

## **Draft Policy LP17 - Environmental Assets - Green Infrastructure, Historic Environment, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity**

Link to draft policy and comments in full received from the draft consultation stage:

<https://west-norfolk.objective.co.uk/portal/lpr2019/lpr2019?pointId=s1542883481756#section-s1542883481756>

### **Consideration of issues:**

The main issues raised by consultees were:

- Historic England (HE) suggest changing 'protect' to 'conserve'; changing 'historic assets' to 'heritage' assets; changing 'Historic Parks and Gardens' to 'Registered Parks and Gardens'; and changing 'Scheduled Ancient Monuments' to 'Scheduled Monuments' in line with NPPF terminology. These changes are recommended to be accepted.
- The Norfolk Coast Partnership would like to see 'heritage coast' added to the list.
- Natural England would like a separate AONB policy.
- HE would like separate heritage policies.
- The need to give protection given to soils and best and most versatile agricultural land.

The resulting changes recommended to the policy and supporting text are set out below, together with a new separate heritage policy.

### **Officer Recommendations to Task Group:**

The Task Group is recommended to:

- 1) Change 'protect' to 'conserve'; 'historic' to 'heritage' assets; 'Historic Parks and Gardens' to 'Registered Parks and Gardens'; and 'Scheduled Ancient Monuments' to 'Scheduled Monuments'; also add 'heritage coast' to list.**
- 2) Amend wording of LP17 3 as suggested.**
- 3) Delete duplicate text in 6 and add remainder to 3.**

## **Policy Recommendation**

### **Policy LP17a: Historic Environment**

The historic environment of the Borough will be conserved and enhanced. Key buildings, structures and features which contribute to the Borough's character and distinctiveness will be protected from inappropriate development or change. Proposals which maintain, enhance and provide better understanding of the significance of the overall cultural heritage value of the Borough will be sought through:

- i) Supporting the repair and appropriate re-use of buildings and structures of historic, architectural, cultural or landscape value where the repair and/or use would not be detrimental to the character, appearance or integrity of the building or structure, its context or setting; and
- ii) Requiring the highest standard of design which will protect the historic environment and add to the future cultural heritage value of the locality.

The archaeology of the Borough will be better understood, protected and enhanced by:

- iii) Protecting archaeology from inappropriate development or change.

Appropriate development proposals that bring into use or improve an asset so it is no longer deemed at risk on the heritage at risk register will be supported where appropriate to their significance.

**Policy LP17a contributes to Strategic Objectives 6 Economy; 10, Society; 12, 13, 16 Environment;.**

## **Supporting Text**

The NPPF defines Historic Environment as ‘all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora’.

The historic environment and heritage assets within the borough feed into the importance of local identity, health and wellbeing, tourist exploration and having open spaces for all to use. The conservation and enhancement of the historic environment amongst adapting to environmental and socio-economic challenges is a key consideration when determining planning applications; and contributing to the Government’s goals for improving our natural heritage and achieving goal 6 of the DEFRA 25 Year Environment Plan “enhanced beauty, heritage and engagement with the natural environment”.

The Borough has a rich and varied cultural heritage. The historic environment makes a significant contribution to sustainable communities through supporting economic vitality, social and cultural links to the past and a dynamic and varied built environment.

The Borough has a significant number of heritage historic assets, including:

- 5 Registered Parks and Gardens;
- 42 Conservation Areas;
- approximately 2,000 Listed Buildings;
- 133 Scheduled Ancient Monuments (which is the greatest number for any district or unitary authority in the East of England);
- many non-designated heritage assets.

Parks and Gardens are fundamental components within the historic environment and are landscapes which are important heritage assets. In the Borough there are five Registered Parks and Gardens which play a large contribution to the benefits of the local community and its historical identity. Parks and gardens, amongst other natural and historical assets, all play crucial and valuable roles within society for their contribution to green infrastructure, climate change adaptation and enhancing the beauty of such natural spaces<sup>1</sup>.

Heritage assets are defined by the NPPF as 'a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing)'.

- Designated heritage asset. The NPPF defines these as World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or Conservation Areas designated under the relevant legislation.
- Non-Designated Heritage Assets. The PPG says these are locally designated 'buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which are not formally designated heritage assets'.

There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or may potentially hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary evidence source about the substance and evolution of places, and the people and cultures that made them.

Heritage at Risk is a term applied to designated heritage assets at risk as a result of neglect, decay, or inappropriate development, or vulnerable to becoming so. The Council generally supports improvements to the 'at risk' assets that will enable them to be taken off the register, but these changes must be in conformity with the other adopted policies of the Local Plan and with national planning policies.

Policy LP17a Environmental Assets – Historic Environment - East Marine Plans Supporting Policies:

[SOC2](#): Proposals that may affect heritage assets should demonstrate, in order of preference:

- that they will not compromise or harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage asset;
- how, if there is compromise or harm to a heritage asset, this will be minimised;
- how, where compromise or harm to a heritage asset cannot be minimised it will be mitigated against;
- the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate harm to the heritage asset.

