

Appendix 3 - Consultation Feedback Summaries

SD2 - Community-Led Development

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD2)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, Community led development should be subject to the same scrutiny as any development. Consideration in favour of these developments would be appropriate and inclusive of the local community but should not be at the expense of quality, compliance, sustainability or policy.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial comments received or issues raised. Community led development should be subject to the same scrutiny as any development. 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 policy.
Council's Response		Noted, 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.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD2)
Objection	0	Approach endorsed.
Support	1	
General Comments	0	

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD2)
Objection	1	The principle of community led development (through neighbourhood plans) was supported. Clarification was sought on the extent of community support with some organisations seeking amendments to the approach around the inclusion of estate masterplans, greater recognition and endorsement of market housing in rural areas, recognising the contribution to sustainable development and the use of Housing needs assessments in demonstrating need, and hence support in rural areas.
Support	4	
General Comments	3	

SD3 - Settlement Hierarchy

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
Summary of Objections	40	The majority of respondents objected to growth in the Small Growth Villages and the Countryside. Housing development should be focussed where there is appropriate infrastructure, public transport, healthcare and other services including employment and the approach fails to integrate problems of climate crisis. many suggested that rather than allocating in these villages, development should be allowed on infill and brownfield sites. Concerns that the countryside is under constant threat of being developed; having an adverse effect on wildlife and dark skies etc. Others though objected that due to concerns that the Plan doesn't go far enough and should be

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
		<p>promoting limited development in settlements not currently designated for growth, in order to enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities. Suggest that Bodham, Edgefield and Northrepps are identified as suitable Small Growth Villages. Suggest amending the policy to remove reference to PDL and allow small scale development on greenfield land or vacant derelict sites. Also suggested removing the wording 'Outside defined development boundaries...' altogether. More consideration should be given to provide housing for local people with families within a 3 mile radius.</p> <p>One objection promotes the alternative option to provide new settlements and new roads instead. Raise concerns around Large Growth Town designations, specifically; Cromer, Fakenham, North Walsham. Small growth town designations, specifically; Hoveton, and Wells-next-the-sea. Large Growth Villages ;Briston & Melton Constable, Mundesley. And Small Growth Villages; Bacton, Happisburgh, Langham , Little Snoring, Southrepps, Trunch, Walcott. See specific settlement summary below. Suggest change to bullet point 7.20 'reduce' with 'minimise'.</p>
Summary of Supports	10	<p>Support the principle of development being targeted in designated settlements and recognises the benefits of allocating land immediately adjacent to built up areas. Growth most required where there are employment and services. Development in rural locations would generate additional car journeys. Suggested amendments to remove reference to PDL and allow small scale development on greenfield land or vacant derelict sites. Development should only commence when capacity at Schools, Doctors, Dentists is ensured. Support the identification of Briston as a large growth village.</p>
Summary of General Comments	15	<p>Most comments recognised that this is an appropriate strategy and is overall consistent with national policy resulting in sustainable development. General understanding of the need for housing and the policy is reasonably well argued. Housing should be located near to shops, schools, employment and public transport. One comment states that accepting development of 0 - 10 dwellings will have same impact as 100 houses but will not contribute towards local infrastructure or to the wider community. Suggest amendments to allow small scale new build on greenfield sites subject to occupancy restrictions. others raised concerns around Small Growth Town designations, specifically; Holt and Wells-next-the-sea and Small Growth Village Weybourne. See settlement summaries below. The exclusion of a site / Beeston was challenged on the basis of the 2017 HELAA assessment and its non inclusion as a selected settlement.</p>
Overall Summary		<p>A number of comments received to this policy. Key issued raised focused on: In order to meet environmental objectives, development should be focused where appropriate infrastructure, services, public transport and employment are in place and there is a specific housing need and the overall support for focussing development in Large Growth Towns, which are the largest most sustainable and able to accommodate growth. One representation disagrees and considers that the town infrastructures will be unable to cope and a more appropriate option would be to build a new settlement. There was some support for growth in villages, to address housing need and maintain vitality of rural communities. One representation questions whether small growth villages can accommodate the proposed growth without site-specific constraints being considered. In the main, it is considered that villages are unsuitable locations for growth. There is no local demand and limited employment or services. There is strong support for provision of affordable housing in villages, and for the protection of village character and green gaps between settlements. Many consider that allocating development in Small Growth Villages will have a knock on effect on the delivery of rural exception affordable housing schemes and a preference was expressed for small scale and suitable infill development coming forward. On the other side, some consider that growth in Countryside is overly restrictive and small scale development should be allowed on greenfield sites and on derelict neglected sites.</p>
Large Growth Towns		<p>Overall support for focussing development in Large Growth Towns, which are the largest most sustainable and able to accommodate growth. One representation disagrees and considers that the town infrastructure will be unable to cope and a more appropriate option would be to build a new settlement and roads.</p>
Cromer		<p>Concerns relate to Cromer's status a Large Growth Town, mainly due to the landscape constraints encompassing the town.</p>

