

SAHAM TONEY
NEIGHBOURHOOD
DEVELOPMENT PLAN

2018 - 2036



REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION (MARCH
2018) CONSULTATION REPRESENTATIONS

VOLUME 3: FROM SAHAM TONEY
PARISHIONERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. REPRESENTATIONS BY SAHAM TONEY PARISHIONERS	3
2. REPRESENTATIONS BY OTHERS	18

1. REPRESENTATIONS BY SAHAM TONEY PARISHIONERS

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 1 Comment 1	DATE: 10th April 2018
Would like to see no more loss of road frontage except for access to estate development	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 3(?)	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Comment does not appear to relate specifically to any wording in the Plan or its supporting documents	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 1 Comment 2	DATE: 10th April 2018
REPRESENTATION: Do not support 20mph restriction	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 7, Parish Action Point 1	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted. Before adoption Parish Action Points are a matter for the Parish Council to review in consultation with parishioners and others before determining what actions, if any, should be taken.	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: It was made clearer in the Parish Action Points set out are subject to further review, study and consultation by the Parish Council before implementation. Parish Action Points were subsequently and formally handed over to the Parish Council for implementation and no longer form part of the Neighbourhood Plan.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 2 Comment 3	DATE: April 2018
REPRESENTATION: This being a country village it doesn't have sufficient infrastructure to support large development	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 2A / Evidence Base Volume 1 / General	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted. Comment accords with the Plan	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 3 Comment 4	DATE: 2 April 2018
REPRESENTATION: I value the dark skies from the absence of street lights.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policies 3 and 4C	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted. Comment accords with the Plan	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 3 Comment 5	DATE: 2 April 2018
REPRESENTATION: I particularly value the view from Pound Hill to the Mere and suspect that it is of archaeological significance.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 7B	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): The respondent refers to Communal View CV1, which is protected under Policy 7B. Support noted	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 4 Comment 6	DATE: April 2018
REPRESENTATION: The village is very much a rural location and does not support massive developments, as the amenities, highways are unable and insufficient to cope	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 5.1 / Policy 2A / Evidence Base Volume 1 / General	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted. Comment accords with the Plan	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 5 Comment 7	DATE: 10 April 2018
REPRESENTATION: I see that once again the village boundary line on Ovington Road excludes the last two road side houses on Ovington Road. I have tried unsuccessfully in the past to get an explanation for this exclusion, the reasons for it and the significance of it. I have never been able to find out why these two properties, so obviously a part of the ribbon of development along Ovington Road are always excluded. My property is Cranford House, the last village house with road frontage on Ovington Road. Our garden already has planning permission for development and this, along with Brick Kiln Cottage, will make three houses excluded by the boundary line, for no apparent reason and for no known effect. In the absence of any reason why it should be excluded, I wish for my property to be included within the village boundary line. If you are the wrong person to contact, I would be grateful if you could forward this email to the correct authority. I would also be grateful for a name and contact details of that authority.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 1	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Although Policy 1 refers to the settlement boundary map for Saham Toney, control of that boundary is the responsibility of Breckland Council and cannot be amended by the Neighbourhood Plan. The respondent has been put in touch with Breckland Council	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 6 Comment 8	DATE: 18th March 2018
REPRESENTATION: Your leaflet shows the Settlement Boundary thumbnail but I cannot find a dedicated PDF on the website only map 10, a ST policy map (overall) which distorts when zoomed in to find my property. Please add a dedicated PDF.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Regulation 14 Consultation publicity leaflet	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): The respondent was sent a link to the required map on the website for the Plan	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 6 Comment 9	DATE: 18th March 2018
