

Appendix 1 - Schedule of Representations

Extract of Report of Representations

References to 'Officer Summary' indicate that lengthier submissions were made and have been summarised.

Policy SD11 Regulation 18 responses

Individuals

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD11	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP384	Object	Proposed Policy SD11 The policy proposes to limit new development within the Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA). Footnote 25 states that the CCMA "can be viewed on the existing Core Strategy Proposals Maps". However, there is no such designation on the CS Proposals Maps. The maps do show a Coastal Erosion Constraint Area, which refers to CS Policy EN11 – which the text confirms was informed by Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) dating to 2006 -7. The Draft Local Plan refers to SMPs adopted 2012 and other studies undertaken since the SMPs were adopted. Therefore, it is expected that the Areas of Coastal Change/Erosion Constraint would be reviewed for the Local Plan 2016 – 36 and that the extent of CCMA would be clearly shown on a plan. There is a plan (Fig 5) included in the Draft LP which indicates the CCMA but it is not clear enough.
SD11	Burke, Mr Stephen (1216753)	LP798	Object	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Villages and towns on the coast and at risk of erosion and flooding should be properly protected to maintain existing communities, encourage tourism and protect productive agricultural land and wildlife

SD11	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: New homes should not be built in areas at risk of coastal erosion.
------	-----------------------------	-------	------------------	---

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD11)
Summary of Objections	2	Two objections to this policy. Villages and towns on the coast should be protected from the risk of coastal erosion and flooding in order to maintain existing communities, encourage tourism and protect agricultural land and wildlife. The Coastal Erosion Zone is not included on the Proposals Map.
Summary of Supports	0	None received.
Summary of General Comments	1	One comment received, new houses should not be built in areas at risk of coastal erosion.
Overall Summary		Representations relate to the concerns over the implications of coastal erosion. Want to see the protection of villages and towns along the coast. Consider whether the Proposals Map shows the Coastal Erosion Zone clearly enough.
Council's Response		The shore Line management plan provide the strategic approach to management of the coast. The policy approach seeks to reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding in appropriate development in vulnerable areas in line with national policy. Taken together with SD12 the approach seeks to provide a framework to address coastal adaptation.

Parish and Town Councils

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD11	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Organisations and Statutory Consultees

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
SD11	Natural England (1215824)	LP714	General Comments	The Plan should consider the marine environment and apply an Integrated Coastal Zone Management approach. Where Marine Plans are in place, Local Plans should also take these into account. More detail about the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans can be found here.	Noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy
SD11	Norfolk Coast Partnership, Ms Gemma Clark (1217409)	LP492	Support	Can geology be mentioned? Exposure and erosion of geology through coastal erosion and inappropriate development/projects and possible loss of geological records. There is a need to involve the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership in applications and projects.	Support welcomed: Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy
SD11	RSPB (1217391)	LP425	General Comments	The RSPB recognises the need to protect particular areas of the coast and that this needs to be appropriate to location and ensure no increased erosion along other stretches of the coast. This will require more detailed assessments that consider changes to coastal processes and	Noted- consider the removal of the word