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
Fakenham		Concern expressed about the impact of major residential growth in respect of the lack of employment opportunities and services available.
North Walsham		One representation raises concern over the ability of North Walsham to accommodate growth due to the current volumes of traffic and the car parks being full. Concerns expressed about the capacity of doctors and dentist.
Hoveton		Concern about Hoveton's proposed Small Growth Town status (when it is a village) adding to the current heavy volumes of traffic experienced in the village and the resulting congestion, air quality issues. Concerns also expressed about the adequacy of education, health provision. Concerns over surface water, flooding and foul water drainage.
Sheringham		One comment considered Sheringham as suitable to accommodate growth as it has a wide range of services and amenities.
Wells		Agrees with Well's status of a Small Growth Town but should be recognised that the town has a finite capacity.
Briston		Concern raised about Briston's Large Growth Village Status, increasing traffic, especially by school and the impact on the character of Briston – development could lead to identical overdeveloped villages in a location where tourism is important. Concerns expressed about the capacity at doctors.
Small Growth Villages		feedback suggested that villages are unsuitable locations for growth. There is no local demand and limited employment or services. There is strong support for provision of affordable housing in villages, and for the protection of village character and green gaps between settlements. Many consider that allocating development in Small Growth Villages will have a knock on impact on the delivery of rural exception affordable housing schemes. Happy with small suitable infill development. On the other side, some consider that growth in Countryside is overly restrictive and small scale development should be allowed on greenfield sites and on derelict neglected sites and other settlements should also be promoted
Bacton		Objection to Bacton status as a Small Growth Village due to impact development could have on the character of the village which historically has a 'scattered or 'dispersed' settlement pattern. Express concerns about the adequacy of infrastructure, public transport and traffic and associated pollution. Difficulty getting to doctors, schools and shops. Parking and a bypass of the old part of the village is needed before development is built. Issue with the number of second homes and impact on housing affordability.
Happisburgh		Concerns expressed about the adequacy of infrastructure, public transport and traffic. Along with issues of the number of second homes and housing affordability.
Mundesley		Concerns expressed about the adequacy of infrastructure and services which are at capacity. Issues with traffic and housing should be affordable.
Northrepps		Propose Northrepps as Small Growth Village.
Little Snoring		Lack of services and facilities, public transport, issues with road network, broadband nearing capacity, Limited capacity at WasteWater treatment works. Important to preserve rural character and green space. Would impact wildlife.
Langham		No shop or post office.
Southrepps		Will lose identities, strain on road network, impact on wildlife, lack of public transport. Located in AONB. Would impact on quality of life for residents. Create light and noise pollution. Development in Mundesley will impact Southrepps. Respondents were against the identification of Southrepps as an infill village
Trunch		Low water pressure in village. Important Conservation Town. Limited facilities
Walcott		Concerns expressed about the adequacy of infrastructure, public transport and traffic. Along with issues of the number of second homes and housing affordability.
Weybourne		No public transport for working people, lack of services, new homes unaffordable to local people. Negative impact on AONB and wildlife. Parking inadequate
Alternatives		Bodham, Northrepps, Edgefield promoted as Small Growth Villages. Fails to recognise the settlements that are within close proximity to higher order settlements. Weybourne, Southrepps, Bacton, Walcott, Happisburgh should not be identified settlements. Alternatively put forward include, reintroduce settlement boundaries around the non-growth settlements that are currently misleading designated as 'countryside'.
Council's Response		Noted: Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. The distribution of growth is informed by the guiding principles of the NPPF, including that of supporting rural

