

Appendix 1 - Schedule of Representations

Extract of Report of Representations

References to 'OFFICER SUMMARY' indicate that lengthier submissions were made and have either been summarised or separated out into relevant policy or site areas. The original representation can be viewed in full by searching the LP ref number at: <http://consult.north-norfolk.gov.uk/portal>

Policy SD13 - Pollution & Hazard Prevention and Minimisation

(Regulation 18 Reponses)

Individuals

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD13	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: 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 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. All development should have an environmental impact statement considered as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Developments that could potentially cause noise should have appropriate planning conditions attached to prevent that occurring.</p> <p>Inappropriate lighting schemes should be prevented.</p>
SD13	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP055	Support	<p>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Noise and outside light control zones must be introduced in rural areas. The increasing use of ride on mowers, strimmers and hedges means there is often a constant hum in villages! Many incomers do not feel secure unless they have outside</p>

				lights on during the night. Cars are being parked on green areas, including public footpaths. Dog noise and waste, including plastic bags, are increasing hazards. Noise and outside light control zones must be introduced in rural areas.
--	--	--	--	---

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD13)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy, important to minimise noise and light pollution. Suggest that development with unnecessary lighting should not be permitted. Noise and light control zones should be introduced in rural areas and all development should have an EIA.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Overall support for this policy, especially for minimising noise and light pollution. Suggest that development with unnecessary lighting should not be allowed, noise and light control zones should be introduced in rural areas and all development should have an EIA.
Council's Response		Support noted. EIA is a process of evaluating the likely environmental impacts of a proposed project or development. The screening provisions including thresholds are set out in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011

Parish & Town Councils

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD13	Cley Parish Council (1217592)	LP654	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Re comments on reducing light pollution, can we have this more robust, more enforceable? The council suggests developers avoid large glazed area and outside lights unless for security, how is this enforced? Can we have more areas designated as dark sky discovery sites? And how would we enforce this?	Dark skies need to meet strict criteria and be away from local light pollution.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD13)
Objection	0	Cley PC requested more areas designated as dark skies.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Statutory Bodies & Other Organisations

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
SD13	Anglian Water (1217129)	LP353	Support	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Anglian Water is generally supportive of Policy SD13. It is suggested that applicants should also demonstrate that development proposals would not be adversely affected by the normal operation of Anglian Water's	Noted: Consider feedback in the development of the policy

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
				existing assets. Proposed amendments include adding new section: Proposals for development adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, existing uses will need to demonstrate that both the ongoing use of the neighbouring site is not compromised, and that the amenity of occupiers of the new development will be satisfactory with the ongoing normal use of the neighbouring site, taking account of the criteria above'	It should be noted that this point has been picked up in Policy ENV10: Protection of Amenity.
SD13	Broads Authority (321326)	LP806	General Comments	7.101 and 7.102 and SD13 – parts of NNDC area in the Broads are good or very good dark skies as referred to in DM22 of our Local Plan and shown at Appendix I of our Local Plan . Please mention this in these sections of the Local Plan. What happens outside the Broads can affect the Broads as per 8.10. • I have not seen mention of the Horning Knackers Wood Water Recycling Centre capacity issue or mention of the Joint Position Statement.	Noted: Consider feedback in future iteration of the Plan
SD13	Environment Agency (1217223)	LP457,458	General Comments	Paragraph 7.99 It is worth noting that air quality requirements are likely to become stricter within the window of this plan and restrictions on particulate matter and NOx may need reviewing in light of those changes. It would be useful to include reference to the fact that air quality is important to the Environment and Human Health and will therefore be reviewed against any changing guidelines. Paragraph 7.100 We are pleased to see the inclusion of reference to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) here. The wording should also state that developments impacting the water environment must carry out a WFD compliance assessment in accordance with the Planning Inspectorates advice note 18. The section on WFD would also benefit from some expansion. Two requirements of WFD are that the development should not cause a deterioration and should not prevent the future 'good' target status from being achievable. The local plan needs to consider this and provide	Noted: Consider comments in the future iteration of the Plan

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
				<p>evidence that the developments within the growth areas and their associated increase in wastewater flows from WRCs will not cause a deterioration the receiving rivers or waterbodies. It would be useful for the local plan to include relevant River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) 2 baseline WFD status for these North Norfolk waterbodies to be highlighted to provide context (for example, overall ecological status, fish, water quality determinants). It is important that growth and development does not cause a deterioration in these individual statues. We would also expect to see the Habitats Directive mentioned here as this directive is especially important for North Norfolk with the close proximity of the Broads and associated sensitive SSSIs/SACs. In terms of industrial activity – it should be ensured that industrial development within an area takes into account the need to be sustainable. Any location must allow the industrial activity to be sustainable so that material flows can make the plant as efficient as possible. Where possible, the plan should encourage the use of energy efficient technology such as Combined Heat and Power (CHP) at energy intensive industries so that efficient use of fossil fuel is optimised. Wastes in the form of effluent and process wastes should be recovered into the circular economy and where possible any treatment facility should be co-located, or at least situated nearby, to minimise transport impacts of moving wastes around the country. • Policy SD 13 – Pollution & Hazard Prevention and Minimisation We are pleased to see reference to water quality within the policy. The policy should also reference the WFD and the habitats directive. Specifically, the 2 two objectives of WFD, no deterioration and improvement in status should be referenced. In relation to Major Hazard Zones, we will be asked to comment on any inappropriate development highlighted in partnership Health & Executive</p>	

