

Appendix 1 Schedule of Representations LCA and LSA.

Landscape Character Assessment

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	<i>Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)</i>
LCA1	Draft LCA	Mr Colin Rice 1210475	Providing General Comments	<p>Figure 1.6 does not highlight the coastal development at places like Eccles, marking it as 'Coastal Settled Farmlands', whereas Figure 1.7 (covering the designations for Gt Yarmouth) has a separate category 'E: Dunes, coastal levels and resorts'. There is a case for an appropriate separate designation for the coastal strip development to be made in NN district too.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10 on cultural heritage focuses entirely pre-20C cultural assets - the 'high end' only - rather than including the modest plotland style development of the coastal strip which, after nearly 80 years, is an established part of the character of the coastal landscape. For those who have owned and looked after these houses, or holidayed in them, they represent as important an expression of our freedom and love of the area as the grand estates.</p>	The particular character of the coast development should be recognised as part of the richness and diversity of the human settlement, whereas it is largely ignored.	I would like to see the assessment amplified to give better recognition of humbler 20C and contemporary buildings in the landscape, rather than either ignoring them or seeing them purely as detractors.	<p><i>Fig 1.6 is at a regional scale, so the Coastal Settled Farmland designation is considered appropriate. Coastal strip development is included in the Coastal Plain designation within the North Norfolk LCA.</i></p> <p>Action: Remove note on Fig 1.6, 'Draft to be updated'</p> <p>Deleted</p> <p><i>3.9 and 3.10 relate to statutory listed heritage assets only</i></p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				<p>In the summary of the section on Coastal Plain, there is no mention of the settlements that form part of it, i.e. Bacton, Walcott, Happisburgh, Eccles, Sea Palling, Waxham and Horsey.</p> <p>Indeed on p. 131 Sea Palling is listed in the Settled Farmland category when it is shown in the Coastal Plain.</p> <p>On p. 155 under 'Valued features and qualities', due recognition is given to the 20C wooden bungalows and chalets in Bacton, but there is no mention of such assets in other areas. Similar recognition should be given to Cart Gap, Eccles, Sea Palling and similar areas of the best of coastal strip development. The 'Landscape Vision' on p158 should include</p>			<p><i>p. 146 Coastal Plain LCT Summary. There is no mention of settlement so add para re presence of coastal strip development in shaping the character of this Type.</i></p> <p>Added</p> <p><i>p. 153 Name more places (e.g. Sea Palling, Eccles) in Key Characteristic no.6. Correct typo in No. 6 (mostly 19 os/os)</i></p> <p>Added and amended</p> <p><i>p.131 Remove error. Sea Palling is not in SF1. Add Catfield</i></p> <p>Amended</p> <p><i>p.155 Valued Feature no.5 After Bacton, add Ostend and Walcott</i></p> <p>Added</p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				a place for limited but good quality development of this type.			
LCA2	Draft LCA	Broadland District Council, Spatial Planning Team 1216187	Providing General Comments	Figure 1.7 and Figure 4.2 Both of these figures display the Broadland District Council landscape character areas, however, there is no key included to describe these. For consistency, it may be worthwhile to include these.			Fig 1.7 and 4.2 Add the Broadland and West Norfolk LCT's list to the Key in both of these Figures. Are all of the Gt Yarmouth LCT's shown graphically? Added and double checked
LCA3	Draft LCA	Norfolk Coast Partnership Gemma Clark 1217409	Providing General Comments	1.24 Our Integrated Landscape Character Assessment which was undertaken with our partner Local Authorities meant that our character types all dovetailed and enabled a more coordinated response to planning applications. With the changes to the new LCA it has meant that a couple of the character types are now different to our character types. A decision needs to be made as to whether we commission a new LCA and work to integrate these new changes, or whether we don't have our own LCA for the AONB and refer to the Local Authorities LCA'S. This is a conversation that can be had with the Landscape Officers to decide a way forward. We are happy to see Key Qualities of Natural Beauty of the Norfolk Coast included in the description and light pollution mentioned in many of the guidelines and forces for change.			<i>On-going discussion with the AONB Partnership. No action required</i>
LCA4	Draft LCA	Norfolk County	Supporting	Both of these documents acknowledge the important contribution that heritage assets			<i>Comments noted</i>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	<i>Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)</i>
		Council, Laura Waters 931093 (on behalf of Historic Environment Team)		and the historic landscape make to the overall character of the North Norfolk landscape. The Sensitivity Assessment pays particular attention to former airfields within the district and highlights their heritage significance. From a historic environment perspective we are supportive of the overall conclusions of the two assessments and do not have any specific comments to make on them.			
LCA5	Draft LCA	Historic England Mrs Debbie Mack (Historic Environment Planning Adviser) 1215813	Supporting	We welcome the production of these two related assessments. We do not have capacity to review these documents in great detail but advise that these documents form an important part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and other work going forward. It is clearly important that consideration of the historic environment is given in the preparation of the landscape character assessment and we would expect the methodology to follow current best practice.			<i>Comments noted</i>
LCA6	Draft LCA	Broads Authority Natalie Beal (Planning Policy Officer) 321326	Providing General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.5 says: ‘the eastern end of the District also adjoins The Broads, which has the status of a National Park’. This is not quite right. The eastern end of the District is the Broads and the Broads has a status equivalent to a National Park. 			Page 2. Para 1.5 Amend text to: ..The eastern end of the District forms part of the Broads, which has a status equivalent to a National Park. Since the planning jurisdiction in this area is managed by the Broads Executive Authority and not