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
				<p>seek to understand changes in the offshore environment as well. Changes to sediment inputs offshore can affect fish spawning areas and in turn affect success for tern colonies. Any assessments regarding coastal change must also consider these wider issues, especially in a changing climate and weather patterns. We note that the policy states no "material adverse impact". This is not consistent with Habitats Regulations terminology and should be amended. Proposed changes: We recommend the policy makes it clear that all potential impacts from coastal changes will be assessed. We recommend that "adverse impact" is used in the policy and "material" is removed.</p>	<p>'material' from the policy wording.</p>
SD11	<p>Timewell Properties (John Long Planning ltd.) (1216647 (1216065))</p>	LP362	Object	<p>Blue Sky Leisure notes that the Policy's reference to the 'Coastal Change Management Area, as defined on the Policies Map', equates to the Policies Map Coastal Erosion Constraint Area. This affects part of the Woodhill Park, operated by Blue Sky Leisure. The Coastal Change Management Area is presumably a composite of the 2025; 2055; and the 2105 Coastal Erosion zones (i.e. the area likely to be affected by development over the next 100 years). Blue Sky Leisure is currently working on proposals that seek to address the impact the erosion zones have on its operation at Woodhill Park, East Runton; and is very concerned that the Plan's policy as currently drafted, is overly restrictive and limits opportunities for the staged 'roll back' or possibly relocation of existing tourist related businesses within the Coastal Change Management Area. For instance, the Policy fails to explicitly acknowledge the potential for development such as static caravans and touring caravan pitches, to be safely moved from the most vulnerable areas of the Coastal Change Management Area (the 2025 Coastal Erosion Zone), to less vulnerable areas in the Coastal Change</p>	<p>Noted - consider the flexibility of the wording of Policy SD 11 and whether this would inhibit future tourism development in the area.</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
				<p>Management Area (the 2055; and the 2105 Coastal Erosion Zone); in a managed and phased way. For many businesses along the North Norfolk Coast, a staged/phased 'roll back' of development within the Coastal Change Management Area will be more feasible, viable and deliverable, than a complete move outside of the Area, particularly given some of the Plan's other restrictive policies, including Policies for new/relocated/replacement tourist accommodation; and policies that seek to protect the character and appearance of the North Norfolk AONB and Countryside. As currently drafted, the Plan will make it incredibly difficult to find suitable alternative and viable sites outside of the Coastal Change Management Area and close by the coast, where visitors want to stay. Much of the area close to the coast and outside of the Coastal Change Management Area is AONB and designated Countryside. The Plan has restrictive policies that seek to protect the character and appearance of the AONB. Recent experience would suggest that opportunities for the relocation of tourist accommodation from vulnerable areas, to other less vulnerable coastal locations are few and far between, with very little take up and even where sites have been found they have not always been supported. It is going to be virtually impossible for tourist accommodation operators to find suitable and affordable potential sites within or adjacent to settlements close to the coast. Such sites often have a 'hope value' or are already optioned for residential development. A relocated caravan and camping site cannot compete with the expected land values that residential development would generate, particularly given the considerable costs of relocation. The Plan needs to acknowledge the special circumstances that affect the relocation of tourist business and be more understanding and supportive, if it is to deliver the 'roll back' policy.</p>	

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
				<p>Also, Blue Sky Leisure is concerned that for relocation/replacement proposals to be acceptable they need to be supported by a Coastal Erosion Vulnerability Assessment demonstrating that the proposal will not result in an increased risk to life, or a significantly increased risk to property AND also demonstrate, substantial economic, social and environmental benefits to the community. It is not clear what these benefits may be or how the scale of the benefits will be judged, in order that proposals may meet this requirement. The Council's own evidence acknowledges the importance of tourist accommodation to the North Norfolk accommodation, and it is not clear what other evidence will be required. Furthermore, for those businesses seeking to relocate (or expand) from the Coastal Change Management Area to another coastal location outside of it, the Policy requires them to demonstrate that the long-term implications of coastal change on the development have been addressed. However, on the basis that the Coastal Change Management Area deals with coastal change over a 100 year period (up to 2105); and the Plan's period is only up to 2036, it is not clear why this is requirement is needed within the policy. Any development outside of the Coastal Change Management Area must be 'safe' from coastal change by definition for at least 100 years. Predicting implications of coastal change beyond 100 years is going to be almost impossible. Blue Sky Leisure acknowledges that there may be opportunities to relocate existing threatened clifftop businesses to alternative sites further away from the coast, but even this is a complex and difficult process, that involves an extremely high level of risk, as well as cost. Relocations sites have to be attractive and viable locations or people will not stay in them. Unfortunately, most of the attractive locations in North Norfolk are covered by restrictive policies and zonings such as the AONB, the</p>	