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
		economy, 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. 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 evidence of need and the potential impacts on affordable housing provision.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
Objection	5	Issues raised include more clarity around meaning and quantities around infill development. The following PC/TC's objected to being identified as small growth villages: Bacton, High Kelling, Roughton & Southrepps & Weybourne reasons given varied but included preference for exception site development, impacts on existing character & infrastructure and as such small scale allocations run the risk of disproportionate and unsustainable growth. One parish council requested more information on housing need methodology and that more support should be given to small growth towns for the retention and provision of services.
Support	0	
General Comments	2	

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD3)
Objection	9	Key issues raised: a) The requirement to locate growth in the identified the sustainable settlements in the AONB was commented on and organisations such as Natural England, Norfolk Coast partnership, advised that supporting documentation such as the SA and HRA should justify site selection (and distribution - our emphasis) on the least environmental or amenity value and site selection should avoid most versatile agricultural land protected landscapes. b) General support for growth in smaller rural settlements, but for many different reasons, land owners and promoters supported larger scale growth especially in higher valued areas in order to support rural economies and their development needs and sought the removal of the overall prescriptive and restrictive cap in footnote 21 as well as suggesting a number of further settlements which the council should include in the settlement hierarchy e.g. Great Ryburgh and some provided reasoning for the exclusion of others including recognising their commercial interests and hence marketability of settlements , others however used the opportunity to support the identification of smaller villages as in the policy through expressing support and analysis of service provision and local connections. Others expressed concern and sought lower numbers due to concerns around landscape impact and estate housing. c) Those promoting estate management sought more flexibility and a policy commitment facilitating appropriate estate growth and the recognition of the role larger estates make to the District d)The principle of broadly focussing growth in and close to the larger settlements was generally supported, however the challenge was again to ensure the Plan facilitates appropriate levels of growth in the correct locations with commentary closely linked to HOU1 and the Plans deliverability of substantial growth at North Walsham. Some commentary supported a more flexible approach seeking the Plan to adopt a more flexible approach to longer term growth and support development by allowing for residential development adjoining or close to the existing built up confines of [list settlements] will be acceptable provided that a set of criteria was met and one respondent commented that the reliance on the provision of key services to identify settlements for growth was an over simplification of reality and promoted the wider contribution surrounding villages could make subject to a review of accessibility and transport network. e) The high reliance on windfall in the strategy and the longer delivery expectations of the large growth towns was used to help justify responses around more flexibility around the approach to large and medium growth towns and the identification of a greater number of selected settlements. One larger urban extension was proposed crossing Into Broadland District Council at Coltishall and the village of Badersfield.
Support	12	
General Comments	7	

SD4 - Development in the Countryside

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD4)
Summary of Objections	2	This policy received two objections. Suggest changes to policy to allow for low carbon development in the countryside including small scale greenfield infill sites for permanent residence, low carbon small scale sustainable projects, 'eco-tourism' holiday lets, Low carbon Self and Custom Builds. Suggest that NNDC works with farmers to support organic farming where possible and should not allow permission for factory farms.
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy. Consider that the general presumption against development in the Countryside is the right approach to sustainable development in North Norfolk. But appropriate development should be allowed to ensure that the rural economy is preserved.
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment received. Allow more small scale development in rural villages to meet local demand by committing to do so on a case by case basis rather than linkage to specified available facilities.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised, consider that the general presumption against development in the Countryside is the right approach to sustainable development in North Norfolk. However others suggested that more small scale development is allowed in rural villages to meet local demand. Suggest that the policy should allow for low carbon development in the countryside including small scale greenfield infill sites for permanent residence, low carbon small scale sustainable projects, 'eco-tourism' holiday lets, Low carbon Self and Custom Builds.
Council's Response		Comments noted: The Local Plan supports the transition to a low carbon future and included policies throughout the plan to allow appropriate development in countryside locations in line with the approaches envisaged in national policy. Paragraph 79 in the NPPF also allows for exceptional development proposals in the countryside subject to truly outstanding and innovative design which also enhances the setting .