REPRESENTATION: Policy 2A.2.2 states that "An appropriate level of services, facilities and infrastructure is in place or provided to serve the development: Perhaps this statement is not in the old plan but having being forcibly removed from Watton Surgery to Shipdham Surgery because of lack of spaces at the Dr's I feel this statement needs to carry much more weight in planning terms. I feel the word "appropriate" should be defined, for instance a maximum fixed number of residents to the number of Dr's, or "a minimum fibre speed to the development", or "footpaths be provided to and from the development connecting to the nearest existing footpath", or "There shall be a gas main provided to the development". I am sure the committee can think of some more.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 2A / Section 7	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): It would be impossible for a Neighbourhood Plan to quantify criteria as suggested. Additionally, policies cannot address provision of healthcare or footpaths; these are dealt with to the extent practical in Section 7	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 6 Comment 10	DATE: 18th March 2018
REPRESENTATION: Policy 2A.2.3.3.1 states: Improving the ratio of one and two-bedroomed dwellings in the Neighbourhood Area to three, four and five bed-roomed dwellings. Again I feel this needs more definition and more weight in planning terms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the ratio at present? Without that how can we judge if it has been improved or not? • The new ratio should be specified. I suggest it should be 50/50! • What is affordable? Chris Tilley (and others) build some lovely houses but I would not call these "affordable" to be affordable to around Saham. With these major exceptions above, I feel the plan is good. Thank you to all who contributed.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 2A / Policy 2B	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): The comment actually refers to PA2.2 c.2.iii. Chart 2B2 in the supporting text for Policy 2B shows the numbers of dwellings by size, as does Evidence Base Volume 4, but it is agreed the charts do not show actual numbers. It is highly unlikely that the Plan would be allowed to specify an exact ratio so that suggestion will not be pursued. The definition of "Affordable" is given in the National Planning Policy framework and cannot be varied in the Neighbourhood Plan	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: Baseline data on dwelling sizes at 31 March 2019 has been added to section 8 of the Plan	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 7 Comment 11	DATE: 17th April 2018
REPRESENTATION: Compliments on a well presented and well documented case report. Thank you all for your work, and time given to this	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: General	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S); Support noted	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 8 Comment 12	DATE: 17th April 2018
REPRESENTATION: Regarding 7(2) I always understood there was a public footpath via Coberg Lane through the Panworth Estate to Ashill, in the past this has been used by locals but to my knowledge was not registered as a Local Footpath by the then Parish Council in the 1970's when Village PC were asked to detail. For interest there is a branch Path in the Panworth area that proceeds to Saham Waite.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 7, Parish Action Point 2	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S) The representation from the Ramblers Norfolk (see Representations Volume 2, section 7) deals with the noted route and suggests it be claimed as a public right of way. This would be a matter for the Parish Council to pursue outside of the Neighbourhood Plan should it choose to do so	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 8 Comment 13	DATE: 17th April 2018
REPRESENTATION: As long as this action does not mean that the good detailed work is no corrupted by higher genders.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 8	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S) Comment unclear but is not seen as suggesting a revision to the wording of the Plan	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 9 Comment 14	DATE: 21 March 2018
REPRESENTATION: Roads will not be made safer with 20mph limits or traffic calming - all it will do is cause excess pollution and extra maintenance problems for vehicles. Long Road/Hill Road being single track with passing places does nothing for the 'character of the village', it's a major pain in the arse. Leave the 30mph speed limit in place. Do not under any circumstances install traffic calming measure. Instead make sure the road surface is smooth and well maintained including drainage and edging as this increases safety and reduces traffic noise. Similarly ensure Hill Road and Long Road are properly resurfaced, including the passing places as the road is currently a death trap with holes sufficiently deep that they're likely to cause serious injury if struck. Patching them up in the council normal half-arsed manner is not good enough - it needs doing properly	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 7, Parish Action Point 1	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted. Before adoption Parish Action Points are a matter for the Parish Council to review in consultation with parishioners and others before determining what actions, if any, should be taken.	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: It was made clearer in the Parish Action Points set out are subject to further review, study and consultation by the Parish Council before implementation. Parish Action Points were subsequently and formally handed over to the Parish Council for implementation and no longer form part of the Neighbourhood Plan.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 10 Comment 15	DATE: 15 April 2018