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
				<p>Coastal strip etc. which realistically means the finding of alternative sites is virtually impossible. Blue Sky Leisure therefore suggests that the policy needs to be more supportive of businesses operating within the Coastal Change Management Area, particularly those providing tourist accommodation. These businesses are a vital component of the District's economy; and the Plan should be helping such businesses to deal with Coastal Change rather than hinder them through overly restrictive planning policies. Proposed change: Blue Sky Leisure suggest that an additional provision is included in the policy after point 5 to explicitly support existing tourist accommodation businesses operating within the Coastal Change Management Area, along the lines of"planning permission will be granted for development proposals subject to:..... 6. Proposals being for the phased roll-back of tourist accommodation within the Coastal Change Management Area, provided they are from the more vulnerable parts of the area (2025 Coastal Erosion Zone) to the less vulnerable parts of the area (2055 and 2105 Coastal Erosion Zones) and will not result in an increased risk to life." Also, that the requirement for proposals to demonstrate that "...substantial economic, social and environmental benefits to the community... "; is not applicable to existing businesses, particularly those providing tourist accommodation; and the part of the policy that requires "...New development, or the intensification of existing development in a coastal location, but outside the Coastal Change Management Area, will need to demonstrate that the long-term implications of coastal change on the development have been addressed..." is deleted.</p>	

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD12)
Objection	1	Restricting inappropriate development within Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMAs) is critical, however a key issue raised was for the policy to promote more active adaptation with CCMAs and for the Council to reflect on more incentives to make the approach of roll back more deliverable e.g. 2 for 1. Suggestions include the consideration of relocation to a location that exhibits similar or improved sustainability rather than restrictions on to the coastal community it replaces. The environment Agency support the consideration of a further SPD in coastal management and the reference to the Norfolk and Suffolk Coastal Authorities, Statement of Common Ground, & Coastal Zone Planning is referred to within this section of the document. One representation raised concerns around the prescriptive 20yr limit highlighting that this may not be the most economically viable or feasible approach to relocation of certain users.
Support	2	
General Comments	2	

Alternatives

SD11	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC019	General Comments	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: 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</p>	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD11 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
------	----------------------------	-------	------------------	--	---

				<p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Policy SD12 Regulation 18 responses

Individuals

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD12	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Agree but with comments. 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.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD12)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	1	One supports the policy but suggests that coastal adaption should be for local occupiers and shouldn't allow second home owners to relocate.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Limited comments received on this policy. Coastal adaption should be for local occupiers and shouldn't allow second home owners to relocate.

Council's Response		Disagree. Coastal adaptation is for the whole community. Occupation is not a land use planning consideration
---------------------------	--	--

Parish & Town Councils

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	
SD12	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	Condition 2 of the Proposals for the relocation and replacement of dwellings affected by erosion states that new dwelling(s) is/are used as a primary residence. STC's concern is that if the replacement of holiday homes/second homes is not permitted under the policy then this could lead to increased pressure on an already stretched housing supply.	Comments noted: Consider comments in the development the policy.
SD12	Bacton & Edingthorpe (149585)	LP239	Object	Concerned that cliff-top caravan parks to sites within the undeveloped coast would be potentially harmful to the landscape; the policies should provide for the safeguarding of the landscape are essential. This could encroach into the local countryside and conflict with Policy SD4. Designation of Bacton as a Growth Village could potentially limit the future availability of suitable sites for relocation of facilities threatened by coastal erosion.	Disagree, the policy presents a positive approach for long term resilience, community cohesion, enabling adaptation to take place in advance of actual loss. Proposals are required to respect existing character and appearance and accord with wider landscape policies as a whole.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD12)
Objection	1	Issues raised include the need to exclude existing second homes from the policy and exclude caravan parks in the "Undeveloped Coast" where impacts on the landscape are potentially damaging.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Organisations and Statutory Consultees