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
				as part of our role as competent authority enforcing the CoMAH Regulations.	
SD13	Norfolk Coast Partnership, Ms Gemma Clark (1217409)	LP497	General Comments	<p>7.102 – We would like to see standard conditions on all applications where external light is proposed. National Planning Policy Framework Clause 125 and Norfolk County Council’s Environmental Lighting Zones Policy both recognise the importance of preserving dark landscapes and dark skies. In order to minimise light pollution, we recommend that any outdoor lights associated with proposed development should be: 1) fully shielded (enclosed in full cut-off flat glass fitments) 2) directed downwards (mounted horizontally to the ground and not tilted upwards) 3) switched on only when needed (no dusk to dawn lamps) 4) white light low-energy lamps (LED, metal halide or fluorescent) and not orange or pink sodium sources Please also refer to the Institute of Lighting Professionals, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Lights which gives guidance for lighting in an AONB.</p> <p>https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/obtrusive-light/ https://www.theilp.org.uk/resources/free-resources/ilp-guidance-notes/</p> <p>This has been nationally tested and is used as guidance for developers to reduce impact in designated areas. Dark Sky Discovery Sites – can we please ask to be particularly vigilant regarding proposed lighting within a 2km radius of any Dark Sky Discovery Site? DSDS are not statutory but they are a clear indication of the high quality dark skies, which is directly linked to the special qualities of the AONB. NNDC officers requested that they be put on a GIS layer so that planners are aware of them when assessing applications, please let us know if you are using them. No need to mention the specific Dark Sky Discovery sites specifically as hopefully we will be adding more sites over time.</p>	Support welcomed: Consider comments in the finalisation Plan and policy ENV10

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
SD13	RSPB (1217391)	LP431	General Comments	The RSPB notes that section 7.100 states "developer must strive" to meet requirements of the WFD. Water quality remains a serious issue for the Broads and other watercourses. It is important to ensure that all new development will ensure that there will be no deterioration in water quality. The policy should also ensure that new development contributes towards measures to complement action to improve water quality and make improvements. Proposed change: Remove "must strive" and state that developments will be required to WFD targets and support water quality improvements in line with net gain requirements for the environment.	Noted - consider the removal of the wording 'must strive' and state that new developments will be required to WFD targets and support water quality improvements in line with the net gain requirements for the environment.
SD13	Pigeon Land Ltd & JM & ID Clifton (1217026)	LP617	Support	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Supports the need for a Pollution and Hazard Prevention and Minimisation Policy but suggests that the Council may wish to consider providing more guidance in the Policy's justification on what an unacceptable level of impact may be, i.e. the standards, targets to be applied etc.	Support noted. Consider comments in the development of the policy.

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD13)
Objection	0	Feedback was supportive of the approach however more emphasis could be given to air quality, dark skies and further detail given around the Water Frame Directive and the Habitats Directive included especially given the close proximity to the Broad's. One representation suggested that more prescription and guidance should be considered around how the approach would be implemented and quantified e.g. what are the standards/ targets that need to be reached.
Support	2	
General Comments	4	

Alternatives

SD13	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC021	Support	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: 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 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.</p>	<p>Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD13 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).</p>
------	----------------------------	-------	---------	--	--

Policy SD14 - Transport Impact of New Development

(Regulation 18 responses)

Individuals

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD14	Carr, Mrs Elizabeth (1216730)	LP395	General Comments	<p>creating green cycle paths that do not use the roads at all would be beneficial to locals and tourists. The narrow roads without footpaths are very dangerous for inexperienced or young cyclists. As there is not much that can be done to the width of roads without knocking down heritage buildings, creating green cycle paths would be an alternative. Perhaps use the disused railway network paths?</p> <p>Alternative transport is not an option for many residents. The roads are too narrow and busy for cyclists to use when trying to get to somewhere with facilities. Carrying shopping on the bus or cycling with it from North Walsham is not easy, so cars are an essential part of the infrastructure in a rural location. Should be greater consideration for the safety of locals and tourists who wish to use environmentally friendly means of transport.</p>
SD14	Swift, Mrs Julie (1216911)	LP243	Object	<p>As a rule of thumb Highways estimate 7 car movements a day per property (often this can be far more if there are multiple cars at the property). Add to this delivery vehicles to each property (from supermarkets, online shopping, oil deliveries etc.). Even small developments can soon add a large number of extra vehicle movements a day. Rural villages like Southrepps have largely single track roads or at best narrow roads that will allow two cars to pass but not two delivery vans/lorries. Extra vehicle movements on inadequate road networks (often with no pavements) threaten both vehicle and pedestrian safety. Looking at Southrepps any developments over 1-2 infill houses will be a departure from both SD 14 and Core Strategy Policy CT5, both of which say: Development will be designed to reduce the need to travel and to maximise the use of sustainable forms of transport appropriate to its particular location. SD 14 and CT5 say Development proposals will be considered against the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The proposal provides for safe and convenient access on foot, cycle, public and private transport addressing the needs of all, including those with a disability; · the proposal is capable of being served by safe access to the highway network without detriment to the amenity or character of the