[SOC3](#): Proposals that may affect the terrestrial and marine character of an area should demonstrate, in order of preference:

- that they will not adversely impact the terrestrial and marine character of an area;
- how, if there are adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area, they will minimise them;
- how, where these adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area cannot be minimised they will be mitigated against;
- the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.

**Sustainability Appraisal:**

**Draft Policy LP17a - Environmental Assets - Historic Environment**

The new policy recommended has a likely positive effect.

LP17a: Environmental Assets - Historic Environment																							
Policy	SA Objective:																						Overall Effect
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	+	-	
LP17a	0	0	+	++	++	+	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	+15	0	Likely Positive Effect +15
CS12	0	0	+	++	++	+	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	+15	0	Likely Positive Effect +15
No Policy	-	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+/-	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	+10	-4	Likely Positive Effect +6

## Policy Recommendation:

### Strategic Policy LP17 Environmental Assets - Green Infrastructure, ~~Historic Environment~~, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity

1. Proposals to ~~conserve protect~~ and enhance our ~~historic environment and~~ landscape character, biodiversity and geodiversity will be encouraged and supported.
2. The Council will ~~conserve protect~~ (and where appropriate enhance) County Wildlife Sites, Ancient Woodlands, and Regionally Important Geological Sites ~~and designated and undesignated sites of historical value~~ from development which damages their interest or significance unless the need for, and public benefits of the development outweigh the loss of interest or significance.
3. Development should seek to avoid, ~~and where this is not possible~~, justify, mitigate or compensate for any adverse impacts on biodiversity, geodiversity and heritage as well as seeking to enhance sites through the creation of features of new biodiversity ~~geodiversity and heritage~~ interest. The design of new development should be sensitive to the surrounding area and not detract from the inherent quality of the environment.
4. Appropriate weight will be given to the roles performed by the area's soils. These should be valued as a finite multi-functional resource which underpins our wellbeing and prosperity. Decisions about development should take full account of the impact on soils, their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver.
5. The long-term capability of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification) will be safeguarded as a resource for the future.
6. The Council and its partners will support a range of initiatives and proposals that will improve areas of poor quality lacking in biodiversity and geodiversity as well as maintaining, enhancing and linking areas of good quality.

7. The Borough Council will work with partners to ensure an integrated network of green infrastructure throughout the urban and rural areas (identified through the Green Infrastructure Management Plan) is successfully created and managed to:
  - a. meet the environmental, social and economic needs of local communities and the wider borough;
  - b. create a high quality environment for biodiversity and geodiversity to flourish;
  - c. provide opportunities for species to adapt to the impacts of climate change;
  - d. contribute to an improved quality of life for current and future residents and visitors;
  - e. target areas identified as being deficient in multi-functional green space;
  - f. Incorporate **multifunctional** Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) within new development to encourage new habitats.
8. **Development should seek to avoid, mitigate or compensate for any adverse impacts on biodiversity, geodiversity and heritage as well as seeking to enhance sites through the creation of features of new biodiversity, geodiversity and heritage interest. The design of new development should be sensitive to the surrounding area and not detract from the inherent quality of the environment.**

### **European Sites (see also Policy LP24)**

#### **Development proposals in the Breckland SPA**

9. New built development will be restricted within 1,500m of the Breckland SPA. Development will be restricted to the re-use of existing buildings or where existing development completely masks the new proposal from the Breckland SPA. Beyond the SPA, a 1,500m buffer will also be applied to areas where the qualifying features are known to exist, or where nesting attempts have been made. In this area, development may be acceptable where suitable alternative habitat (outside the SPA) can be secured.

#### **Character Assessment**

10. Proposals for development will be informed by, and seek opportunities to reinforce, the distinctive character areas and potential habitat creation areas identified in the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment and other character assessments.



---

**Policy LP17 contributes to Strategic Objectives 6 Economy; 10, Society; 12, 13, 14, 16 Environment; 33 Rural Areas; 37, 38, Coast.**

## **LP17 Environmental Assets (previously CS12)**

### **Introduction**

6.4.1 The Borough has a significant number of natural and heritage historic assets, including:

- an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - nationally recognised for its landscape importance;
- **Heritage Coast;**
- 5 Ramsar sites - internationally recognised for their wetland importance;
- 8 Special Areas of Conservation – internationally recognised for their unique habitats;
- 4 Special Protection Areas – internationally recognised for their birdlife;
- 6 National Nature Reserves;
- 29 Sites of Special Scientific Interest – nationally recognised for their ecological and geological importance;
- 212 County Wildlife Sites – locally recognised for their biodiversity value;
- 23 ancient woodlands;
- ~~5 Registered Parks and Gardens historic parks and gardens;~~
- ~~42 Conservation Areas;~~
- ~~approximately 2,000 Listed Buildings;~~

- ~~133 Scheduled Ancient Monuments (which is the greatest number for any district or unitary authority in the East of England);~~
- ~~many non designated heritage assets.~~

6.4.2 Part of the appeal of the area to visitors and local people is the environment ~~and heritage~~, therefore it is important that these assets are protected and enhanced.

