

SAHAM TONEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PRESENTATION SUITE

SLIDESHOW 04 - CONSULTATION COMMENTS & RESPONSES



This presentation summarises the comments received during the Regulation 14 consultation that ran from August to October 2019, and the responses to them

TABLE OF CONTENTS – PART 2: GENERAL POST-CONSULTATION UPDATE

Overall summary of comments received



Breckland Council comments' classification



Main responses to Breckland Council concerns
(includes link to more detail)



Villagers' comments classification



Main responses to villagers' concerns



Norfolk County Council comments



Main responses to County Council concerns



Objections from site owners



Main responses to site owner objections



Comments from other organisations



Main responses to organisations' concerns



Click on the buttons to navigate to any section without viewing the entire presentation 

Click on the blue home button to return to this contents list from any page



Links to other presentations



THE PLAN'S GUIDING
PRINCIPLES

UPDATED POLICY
SUMMARIES

PLAN TIMELINE & FUNDING

REMAINING STEPS

POST-CONSULTATION
STUDIES



BRECKLAND COUNCIL: 88 COMMENTS

- Mostly minor, logical or needing a little clarification – generally accepted
- Disputed any that would weaken the Plan, such as no strict limit on number and no phasing of new houses, and presented more evidence to persuade Council to withdraw those

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

- Comments on infrastructure, highways, flood risk and heritage issues
- Mostly helpful and accepted
- Some highways comments disputed

PARISHIONERS: 42 RESPONDED; 11 OF THOSE MADE 27 COMMENTS

- 31 supported the Plan without comment
- 6 others supported the Plan, subject to their comments
- 5 others did not support the Plan and gave their reasons in comments

OTHER ORGANISATIONS: 121 CONSULTED; 10 RESPONDED; 6 WITH COMMENTS

- Mostly not significant
- Comments from the agent of the owners of sites STNP4-7 seeking more houses

88 COMMENTS FROM BRECKLAND COUNCIL

Format, clarifications, cross-references, observations, inconsistencies 44 comments	Minor policy rewording 15 comments	Landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) not justified 7 comments
Site specific details 5 comments	Revise design policy to be more Saham-specific 5 comments	Additional evidence required 4 comments
Phasing of development & limit on housing numbers 4 comments	Policies over-prescriptive or restrictive 3 comments	Reduce area of gap to Watton 1 comment

[Click for more details](#)



MAIN RESPONSES TO BRECKLAND COUNCIL CONCERNS



Formatting, cross-references etc:

- Maps enlarged and made clearer throughout;
- Plan glossary added;
- Necessary clarifications provided in a meeting with the Council, October 2019

Revised policy wording discussed, agreed and incorporated without change to policy intent

LVIA requirement agreed to be substituted by LVA (Landscape and Visual Appraisal) 

Site specific details confirmed or amended as applicable

Design policy and village design guide rewritten. Guiding principles for design added as an appendix to the Plan 

Additional evidence provided where requested

Justification to maintain phasing of development and limit on overall housing allocations provided and agreed 

Rural gap area slightly reduced 

[Click for more details](#)



27 COMMENTS FROM 11 VILLAGERS

Flood risk 6 comments	Site size & density 4 comments	Sewage overspill risk 3 comments
Impact on key views and openness 3 comments	Maintain open aspect from village walk routes 2 comments	Highway safety & vehicle speed 2 comments
Supporting the Plan 2 comments	Improve Page's Place appearance 1 comment	Biodiversity surveys 1 comment
Development outside settlement boundary 1 comment	Loss of land - Undeveloped - Agricultural 1 comment	Typographical error 1 comment

[Click for more details](#)



LINK INACTIVE



MAIN RESPONSES TO VILLAGER CONCERNS

Single flood risk policy split into 9 component parts giving much greater detail of measures to avoid increasing flood risk to existing properties, with new requirements for:

- Surface water runoff rate and volume;
- Infiltration testing;
- Management and maintenance of drainage systems;
- Resilience of drainage systems in events exceeding the extreme design case;
- Design of drainage systems; and additionally
- Further recommendations of the Lead Local Flood Authority incorporated