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
				<p>locality; · the expected nature and volume of traffic generated by the proposal could be accommodated by the existing road network without detriment to the amenity or character of the surrounding area or highway safety. Any development in a rural village, like Southrepps, cannot “reduce the need to travel and maximise the use of sustainable forms of transport” as there is little employment in the village, the bus service is inadequate, access to primary schools requires a car journey etc. It is not an easy area to live in without a car if you have children at school, a job, need to go shopping to a large supermarket, visit the doctors and so on. Most properties in the village have two cars or more. The recent Drurys Yard development in Southrepps containing 18 houses was given the requisite number of parking spaces seen to be applicable to the size of property. However, cars are constantly parked all down the access road as there are a lot more cars than parking spaces. Southrepps is a ‘rural’ village with working farms, both arable and livestock. Its road network comprises of mainly single-track rural lanes. Even the ‘main’ road through its centre is not capable of carrying two medium/large vans side by side. The figures on the Parish Councils website from the new SAM2 show over 60,000 vehicles a month are passing through the village (around 30,000 in each direction). The SAM2 also records that many of these vehicles are travelling in excess of 30mph. This volume of traffic has made the village roads increasingly dangerous for vehicle users, cyclists and pedestrians. Over half of the roads have no pavements or short stretches of pavement only. Elderly people, children, dog walkers, cyclists are experiencing 'near misses' on a regular basis. Every increase in traffic raises the danger levels within this village (and others like it). Developments in this village, therefore, cannot comply with the criteria above - they cannot provide for safe access; they cannot be served by safe access to the highway network without detriment to the locality; they cannot be accommodated by the existing road network without detriment to highway safety. Southrepps will see an increase in traffic with the proposed increase in development in Mundesley - as Southrepps is used as a cut through from Mundesley to the A149 and A140. This will put an intolerable strain on the road network through the village without further development in the village itself. I agree with SD 14 (and Core Strategy Policy CT5) - but at present it is being ignored by the planners.</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD14	Filby, Mr Michael, Partridge, Mrs Lois (1217056, 1217052)	LP256	Object	<p>The Policy states that: 'Development proposals will be considered against the following criteria: • Outside designated settlement boundaries, the proposal does not involve direct access on to a Principal Route, unless the type of development requires a Principal Route location.' However, paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that: 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.' The provisions of the policy do not comply with national policy in this respect; they create an additional, more prescriptive requirement which cannot be justified and is not robust. As an example, Land East of Norwich Road would be accessed via the A140, which is a principal route. The proposed access onto the A140 lies within the 30 mph speed zone, some 150m south of the roundabout junction of the A140 and the B1436, and cars would be decelerating towards the roundabout north bound, or pulling slowly up the hill away from the roundabout in a south-bound direction. We do not therefore believe that there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety of creating a new access here, or that the residual cumulative impacts would be severe. We assume that a robust highways assessment of each site nominated through the Call for Sites will be undertaken, and if, as set out in the NPPF, there would be no unacceptable impact on highway safety and no residual cumulative severe impact, sites should be given a positive rating as part of the site selection process, even if they are accessed from a principal route. The policy should be amended to comply with the provisions of the NPPF.</p>
SD14	Hurdle, Mr David (901803)	LP066	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Point 5 under policy SD14 refers to Travel Plans for non-residential. Why not for large residential? Travel still generated! the word maximise is used about sustainable travel, in 1st sentence of SD14. So why not the word minimise when referring to car use, see my comments elsewhere? Cannot find any mention of county council transport policies, nor park and ride schemes to help minimise car use in town centres. Have I missed such references? Are you planning to consult visitors, a significant proportion of the population much of the year? If so, how? How successful has previous Local Plan been? Has it achieved the outcomes expected? Need to know when preparing this new one, i.e. lessons to learn! Travel Plans should be done for large residential developments. In 2nd bullet point of 7.20 replace 'reduce' with 'minimise'.</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD14	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: 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. Development should take place in areas where there is access to facilities and employment in order to limit road use.
SD14	West, Dr Louisa (1210536)	LP058	Object	The impact of more traffic due to development around the area must be considered as a whole, not just around the new development. Residents in adjacent rural areas have increasing difficulty walking due to lack of safe routes and crossing points.
SD14	Spowage, Mr Richard (1216878)	LP329	General Comments	In future development proposals there is a need to assess level of commuting outside local area to ensure wider road infrastructure is not overloaded and ensure greenhouse gases from excessive vehicle use are minimised
SD14	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: The transport criteria against which development proposals will be considered to be essential. Regard for the amenity and character of the local area is paramount, as is a provision of a comprehensive transport assessment for North Walsham as a whole. No mention of accessibility within this policy. Hope to see strengthened wording here as all larger scale development has significant transport implications and should require a transport assessment of the type specified. like to see a requirement for accessibility to both new or existing means of transport to be demonstrated as part of this process.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD14)
Summary of Objections	4	This policy received four objections. Concerns over the adequacy of the road infrastructure to deal with cars resulting from new development. Considered extra cars could threaten both vehicle and pedestrian safety. The impact of increased traffic across the District should be considered. Suggest that Travel Plans should be required for large residential schemes. One comments that restricting direct access onto a Principal Route is in contradiction with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF and cannot be justified. There is no mention of County Council transport policies or park and ride schemes to minimise car use in town centres. Specific concerns over suitability of Southrepps to accommodate more growth.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, stipulating that development should take place in areas where there is access to facilities and employment in order to limit road use.
Summary of General Comments	3	Three general comments received. The transport criteria against which development proposals will be considered to be essential. Support for cycle routes away from roads, as narrow roads are dangerous for cyclists. Suggest these could be provided on the disused railway network. Acknowledges that cars are an essential part of the infrastructure in a rural location. There is a need to assess level of commuting outside local area to ensure wider road infrastructure is not overloaded and ensure greenhouse gases from excessive vehicle use are minimised. Regard for the amenity and character of area is paramount and the provision of a comprehensive transport assessment for North Norfolk as a whole. Like to see strengthened wording as all larger scale development has significant transport implications and require a transport assessment. Like to see a requirement for accessibility to both new and existing means of transport to be demonstrated as part of this process.
Overall Summary		Concerns over the adequacy of the road infrastructure to deal with cars resulting from new development. The impact of increased traffic across the District should be considered. Suggest that Travel Plans should be required for large residential schemes. One comments that restricting direct access onto a Principal Route is in contradiction with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF and cannot be justified. There is no mention of County Council transport policies or park and ride schemes to minimise car use in town centres. Specific concerns over suitability of Southrepps to accommodate more growth. New green cycling paths away from roads would be beneficial. Need to assess level of commuting to ensure wider road infrastructure not overloaded and minimise greenhouse gases. Suggest changes to policy as considered all development has significant transport implications and should require a transport assessment.