REPRESENTATION: In my opinion 20mph speed limits and so-called traffic calming measures are a nuisance, they serve no purpose other than to antagonise drivers and increase pollution. Far better to enforce existing limits and remind drivers of them by increased signage and electronic warnings. Generally, I agree with the remainder of this paragraph.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 7, Parish Action Point 1	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted. Before adoption Parish Action Points are a matter for the Parish Council to review in consultation with parishioners and others before determining what actions, if any, should be taken.	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: It was made clearer the Parish Action Points set out are subject to further review, study and consultation by the Parish Council before implementation. Parish Action Points were subsequently and formally handed over to the Parish Council for implementation and no longer form part of the Neighbourhood Plan.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 10 Comment 16	DATE: 15 April 2018
REPRESENTATION: Section 7 should include a parish action point to improve drainage, despite the parish being plagued by flooding the parish council appears to take little or no interest other than items in the minutes such as report xxxx to highways. We even have councillors who fail to clear there ditches. In my opinion the parish should be the collecting point for local information regarding drainage choke points and take action to ensure they are cleared.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 7	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S) It would be very difficult for the Parish Council to solve existing drainage problems, which are more properly the responsibility of the Lead Flood Authority, Anglian Water and landowners	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: A Parish Action Point on this subject was added. Parish Action Points were subsequently and formally handed over to the Parish Council for implementation and no longer form part of the Neighbourhood Plan.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 11 Comment 17	DATE: 24 March 2018
REPRESENTATION: It states that homes already in the process of being built will not count towards the final allocation of 19 (already increased from 15). As the plan will be quite some time before it is actually finalized, let alone agreed, this could mean that we could be facing one huge housing estate in Saham Toney. Policy 1 states that between 19 & 48 houses up till 2036 only if services, roads and transport etc are considered. The roads around here are not suitable for the constant flow of huge lorry's and work site vehicles. This should be taken into consideration before planning permission is granted.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 1 / Evidence Base Volume 1	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S) The emerging Local Plan sets an allocation that will start only when that Plan is adopted. Policy 1 allocates a minimum of 50% more houses than Breckland Council indicates in its hearing statement for the Local Plan examination (32). Policy 1 sets a start date for the allocation it specifies as 1 January 2018. To date Breckland Council do not accept that. The comment regarding roads accords with the development constraints set out in Evidence Base Volume 1 and referenced in Policy 1	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 12 Comment 18	DATE: April 2018
REPRESENTATION: Improved road edging is a MUST. Now with more housing = more vehicles - more pathways are needed. A pedestrian bridge over Watton Brook should be a <u>priority</u> before anyone is killed. Hedges and trees need cutting back and overgrown verges. More <u>TROD</u> paths are a must. Life moves on and plans have to change accordingly for safety.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 7, Parish Action Point 1	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): The points made are dealt with by Parish Action Point 1C and 1D and will be reviewed for feasibility by the Parish Council at a future date, outside of the Plan	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 12 Comment 19	DATE: April 2018
REPRESENTATION: A community shop would be great as there are more folk in the village - including a P.O.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 7	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Paragraph 7.3 explains why this was not included as a Parish Action Point	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 12 Comment 20	DATE: April 2018