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.10 – this needs to mention the Broads – the Broads is an asset to North Norfolk • The maps at the start – you could include the Broads Landscape Character Assessment by copying over the maps. • 3.9 and 3.10 – this needs to mention the Broads • Figure 3.7 – you could include our dark skies map as well. 			<p>North Norfolk District Council, these areas are excluded from this Assessment.</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>1.10 add the Broads to the list</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Figure 1.7, 4.1, 4.2 show adjacent LPA Landscape Types. Broads Authority area to be added and link to their LCA added to key</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Comment noted. 3.9 & 3.10 is a general comment about cultural assets across the District, so the Broads is already included.</p> <p>3.7 Add dark sky areas of the Broads that are within NNDC area.</p> <p>Also add the designated Dark Sky Discovery Sites at Wiveton Downs and Kelling Heath</p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	<i>Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)</i>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 4.1, 4.2 seems to exclude the Broads. LUC did our Broads Landscape Character Assessment and the information from that could be incorporated. To have a blank for the Broads is misleading and may have impacts as and when applications need to be considered in landscape terms near to the Broads. You could mention our LCA and refer to that rather than leaving a blank and include a link to the document. You could use a colour symbol and then provide the reference to our LCA in the legend? Page 131 – bottom left photo seems to have a formatting error 			<p>Holiday Park (AONB have data files)</p> <p>Added</p> <p>This LCA covers the areas of the District where NNDC has planning jurisdiction.</p> <p>Fig 4.1 should label the Broads Authority Area, as it does other LPA's.</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Fig 4.2 should include a graphic for the Broads and a link to their Character Assessment in the Key</p> <p>Added</p> <p>p.131 Amend photo Amended</p>
LCA7	Draft LCA	Natural England Consultation Service (Jacqui Salt) 931951	Providing General Comments	<p>While we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic this Supplementary Planning Document covers is unlikely to have major impacts on the natural environment. We therefore do not wish to provide specific comments, but advise you to consider the following issues:</p> <p>Biodiversity enhancement</p>			<p><i>Comments Noted</i></p> <p><i>The Landscape Guidelines for each Type already include broad measures to enhance biodiversity of the wider landscape such as</i></p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	<i>Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)</i>
				<p>This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraphs 8, 72, 102, 118, 170, 171, 174 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p> <p>Landscape enhancement The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might makes a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p> <p>Protected species</p>			<p><i>improving ecological connectivity, use of native species, planting of hedgerows. Precise requirements for individual development will form part of the revised North Norfolk Design Guide. Policies within the emerging Local Plan will reference the requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain</i></p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	<i>Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)</i>
				<p>Natural England has produced Standing Advice to help local planning authorities assess the impact of particular developments on protected or priority species.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment A SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance here. While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p>			