Council's Response	Comments noted. The primary purpose of the policy is to ensure that proposals consider safe access for all modes of access and address the transport implications of that development. Consider the suggestions of requiring Travel Plans on larger proposals in the finalisation of the policy approach.
---------------------------	---

Parish & Town Councils

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD14	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	The Principal Routes shown on the Policies Maps does not include the A149. STC believes it should because funding for buses only has to cover Principal Routes	The Identification of Principle Routes are a matter for the Highway Authority and include the A1082 into the Town.
SD14	Wells Town Council (1212319)	LP098 LP110	General Comments	The Council wishes to draw to the attention of the District Council the disappointing lessening of public transport provision in recent years and its effect on the ability of local people to find work out of town and to readily engage in further education, noting also its effect upon the increase of visitor parking of motor vehicles in the town. 21. The Council wishes to draw the attention of the District Council the urgent need to implement the Council's recent proposals in relation to parking restrictions and other traffic management.	Comments noted.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD14)
Objection	0	Consider adding A149 into Sheringham as a principle route. Concern expressed that poor public transport results in over reliance on cars and parking issues.
Support	0	

General Comments	2	
------------------	---	--

Statutory Bodies & Other Organisations

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
SD14	Natural England (1215824)	LP716	General Comments	<p>Transport Impact of New Development We would expect the Plan to address the impacts of air quality on the natural environment. In particular, it should address the traffic impacts associated with new development, particularly where this impacts on European sites and SSSIs. The environmental assessment of the Plan (SA and HRA) should also consider any detrimental impacts on the natural environment, and suggest appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures where applicable. Natural England advises that one of the main issues which should be considered in the Plan and the SA/HRA are proposals which are likely to generate additional nitrogen emissions as a result of increased traffic generation, which can be damaging to the natural environment. The effects on local roads in the vicinity of any proposed development on nearby designated nature conservation sites (including increased traffic, construction of new roads, and upgrading of existing roads), and the impacts on vulnerable sites from air quality effects on the wider road network in the area (a greater distance away from the development) can be assessed using traffic projections and the 200m distance criterion followed by local Air Quality modelling where required. We consider that the designated sites at risk from local impacts are those within 200m of a road with increased traffic¹, which feature habitats that are vulnerable to</p>	<p>Noted: Consider comments in the development of the policy. A reference to the detriment to European sites could be added to bullet 4. Air quality impacts have been ruled out in the Interim HRA, however it also concludes that future HRA work should continue to revisit this conclusion.</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
				nitrogen deposition/acidification. APIS provides a searchable database and information on pollutants and their impacts on habitats and species.	
SD14	Norfolk Coast Partnership, Ms Gemma Clark (1217409)	LP498	Support	Chapter 7 – We would be happy to work in partnership and with other partners to improve opportunities and raise awareness of public transport options.	Noted: Support welcomed
SD14	Persimmon Homes (Anglia), Mr Kian Saedi (1217416)	LP494	Object	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Persimmon Homes Anglia support the broad objectives of Policy SD 14, but object to criterion 4 of the Policy as it would place an excessively onerous test upon new developments and would exceed the standards stipulated under paragraph 109 of the NPPF. The criterion should align with the requirements of the NPPF, which states that “development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.” As such, it is suggested that criterion 4 is revised to require avoiding 'significant' detriment to the amenity or character of the surrounding area or highway safety. In addition, Persimmon Homes (Anglia) suggest that criterion 2 should be revised in a similar way, to read as “the proposal is capable of being served by safe access to the highway network without 'significant' detriment to the amenity or character of the locality”.	Noted, disagree - consider comments in the development of the policy. For information: Policy SD14 relates to the Transport Impact of New Development, where development proposals would be assessed against 5 criterion. Point 2 states 'the proposal is capable of being served by safe access to the highway network without detriment to the amenity or character of the locality. Point 4 states that 'the expected nature and volume of traffic generated

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
					<p>by the proposal could be accommodated by the existing road network without detriment to the amenity or character of the surrounding area or highway safety.' Para. 109 is quoted from the NPPF, which relates to the prevention or refusal of development on highway grounds in relation to an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residential cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Para. 109 refers to an unacceptable impact and not a 'significant' impact on highway safety and therefore, it is considers that the Policy wording accords with para. 109 in this regard.</p>
SD14	Pigeon Land Ltd & JM & ID	LP618	Support	<p>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Supports the Transport Policy’s main aims and principles of increasing</p>	Support noted. Consider comments in the

