make the most of field margins for biodiversity to provide a network of semi-natural features. Nearby is the Chalk Pit, an SSSI and the Wells - Walsingham Light Railway, a Country Wildlife site. Next to the field is the old railway cutting, a haven for wild life, much of which extends out into the field. The LDP recognises Flora and Fauna rely upon a network of available sites to survive so isolating this SSSI, the Wildlife site or the Railway Cutting by developing the field will be detrimental. One field does have extensive margins around it, while the other is grazed land. Both fields, during the year, support populations of lapwings, curlews now in decline, oyster catchers and bats. There is a resident barn owl which uses the field margins to hunt. Other birds of prey which are prevalent over the two fields are kites, buzzards, marsh harriers, sparrow hawks and kestrels. The fields also support cuckoos (increasingly rare), tree creepers and a variety of small birds, particularly within the tit family e.g.flocks of long tailed tits. There</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					are also a range of wild flowers, particularly within the field which is cut or grazed specifically to encourage a diverse flora. 7. Provision of utilities would be problematic: water pressure is already low within this area, while foul water is mentioned above as likely to create a flood risk. To date attempts to boost pressure in the area have created over pressurisation problems down in the town. 8. The track referred to as running between the two fields in W11 becomes a bridle way near the field which links with a range of lanes to Wighton and Warham. It also forms part of the National Cycle Route 1 linking Wells and Holkham with Fakenham and Kings Lynn. The LDP vision is to preserve and encourage walking and cycling and this network is well used by horse riders, walkers, dog owners and cyclists. Any development around it would spoil this amenity. 9. The Old Victorian Water Tower is also by the track. Would any development preserve this?	
Wells	W11	Ms Crawford (1216649)	AC082	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. - Objection to use of W11 for development because of potential impact on wildlife - specifically concerns for two of the ten bat species living in the area: Leisler's bat (scarce in GB) and Nathusius pipistrelle (rare in GB)	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.
Wells	W11	Mr Curtis (1217497)	AC079	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site. - In my view the proposed site W11 should not be considered due to the following issues. Any development on this elevated position will have a seriously detrimental effect on drainage and potential flooding to dwellings located north of the development. The out of town location will encourage the use of vehicles to and from the site thus increasing the already dangerous congestion that occurs during the summer months. Walking into town, especially for the elderly, will not be an option. The elevated position will create an urban skyline at the same time destroying the natural, local habitat Light pollution will be increased to the detriment of the rural aspect. I also question the need for speculative housing. It does not solve the needs of local people. The recent development to the west of the town has demonstrated that only a few of the properties have permanent	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					residents.	
Wells	W11	Holkham Estate (Ms Lydia Voyias, Savills) (1215901 930627)	AC083	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported W11. In respect of sites at Wells reference has been made to a smaller site than previously submitted at Land South of Warham Road. We would like you to please reassess the development potential of this reduced site area.	Comments noted: Support for alternative site W11. Consider the assessment of alternative sites through the plan making process.
Wells	W11	Mr Fennell (1217420)	AC074	Support	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Supports Assessment of the site W11. Homes for Wells supports the reasoning behind the recommendation not to prefer W11. It is a large site, very conspicuous in the landscape, very precious as a natural habitat for rare species; it is remote from the town centre and would generate significant additional road traffic. Homes for Wells hopes to identify and propose other sites for consideration as part of its submissions to the draft Neighbourhood Plan.	Comments noted: Supports Assessment of the site.
Wells	W11	Mr Rainsford (1216818)	AC081	General Comments	Wells Neighbourhood Plan, Local Plan Questionnaire: The survey results showed 42 (16%) of first preferences in favour of this site and 91 (38%) of second preferences.	Comments noted.
Wells	W11	Holkham Estate (Ms Lydia Voyias, Savills) (1215901 930627)	LP562	Object	It is requested that the Council reconsider the potential for a smaller parcel of land at 'Land south of Warham Road, Wells-next-the-Sea' for mixed use development comprising 50 dwellings and circa. 0.75 hectares of light industrial commercial workspace. The landowner is in the process of preparing a concept masterplan for this proposal. Mixed Use The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seeks to create inclusive and mixed communities. The mix of uses proposed for the site complements the existing residential and employment uses in proximity to the site. Paragraph 104 of the NPPF identifies the benefits of an appropriate mix of uses to minimise the number and length of journeys. Site Assessment It is acknowledged that a much larger site was previously submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites which was given the reference W11.	Site promotion noted. This representation is a repetition of comments submitted against the Alternative site considered document.

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Wells-next-the-Sea)
<b>Objection</b>	1	The majority of comments regarding sites in Wells are in favour of the assessment of alternatives that are not proposed as preferred sites in the Local Plan. One comment was made to support site W11 requesting that the council consider a smaller parcel of land for mixed use development.
<b>Support</b>	21	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