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)
SD12	Environment Agency (1217223)	LP455	Support	We welcome the inclusion of these paragraphs and support the sustainable approach to coastal adaptation described in paragraphs 7.92 to 7.94. Restricting inappropriate development within Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMAs) is critical, however, there is also a need to promote adaptation to change within areas subject to erosion, particularly with regards to the diversification of businesses, such as diminishing arable farms, or within rural coastal communities within managed realignment or no active intervention frontages. It is important that this need is reflected within local planning policies that actively promote adaptation within CCMAs. Within a managed realignment or no active intervention frontage it is important that development proposals have the opportunity to demonstrate wider benefits, through a sustainability appraisal or similar, when compared to the 'do nothing' scenario associated with no development. For example, rural properties

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	
				<p>in coastal change areas can be affected by blight, subject to crime and require costly demolition. An opportunity to develop a more suitable land use or construct a moveable dwelling, prior to decline of the existing property, should not be discounted. Paragraph 7.91 indicates that the Coastal Change Management Area is identified on the Policies Map. It is important that there is the facility to update this map in accordance with new, reputable and scientifically robust evidence. A digital, GIS based map (as per the Environment Agency Flood Zones) provides an ideal resource and avoids accidental use of old, paper copies of plans.</p>	
SD12	Environment Agency (1217223)	LP456	General Comments	<p>Policy SD 12 – Coastal Adaptation We have some concerns that policy SD12 is impracticable for some commercial and business uses, for example, private landlords. Relocation costs, including construction and purchase of a site, often make a rollback opportunity unfeasible. This results in the rollback not being utilised; loss of housing stock and the original asset remaining within the risk zone. Some Local Authorities are considering offering 2 for 1 property rollback opportunities to try to offset the high cost of relocation and encourage uptake of rollback opportunities; to retain housing stock and remove assets from the risk zone. The second section of Policy SD12 (focused on dwellings) also states that new development must be in a location that is well related to the coastal community from which it was displaced. We recommend inclusion of ‘or, that the relocated dwelling should be in a location which exhibits a similar or improved level of sustainability’, or similar.</p>	<p>Concerns noted: Consider comments in the development the policy.</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	
				<p>Relocation close to an existing community is often difficult for various reasons; appropriate land may not be available, permissions must be obtained and may be constrained by other policies, the potential rollback site landowner will expect a significant return on the site and like for like development is rarely possible or feasible. This can result in the rollback opportunity not being utilised, the property remaining within the risk zone and a loss of housing stock. Therefore, extending this principle elsewhere within the district, if local land is unavailable or purchase not feasible, should encourage rollback and early adaptation for the benefit of the wider area. Policy SD12 also states that 'the new development (must be) beyond the Coastal Change Management Area'. It is important that that this sentence does not preclude the possibility of replacement of a residential property with a re-locatable dwelling. A property that can be easily lifted and wholly removed from the erosion risk zone represents a considerable improvement in the sustainability of a residential site versus a landowner taking no action to adapt. The construction of permanent dwellings using a rollback opportunity is often prohibitively expensive and local land may not be available, therefore this solution offers a viable adaptation opportunity, particularly if taken as early as possible within the forecasted risk zone. We recommend that North Norfolk District Council considers the development of a Coastal Change Supplementary Planning Document, as per other coastal authorities in East Anglia. Furthermore, we recommend that the Norfolk and Suffolk Coastal Authorities, Statement of</p>	

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	
				Common Ground, Coastal Zone Planning is referred to within this section of the document.	
SD12	Natural England (1215824)	LP715	General Comments	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: We welcome a policy that facilitates coastal adaptation and roll back options for housing and infrastructure in areas vulnerable to coastal erosion. Shoreline adaptation can provide opportunities to improve sustainability, create and maintain crucial coastal habitat and biodiversity. We suggest that the Local Authority consider such opportunities on a strategic scale where feasible and appropriate.	Support Noted
SD12	Norfolk Coast Partnership, Ms Gemma Clark (1217409)	LP493	Support	We support in ensuring no detrimental impact on landscape.	Support welcomed
SD12	Timewell Properties (John Long Planning Ltd.) (1216647 (1216065))	LP363	Object	Blue Sky Leisure is concerned that the policy as currently drafted, is overly restrictive and limits opportunities for the staged 'roll back' of development from the Coastal Change Management Area into the Countryside. The Policy as drafted only allows for the relocation of proposals from the Coastal Change Management Area that will be affected by coastal erosion in the next 20 years of the date of the proposal. However, this may not be the most economically viable or feasible approach to relocation of certain uses. For instance, in	Noted- consider amendments to the wording of the policy to allow for roll back to occur with the next tiers of coastal erosion constraint zone. I.e. the 50 year and 100 year zones. Furthermore, consider the amendment of the wording within criterion 4 from 'no