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
	Clifton (1217026)			<p>sustainable transport modes; and increasing travel choice. However, that the Council may wish to consider whether elements of the Policy go beyond what is expected by the NPPF without sufficient justification. The NPPF (section 109) states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The Plan's Policy as drafted would suggest that development proposals will be judged on the impact access and traffic may have on the 'amenity or character of an area', as well as highway safety and network capacity. Whilst it is accepted that they may be important considerations, it is suggested that the Council may wish to reconsider the Policy so that it is restricted to issues of highway safety and capacity of the road network, and be written in a way that, in terms of traffic impacts, development would be allowed unless there was a demonstrable adverse impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impact on the road network is judged as severe. The written justification could usefully advise on what may be considered a severe impact in North Norfolk.</p>	<p>development of the policy. For information: Policy SD14 relates to the Transport Impact of New Development, where development proposals would be assessed against 5 criterion. Point 2 states 'the proposal is capable of being served by safe access to the highway network without detriment to the amenity or character of the locality. Point 4 states that 'the expected nature and volume of traffic generated by the proposal could be accommodated by the existing road network without detriment to the amenity or character of the surrounding area or highway safety.' Para. 109 is quoted from the NPPF, which relates to the prevention or refusal of development on highway</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
					grounds in relation to an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residential cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Para. 109 refers to an unacceptable impact and not a 'significant' impact on highway safety and therefore, it is considered that the Policy wording accords with para. 109 in this regard.
SD14	Duchy of Cornwall, Mr Nick Pollock (931132)	LP328	Support	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Supported and is conducive to good place-making. The policy should be consistent with NPPF paragraph 104 to achieve soundness.	Support noted.

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD14)
Objection	1	Feedback was supportive of the approach and general principles however more emphasis could be given around how the impacts of air quality could be addressed through this policy. Criteria 4 was objected to as onerous and above that required
Support	3	

General Comments	1	through national policy. Further consideration of Para 104 of the NPPF which promotes high quality walking and cycle parking and the recognition of other forms of transport network was promoted for the Council's consideration.
-------------------------	---	--

Alternatives

SD14	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC022	Support	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</p> <p>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.</p>	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD14 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
------	-------------------------------	-------	---------	--	---

Policy SD15 - Parking Provision

(Regulation 18 responses)

Individuals

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD15	Hurdle, Mr David (901803)	LP067 LP068	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: As well as cycle parking in new developments should there not be a policy of simply providing cycle parking in town centres? why not simply ensure provision of cycle parking in town centres, whether development or not?
SD15	Hurdle, Mr David (901803)	LP069 LP064	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Does the proportion reflect that north Norfolk is the UK's third highest for people aged 65+? Can this specific question please be addressed? My experience is that there is insufficient such parking. And many visitors are blue badge drivers also.
SD15	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Agree. 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. Parking on rural roads in villages should be discouraged.
SD15	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP219	Object	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Policy needs to reflect a differential between rural development and urban development. NPPF Section 9, para 105 a-e allows for a differential. To have the same parking standard in Sheringham/Cromer as in a rural village such as Southrepps does not make sense due to the lack of availability of sustainable transport. consider increase that parking standard for 3/4 bed house in rural locations to reflect NPPF considerations and local evidence

SD15	Hall, Mr Stephen (1215856)	LP218	Object	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: The current parking standards (Appendix 1) are based on evidence from over 10 years ago and need updating. NPPF para. 105 (a-e) deals with local parking standards and clearly states what should be taken into consideration. To have the same standards for parking in Cromer/Sheringham as in growth villages such as Southrepps does not make sense. Due to the lack of public and sustainable transport options para 105 c (NPPF) there is a higher requirement for private cars. To have a parking standard of 2 spaces for a 2 or 3 bed house including the garage does not make sense. Many of the houses now built have small gardens and therefore the garage is used for storage. A 3 bed house then only has one parking space with the potential for 3 or more cars requiring parking, leading to parking on the roads but more often on pavements. The Council should also adopt a policy of not allowing conversion of garages if it reduces the parking below standard requirement. Outside of the main towns which are served with good transport links the parking standard should be increased for a 3 and 4 bed properties. To adopt a policy to stop garage conversion if it means that the parking provision falls below the required current standard</p>
SD15	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Parking Provision In our experience, adequate and well designed parking is essential to a harmonious community. We would hope to see this policy upheld and implemented.</p>

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD15)
Summary of Objections	2	Objections suggest that there should be a differential between development in rural areas and urban areas in line with paragraph 105 in the NPPF.

Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy, illustrates the importance of providing off-street parking. Existing issues with narrow roads falling short of current design standards making access difficult for residents and emergency vehicles in particular.
Summary of General Comments	3	Three general comments received, calls for increased levels of cycle parking in town centres and more well designed car parking is essential for the community. To include blue badge parking.
Overall Summary		The representations on the policy dealing with parking, call for increased levels of car and cycle parking. To ensure that parking is adequate and well designed and includes blue badge parking. Highlights safety issues relating to cars parking on narrow roads and access roads and reflect the different reliance on cars between urban and rural areas
Council's Response		Noted. 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.