REPRESENTATION: For the future a community bus would be wonderful, especially for the elderly and less mobile. Not everyone drives. I have MS and need my mobility scooter to get out and about. I am not allowed on the small buses.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 7	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): It is possible this suggestion could be included under Parish Action Point 3	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: This point was covered in a general way by a Parish Action Point. Parish Action Points were subsequently and formally handed over to the Parish Council for implementation and no longer form part of the Neighbourhood Plan.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 13 Comment 21	DATE: 28th April 2018
REPRESENTATION: I have lived at High House Ploughboy Lane for many years and neither my house or land have flooded in that time. Please correct the flood risk map	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Evidence Base Volume 12	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Comment noted	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: Evidence Base Volume 12, including its maps, has been withdrawn and no longer forms part of the Plan.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 14 Comment 22	DATE: 27 April 2018
REPRESENTATION: I have lived at Homelands Ploughboy Lane for many years and neither my house or land have flooded in that time. Please correct the flood risk map	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Evidence Base Volume 12	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Comment noted	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: Evidence Base Volume 12, including its maps, has been withdrawn and no longer forms part of the Plan.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 15 Comment 23	DATE: 16th April 2018
REPRESENTATION: Evidence Map ST 06 This area should never be considered for planning, surface water will run naturally toward Mere, the level of which is much higher than in the past. I take the excess water from this through my land and I know from the amount of water that flows throughout the year it is so. It is not impossible that it could contribute to further flooding to an already vulnerable area - Bell Lane/Richmond Road	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Evidence Base Volume 1	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): There is no Evidence Map ST06 in the Plan or Evidence Bases. The comment is thought to refer to Constraints Map I in Evidence Base Volume 1, which is taken from a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment by Breckland Council in 2014, and which includes depiction of a site designated "ST06". Saham Toney was subsequently reclassified in the emerging Local Plan as a "Rural Settlement With Boundary" instead of a Local Service Centre, and hence no site allocations are made for Saham Toney in the Local Plan, nor in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is also noted that an application to develop 19 houses on the site indicated was refused both by Breckland Council and at appeal in 2017.	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 15 Comment 24	DATE: 16th April 2018
REPRESENTATION: Oppose policy A bad planning decision regarding the SuBridge development has already vastly increased the number of articulated lorries negotiating totally unsuited road, undermining verges, width of road restricting traffic, being quite dangerous, Church corner particularly. Non residential development should only be on Industrial Estates identified for ease of access, minimum invasion of residential areas.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 4C	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Comment noted, but the Neighbourhood Plan cannot dictate that non-residential development should only be on industrial estates. Policy 4C sets criteria against which the design of non-residential developments is to be judged	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 16 Comment 25	DATE: 17th March 2018
REPRESENTATION: We must have affordable housing for LOCAL's only We must help local people in the community.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 2B / Parish Action Point 7	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Policies 1, 2A and 2B address this to the level felt most likely to be deemed acceptable. While we may like to go further, we do not consider that would be in accordance with national planning rules	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 17 Comment 26	DATE: 17th March 2018
REPRESENTATION: It is important to have more affordable housing for first time buyers.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 2B / Parish Action Point 7	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Policies 1, 2A and 2B address this to the level felt most likely to be deemed acceptable. While we may like to go further, we do not consider that would be in accordance with national planning rules	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 18 Comment 27	DATE: 7th April 2018
REPRESENTATION: i) If possible, further weight should be applied to the known problems with the inadequate drainage system. Not sure that you have the ability to address this in this document. ii) Preservation of the bridge in Cley Lane/Saham Road should be enhanced. This bridge is taking excessive weight. It is a lovely bridge and it would be a shame to lose it. In the absence of pavements, pedestrian safety is compromised.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Section 7	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S) i) It would be very difficult for the Parish Council to solve existing drainage problems, which are more properly the responsibility of the Lead Flood Authority, Anglian Water and landowners ii) Noted	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: A Parish Action Point was added on the subject of drainage. Parish Action Points were subsequently and formally handed over to the Parish Council for implementation and no longer form part of the Neighbourhood Plan.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 18 Comment 28	DATE: 7th April 2018