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	
				<p>some circumstances, it will be more economical and feasible to move development within the Coastal Change Management Area that is not directly affected until after 20 years, and perhaps affected by the next erosion epoch (i.e. the 2055 Coastal Erosion Zone). Blue Sky Leisure suggests that this time limit requirement should be deleted, or extended, and/or provisions included within the policy to allow for development not affected until after 20 years to be relocated to the Countryside, where it can be demonstrated that it is not feasible or viable to restrict relocation to just that development affected within 20 years of the proposal. Furthermore, the Policy includes additional onerous requirements that will need to be met in order for a 'roll back' proposal to be supported. As currently drafted, proposals will need to result in "...no detrimental impact upon the landscape, townscape or biodiversity of the area, having regard to any special designations...". Blue Sky Leisure consider that demonstrating that there is no detrimental impact will be a high hurdle to address, and potentially impossible given the nature of certain developments and coastal landscapes. The impact of all these additional requirements and potentially cost burdens, coupled with the considerable costs of relocation could have the effect of making relocation proposals unfeasible and/or unviable and effectively, undermine the 'roll back' strategy. The Plan should be more helpful and proactive in its approach and properly support the continuation of businesses threatened by Coastal Erosion, rather than hinder them. Blue Sky Leisure suggests that the policy should be drafted in a way that allows for the</p>	<p>detrimental impact' to 'no net detrimental impact'.</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	
				<p>benefits of removing development away from the Coastal Change Management Area, including the continuation of an existing viable business, and the landscape benefits of removing development from coastal areas; to be weighed against the impacts on the landscape, townscape or biodiversity in the Countryside. Proposed changes: In other words the policy should refer to "...no net detrimental impact...taking into account the landscape, townscape or biodiversity benefits resulting from removal of development from the Coastal Change Management Area...", rather than "...no detrimental impact...". Additionally, the Policy should also acknowledge that achieving the Policy's requirements will be weighed up and balanced with the viability of relocation, with the ability for requirements to be relaxed where it would help with the viable relocation of an existing business out of the Coastal Change Management Area.</p>	

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD12)
Objection	1	<p>Restricting inappropriate development within Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMAs) is critical, however a key issue raised was for the policy to promote more active adaptation with CCMAs and for the Council to reflect on more incentives to make the approach of roll back more deliverable e.g. 2 for 1. Suggestions include the consideration of relocation to a location that exhibits similar or improved sustainability rather than restrictions on to the coastal community it replaces. The environment Agency support the consideration of a further SPD in coastal management and the reference to the</p>
Support	2	
General Comments	2	

		Norfolk and Suffolk Coastal Authorities, Statement of Common Ground, & Coastal Zone Planning is referred to within this section of the document. One representation raised concerns around the prescriptive 20yr limit highlighting that this may not be the most economically viable or feasible approach to relocation of certain users.
--	--	--

Alternatives

SD12	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC020	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: 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).
------	----------------------------	-------	------------------	---	---