DRAFT



# Blakeney

## Alternative Sites in Blakeney

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Blakeney	BLA01	Mr & Mrs Albany (1210593 / 1216374)	AC047 / AC046	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> BLA01 and BLA09 would have less of a landscape and visual impact, no impact on the setting of St Nicholas Church, limited effects on residential amenity and potential benefits in terms .BLA01 and BLA09 would have less of a landscape and visual impact, no impact on the setting of St Nicholas Church, limited effects on residential amenity and potential benefits in terms . BLA01 should be promoted as the preferred housing allocation in Blakeney as it would have less landscape and visual impact, not adversely impact key views of St Nicholas Church and can be accessed off Langham Road, with options for a second access off Morston Road for pedestrians/cyclist and vehicles (if visibility splays can be provided). BLA09 should be promoted as the preferred housing allocation in Blakeney as it would have less landscape and visual impact, not adversely impact key views of St Nicholas Church and can be accessed off Langham Road.	Comments noted: Object to the allocation within the Local Plan and support the alternative sites BLA01 and BLA09.
Blakeney	BLA01	Mrs Albany (1216374)	AC049	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> I am supporting the case for BLA01 which has been grossly overlooked in favour of BLA04/A and thus I am requesting its re-evaluation. BLA01 should be reconsidered and become the Preferred Site as it negates many of the identified issues with BLA04/A by reducing a) the obvious negative impacts of the BLA04/A setting in the landscape, and b) builds on the success of the 2015 Avocet View	Comments noted: Object to the allocation within the Local Plan and support the alternative site BLA01.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					housing development (which is part of the original field that BLA01 and BLA09 remain part of), and brings an unparalleled strategic opportunity of addressing where future housing could be built outside the current Local plan period of 2016-36.	
Blakeney	BLA01	Mr Albany Mrs Kewell Mrs Roden (1216772 1216776 1216777)	AC055	Object	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p> <p>Alternative Site is supported - a) Visual impact : The Alternative Preferred Sites BLA01 and BLA09 are more enclosed from a landscape and visual perspective than BLA04/A. This is due to the more intact hedgerow along the western side of Langham Road, vegetation along the boundary with the Wiveton Downs SSSI, and the urban edge of the village. Siting of 30 houses to the North West/West edge of BLA01 would have minimal additional visual impact when viewed from the Morston, Langham and Saxlingham roads on entry into the village. b) Access Aspects : BLA01 appears to have been ruled out because of access concerns off Morston Road. Access from Langham Road (via BLA09 which is in the same available ownership as BLA01) is however recognised by NNDC in the Suitability Conclusions. Access from Langham Road along a new Avocet View boundary access road is entirely possible as only a strip of BLA09 would be required and this road would be sited where the mature hedge was removed when the Avocet View development was built; thus no additional mature boundary hedging would be remove and thus it will maintain the current degree of screening from the Langham Road. c) Future Housing Needs: Blakeney has been identified as a Growth Village€• in the Local Plan. This suggests that more housing maybe needed earlier in the Local Plan period. Where will such future development be sited? All other sites within the current Local Plan have been discounted for a variety of reasons. Only BLA01 was in-depth reviewed against BLA04. If BLA04 needed to be developed beyond BLA 4/A, i.e the whole 4.4 hectare field, then the visual and environmental impact would be excessive. Whereas the full development of BLA01 land area would minimise future visual impact from any access road into the village. The land BLA01 is only twice the area as currently needed for the proposed 30 houses. Making BLA01 as the Preferred Site would therefore offer a clear direction as to where more housing can be sited. It could be</p>	Comment noted: Object to the proposed site within the Local Plan, support for alternative sites BLA01/ BLA09. Collectively the sites represent higher housing numbers that required. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					so identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. There would also be an existing access road from which a similar development to that envisaged could be built off from. d) Social and Safety Aspects : Development of 30 houses on BAL01 would allow the new development to be well integrated into the landscape, and also have a direct connection with the Queen's Close housing area, and thus the centre of the village. There certainly could be pedestrian access via Haywards Close, although vehicular access may cause traffic issues. Pedestrian access via Harbour Way should also be possible. Access to the daycare facilities at Thistleton Court (in Queen's Close) would be a real benefit to new residents who may need such services. Children attending the village school could walk out of Queen's Close and via the main playing fields to safely walk along New Road to the school by the church. Residents walking to the local Spar shop and Doctors surgery would not need to walk down the busy Langham Road but could go via Queen's Close.	
Blakeney	BLA01	Mr Roden Mr Albany (1210592 1210593)	AC047	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported. Alternative site allocation BLA01 is more enclosed from a landscape and visual perspective than BLA04/A. This is due to the more intact hedgerow along the western side of Langham Road, existing settlement on Morston Road, vegetation along the boundary with the Wiveton Downs SSSI and the urban edge of the main village. BLA01 appears to have been ruled out because of access concerns off Morston Road. However, the site could also be accessed off Langham Road through BLA09, which is in the same ownership. This is recognised in the fourth column of Appendix B of Background Paper 6: Development Site Selection Methodology (Summary of Site Assessment for Selected Settlements), but is ignored in the fifth column (Suitability Conclusions). It is clear from the Councils' own assessment that a suitable access off Langham Road could be provided. As such, access should not have been used to rule BLA01 out as the preferred site. The Suitability Conclusion in Background Paper 6, referenced above, states that: The site is sheltered from view on the Morston Road edge of the settlement, however, depending on scale and form, could have a negative visual impact on the landscape when viewed from the Langham Road approach. However, it is clear from site	Comments noted: Support for alternative site BLA01. Consider the assessment of alternative sites through the plan making process.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					visits that there would be limited visibility of BLA01 from Langham Road due the intact hedgerow and the land falling away to the north. This established hedgerow could easily be grown higher and be supplemented with additional woodland planting to avoid any visibility from Langham Road. As such BLA01 would have far less landscape and visual impact than BLA04/A and sequentially should be preferred to BLA04/A.e existing settlement.	
Blakeney	BLA01	Mrs Albany (1216374)	AC049	Object	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p> <p>Alternative Site is supported. Reasons to support the change:- a) Visual Impact The Alternative Preferred Sites BLA01 and BLA09 are more enclosed from a landscape and visual perspective than BLA04/A, due to the more intact hedgerow along the western side of Langham Road, vegetation along the boundary with the Wiveton Downs SSSI, and the urban edge of the village. Siting of 30 houses to the North West/West edge of BLA01 would have minimal additional visual impact when viewed from the Morston (A159), Langham (B1156) and Saxlingham roads on entry into the village. b) Access Aspects BLA01 appears to have been ruled out because of access concerns off Morston Road. Access from Langham Road (via BLA09 which is in the same available ownership as BLA01) is however recognised by NNDC in the Suitability Conclusions. Access from Langham Road along a new Avocet View boundary access road is entirely possible as only a strip of BLA09 would be required and this road would be sited where the mature hedge was removed when the Avocet View development was built; thus no additional mature boundary hedging would be removed and thus it will maintain the current degree of screening from the Langham Road (B1156). The Ownership of BLA01 have indicated that it is readily available for disposal for housing projects. c) Future Housing Needs Blakeney has been identified as a Growth Village in the Local Plan and now requires to 30 dwellings. This suggests that more housing maybe needed earlier in the Local Plan period. Where will such future development be sited? The Ownership of BLA01 and BLA09 have indicated that this land is readily available for disposal for housing projects. The whole of BLA01 could possibly house 60 dwellings. All other sites within the current Local Plan have been discounted for a variety of reasons. Only BLA01 was in-depth reviewed against</p>	Comments noted: Support for alternative sites BLA01 and BLA09. Consider the assessment of alternative sites through the plan making process.