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
LSA1	Draft Landscape Sensitivity Assessment	Mr Peter Terrington 1215743	Providing General Comments	<p>Whilst erosion is recognised as a threat along the cliff coastline, east of Weybourne, the DLSA does not appear to recognise the threat caused by accretion of sand along the sand dune and marsh coastline, west of Weybourne. Accretion of sand in Wells and Blakeney harbours is creating economic, recreational and environmental impacts.</p> <p>There is strong circumstantial evidence to link the increased rate of accretion of sand in Wells and Blakeney harbours with the commencement of dredging and channel Deepening at Wells and placement of dredged spoil within the marine environment. Increased accretion of sand is also contemporaneous with the development of offshore wind farms and the trenching for cable routes. Obviously natural processes play a huge part in the erosion, transport and deposition of material along the North Norfolk Coast, but little research has been carried out about the part played by human intervention. Observations since 2009 suggest that the rate of accretion of sand has greatly increased. This has had a devastating impact on the mussel fishery at Morston, resulting in the virtual closure of the fishery, putting a number of mussel fishermen out of work. Increased accretion</p>	<p>The DLSA does not appear to consider the Impacts of localised dredging channel Deepening and placement of dredged material within the marine environment. The DLSA does not appear to consider the cumulative impacts of wind farm development and cable routes within the Wider North Sea on sediment movement and the accretion of sand along the lowland coastline of North Norfolk.</p>	<p>The Landscape Sensitivity Assessment needs to recognise the impacts that increased rates of accretion are having on the Open Coastal Marshes coastline and include in its policies a commitment to work with other groups, including the SWG, to investigate the causes of this increased accretion, identify the impacts and</p>	<p><i>The LCA recognises the highly dynamic and sensitive nature of the Open Coastal Marshes and Drained Coastal Marshes Landscape Types (highlighted as Key Characteristics within each Type). This is translated across into the LSA as High Sensitivity to all of the considered development types in these areas.</i></p> <p><i>The influence of human intervention on the dynamic processes and proposals for appropriate management and mitigation is more relevant to the Marine Management Organisation</i></p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				<p>of sand in Wells and Blakeney harbours is also impacting on the offshore fishing industry and the recreational boating interests, as well as impacting on wildlife through the loss of feeding grounds. It is now necessary to regularly dredge inner harbour to keep the channel to the Quay open and around the pontoons at the Main Quay and at Tugboat Yard. Boating interests at Blakeney are seriously investigating the need to dredge Blakeney Harbour. The Wash & North Norfolk Marine Partnership (Formerly the Wash & North Norfolk EMS) has set up a Siltation Working Group to investigate the accelerated accretion of sand along the coastline and in the tidal inlets and it is forming partnerships with other bodies to try to find out why the rate of accretion has dramatically increased over recent years.</p>		<p>encourage mitigating measures to be put in place to alleviate the impacts.</p>	
LSA2	Draft Landscape Sensitivity Assessment	Norfolk Coast Partnership, Ms Gemma Clark 1217409	Supporting	<p>We are pleased to see the key qualities of natural beauty of the Norfolk Coast identified in the report. This looks to be an interesting study and the results should be cross referenced in the LCA, emerging HRA and SA.</p> <p>This will be a useful document for the Norfolk Coast Partnership to refer to on applications for renewable energy and low carbon development.</p>			<i>Comments noted</i>
LSA3	Draft Landscape	Norfolk County	Supporting	Both of these documents acknowledge the important contribution that heritage assets			<i>Comments Noted</i>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
	e Sensitivity Assessment	Council, Laura Waters 931093 (on behalf of Historic Environment Team)		and the historic landscape make to the overall character of the North Norfolk landscape. The Sensitivity Assessment pays particular attention to former airfields within the district and highlights their heritage significance. From a historic environment perspective we are supportive of the overall conclusions of the two assessments and do not have any specific comments to make on them.			
LSA4	Draft Landscape Sensitivity Assessment	Historic England Mrs Debbie Mack (Historic Environment Planning Adviser) 1215813	Providing General Comments	We welcome the production of these two related assessments. We do not have capacity to review these documents in great detail but advise that these documents form an important part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and other work going forward. It is clearly important that consideration of the historic environment is given in the preparation of the landscape character assessment and we would expect the methodology to follow current best practice.			<i>Comments noted</i>
