

SAHAM TONEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PRESENTATION

SUB-SECTION 2: VILLAGER CONSULTATION COMMENTS



42 villagers submitted responses to the Reg. 14 consultation that ran from August to October 2019.

31 of those simply expressed their support for the Plan.

The other 11 made a total of 27 comments. 6 of those supported the Plan subject to their comments; 5 opposed the Plan on the basis of their comments

This presentation summarises each comment and response in a more concise form, but in doing so, of necessity omits the detailed nuances within some of the comments and responses to them.

The full and definitive set of comments and responses to them can be found in the Consultation Statement, available at www.stnp2036.org (*after submission of the Plan at Reg. 15*)

Summarised Villager Consultation Comments & Responses: 1

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Historic flood issues at the Hills Road, Page's Lane, Chequers Lane junction not taken into account (3 similar comments)	The potential flood risk of new development, including its potential impact on existing houses and land has been fully accounted for The Lead Local Flood Authority and Anglian Water assessed sites and their recommendations have been implemented Drainage policies split into 9 component parts and strengthened
Disregarded villager wishes to limit site sizes to 4-6 houses (3 similar comments)	The Plan must conform with the Local Plan. A 5-house limit in the latter was deemed unsound by its examination and removed. It was therefore necessary to also remove the limit from the Neighbourhood Plan Additionally robust site assessments and site selection processes showed larger sites to be sustainable and thus acceptable
Site allocations on Pound Hill remove opportunity to enjoy open views (4 similar comments)	Masterplanning studies looked into this. One of the conclusions of that resulted in the deletion of two sites to the east of Pound Hill, thus retaining the open aspect to that side. Masterplanning also prepared a layout for the site to the west that retains long distance views across that site
Can the Plan solve existing village flood issues?	No, but it can and does ensure new development will not add to that risk. Requirements on new sites to improve and maintain ditches forming part of a site will go some way to alleviating existing problems downstream

[Back to main presentation](#)



Summarised Villager Consultation Comments & Responses: 2

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Two sites on Richmond Road will result in unsafe access to and from them	To address various concerns related to the impact of development on village traffic and road safety, a Transport Study of all sites allocated in the Reg. 14 version of the Plan has been prepared by independent consultants. It includes indicative scale drawings of access to and from each site, and concludes such access can be safely provided in all cases
The amount of new housing proposed on Pound Hill will greatly increase traffic past the school and add to danger caused by parking outside the school	The Transport Study noted above concluded that the impact on village traffic levels of developing 83 new homes on 11 allocated sites would be “negligible”. Full details can be found in the study report, but in summary the report concludes: (a) There is no evidence that any existing road safety concerns could be exacerbated by the new development outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan; (b) The assessment demonstrates that the scale of change in two-way traffic flows, taking account of the current low volumes of traffic, is negligible in real terms, and that peak hour flows will remain low after development.
What is being done to resolve the unsightly appearance of Page’s Place?	While we sympathise and tend to agree with the concerns raised, the redevelopment of Page’s Place is an ongoing process approved by a planning application supported by Historic England. While we might wish it would happen at a quicker pace, there is nothing the Neighbourhood Plan can do to achieve that.
What will the Plan do to protect biodiversity?	(i) At planning application stage the site allocation policies require every allocated site to submit a full ecological impact assessment demonstrating any impacts remain at acceptable levels; (ii) There are specific policies in the Plan to preserve habitats and biodiversity (Policy 7D), green infrastructure (Policy 7E) and trees and hedges (Policy 7F). Where relevant these have been further strengthened following consultation



Summarised Villager Consultation Comments & Responses: 3

COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>Additional development will add to existing sewage overspill problems (3 similar comments)</p>	<p>Anglian Water assessed each site put forward for allocation in the Plan, and concluded that “Anglian Water has a statutory obligation to provide sufficient capacity for sites with the benefit of planning permission. As such this shouldn’t be viewed as an absolute constraint to additional residential development at Saham Toney.” It is further highlighted that at the time Anglian Water undertook its site assessments, sites in the area concerned had a potential capacity of 131 dwellings, whereas the number allocated in the Plan is 35.</p> <p>The problems are historic in Saham Toney and result not from lack of sewerage capacity, but the inflow of surface water to the foul sewerage system due to (the incorrect) connection of surface water drain pipes to the foul system. That is a problem neither the Neighbourhood Plan nor Anglian Water can solve: responsibility lies with those householders who allow surface water to drain into the foul system.</p> <p>It is noted that in its response to the consultation, Anglian Water raised no concerns in this respect.</p>
<p>The Plan is a high-quality document</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The Plan does not address traffic issues, especially speeding traffic in the Page’s Lane area (2 similar comments)</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address issues regarding vehicles exceeding the speed limit. Site assessment and a consultation response by the Local Highways Authority of the sites in question did raise some concern about the total number of houses in the area in question, and suggested a combined limit of 25 dwellings for sites STNP4, 5, 6 and 7. That limit has been adhered to in the Plan.</p> <p>Additionally, the Saham Toney Neighbourhood Plan Transport Study, AECOM, April 2020 demonstrates that both individually and cumulatively, the impact of all allocated sites on traffic flows in the village and on queue lengths at two key junctions, will be negligible compared to existing levels.</p>



Summarised Villager Consultation Comments & Responses: 4

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Site allocations will add to existing flood risk problems (2 similar comments)	The potential flood risk of new development, including its potential impact on existing houses and land has been fully accounted for. The Lead Local Flood Authority and Anglian Water assessed sites and their recommendations have been implemented Drainage policies split into 9 component parts and strengthened. Policies enforce a requirement for development not to lead to any increase in flood risk over the pre-development situation
Opposed to allocation of site STNP5 as it spoils the 'Key View' to Saham Mere	Site STNP5 has been removed from allocation in the Plan
Sites clustered in the Pound Hill area would impair the openness of area and village views	Sites STNP5 and 6 have been removed from allocation precisely because of their harmful landscape impact Remaining sites in the area are subject to a new masterplanning policy that includes indicative site layouts which seek to preserve openness and views
Against allowing development outside the settlement boundary	Strategic Policy HOU 04 of the emerging Breckland Local Plan specifies that new residential developments may be located "immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary". That clause was not challenged at examination. The Neighbourhood Plan must comply with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and hence also allows residential development immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary.
Potential archaeological impact of proposed sites on Pound Hill	Sites STNP5 and 6 removed from allocation in the Plan No known archaeological finds in the area Policies for remaining sites in the area updated to include the use of planning conditions to protect any archaeological finds made during site investigations