Parish & Town Councils

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD15	Sheringham Town Council (1217426)	LP548	General Comments	The final paragraph of SD15 states that development proposals that would result in the loss of designated car parks identified on the Policies Map will not be permitted. STC believes this proposed policy is pertinent to the redevelopment of the Shannocks Hotel in Sheringham because the NNDC proposed CPO and redevelopment plan proposes to develop the car park. STC would like to see the CPO instigated but would also like to see an element of public car parking retained.	Comments noted: CPO's are not a matter for the Local Plan.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD15)
Objection	0	Support expressed for the retention of designated car parks.
Support	0	
General Comments	1	

Statutory Bodies & Other Organisations

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
SD15	Norfolk Coast Partnership, Ms Gemma Clark (1217409)	LP499	Support	7.112 – Mitigation of impacts is needed in regards to lighting and signage in car parks in the AONB. See our comments for 7.102 (SD13) – same guidance applies	Support welcomed
SD15	Duchy of Cornwall, Mr Nick Pollock (931132)	LP328	Support	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Policy SD15 requires new development to provide adequate vehicle parking to serve the needs of the development. The starting point for provision should be the Council’s parking standards. However, local conditions such as availability of local public transport should be considered. This is consistent with NPPF paragraph 105. Supports the flexibility of the policy, as each development site has individual characteristics regarding connectivity and local sustainable transport opportunities.	Support noted. Consider amendment to policy SD15 in the preparation of the policy

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD15)
Objection	0	Limited comments were received on this policy. Both representations were supportive. The further consideration of the potential impacts of external lighting was supportive as was the requirement to remain flexible on parking provision in line with site specific characteristics and sustainable transport considerations.
Support	2	
General Comments	0	

Alternatives

SD15	Mr Hall (1215856)	AC054	Object	<p>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</p> <p>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.</p>	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	<p>OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</p> <p>Partially supports assessment SD15. Parking on rural roads in villages should be discouraged. Narrow roads which fall short of</p>	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD15 made

			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.	against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
--	--	--	--	--

Policy SD16 - Electric Vehicle Charging

(Regulation 18 responses)

Individuals

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD16	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: 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 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.
SD16	Rose, Mr Alan (1217227)	LP580	General Comments	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: With the rise of electric cars, it is important that more electric charging points for vehicles are installed.

SD16	Brooks, Mr David (1217039)	LP251	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: What infrastructure is being planned in order to provide charging points for electric vehicles in the anticipation of transition from petrol and diesel transport modes. There appears to be a considerable lack of this facility in the North Norfolk area.
SD16	Adams (1215905)	LP590	Support	Every new dwelling must be provided with a private parking space on the plot associated with the dwelling with access to a secure and safe charging point
SD16	Green, Mr Stephen (1218541)	LP770	General Comments	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: New homes must all have one active standard charge-point for electric vehicles.
SD16	Members for North Walsham Gay, Cllr Virginia (1218492)	LP802	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: We recognise the need for vehicle charging points within proposals for development of all kinds and we welcome this policy. What we would like to see is the removal of the phrase where practical from the first line of the policy.
SD16	Dixon, Cllr Nigel (1218612)	LP738	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Should ensure electric vehicle charging infrastructure for public car park use (and to incentivise businesses to do the same) as well as points for new homes.

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD16)
Summary of Objections	0	None received
Summary of Supports	2	Two support this policy, suggest that every new dwelling should be provided with a private parking space with access to a charging point. One doesn't consider electric vehicles as the solution for reducing traffic pollution and carbon dioxide emissions

		as it is just moving the point at which the Co2 is being generated to a central power station. Have to reduce traffic to reduce pollution.
Summary of General Comments	5	Five general comments received. Support for the provision of electric charging points for homes and public car parks but concerns with how these will be delivered with the lack of existing infrastructure in place. Suggest changes to remove the phrase where practical from the first line of the policy.
Overall Summary		Overall support for the provision of electric charging points, but concerns with how this will be delivered. Suggest change to wording to remove the phrase where practical from the first line of the policy.
Council's Response		Support noted. The provision of charging points reflects the move to providing the required infrastructure to support the wider role out of electric vehicles and the move to a lower carbon economy by 2040. The UK power generation as a whole is moving to a lower reliance on fossil fuel generation. The provision for such infrastructure is included in the Plan under SD16

Parish & Town Councils

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD16	North Walsham Town Council (1218408)	LP730	Object	Town Council supports the NNDC commitment to meeting the 'climate emergency' and believes that the draft design guidelines need to be amended as below. The provision of charging points by developers in domestic driveways is excellent, but this should be extended to communal parking areas as well, with active charging points provided. (rather than passive)	Support for policy and additional active charging points in communal areas noted and welcomed.

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD16)
Objection	1	Principle supported but policy should be amended to include requirement for active provision in communal areas.

Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Statutory Bodies & Other Organisations

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
SD16	Broads Authority (321326)	LP806	General Comments	Could electric charging points be lit? Boat electric points tend to be. If they are lit, this could add to light pollution.	Noted: Consider clarification in future iteration of the Plan
SD16	Hopkins Homes (Mr Alex Munro, Armstrong Rigg Planning (1218489, 1218491)	LP803	General Comments	Our client is generally supportive of the inclusion of electric vehicle (EV) charging points as part of new residential development proposals. It is, however, important to ensure that the policy lends itself to levels of EV parking provision that is both proportionate and practical in respect of both delivery and management.	Noted Consider comments in the finalisation of the policy: It is recognised that the challenge for the Local Plan is to take a proactive approach to the development and use of land to contribute to mitigation and adaptation to climate change in a way that contributes positively to meeting local, national and international climate change challenges and commitments.