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>BLA04. If BLA04 needed to be developed beyond BLA 4/A, i.e the whole 4.4 hectare field, then the visual and environmental impact would be excessive and environmentally overbearing Whereas the development of BLA01 and 09 land area would minimise future visual impact from any access road into the village. The land area of BLA01 is only twice the area as currently needed for the proposed 30 houses. Making BLA01 as the Preferred Site would therefore offer a clear direction as to where more housing can be sited. A further 20-30 houses could be easily accommodated. It could be thus identified in the emerging Blakeney Neighbourhood Plan. There would then already be an existing access road from which a similar development to that envisaged above could be built off from. d) Social and Safety Aspects Development of 30 houses on BLA01 would allow the new development to be well integrated into the landscape. As importantly it will also have a direct connection with the Queen's Close housing area, and thus through this to the centre of the village. There can be pedestrian access from BLA01 directly into Haywards Close, although vehicular access may cause traffic issues. Pedestrian access via Harbour Way should also be possible. Access to the day-care facilities at Thistleton Court (in Queen's Close) would be a real benefit to new residents who may need such services. Children attending the village school could walk out via Queen's Close and then walk in safety via the main playing fields and along New Road to the school by the church. Residents walking to the local Spar shop and Doctor's surgery would not need to walk down the busy Langham Road but also could go via Queen's Close A sketch plan of how BLA01 can be accessed and developed is attached.</p>	
Blakeney	BLA01	The Oddfellows (Strutt & Parker) (1219331 & 1219332)	LP826	Object	The Oddfellows support the alternative sites BLA01 (Land south of Morston Road) and BLA09 (Land west of Langham Road), which form a continuous land parcel, being available, deliverable and achievable.	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Blakeney	BLA04/A	Mr & Mrs Albany (1210593 / 1216374)	AC046/AC049	Object	<p>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Objection to allocation of BLA04/A as the preferred housing location in Blakeney Given the potential long term impact of development within a relatively small village a more strategic long term approach should be adopted, rather than the piecemeal approach currently proposed. BLA01 and BLA09 would have less of a landscape and visual impact, no impact on the setting of St Nicholas Church, limited effects on residential amenity and potential benefits in terms. BLA01 should be reconsidered and become the Preferred Site as it negates many of the identified issues with BLA04/A by reducing a) the obvious negative impacts of the BLA04/A setting in the landscape, and b) builds on the success of the 2015 Avocet View housing development (which is part of the original field that BLA01 and BLA09 remain part of), and brings an unparalleled strategic opportunity of addressing where future housing could be built outside the current Local plan period of 2016-36.</p>	Comments noted: Object to the allocation within the Local Plan and support the alternative sites BLA01 and BLA09.
Blakeney	BLA04/A	Mr Roden Mr Albany (1210592 1210593)	AC046	Object	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Objecting to the Assessment. Allocation BLA04/A is not reasonably well enclosed in the landscape but very prominent. Views across the arable field from Langham Road to the east are very open due to the intermittent fragmented hedge on the east side of the road. In contrast, views to the west are less open due to a continuous hedgerow that provides a degrees of screening of recent development at Avocet View and further development opportunities to the west of Langham Road. The existing settlement edge is defined by a line of pines and other trees to the south of properties on Kingsway and deciduous woodland further to the east. These have taken c. 50 years to mature and provide the current screening benefits. These trees filter views of the properties on Kingsway, softening the urban edge of Blakeney. Development of land within BLA04/A would be highly conspicuous, introducing a hard edge to the settlement that would take a number of decades to soften with appropriate planting. This would have adverse landscape and visual effects from one of the main roads accessing Blakeney and footpaths to the south. Whilst the line of pines and other trees soften the urban edge of Blakeney, when viewed from the south, they would not screen views of development in BLA04/A from</p>	Comments noted: Support for alternative sites BLA01 and BLA09. Consider the assessment of alternative sites through the plan making process.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>properties on Kingsway. South facing views from the eight residential properties bordering the site are available under the tree canopies across the arable field. This would be contrary to ENV 10 of the First Draft Local Plan. Development of allocation BLA04/A would have adverse effects on the setting of St Nicholas Church. The Blakeney Draft Conservation Area Appraisal &amp; Management Plan sets out the need to appreciate heritage assets individually or collectively from key viewpoints that contribute to their special interest. BLA04/A as the preferred location appears to be based on factual errors and contradictory assessments that are not robust when reviewed through site visits. The selection of the preferred site allocation should be reconsidered in favour of sites that are less conspicuous in the landscape, would have less of an impact on residential amenity, public footpaths and the setting of St Nicholas church. (See accompanying document). Blakeney has been identified as a Growth Village and it is considered that a longer term strategy to integrating development should be taken beyond the current plan period. The existing Avocet Way development was included in the previous Local Plan, but no consideration was given to the future need for expansion or integrating the site with the wider community of Blakeney. The current plan review is an opportunity to take a long term strategic approach to development within the village and to integrate future proposals more fully with the existing settlement. Development within BLA01 &amp; BLA09 would be a natural extension to the recent Avocet View development.</p>	
Blakeney	BLA09	The Oddfellows (Strutt & Parker) (1219331 & 1219332)	LP826	Object	The Oddfellows support the alternative sites BLA01 (Land south of Morston Road) and BLA09 (Land west of Langham Road), which form a continuous land parcel, being available, deliverable and achievable.	
Blakeney	BLA09	Mr Albany (1210593)	AC048	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY</b></p> <p>:BLA01 and BLA09 would have less of a landscape and visual impact, no impact on the setting of St Nicholas Church, limited effects on residential amenity and potential benefits in terms .BLA09 should be promoted as the preferred housing allocation in Blakeney as it would have less landscape and visual impact, not adversely impact</p>	Comments noted: Object to the allocation within the Local Plan and support the alternative sites BLA01 and BLA09.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					key views of St Nicholas Church and can be accessed off Langham Road.	
Blakeney	BLA09	Mr Albany Mrs Kewell Mrs Roden (1216772 1216776 1216777)	AC055	Object	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p> <p>Alternative Site is supported - a) Visual impact : The Alternative Preferred Sites BLA01 and BLA09 are more enclosed from a landscape and visual perspective than BLA04/A. This is due to the more intact hedgerow along the western side of Langham Road, vegetation along the boundary with the Wiveton Downs SSSI, and the urban edge of the village. Siting of 30 houses to the North West/West edge of BLA01 would have minimal additional visual impact when viewed from the Morston, Langham and Saxlingham roads on entry into the village. b) Access Aspects : BLA01 appears to have been ruled out because of access concerns off Morston Road. Access from Langham Road (via BLA09 which is in the same available ownership as BLA01) is however recognised by NNDC in the Suitability Conclusions. Access from Langham Road along a new Avocet View boundary access road is entirely possible as only a strip of BLA09 would be required and this road would be sited where the mature hedge was removed when the Avocet View development was built; thus no additional mature boundary hedging would be remove and thus it will maintain the current degree of screening from the Langham Road. c) Future Housing Needs: Blakeney has been identified as a Growth Village in the Local Plan. This suggests that more housing maybe needed earlier in the Local Plan period. Where will such future development be sited? All other sites within the current Local Plan have been discounted for a variety of reasons. Only BLA01 was in-depth reviewed against BLA04. If BLA04 needed to be developed beyond BLA 4/A, i.e the whole 4.4 hectare field, then the visual and environmental impact would be excessive. Whereas the full development of BLA01 land area would minimise future visual impact from any access road into the village. The land BLA01 is only twice the area as currently needed for the proposed 30 houses. Making BLA01 as the Preferred Site would therefore offer a clear direction as to where more housing can be sited. It could be</p>	Comment noted: Object to the proposed site within the Local Plan, support for alternative sites BLA01/ BLA09. Collectively the sites represent higher housing numbers that required. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.



Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					so identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. There would also be an existing access road from which a similar development to that envisaged could be built off from. d) Social and Safety Aspects : Development of 30 houses on BAL01 would allow the new development to be well integrated into the landscape, and also have a direct connection with the Queen's Close housing area, and thus the centre of the village. There certainly could be pedestrian access via Haywards Close, although vehicular access may cause traffic issues. Pedestrian access via Harbour Way should also be possible. Access to the daycare facilities at Thistleton Court (in Queen's Close) would be a real benefit to new residents who may need such services. Children attending the village school could walk out of Queen's Close and via the main playing fields to safely walk along New Road to the school by the church. Residents walking to the local Spar shop and Doctors surgery would not need to walk down the busy Langham Road but could go via Queen's Close.	
Blakeney	BLA09	Mr Roden Mr Albany (1210592 1210593)	AC048	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported. Alternative to options (BLA04/A) should be considered in more detail. The Suitability Conclusion in Background Paper 6 states that BLA09: could have a negative visual impact on the landscape when viewed from the Langham Road approach. However, based on site visits it is clear that alternative site allocation BLA09 is more enclosed from a landscape and visual perspective than the currently preferred site (BLA04/A). This is due to the more intact hedgerow along the western side of Langham Road, existing settlement on Morston Road, vegetation along the boundary with the Wiveton Downs SSSI and the urban edge of the main village. There would be limited visibility of BLA09 from Langham Road due the intact hedgerow and the land falling away to the north. This established hedgerow could easily be grown higher and be supplemented with additional woodland planting to limit visibility from Langham Road. As such BLA09 would have far less landscape and visual impact than BLA04/A and sequentially should be allocated in preference to BLA04/A. BLA09 can be accessed off Langham Road and this has been identified as acceptable in NNDC appraisals. As such, there is no difference between BLA04/A and	Comments noted: Support for alternative site BLA09. Consider the assessment of alternative sites through the plan making process.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					BLA09 in respect of access considerations.	

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Blakeney)
<b>Objection</b>	4	A number of comments raise objections to the preferred site being within the Local Plan. The primary issues raised are in regard to landscape, the historic environment and residential amenity. A number of comments offer support for the alternative sites, BLA01 and BLA09, as it is proposed that these sites would have less significant impacts upon the landscape, the historic environment and residential amenity. The highway objections to these sites are disputed and it is stated that the alternative sites are available, deliverable and achievable.
<b>Support</b>	10	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

DRAFT

# Briston

## Alternative Sites in Briston

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Briston	BRI10	Mr Danials Mr Jenkins (1217050 1217047)	AC061 ACO75	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Alternative Site is supported - There are concerns that the Council has failed to fully assess the alternative sites put forward in Briston and have not fully explained their reasoning as to why sites have been rejected in preference to the two sites which are proposed for allocation. Both these sites have clear constraints and issues associated with their development. There are also concerns that the selection of these sites has prejudiced the consideration of other sites. Seek for a full and detailed assessment of all the sites to be undertaken so that it can be fully understood as how the alleged attributes of the proposed allocations outweigh those of the rejected advice, sites particularly in relation to the criteria detailed at paragraph 21.5 of the consultation draft local plan. See attached Transport Statement which details how the highway impacts of this scheme can be ameliorated and how the scheme could result in highway safety improvements in the vicinity of the site. It also demonstrates that the District Council's comments regarding access are incorrect. The attached document also needs to be read in conjunction with the earlier representations submitted on behalf of Mr Daniels in relation to this site.	Support for alternative site BRI10 - Comments noted. Background Paper 6 Site Selection Methodology published as part of this consultation provides full detail on the methodology used and the results of each site assessment including alternative sites. Consider feedback in the submitted transport assessment in the finalisation of preferred sites
Briston	BRI10	Mr Jennings Mr Daniels (1217047 1217050)	AC061	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Objection to Assessment of all Alternative sites BRI10. There are concerns that the Council has failed to fully assess the alternative sites put forward in Briston and have not fully explained their reasoning as to why sites have been rejected in preference to the two sites which are proposed for	Comments noted: Objection to Assessment of all Alternative sites. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					allocation. Both these sites have clear constraints and issues associated with their development. There are also concerns that the selection of these sites has prejudiced the consideration of other sites.	
Briston	BRI10	Mr Jennings Mr Daniels (1217047 1217050)	AC061	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Objection to Assessment of all Alternative sites BRI10 - There are concerns that the Council has failed to fully assess the alternative sites put forward in Briston and have not fully explained their reasoning as to why sites have been rejected in preference to the two sites which are proposed for allocation. Both these sites have clear constraints and issues associated with their development. There are also concerns that the selection of these sites has prejudiced the consideration of other sites.	Comments noted: Support for alternative site.
Briston	BRI10	Mr Jennings Mr Daniels (1217047 1217050)	AC075	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Objection to Assessment of all Alternative sites BRI10 - Attached statement provides details as to how the highway impacts of the scheme can be addressed. See attached Transport Statement which details how the highway impacts of this scheme can be ameliorated and how the scheme could result in highway safety improvements in the vicinity of the site. It also demonstrates that the District Council's comments regarding access are incorrect. The attached document also needs to be read in conjunction with the earlier representations submitted on behalf of Mr Daniels in relation to this site.	Comments noted: Support for alternative site. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.
Briston	BRI11	Mrs Williams (1216484)	AC050	Object	<b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> Objecting to the Assessment. Our land is available for immediate development and can be vacant within a 6 month notice period. We would like it to come forward for development. note: the Council feel there are highway constraints but we believe these can be overcome with further investigation and work. Our land backs onto existing housing which is situated on the main in the centre of the village and would consolidate housing in the central core of the village. Key services such as water and electricity are already in place at the site.	Comments noted: Support for alternative site. Consider the assessment of alternative sites through the plan making process.