REPRESENTATION: We have serious concerns that any form of development should take place without the agreement of all stakeholders, i.e., Anglian Water.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 8 / General	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Agreed. We have received comments on Policy 8 from Anglian Water and will consider how best to incorporate them in the Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot dictate who must agree to new development. Breckland Council must consult statutory consultees on planning applications, but do not require agreement of all stakeholders before granting approval.	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: Improve and strengthen Policy 8 based on representations from Anglian Water and the Lead Local Flood Authority	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 19 Comment 29	DATE: 21st April 2018
<p>REPRESENTATION: With reference to the neighbourhood plan and in response to your request for comments</p> <p><u>Evidence Map Flood Risk From Surface Water - Ovington Road and Mill View.</u> You have incorrectly marked number 6 Mill View as being a property which flooded. Numbers 6,7 and 9 Mill View have never suffered any flooding to either their buildings or gardens and you should remove any areas on these properties that you have coloured or boxed blue. Having spoken to a number of residents on Mill View following the flooding of 2016 we do not believe that there were any buildings flooded on the estate. You have incorrectly marked a portion of our field to the north of Mill View as Land Flooded. This land did not flood and you should remove the area that you have coloured blue. You have marked the entire road on Mill View as Land Flooded again this is incorrect due to the levels and falls on this road it would not be possible for it to have flooded in this way. Please note that only a small area of the lowest part of the estate road (where it meets the Ovington Road) flooded and then only for a short period of time. We understand that the Highway Authority only classes a road as having flooded if over 3/4 of the road has been under water for a period of 24 hours. What criteria have you set for the land and roads you have marked as having been flooded? This information does not appear to have been specified. We note that the worst flooding on the Ovington Road occurred at the point where it is crossed by the old railway line, as shown on the original Environment Agency Map, however this area is not marked on your plan.</p> <p><u>Evidence Map Flood Risk From Surface Water - Chequers Lane/Pound Hill South Bell Lane etc.</u> Firstly this map does not correspond with the previously mentioned map where it overlaps. Numbers 3, 4 and 5 Mill View are shown on this map as having their gardens flooded. Although it was not possible to see into their back gardens the front gardens on these properties certainly did not flood. You have on this map shown the rear garden of number 6 as being Land Flooded. This land did not flood and you should remove the area that you have coloured blue. There have been a number of photographs of the crossroads at the end of Bell Lane in the local papers, these show all four of the roads at that point underwater, again this is as shown on the original Environment Agency Map, however this area is not marked on your plan. We note that you have drawn in a cross shaped area of flooding on the right-hand side of this map. Is this area in the wrong place? Should it actually be on the crossroads in order that it corresponds with the official map? This and the other errors on these maps raise questions about two other areas you have marked as Land Flooded on this map. Firstly, the area shown on Amys Close should this area actually be on Bell Lane which would then correspond with the official map? Secondly the area at the corner of Richmond Road where it meets the road leading to Su-Bridge. This road occasionally floods on the corner as this is the lowest point in this area and this corresponds with the official map. The area of Land Flooded you have marked runs through the gardens of a number of properties the gardens of these properties appear to be on a slope making it unlikely that your map is correct.</p> <p><u>Evidence Map Flood Risk From Surface Water - Pages Lane and Chequers Lane.</u> On this map on Chequers Lane the area between the pig farm and Stanway Farm is not coloured blue. This area of the road together with the bottom of Ploughboy Lane was also under water, in line with the official map. You may recall that there was again a picture in the local paper showing the water covering Ploughboy Lane. You appear to have put three Property flooded boxes at Stanway Farm (a single property) although one of these boxes is not even on a building! The area around Charlean, Shambani and Chequers is shown on the official map as at risk of flooding but again these properties have not been coloured blue on your maps.</p>	