Masterplanning studies undertaken for the group of sites of concern

Professional landscape review undertaken of the group of sites of concern

Transport study undertaken for all allocated sites

Strategic Environmental and Habitats Regulations Assessments of the Plan

Biodiversity policy strengthened

Sites STNP5 and 6 (Pound Hill east and Page's Lane) removed from allocation

[Click for more details](#)



NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Highways Comments to each of 11 allocated sites: ➤ Objections to 7: • 5 unless safe site access is demonstrated • 3 due to lack of footways to Parker's school ➤ Limits to maximum number of houses on sites STNP4-7	Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) 2 comments, about: ➤ Points to include in policy ➤ Flood risk assessments of sites
Infrastructure 2 comments, about: ➤ Developer contributions; ➤ Use of sprinklers	Heritage Comments to each of 11 allocated sites: ➤ 1 acceptable ➤ 10 need more justification

[Click for more details](#)

Work in progress



LINK INACTIVE



MAIN RESPONSES TO NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL CONCERNS

Highways concerns:

- Transport study demonstrated safe access to and from all sites can be achieved; 
- Evidence as to why lack of footways to the school should not prevent sites being allocated; 
- Restriction on overall total number of houses on sites in question 

Lead Local Flood Authority comments:

- Surface water drainage policies updated and expanded to include all LLFA recommendations (except where already in Local Plan or NPPF);
- Sites robustly assessed for flood risk (by the LLFA)

Infrastructure comments:

- Developer contributions covered by the Local Plan;
- Requirement for sprinklers specified in design policy

Heritage comments:

- Confirmed there are no known archaeological remains on allocated sites;
- Proposal to apply planning conditions to apply to sites if any archaeological finds are made during site investigations

OBJECTIONS FROM OWNERS OF SITES STNP4-7

Site densities too low: Proposed to roughly double them	Number of houses: Proposed to increase from 38 to 62 houses	Phasing of development: All sites to be developed over a single period rather than over entire Plan period
Some planning document requirements too onerous: Traffic impact studies; Landscape impact assessments	Single storey house limit on Pound Hill east: Proposed 1 ½ & 2 storey	Requirements to protect the view to Saham Mere: Disputed that there would be impact



MAIN RESPONSES TO SITE STNP4-7 OWNER OBJECTIONS

Site densities:

- In accordance with NPPF and Landscape Character Assessment, therefore justified;
- Reasoning behind objection flawed

Number of houses:

- Justified by a rigorous process of site assessment and selection;
- Further supported by masterplanning studies and landscape assessment

Phasing of development:

- Village infrastructure inadequate for condensed development timeframe

Single-storey limit:

- Flawed objection – no such limit was stated in the Plan

View towards the Mere:

- Requirements supported by the Landscape Character Assessment and Masterplanning

Documents required with planning application:

- Deleted need for traffic impact studies on the basis of the overall transport study findings;
- 'Softened' landscape assessment requirements



MAIN COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Anglian Water ➤ Utility infrastructure in the rural gap ➤ Support for drainage policy	Historic England ➤ No specific comments ➤ Reference to their guidance notes	Gladman Developments ➤ Housing mix not flexible ➤ Design policy too restrictive
Natural England; National Grid; Highways England ➤ No comments	Norfolk Police ➤ Crime prevention through design ➤ Developer contributions to reduce crime	Sport England ➤ Reference to their guidance

ANOTHER 111 ORGANISATIONS DID NOT RESPOND



RESPONSES TO COMMENTS OF ORGANISATIONS



Anglian Water:

- Essential utility infrastructure permitted in the Rural Gap

Historic England:

- Guidance was already reflected in the heritage policy which had been written with the help of Historic England

Norfolk Police:

- Developer contributions covered by the Local Plan
- Noted that Police initiative 'Secured by Design' was already referred to in the design policy

Sport England:

- Noted that comments were mainly generic, rather than specific to the Plan;
- Added reference to their guidance in policy supporting text

Gladman Developments:

- Comments refuted and not acted upon