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD4)
Objection	0	This approach was strongly supported, 1 PC questioned the effectiveness of the policy given the number of exceptions.
Support	4	
General Comments	1	

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD4)
Objection	1	General support expressed but suggest that their needs to be some development necessary to ensure rural communities prosper in a sustainable way. The view that growth should only be promoted in the countryside in order to meet identified need was promoted by some, others sought the provision of a policy or specific wording to support estate management and the contribution they bring to sustainable development. The development industry sought greater flexibility and a more positive approach to growth (rather than restrictive). Norfolk coastal partnership are concerned around the potential impact of business extensions and wish further consideration given to the requirement for a landscape Visual impact assessment in the policy. Norfolk County council, Mineral and waste team requested that bullet point 2 be removed in its entirety.
Support	3	
General Comments	5	

SD6 - Provision & Retention of Local facilities and Services

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD6)
Summary of Objections	2	This policy received two objections. Suggest amendment to policy to make it tougher for pubs and shops to change use. Health Care Campus are not shown on the Proposals map.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy for the protection of community facilities but considers that the retention of these facilities can only be sustainable if their costs are sustainable and customer base is retained.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received.
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Overall support for protecting community facilities, suggest amending the policy to reference change of use and make it tougher to change pubs and shops. Health Care Campus are not shown on the Policies Map.
Council's Response		Noted Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. Local facilities considered important are detailed in footnote 16. The change of Use between Use classes is governed by the Use Classes order. Ensure the identification of Health care campuses on the policies mapping

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD6)
Objection	0	Sheringham town council requested the consideration for a health and social care campus. No comments were received on the principle of protection of such sites.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD6)
Objection	0	Responses supported the inclusion of a policy and the strong protection given to local facilities and services. The Boards Authority suggested the approach may be too permissive.
Support	2	
General Comments	2	

HOU3 - Affordable Homes in the Countryside

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU3)
Summary of Objections	1	Objection concerned that a bespoke rural exception policy should be set for Wells -next -the Sea.
Summary of Supports	2	conditional support for this approach- Development should be well related to settlements with facilities and are not just a cluster of private dwellings and have the support of the local community and clarification of facilities.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received.
Overall Summary		Limited number of comments received on this policy. Clarity is sought over the definition of 'facilities' and the requirement for proposals to be well related to settlements with local facilities and how housing need will be calculated.
Council's Response		Noted - No substantial issues raised, consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. Clarity over the definition of 'facilities' and how housing need should be demonstrated. Consider restricting policy to those settlements with a level of service provision. Wells is identified as a small growth town and as such the exceptions approach detailed actively support the provision of rural exception sites and affordable housing provision through the delivery of sites to address additional identified local need. The Council and other policies support the delivery of growth to address local needs through neighbourhood planning and through community land trusts brought about through community planning powers. As an exception to planned development occupation is limited to those that meet the Councils local occupancy policy i.e. those that have a strong connection to the local community in perpetuity.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU3)
Objection	0	Broad support expressed for this approach.
Support	1	
General Comments	1	

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU3)
Objection	0	The approach that delivers additional housing opportunities for affordable housing in the countryside and flexibility to the spatial strategy was supported. some respondents suggested that the policy should be more prescriptive on the tenure of homes to be allowed, while other sought clarification that growth would not exceed identified local need
Support	6	
General Comments	1	

HOU4 - Agricultural & Other key Worker Accommodation

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU4)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy; restrictions should be in place to restrict these houses being sold for other purposes/ second homes.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Support this policy; restrictions should be in place to restrict these houses being sold for other purposes/ second homes.

Council's Response		Comments noted. The council will impose a restrictive occupancy condition to ensure the that any dwelling remains available to meet the needs of the particular business
---------------------------	--	--

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU4)
Objection	0	Broad support expressed but the approach could be expanded to cover key workers first in the towns and not just focus on those connected to the land.
Support	1	
General Comments	0	

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU4)
Objection	0	Limited feedback received - No issues raised. Consideration of some amended wording with regard to landscape and designated sites was suggested.
Support	1	
General Comments	1	

HOU5 - Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy HOU5)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One support for this policy.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantive issues raised
Council's Response		Noted

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU5)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy HOU5)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	