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
SD16	Blakeney Hotel (Mr John Long, John Long Planning Ltd) (1216065 & 1216646)	LP228	Support	<p>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</p> <p>Blakeney Hotel supports Policy SD16’s aims and is keen to provide additional electric vehicle charging points at the Hotel. However, the Hotel has concerns over the potential costs that would be incurred in providing the capacity in the electricity supply and distribution network needed to provide such charging points, which may be prohibitive. The Hotel requests that the policy is amended to only require the provision of electric charging points where it is technically feasible and financially viable to do so, taking into account the cost of electricity infrastructure reinforcement and upgrades. The Hotel note that the Policy includes provision for an ‘in lieu’ payment to be made, but there is no indication of what the level of contribution would be; or how it would be calculated. Blakeney Hotel therefore also requests that the Plan includes more detail on the level of contribution and/or how it would be calculated.</p>	<p>Support noted. Climate Change is recognised as an important consideration to the Council and further consideration will be given through the finalisation of policies. It is recognised that the challenge for the Local Plan is to take a proactive approach to the development and use of land to contribute to mitigation and adaptation to climate change in a way that contributes positively to meeting local, national and international climate change challenges and commitments. As such the emerging Local Plan incorporates climate change at its heart and seeks to addresses a wide spectrum of matters from adaptation and improved resilience through a number of standalone and integrated policies and</p>

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
					proposals which must be taken as a whole. 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
SD16	Larkfleet Homes, Miss Charlotte Dew (1217517)	LP681	General Comments	<p>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY:</p> <p>Larkfleet provide general comments on Policy SD16 as follows:</p> <p>There is a cost to this in terms of the network within the parameters of a housing development , but the network outside of the site and generating capacity will also need to be sorted and at the moment this seems unlikely to happen. Providing electrical chargers on every home is not realistic as not every household will have an electric car for many years to come and by the time a significant proportion do so, the technology will have advanced so much that plugging a car in to charge will be redundant. In the long term, with autonomous vehicles the need for parking at home is questionable and this could fundamentally change the urban design of future developments, freeing up significant amounts of land which would otherwise be used for the storage of vehicles.</p>	Noted. Climate Change is recognised as an important consideration to the Council and further consideration will be given through the finalisation of policies. It is recognised that the challenge for the Local Plan is to take a proactive approach to the development and use of land to contribute to mitigation and adaptation to climate change in a way that contributes positively to meeting local, national and international climate change challenges and

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
					<p>commitments. As such the emerging Local Plan incorporates climate change at its heart and seeks to addresses a wide spectrum of matters from adaptation and improved resilience through a number of standalone and integrated policies and proposals which must be taken as a whole. 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. These issues have been taken into account and will continue to be taken into account through iterative dialogue in the finalisation of the Local Plan</p>
SD16	Persimmon Homes (Anglia),	LP495	Support	<p>OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Persimmon Homes (Anglia) recognise the environmental importance of</p>	Noted, Consider comments in the development the

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
	Mr Kian Saedi (1217416)			ensuring that all new cars are zero carbon by 2040 and share the Government's ambition to achieve this target. However, Persimmon Homes (Anglia) emphasise the need for Policy SD16 to be informed through consultation with UKPN to ensure that the provisions of the policy are achievable and the network has capacity to accommodate the associated increase in domestic electricity demand that would result from the policy.	policy approach. The Local Plan supports the transition to a low carbon future.
SD16	Pigeon Land Ltd & JM & ID Clifton (1217026)	LP619	Support	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Supports the ambition to ensure all new residential developments have access to electric charging points; and accept that it will become a customer expectation. However, the Council may wish to consider a change to the Policy to acknowledge that the provision should be subject to technical feasibility, for instance, by taking account of the additional loading necessary to deliver the requirement and the available capacity of local electricity infrastructure.	Support noted. Consider comments in the development of the policy.
SD16	Norfolk Homes Ltd / Norfolk Land Ltd, Mr A Presslee (1216619 1216614)	LP315	General Comments	The implementation of a policy promoting the provision of electric vehicle charging in new development is to be welcomed. Norfolk Homes has already started to make provision for electric charging points in the garages of new schemes (detached homes); such provision more widely for private drives/garages ought not to present any general difficulties. It is less easy in the absence of a garage, however, and we raise concerns about how the management of communal charging points will operate in practise. In the cases where affordable houses are grouped and controlled by an RSL, then this is more easily managed. The policy suggests that "passive charging points ... should be made available to all residents in accordance with a management agreement." In theory this could be done via a management company but is open to criticism from	Support noted. Consider comments in the future iteration of the Plan.

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
				<p>those residents who do not charge cars having to subsidise those that do. This is a Common Pool Resource (CPR), where a resource benefits a group of people - in this case car charger users - but provides reduced benefits to everyone else. The non-users still need to pay into the scheme/maintenance of the charging ports. The policy notes: "For major developments, details of how the required electric vehicle charging points will be allocated, located and managed should be included within the relevant Transport Assessment or Transport Statement. The management of the charging points, including the mechanism/procedure for taking payments, will be the responsibility of the developer/occupier". Does this mean the statutory definition of 'major development', as Transport Assessments/Statements will not necessarily be required for all such? If the provision for communal spaces is to be passive" (see definition at footnote of the policy) how is the management and the taking of payments to be the responsibility of the developer, including when the developer has completed and sold the development? We emphasise support for the principle of electric vehicle charging provision but believe that further thought needs to be given to the issue of active/passive provision, and to the subsequent management/payment processes (avoiding superfluous/onerous expectations on the developer post provision). For further note/consideration: the reference in paragraph 7.120 to the use of street light columns to accommodate charging points is somewhat at odds with the trend of reducing street lighting. Depending upon design, such might encourage on-street parking and may require estate roads to be widened to accommodate cars parked on the road to charge. Possible amendments required to clarify meaning/intent</p>	

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
SD16	Duchy of Cornwall, Mr Nick Pollock (931132)	LP328	Support	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: Supports facilitating the use of new, sustainable technologies such as electric vehicles.	Support noted.