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Briston)
<b>Objection</b>	0	A number of comments raise objections to the preferred site being within the Local Plan. The primary issues raised are in regard to the constrains and issues on the sites. It is proposed that the assessment of sites BRI10 and BRI11 has not been undertaken sufficiently and that these sites should be considered preferred sites in the Local Plan.
<b>Support</b>	5	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

DRAFT

# Ludham

## Alternative Sites in Ludham

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Ludham	LUD05	Mrs Crichton (Lanpro Services) Mr Monk (1208138 1217392)	AC072	Object	<p><b>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p> <p>Alternative Site is supported - Site LUD05 was considered through the HELAA (Ref H0137/LUD05) in June 2017 and the only matters which were marked as red were related to highways. In the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) Alternatives Considered document the site has been identified as not a preferred site due to unsatisfactory access and a negative effect on the landscape but extending development into the open countryside. Highways - In order to address the highway related concern, the landowner instructed us to undertake discussions with Norfolk County Council Highways to look to resolve this matter which has now been done. To accompany this submission an indicative layout and access strategy have been prepared and sent to Highways who confirmed, based on these details there would be no highway objection. This has been confirmed in an email from Andrew Willeard dated the 4th December 2018 (enclosed with this submission). Therefore, it is considered that the Council can not maintain an objection to this site based on highway grounds. Landscape Impact - The accompanying indicative masterplan demonstrates how 20 dwellings and a new doctor's surgery and areas of open space and new planting. The site is not located in a more sensitive landscape than either of the proposed allocations. It is stated that the site will extend into the open countryside, but the site will not extend any further east of Ludham than proposed allocation LUD06/A. The density of the scheme is such that it respects the sites position on the edge of the countryside with extensive</p>	Comments noted: Support for alternative site LUD05. Additional information has been submitted. Consider feedback in the finalisation of preferred sites.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>areas of landscaping that could be accommodated (as demonstrated in the indicative masterplan). This will provide a soft edge to the development as you leave and enter the village from an easterly direction. The site is not currently agricultural land (it is used for horse grazing) therefore there is no loss of best and most versatile land agricultural land. Landscaping proposals would form part of any planning application process and it is not considered that a scheme could not be designed which couldn't mitigate any impacts in the same way that they would have to be done with any of the other proposed allocated sites. The area shown for a doctor's surgery is proposed by the landowner as he has been in discussions with the Parish Council and understands there is a growing need for a new site for an enlarged surgery to cater for the growth. Discussions are on-going and further information can be provided on this in due course.</p>	
Ludham	LUD09	Deloitte Real Estate Tucker, Mr Nolan (1217045)	LP252	Object	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> These representations put forward land south of Norwich Road, Ludham as a suitable for allocation for residential development; assisting in the required growth or North Norfolk over the Plan period. The previous representations were supported by a number of supporting documents including a concept Masterplan Site Access Feasibility Review and access appraisal. The constraints identified through the SHLAA assessment can be overcome; no designated heritage assets on or immediately adjoining the Site, nearest assets to the east of site. Gently sloping, not PDL and no contamination. Site is in single ownership. Majority of site is in Flood Zone 1. The part of the site to the south and east, which is not proposed for development, is in Flood 2 and 3 and has been identified as having the potential to form part of the public open space for the Site. Access appraisal shows how access can be achieved on western end on Norwich Rd with appropriate visibility splays. the Site also has clear advantages in terms of its location, being in close proximity to local services. Would help to boost housing numbers in North Norfolk and would provide more certainty that the housing delivery targets within the North Norfolk Local Plan can be met over the Plan period. The site is deliverable, viable, and suitable. Contribute to the housing needs of North Norfolk; Providing a varied choice of housing, designed to improve local character and built to ensure a high standard of sustainable construction to meet the needs of future generations; Providing a number of economic benefits including</p>	<p>Background paper no6 published with this consultation provides full detail on the methodology used and the results of each site assessment. The reason the site is not preferred is the Highway Authority do not support an additional access onto the A1062 and there is no continuous footway link to the village with no ability to provide a new footpath at sections along the road. This site provides an important open landscape in this part of Ludham. Development of this site would have a greater impact on the quality of the landscape than the preferred sites. Furthermore the preferred sites can deliver sufficient housing for Ludham. Further consideration of the Access Appraisal required.</p>

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					job creation (direct and indirect) and increasing the expenditure in the local economy by supporting the continued vitality and vibrancy of existing nearby services and facilities;Improvement of vehicle, pedestrian and cycle connections;Provision of high quality open space, including the retention of existing hedgerows and ponds as part of a site-wide SUDS network; and Contributing to enhancing the landscape character through the provision of high quality green infrastructure.	