Policy ENV3 Regulation 18 responses

Individuals

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
ENV3	Witham, Mr I M (1216498)	LP201	Support	A much-needed policy for north Norfolk. Suggest add to the policy wording: "provided that the relocation would not have a significantly adverse visual impact upon the landscape of the Undeveloped Coast area".
ENV3	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP141	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: 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.
ENV3	Johnson, Mr Jamie (1216384)	LP341 LP539	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Where it is assumed that Figure 5. page 93 will be supplemented by new Proposals Maps, the area shown shaded green as 'Undeveloped Coast' should be amended in line with the current proposals maps to show established settlements within the area which are already developed and should be recognised as distinct from the wider 'undeveloped coast' area in which they are sited. For accuracy and clarity the following settlements should be removed from the green-shaded 'Undeveloped Coast' area on figure 5 and follow the current proposals maps demarcation including Stiffkey, Cley Next the Sea, Salthouse, Trimingham, Lessingham, Eccles on Sea including the Cart Gap to North Gap coastal ribbon, and Sea Palling.
ENV3	Mr Phillip Duncan (1217309)	LP392	Object	Proposed Policy ENV3 The Plan (Fig 5) is insufficient to clearly show the proposed area of Undeveloped Coast.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy ENV3)
Summary of Objections	1	No substantive issues raised: Figure 5 is insufficient to clearly show the proposed area of Undeveloped Coast.
Summary of Supports	3	Three support this policy. Overall support, much-needed policy for North Norfolk. Protection should be given to important areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity. Undeveloped Coast on Proposals Map needs to be updated to exclude existing settlements and consideration to adding to the policy wording: "provided that the relocation would not have a significantly adverse visual impact upon the landscape of the Undeveloped Coast area" .

Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		No substantial issues raised. Support for policy, considered to be much-needed for North Norfolk. Protection should be given to important areas of wildlife habitat and biodiversity. Consideration should be given to amending the Undeveloped Coast on Proposals Map to exclude existing coastal settlements. Figure 5 is insufficient to clearly show the proposed area of Undeveloped Coast.
Council's Response		Noted, Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy. The majority of growth is located in those settlements identified as sustainable growth locations and as such are identified as outside the Undeveloped Coast designation. It is not appropriate to exclude smaller settlements, which the policy seeks to manage appropriate development in . The boundaries will be reviewed along with the finalisation of policy SD3- settlement hierarchy. The map is an illustration, more detail can be found on the interactive proposals map on line. Consider updating policy in line with suggested policy wording: "provided that the relocation would not have a significantly adverse visual impact upon the landscape of the Undeveloped Coast area".

Parish & Town Councils

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
ENV3	Bacton & Edingthorpe Parish Council (149585)	LP239	Support	A great deal of Bacton is designated "undeveloped coast" . Strong support for the continued operation of this policy, with reference to the area's links to the near-by Norfolk Coast AONB and to the Bacton Gas Terminal.	Support Welcome.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV3)
Objection	0	The policy approach was strongly supported.

Statutory bodies & organisations

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
ENV3	Broads Authority (321326)	LP806	General Comments	Figure 5 could helpfully show the Broads	Noted : Consider feedback in the future iterations of the Plan
ENV3	Kelling Estate LLP (Mr Roger Welchman, Armstrong Rigg Planning) (1218427, 1218424)	LP746, LP754	General Comments	This is considered to represent an unduly restrictive policy, particularly given the overlap with the AONB offering a national statutory designation reinforced by Local Plan policy which provide an adequate safeguard against which to assess development proposals as they come forward. The policy should be omitted.	Disagree. The purpose of the policy is to protect the character of the Undeveloped Coast and recognises that the undeveloped coast is an important national and international

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
					resource. Developments that do not require a coastal location should be directed elsewhere to protect the appearance, character and environment of the area.
ENV3	Norfolk Coast Partnership, Ms Gemma Clark (1217409)	LP506	Support	Support	Support welcomed
ENV3	Historic England (1215813)	LP705	Support	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Broadly welcome this policy	Support noted

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy ENV3)
Objection	0	

Support	2	Limited comments received, no substantive issues raised. The approach was broadly supported, however one respondent thought the approach was unduly restrictive given the existence of national policy approach to the AONB.
General Comments	2	

Alternatives

ENV3	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC027	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: 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 character of the area.	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support ENV1 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
------	-------------------------------	-------	---------	---	---