LSA5	Draft Landscape Sensitivity Assessment	Broads Authority Natalie Beal (Planning Policy Officer) 321326	Providing General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Summary, particularly para 6, does not mention the Broads and needs to. Development outside of the Broads can impact on the Broads. 			<p><i>Executive Summary</i> <i>Add reference to the Broads being a designated landscape immediately adjacent to the District that could be impacted by renewable energy development, e.g. wind turbines.</i> Complete</p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.3 needs to mention the Broads. 2.4 says: 'the eastern end of the District also adjoins The Broads, which has the status of a National Park'. This is not quite right. The eastern end of the District is the Broads and the Broads has a status equivalent to a National Park. 			<p>1.3 Add sentence.. <i>The eastern section of the District lies within the Broads, a national landscape designation equivalent to a National Park, where the Broads Executive Authority has planning jurisdiction.</i> Added</p> <p>2.4 Amend to read.. <i>The eastern end of the District lies within the Broads, which has the status of a National Park and where the Broads Executive Authority are the planning body. For the purposes of this Assessment, only areas of the District where NNDC is the Local Planning Authority have been included.</i> Amended</p> <p>Figure 2.2 and 2.4 are just the NNDC</p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 2.2, 2.4 seems to exclude the Broads. LUC did our Broads Landscape Character Assessment and the information from that could be incorporated. To have a blank for the Broads is misleading and may cause issues as and when applications need to be considered in landscape terms near to the Broads. You could mention our LCA and refer to that rather than leaving a blank and include a link to the document. You could use a colour symbol and then provide the reference to our LCA in the legend? • 2.18 and 2.19 – needs to include the special qualities of the Broads in a similar way to the AONB section does. See b7.4 of our Local Plan. • Table 5.1 only refers to the AONB. It has an ‘out of AONB’ column. It needs to have an ‘out of Broads’ column. • Section 5 does not seem to mention the Broads and needs to. 			<p><i>Landscape Classifications. The Broads could be included as a lighter colour and the Broads LCA referenced in the key via a hyperlink</i> <i>Amended</i></p> <p><i>2.18 Add..The Authority has planning jurisdiction and has a special duty to</i> <i>Added</i> <i>Add list of defined special qualities of the Broads from the Broads Local Plan?</i> <i>Added</i></p> <p><i>NNDC is the Local Planning Authority for much of the AONB, but not for the Broads. The LSA is a tool to guide development within the NNDC planning area.</i></p> <p><i>Table 5.1 Add below table...</i></p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report needs to include parts of or cross refer to our landscape sensitivity study and it still needs to consider the setting of the Broads. Figures 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 - seems to exclude the Broads. LUC did our Broads Landscape Sensitivity Study and the information from that could be incorporated. To have a blank for the Broads is misleading and may have impacts as and when applications need to be considered in landscape terms near to the Broads. You could mention our LSS and refer to that rather than leaving a blank and include a link to the document. You 			<p><i>In the case of any of the types of development listed above, due regard should of course be given to the impact of the development on adjacent Landscape Types, both within the NNDC District and in neighbouring local authority areas.</i> Added</p> <p><i>Figures 5.1 to 5.7 should all include the Broads Authority Area, graphically and referenced in the Key</i> Added</p> <p><i>The LSA is limited to areas of the District where NNDC has planning jurisdiction.</i></p> <p><i>Maps already show the Broads Authority area</i></p>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				<p>could use a colour symbol and then provide the reference to our LCSS in the legend?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.2 needs to have a row for the Broads. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 1 could have the Broads as an area copied over from our LSS or again cross referred. 			
Add.. LSA6	Draft Landscape Sensitivity Assessment	Natural England Consultation Service 931951	Providing General Comments	<p>While we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic this Supplementary Planning Document covers is unlikely to have major impacts on the natural environment. We therefore do not wish to provide specific comments, but advise you to consider the following issues:</p> <p>Biodiversity enhancement This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraphs 8, 72, 102, 118, 170, 171, 174 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst</p>			<i>Comments noted</i>

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				<p>other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p> <p>Landscape enhancement The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p> <p>Protected species Natural England has produced Standing Advice to help local planning authorities assess the impact of particular developments on protected or priority species.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment A SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional</p>			

ID	Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Comments (as submitted)	Summary (as submitted)	Proposed Changes (as submitted)	Proposed Action (Action in bold, Comment not bold)
				<p>circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance here. While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p>			