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Ludham)
<b>Objection</b>	2	Limited support is given to two sites in Ludham as being more suitable than the preferred site. The sites are both considered to be available, deliverable and achievable.
<b>Support</b>	0	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	



# Mundesley

## Alternative Sites in Mundesley

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Mundesley	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Mundesley)
<b>Objection</b>	0	No comments received.
<b>Support</b>	0	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

## Other Areas

### Alternative Sites in High Kelling

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

This table includes a fourth scenario where a respondent promoted an alternative site which does not feature in the First Draft Local Plan or Alternatives Considered consultation documents.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
High Kelling	HKG04/A	White Lodge (Norwich) Ltd Lawson Planning Partnership Oelman, Ms Kathryn (1217091 1217088)	LP291 LP293	Support	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> White Lodge (Norwich) Limited are the sole owner of 'the Former Nursery site' identified in Appendix 1. The site, located north of Selbrigg Road and the Cromer Road (A148), in the settlement of High Kelling, occupies a land area just under 1ha in area. The Four Seasons Nursery horticultural business, which previously occupied this land, and has been vacant since 2012, despite being actively marketed as a horticultural nursery. A slightly larger site submitted under 2016 Call for Sites (HKG04), though some areas of the site neither practical nor desirable to develop. Considered suitable in HELAA. Evident recently, to remain in line with National Policy not sufficient to restrict development to only handful of larger towns and villages. Quotes paragraph 78 of NPPF. High Kelling has good range of services including post office, shop, village hall and church. Holt hospital to the west of village include; medical practice, pharmacy and dental practice. Easy walking distance from site to these services. Well placed to support Kelling Primary School, 2.6 miles away accessible by bus. Holt is 2.5km away, accessible on foot via a continuous footway along the Cromer and Old Cromer Road, but is more likely to be reached by a small car journey, cycle or bus ride. Range of services in Holt. Plan acknowledges that North Norfolk is a predominantly rural district. Sensible to maintain the vitality of these rural communities by allocating	Comments noted: Alternative site suggestions put forward will be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan. This site has been promoted through the Call for Sites exercise.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>housing development within their boundaries. Allowing those who grow up in these villages a chance to remain. Quotes paragraph 68(a) NPPF. Policy SD3 seeks positively to address this issue by allocating sites of under 1 hectare within the Small Growth Villages and we regard this to be an appropriate solution to meeting the identified housing need. It is therefore apparent that, by locating development in High Kelling, this would enhance and maintain existing services in the village and other surrounding villages. Support the principles of Policies SD3 and HOU1, which seek to deliver sustainable development in rural areas and are sound by virtue of their consistency with national policy approach to this issue. Request that land identified at the Former Four Seasons Nursery is allocated as a small site for up to 20 units within the Local Plan. The site is available for development now, and prior to adoption of the plan, and its suitability and deliverability have been recognised in HELAA. Transport statement provided in May 2016, demonstrated that traffic generated by development of the site for housing purposes would result in an overall decrease in vehicle movements, both accesses appropriate and are capable of being provided. Indicative layout provided, site capable of providing 16 dwellings. Final numbers will be influenced by the chosen mix, scale and layout of development proposed at a later stage and could increase or decrease in response to these detailed considerations. Retain area of land immediately east of Woodland Lodge to ensure separation likely to become garden area. Sufficient separation between dwellings can be achieved. No heritage assets in vicinity. Trees subject to TPO and substantial area of woodland designated as County Wildlife Site on opposite side of Selbrigg Rd. Trees on northern and southern boundaries would be retained and trees planted. Site within Flood Risk 1, surface water could be directed away from proposed dwellings. The Former Nursery site proposes development of previously occupied land, which is located between existing residential dwellings, and is not subject to significant environmental constraints. This site should therefore be considered for allocation to provide much needed housing within the Small Growth Village of High Kelling. An additional site (HKG01/1) was proposed in Call for Sites 2016. Due to its location within the AONB boundary, site reference H0088 (and any others north of the Cromer Road) would not be preferable for allocation in comparison to other</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					identified suitable, available and deliverable sites which lie outside the AONB boundary, such as the Former Nursery site as proposed.	

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in High Kelling)
<b>Objection</b>	0	A comment has been raised in support of site HKG04/A. It is set out that the site is available, deliverable and achievable and that the site would be more suitable than the preferred site.
<b>Support</b>	0	
<b>General Comments</b>	1	