Evidence Map Flood Risk From Surface Water - Hills Road Central North.

Flooding also occurred on Hills Road at the point where it is crossed by the old railway line, as shown on the original Environment Agency Map, however again this area is not marked on your map.

Map 10 Saham Toney Policy Map.

On this map there is a blue broken line marked as Indication of principal surface water flood risk areas.

This line runs through the Ovington Road and then up through the highest part of our farm which is certainly not at any risk whatsoever of surface water flooding and out onto Hills Road.

This line needs to be moved to the proper location which is probably the stream by the old rail line.

We note that this map is marked with the words 'Background map source', surely the flood maps should be marked with this same wording.

At present these maps merely state Source: Environment Agency which gives the false impression that your various added colourings on the maps are the work of the Environment Agency.

Given not only the large number of omissions and errors which are on your maps but also their dubious origins they are currently not fit to be put forward as Evidence.

Every area and property you are proposing to mark on your maps should have been checked and validated (preferably independently).

Any parishioner who has not been able or not wished to wade through the vast amount of information you have produced may find themselves in a position where their property is blighted by your mistakes. This is simply unreasonable and unfair on those people.

The Environment Agency maps were prepared professionally by people who are both independent and properly trained and give a far better indication of events.

These maps are the maps which should be used in the Neighbourhood plan and any future decision making.

RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE:

Evidence Base Volume 12

REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S):

The purpose of the annotations to the Environment Agency maps were to reflect, on an indicative basis only, villager reports of flooding which occurred on 23 June 2016.

Regarding the evidence map for Ovington Road and Mill View (E8.12)

Some of these comments are contrary to reports received from other villagers, three of whom noted their properties in Millview being flooded in June 2016. Additionally, several people who live in Millview highlighted flooding there when objecting to a planning application for land immediately to the north. Going forward we will establish a method to best clarify and confirm the facts behind these apparently opposing reports.

Regarding the evidence map for Chequers Lane /Pound Hill South, Bell Lane etc (E8.10)

We will correct the anomaly at the overlap with map E8.12.

Regarding Millview see notes above.

As stated in the Plan, we did not undertake a scientific survey of the flood event of June 2016, and have not claimed that our map annotations are comprehensive, nor that they are anything but indicative of reports received from villagers. As a result, we were unable to annotate areas that were affected but for which we received no reports.

It is agreed that three annotations noted are incorrectly positioned and those will be corrected; but not accepted this means other annotations are also erroneously positioned.

Regarding the evidence map for Pages Lane and Chequers Lane (E8.9)

As above we did not annotate areas for which we received no reports, but will add the areas for which the respondent has provided information.

It is not the purpose of our annotations to replicate the flood risk areas shown on the Environment Agency maps; they are simply to give an indication of reports received from villagers in response to a questionnaire that went to all households in late 2016.

Regarding the evidence map for Hills Road Central North (E8.6)

As above we did not annotate areas for which we received no reports, but will add those areas for which the respondent has provided information.

Regarding Map 10

We will review this map for accuracy and adjust it accordingly.

More generally in the light of the comments we plan to review how we can better illustrate villager flood reports.

If they remain as annotations to the Environment Agency backgrounds, we will certainly label the latter as such; but to further ensure clarity we may in fact separate the two forms of data when updating the evidence base. Either way we will ensure greater clarity and accuracy.

Regarding the more general comments:

- It should be understood that there is no proposal for the villager flood report annotations to be used in future planning decisions and this is made clear in the supporting text to Policy 8 and in Evidence Base volume 12. Only the up to date online Environment Agency maps are to be used in that context as the Plan already states. We will give further emphasis and clarity to this fact when updating the plan;
- We note that the Environment Agency maps carry their own caveats regarding accuracy;
- It is our understanding that the Environment Agency's online maps are based on an assessment carried out in 2008 and hence do not yet account for events in June 2016 (and indeed not for December 2017 / January 2018 events in the village). Therefore, we feel it is reasonable for the Neighbourhood Plan to include some indication of those events. While we do not claim ours to be a highly scientific survey we consider the information is broadly fit for its intended purpose - which is simply to highlight the concerns many villagers have that the Environment Agency maps do not tell "the whole story"; and that mapping flood risk on a 1-in 100 year event basis is not the most relevant consideration to anyone whose home or property is flooded repeatedly over the course of a few years.

ACTION TO BE TAKEN:

Evidence Base Volume 12, including its maps, has been withdrawn and no longer forms part of the Plan.