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD16)
Objection	0	Responses were generally supportive of the inclusion of electric vehicle (EV) charging points as part of new residential development proposals, highlighting the important to ensure that the policy lends itself to levels of EV parking provision that is both proportionate and practical in respect of both delivery, technically and practical and management. Some responses raised concerns around the potential costs associated with the required infrastructure around existing locations and expansion of parking and sought clarity on the levels of any in lieu payment allowed. House developers confirmed willingness to support the approach , (much of which is in the general direction of national policy) especially where private garages are concerned but raised delivery and maintenance issues around communal parking areas and suggested that further thought needs to be given in the finalisation of the policy to the issue of active/passive provision, and to the subsequent management/payment processes (avoiding superfluous/onerous expectations on the developer post provision).
Support	4	
General Comments	4	

Alternatives

SD16	Mr & Mrs Johnson (1215700)	AC024	General Comments	OFFICER SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: 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	Comments noted: This comment repeats the support SD16 made against the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1).
------	----------------------------	-------	------------------	--	---

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

Policy SD17 - Safeguarding Land for Sustainable Transport

(Regulation 18 responses)

Individuals

Draft Policy	Name & Consultee ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Individuals)
SD17	Walker, Mrs Kerry (1217345)	LP331 LP631	Object	Hoveton is omitted from the list of settlements where land should be safeguarded for Sustainable Transport use.
SD17	Johnson, Mr & Mrs (1215700)	LP139	Support	Agree

SD17	Ringer, Mr Callum (1218562)	LP772	Object	OFFICERS SUMMARY – SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FULL SUMMARY: NNDC needs to be more pro-active in encouraging the re-building of the rail link in to Fakenham and also into Holt and the extension on the bittern line to serve this town, especially as it is an identified growth town. Safeguarding the track bed alone is not particularly visionary and the council should be more pro-active.
------	-----------------------------	-------	--------	---

Individuals	Number Received	Summary of Responses (Policy SD17)
Summary of Objections	2	This policy received two objections. Would like to see the rail link to Fakenham and Holt reintroduced and Hoveton included in the policy list where land will be safeguarded for Sustainable Transport use.
Summary of Supports	1	One supports this policy.
Summary of General Comments	0	None received
Overall Summary		Overall support for this policy. Would like to see the rail link to Fakenham and Holt reintroduced and Hoveton included in the policy list where land will be safeguarded for Sustainable Transport use.
Council's Response		The first part of the policy already provides an appropriate response for the safeguarding of track beds in the suggested locations.

Parish & Town Councils

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Parish & Town Councils)	Council's Response
SD17	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A

Parish & Town Councils	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD17)
Objection	0	No comments received.
Support	0	
General Comments	0	

Statutory Bodies & Other Organisations

Draft Policy	Name & Comment ID	Ref	Nature of Response	Summary of Comments (Statutory Consultees & Other Organisations)	Council's Response
SD17	Natural England (1215824)	LP717	Support	Safeguarding Land for Sustainable Transport We support the safeguarding of disused railway routes and the use of these routes as sustainable transport links and facilities. We also highlight the potential of these routes as footpaths, cycle ways and bridle ways as an option for improving GI, biodiversity networks and connectivity. We recommend direct communication with King's Lynn Borough Council where routes cross boundaries.	Support welcomed
SD17	Wells & Walsingham	LP579	Support	WWLR comments on Local Plan Wells and Walsingham Light Railway (WWLR) is a unique tourist attraction in Wells, and has operated now for 37 years. It is entirely	Comments noted consider

	Railway, Mrs Jo Meakin (1217469)		<p>self-financing and makes no call on public funds. For over eight months of the year it provides daily scheduled public transport between Wells, Warham, Wighton and Walsingham; offering up to five return trips per day at the height of season. It is a local employer, brings tourists to Wells and Walsingham and spends the majority of its money in Wells or nearby. The primary, secondary and tertiary benefits of the railway are not insignificant to the local tourist economy and infrastructure. In our view it offers potential relief to traffic congestion in peak season by serving as a park and ride service for day trippers. Visitors to Wells could park in Walsingham and complete the last four miles of their journey by train. There is scope to increase car parking beside the coach park at the old goods shed in Walsingham. Additionally, a large overflow car park at our Wells terminus on the Stiffkey Road offers short-term relief at the height of season with potential for pay to park spaces with a 15-20 minute walk to the harbour. The original station, on Polka Road, is now a pottery and bookshop. The former trackbed to it has been partly built on in Maryland, but there is also a trackbed to East Quay, which is currently designated a byway open to all traffic. It could serve as an excellent arrival point for pedestrians using the railway as a park and ride. In other coastal resorts, such as St Ives in Cornwall, the branch line railway serves as a park and ride in high season, allowing many more visitors to reach the town than could be provided with car parking spaces. The WWLR requests that no building takes place on any of the former railway routes in Wells, to keep these open for eventual park and ride services, which the railway looks forward to operating.</p>	comments in the finalisation of policy SD17
--	----------------------------------	--	---	---

Statutory & Organisations	Number Received	Combined Summary of Responses (Policy SD17)
Objection	0	
Support	2	

General Comments	0	Limited comments were received on this policy. The safeguarding of sustainable transport routes was supported highlighting the potential for footpaths and Green infrastructure. The addition of Wells next the Sea and in particular land at Wells & Walsingham railway was put forward for consideration as a further location to protect.
-------------------------	---	--

Alternatives

SD17	N/A	N/A	N/A	No comments received.	N/A
------	-----	-----	-----	-----------------------	-----