DRAFT

## Alternative Sites in Scottow

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

This table includes a fourth scenario where a respondent promoted an alternative site which does not feature in the First Draft Local Plan or Alternatives Considered consultation documents.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Scottow (Badersfield)	SCT01/A and SCT02	Glavenhill Ltd Lanpro Smith, Hannah (1218811)	LP736	General Comments	<p><b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b></p> <p>These representations are submitted on behalf of the land promotor, Glavenhill Limited who is submitting the site (land adjacent to the former RAF Coltishall and the village of Badersfield) for its mixed-use, residential-led allocation on behalf of the landowner, Mr Simon Shaw. A Call for Sites (Small Growth Village) has been submitted along with a Sustainable Urban Extension Vision and Delivery Document. Whilst the North Norfolk site is modest in size, it forms part of a wider proposed allocation area which 'straddles' the two Districts of Broadland and North Norfolk and as set out below and within the enclosed, has the propensity to address a number of cross boundary development requirements in direct accordance with National Planning Policy Guidance. The site (as it relates to Broadland District) has been submitted and promoted through the Greater Norwich Local Plan consultation process. The provision of new homes on land adjacent to the Enterprise Park, together with much needed supporting social, community and highway infrastructure could ensure the continued success of this employment location and deliver a new self-sustaining and contained community for the two constituent Districts. The proposed allocation site, in seeking to address local needs across administrative boundaries, will facilitate on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities to produce a positively prepared and justified strategy in direct accordance with Paragraphs 25</p>	Comments noted: Alternative site suggestions put forward will be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>and 26 of the NPPF. The land is under single ownership and is available and deliverable in the short to medium term. The subject site has been assessed by Glavenhill for its environmental sensitivity and the potential social and economic constraints and opportunities to development. The site is demonstrated within the enclosed Vision and Delivery Document to be 'suitable' for the proposed development and associated new public open spaces and strategic landscaping. In summary the vision document sets out that the extension can –provide a meaningful number of homes across the two authorities to assist in meeting individual and cross boundary housing needs (including affordable and or self-build units) – deliver a new care and extra care facilities to meet identified and pressing cross boundary needs for a mix of elderly person accommodation. –additional residents will provide an additional local working population and support the sustainable and longer-term performance of the Enterprise Park that at present relies heavily on inward commuters. – Provide land for a new primary school to overcome current capacity deficiencies within the local area (cross boundary) and assist in the upgrade or relocation of the current, specialist education facility in the area (subject to further discussions with the education provider) together with a new creche for use by employees of the adjacent Enterprise Park. -Deliver a range of supportive, small-scale commercial and community spaces to include potential small-scale retail provision for use by the existing and future communities. - Provide substantial areas of new green infrastructure, including recreation space and habitat areas to the benefit of the existing and future residential communities and North Norfolk's and Broadland's biodiversity networks. - Improve upon current difficulties with large HGVs travelling through the local villages to enter the Enterprise Park by providing a new dedicated site access to the Park, within the promoter's control. - Enhance the site's accessibility by sustainable transport modes through assisting in the delivery of a new dedicated shuttle bus service between the site and Worstead Train Station. Whilst the North Norfolk proposed allocation area forms part of a far wider proposed allocation site that has far wider reaching combined benefits in terms of addressing cross boundary needs, it can and should, for the purpose of this consultation, be considered to present a self-sustaining, suitable, available and beneficial development</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>offer in its own right. The site is located adjacent to the village of Badersfield which is identified as suitable and capable of accommodating small scale (in the order of 20 dwellings) new residential development, based upon its current local service provision. The settlement is recognised at page 92 of the Council's Background Pater 2, Distribution of Growth that has been published alongside the draft Local Plan to provide a "valuable functional role within the District". The Council conclude that "for Badersfield it is considered that the constraints would not limit the principle of development within the settlement". The provision of housing would in the Council's view help address housing need, enhance the vitality of the community and support the retention and viability of local services. The proposed North Norfolk allocation site is well related to the existing village and is bound on two sides by built form and to the west by woodland and the north by a major road link that clearly and defensibly delineates the proposed allocation site. The North Norfolk site can be seen from the enclosed documentation to be a well contained, defensible and sustainable small-scale extension to the existing settlement that is capable of being supported by the Council's existing Spatial Strategy when considered individually and / or as part of the wider (Broadland) proposed allocation area.</p> <p>Draft Policy SD3</p> <p>Whilst it is considered both logical and sustainable to focus growth within the larger settlements that are capable at present of sustaining additional population, the ability to improve upon the sustainability of a settlement by delivering a mix of uses, including a meaningful element of housing and assisting to address settlement specific needs, including affordable housing, is not, in Glavenhill's view, given appropriate recognition within Draft Policy SD3. Quotes paragraph 78. In this respect, the prescription of no more than 20 dwellings to all identified smaller villages within the Draft Plan is considered overly restrictive. As worded, the Policy lacks the necessary flexibility to allow development proposals to respond positively to the specific characteristics and needs of different settlements. Whilst Badersfield is considered by the Council to lack the necessary services to be 'designated' a larger village within the Settlement Hierarchy, it is capable and in need, due to the presence of a successful Enterprize Park that lacks a large residential / working</p>	

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>population nearby, and the need to provide additional new affordable homes, of accommodating additional residential and local service provision beyond that facilitated through draft Policy SD3. Contrary to paragraph 35 of the NPPF, the Draft Plan's restriction on growth within the smaller villages is considered to be neither 'justified', 'positively prepared' nor 'effective' in responding to the needs of individual populations. For the reasons set out above, and in order to make the Draft Plan 'sound', Glavenhill request that the rather arbitrary and unjustified restriction of between 0 – 20 dwellings for small villages be deleted from the policy and that this restriction be replaced by a criteria based approach to assessing settlement suitability and requirements to accommodate additional growth. That said, the enclosed Vision and Delivery Document demonstrates that the allocation of 40 dwellings at the proposed allocation site would not materially conflict with the Council's proposed Settlement Hierarchy as drafted and in this respect is capable of attracting the support of officers.</p>	

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Scottow)
Objection	0	A comment has been made promoting a site for between 0-20 dwellings in Badersfield.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	



## Alternative Sites in Sculthorpe

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

This table includes a fourth scenario where a respondent promoted an alternative site which does not feature in the First Draft Local Plan or Alternatives Considered consultation documents.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Sculthorpe	SCU01	WSP Indigo Taylor, Miss Emily (1217127)	LP632 LP633	Object	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> There is land available in Sculthorpe that could contribute towards meeting the pressing housing needs. Previously undeveloped, entirely within Flood Zone 1, with very limited areas of surface water flooding. There are no other environmental or landscape designations affecting the site. Adjacent to the Sculthorpe Village Conservation Area and there are two listed buildings located in the built development that lines Moor Lane and Creak Road. The site is well-screened, and large enough to for a layout to avoid having unacceptable impacts on heritage assets. Assessed through HELAA, H0216 or SCU01, shown in Figure 2. Assessment is included in Appendix 1 to these representations. Overall, the Council assesses the site as a 'less constrained development site' as opposed to a 'constrained site not suitable for development'. Despite this being the more favourable score for sites assessed as part of the HELAA, H0216 was not assessed in the Local Plan as a result of its place in the settlement hierarchy. Site H0216 risks being entirely overlooked by the Council as Sculthorpe is classed as a Small Growth Village where only small sites will be assessed for allocation, despite its positive assessment in the HELAA. This removes the chance to consider the best sites for development that are in sustainable locations but disregarded by the Council's current methodology. The site therefore generally scores highly against the various tests included in the assessment, however there are a number of indicators against which the site has been given a score of 'Amber' when	Comments noted: Alternative site suggestions put forward will be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					<p>'Green' would be more appropriate. See WSP Indigo attachment for assessment which states that development of the site would not have any harmful effect upon the heritage significance of the Conservation Area. In relation to potential impact upon the setting and significance of other designated heritage assets, it would be possible through a sensitive masterplan and landscape planning-led approach to ensure that any contribution made to their significance by the open, rural character of the site is preserved, and potentially enhanced. The development of the site could be planned so that it would have no negative impact upon the historic townscape of the Conservation Area. The HEELA assesses the site as being large enough to accommodate up to 472 dwellings. This highlights the opportunity for a large scale, coherent scheme to come forward on the site. A sensitive master-planning process would identify the most appropriate sub-areas that could be developed. The site is clearly suitable for residential development, as demonstrated by the lack of constraints affecting its developable area and its excellent location in relation to the existing built form of Sculthorpe. It can also provide necessary infrastructure enhancements to support growth in the settlement. The Distribution of Growth Background Paper identifies that the school is lacking capacity but the site is large enough to accommodate a new school as part of development proposals. The existing Sculthorpe Primary School is a popular and successful school and its offer could be further enhanced by the provision of new premises and a playing field. Early Delivery As well as its suitability and availability, as established in the Council's own evidence base, the site is also deliverable in the short term. The site is under single ownership and the owner is committed to progressing proposals for the site if it were allocated, so it could deliver housing within the first five years of the Local Plan period. There are no constraints that would pose a risk to the delivery of housing on the site and copious amounts of evidence-based work has already been undertaken to provide a strong basis for a fast-tracked delivery of housing. The site is a key opportunity to allocate land for housing that can be brought forward in the short term.</p>	