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 20

Comment 30

DATE: 17th April

REPRESENTATION:

In response to the flood risk from surface water evidence maps, can I please state that at no time since we have been living here (since 2009) have we known Mill View road to be flooded apart from the entrance to the road beside number 1. It certainly hasn't flooded outside mine (no 9) or to my knowledge anywhere else on the close. During the floods of 2016 the main Ovington Road (up towards Ovington crossroads) was flooded and also the crossroads with Pages Lane. However it certainly didn't flood on Mill View itself, I know because I was out in it at the time.

The evidence map E8.12 therefore is inaccurate in saying that the land had flooded on the whole of Mill View itself, it was just the main entrance to the close beside number 1.

RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE:

Evidence Base Volume 12

REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S):

We have conflicting reports about flooding in Millview, with 3 reports of flooding there in response to a survey in December 2016 and several objectors to a planning application on adjacent land stating their properties / land had been flooded

ACTION TO BE TAKEN:

Evidence Base Volume 12, including its maps, has been withdrawn and no longer forms part of the Plan.

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 21 Comment 31	DATE: April 2018
REPRESENTATION: This (<i>the strategic gap</i>) is of paramount importance, build much nearer and we will become Watton. This is not what we need. Saham Toney must remain as a village with its own parish council and autonomy	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 5	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted. Policy 5 and its supporting evidence stresses the same opinion	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 22 Comment 32	DATE: 29th April
REPRESENTATION: With reference to the neighbourhood plan and in response to your request for comments <u>Evidence Map Flood Risk From Surface Water - Hills Road South and Ploughboy Lane North</u> Homelands bungalow and the land between Homelands and Mercian cottage have never flooded as they are on much higher ground than the river on the opposite side of the road, the meadow at the Hills road/Ploughboy lane junction and the adjoining meadow, are more at risk of flooding as shown on the official Environment agency map.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Evidence Base Volume 12	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: Evidence Base Volume 12, including its maps, has been withdrawn and no longer forms part of the Plan.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 23 Comment 33	DATE: 14 March 2018
REPRESENTATION: Average 3 bedroom properties for families not all 1 or 2 bedroom	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 2B	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Policy 2B does not stipulate "all 1 or 2 bedroom" properties, and allows larger properties to be put forward	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 23 Comment 34	DATE: 14 March 2018
REPRESENTATION: Disagree with where the maps show wildlife corridors around High House farm. There are specific corridors and wildlife areas left that are more conservation friendly than the ones shown on the map	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 7C	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): The parishioner making this comment was asked to provide more detailed information but did not respond further. Regardless of that it is planned to commission the Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service to undertake a detailed study of wildlife areas and corridors in the parish prior to the Regulation 16 submission and the results of that study will be incorporated in an update to Policy 7C	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: There are conflicting reports for the area in question and given the lack of more detail from the respondent the policy map has not been amended in respect of the comment. A professionally and independently prepared habitats and corridors map has been commissioned from the Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service study and will replace the current policy map at the Regulation 15 submission.	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 24 Comment 35	DATE: April 2018
REPRESENTATION: The aims and objectives set out in this document clearly show an enlightened view of what the village should be, and the team should be congratulated on their hard work and diligence in getting the plan to its present stage. I believe it would be churlish to start adding bits on to what is a very accomplished document and I look forward to seeing it adopted as a blueprint for the future of the village.	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: General	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 25 Comment 36	DATE: 27th March 2018
REPRESENTATION: Very impressed with the level of detail in the plan and the supporting evidence Excellent Plan; best of luck with the consultation	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: General	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 26 Comment 37	DATE: April 2018
REPRESENTATION: "The Manor" on Page's Lane is an eyesore. P6.2 doesn't meet 1, 2 or 3	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 6	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): The Manor is otherwise known as Page's Place and is a listed building that is currently undergoing major renovation. The respondent is presumably querying why that was given planning permission, but that was before the designation of the Neighbourhood Area and is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. it is noted that P6.2 refers to non-designated heritage assets and so would not in any case cover Page's Place, which would be dealt with under P6.1	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 26 Comment 38	DATE: April 2018
REPRESENTATION: Thank you for your time and energy in putting this excellent plan together	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: General	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Noted	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: None required	

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 27 Comment 39	DATE: 17th March 2018
REPRESENTATION: P8.1 e Mentions "the highest measured ground water level" and "ground level". The basis for both should be stated to provide an unambiguous baseline	
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 8	
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S): Agreed	
ACTION TO BE TAKEN: Revised wording makes this clearer	

2. REPRESENTATIONS BY OTHERS

One representation was received from a resident of Watton, a neighbouring town to the Neighbourhood Area. Although there is no requirement to accept comments from individuals who do not live, work or run a business in the Neighbourhood Area, the respondent concerned lives immediately adjacent to the Parish boundary, on the Watton side, and provides helpful evidence regarding Policies 5 and 8. The comment is therefore deemed to be a valid representation.

RESPONDENT NUMBER: 28 Comment 40	DATE: 31st March 2018
--	------------------------------

REPRESENTATION:

I live in Langmere Road Watton on land immediately bordering the "Watton Gap" land. Although Policy 5 relates to the visual aspect of maintaining Saham Toney as a separate entity from Watton, my concern is that this land (known as "Nilefields" south of Broom Hall and used every year by the Wayland Show) floods very easily and regularly causes flood problems at the bridge in Richmond Road. The land slopes from the Watton boundary down to the river, and yet the land floods so badly that it isn't just the land near the river that floods (as would be expected). I have photo's of my back garden and Nilefields connected as one flooded area. Should this area be allowed as development the necessary hard paved areas and access roads will only serve to make this flooding more severe and more frequent.

Having lived in Watton for 4 years I can confirm that we have experienced sufficient heavy and continuous rainfall to make flushing the toilet impossible, and have had to drive to Watton Library to use their facilities. We have spoken to our neighbours and they say the same, they are unable to flush their toilets when we have a long period of heavy rainfall. From memory this has happened so far on 3 occasions. Although this problem is due to the well documented fact that the drains in this area no longer adequate, I believe that it is also a result of the houses having old soak-aways from the rainwater downpipes. These soak-aways are over 40 years old (Langmere Road houses were built in 1974) and by now they are presumably no longer doing their job properly. Therefore, any period of heavy prolonged rainfall causes the land around the houses to flood very quickly, adding to the problem that the sewers are overflowing (once we had to disinfect, and clear toilet paper from the ground around a manhole cover lifted by water pressure).

Once the rain stops the flood levels subside surprisingly quickly, and although I am no expert on the matter, I presume that this is not due to the water soaking into the ground, as the land is completely saturated. I therefore presume the reason is that the water is flowing towards the lowest point, being the river, travelling across Nilefields - hence the flooding on the Watton/Saham Toney boundary.

By way of explanation on the photo's - I was in the process of renewing the old rear fence (Watton/Saham Toney boundary) when the rains came. I have highlighted with a yellow line to show the boundary, where the new fence is now constructed.

I have attached 9 photo's:

- 1) showing the water flowing down our driveway at just under 2" deep.
- 2) the drains full.
- 3) - 9) our back garden and Nilefields connected by flood water.

Photo 1: Driveway









Photo 2: Drive-Water 40mm dp



Photo 3: South of boundary



Photo 4: At parish boundary 	Photo 5: At parish boundary 	Photo 6: At parish boundary 
Photo 7: At parish boundary 	Photo 8: At parish boundary 	Photo 9: Flood subsiding 
RELEVANT SECTION(S) OF PLAN / EVIDENCE BASE: Policy 5 / Policy 8		
REACTION TO REPRESENTATION(S) Noted as useful evidence		
ACTION TAKEN: The first-hand reports noted will be considered for incorporation into the evidence bases for policies 5 and 8		