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Sculthorpe)
<b>Objection</b>	1	A comment has been made promoting the site for small scale development. The assessment of the site in the HELAA has been disputed and it is affirmed that the site is available, deliverable and achievable.
<b>Support</b>	0	
<b>General Comments</b>	0	

DRAFT

## Alternative Sites in Sutton

The purpose of the Alternatives Considered document was to detail, and receive feedback on, the alternative site options which the Council has considered in preparing the First Draft Local Plan.

This table details comments made against the **Alternatives Considered consultation document**. However, many respondents also used this document to comment on 'Preferred Site Options', e.g. the proposed sites favoured by the Council and as detailed in the **First Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation document**. The table below brings together three scenarios in which comments were made relating to the Alternatives Considered document. These are when a respondent commented on:

- a **preferred site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the Alternatives Considered document
- an **alternative site option** in the First Draft Local Plan

This table includes a fourth scenario where a respondent promoted an alternative site which does not feature in the First Draft Local Plan or Alternatives Considered consultation documents.

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
Sutton	SUT02	Firs Farm Partnership Lanpro Rejzek, Ms Becky (1218497 1218496)	LP805	General Comments	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> SUT02 can: • Provide up to 31 new homes to assist in meeting North Norfolk Council's identified housing needs (including affordable and/or self-build units); • Deliver improvements to existing surface water flooding problems in the village (see attached Supplementary Drainage Information Report for details); • Help to deliver improvements in water quality within the Ants Broads and Marshes SSSI (See attached Supplementary Drainage Information Report for details); • Provide land sufficient to accommodate a multi-use games area (MUGA) and children's play area in order to help provide improved recreational facilities for the village. The proposed allocation site is located towards the southern end of the village of Sutton which is identified within the First Draft Local Plan Part 1 as suitable and capable of accommodating small scale (in the order of 20 dwellings) new residential development, based upon its current local service provision. The previously submitted site plan demonstrates how up to 31 dwellings can be accommodated on the proposed allocation site. Whilst slightly in excess of the number suggested appropriate for small scale growth villages within the Draft Local Plan Part 1, it will deliver a sufficient number of homes to facilitate the provision of land to accommodate a new IDB pumping station which will provide surface water drainage improvements for the village and water quality improvements within the Ants Broads and Marshes SSSI as explained within the Supplementary Drainage Report. It is the only	Comments noted: Alternative site suggestions put forward will be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan

Settlement	Site Ref	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Alternative Sites)	Council's Response
					potential housing site within the village that can offer these benefits. In addition, it will enable an area of land within the site to be transferred to the Parish Council for the provision of new village recreation space which is currently lacking in Sutton. The allocation site is well related to the village and is bound on two sides by built form. Site access can be provided onto Old Yarmouth Road where there is good visibility in both directions. We consider that a pedestrian footpath link could be provided within the highway curtilage and within a shared surface road if necessary. The site would provide a well contained and sustainable small-scale extension to the village that would provide significant community benefits.	
Sutton	SUT02/A	Firs Farm Partnership Lanpro Rejzek, Ms Becky (1218497 1218496)	LP805	General Comments	<b>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</b> The proposed allocation site is located towards the southern end of the village of Sutton which is identified within the First Draft Local Plan Part 1 as suitable and capable of accommodating small scale (in the order of 20 dwellings) new residential development, based upon its current local service provision. The previously submitted site plan demonstrates how up to 31 dwellings can be accommodated on the proposed allocation site. Whilst slightly in excess of the number suggested appropriate for small scale growth villages within the Draft Local Plan Part 1, it will deliver a sufficient number of homes to facilitate the provision of land to accommodate a new IDB pumping station which will provide surface water drainage improvements for the village and water quality improvements within the Ants Broads and Marshes SSSI as explained within the Supplementary Drainage Report. It is the only potential housing site within the village that can offer these benefits. In addition, it will enable an area of land within the site to be transferred to the Parish Council for the provision of new village recreation space which is currently lacking in Sutton. The allocation site is well related to the village and is bound on two sides by built form. Site access can be provided onto Old Yarmouth Road where there is good visibility in both directions. We consider that a pedestrian footpath link could be provided within the highway curtilage and within a shared surface road if necessary. The site would provide a well contained and sustainable small-scale extension to the village that would provide significant community benefits.	Comments noted: Alternative site suggestions put forward will be considered in future iterations of the emerging Plan

	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Alternatives Sites in Sutton)
<b>Objection</b>	0	Comment set out that the site could provide a sustainable residential development that would also bring significant public benefits.
<b>Support</b>	0	
<b>General Comments</b>	2	

DRAFT

DRAFT