6.4.3 The Council will work to the NPPF to ensure that our ~~heritage historic sites, buildings,~~ biodiversity and geodiversity are protected and that opportunities for enhancement sensitive to the area and features are grasped. Appropriate weight will be given to the roles performed by the area's soils. These should be valued as a finite multi-functional resource which underpins our wellbeing and prosperity. Decisions about development should take full account of the impact on soils, their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver. The long term capability of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification) should be safeguarded as a resource for the future in line with NPPF paragraph 170.

6.4.4 The latest West Norfolk Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) included data relating to visitor pressure impact. This was informed by a variety of work in other districts, by Natural England and the Norfolk Coast Partnership. Since the latest revision to the HRA in 2015 Footprint Ecology consultants have completed a comprehensive study of visitor surveys at European protected sites across Norfolk during 2015 and 2016. This was published in 2017. The report was commissioned by the Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership/Norfolk County Council on behalf of all the planning authorities in Norfolk.

6.4.5 This new data that also takes into account adjacent authorities' visitor impact means that there is a much more reliable source of evidence to inform plan preparation and assess cumulative impact.

6.4.6 The overall conclusion of the report was that growth would cause greater visitor disturbance and therefore mitigation would need to be addressed through local authorities' plan documents. It was also recommended that the local authorities should work in partnership via a memorandum of understanding to deliver and fund strategic mitigation schemes.

6.4.7 A HRA was carried out in 2010 to ensure that the final Core Strategy document presented for examination was fully compliant and adverse effects upon the integrity of any of the European sites had been avoided or mitigated for. It was demonstrated through this report that the policies and amendments would not adversely affect the integrity of the European sites and that any adverse effects have been avoided or mitigated for through policy formulation.

6.4.8 The HRA for the SADMP plan: suggested a range of modifications and suggestions to enable positive mitigation and enhancement of European sites. These suggestions included improved and increased green infrastructure, monitoring, better site connectivity, more effective management of sites a programme of publicity to raise awareness and working in partnership with adjacent authorities.

6.4.9 The report by Footprint Ecology on visitor pressure also outlined mitigation proposals which included:

- restrictions on the activities of dog walkers;
- implement site and access management. The extent of these will need to be agreed with Natural England and the relevant local authorities;
- closing or re-routing of unofficial paths;
- permanent or seasonal restrictions and or closures of sites, or adoption of new fencing;
- operation of new car parking areas to draw visitors away from heavily-used or vulnerable sites; and
- allocating further Sustainable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG);
- adoption of interpretation materials.

6.4.10 In relation to Habitats Regulations Assessment monitoring and mitigation the Council has adopted the following strategy for affected areas a suite of measures including all/some of:

- on site provision of suitable measures;
- offsite mitigation;
- offsite alternative natural green space;
- publicity;
- a project level HRA to establish specific issues as appropriate.

6.4.11 In addition to the above suite of measures the Borough Council has adopted a Borough wide charge of £50 per house to cover small scale mitigation on designated sites and general monitoring.

6.4.12 The HRA Monitoring & Mitigation & GI Coordination Panel responds to monitoring information, including the recommendation for spending from the habitat mitigation fund (primarily aimed at the sensitive European site locations). The panel (Chaired by a Cabinet member from the Borough Council and including representatives from the RSPB, Natural England, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and others) considers the results of monitoring and proposes mitigation measures, as well as co-ordinating wider related proposals for green infrastructure in the Borough.

6.4.13 Norfolk local authorities comprising Broadland District Council, Breckland District Council, Great Yarmouth Borough Council, the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk, North Norfolk District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council and the Broads Authority are currently inviting tenders to prepare a Green Infrastructure and Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. This will enable more informed strategic planning decisions that will help shape emerging Local Plans. The report which will initiate in March 2019 will serve as another vehicle to deliver solutions to impacts on Natura sites by for example identifying other less sensitive sites to accommodate visitor pressure. The Strategy will also consider cross boundary issues therefore ensuring that the cumulative impact of growth across Norfolk is considered and that the local authorities are all playing a role in addressing the impact of their development targets.

6.4.14 The increased growth in the borough means that there will be impacts on the environment in terms of land loss, disturbance and visual impact on the landscape. By working in partnership with other organisations more strategic gain can be made.

6.4.15 The 2007 Landscape Character Assessment recognises the different landscape character types in the borough and their sensitivity to accommodate change. It also provides guidance on how planning can help to make better decisions and shape the future of a more attractive and healthy environment.

6.4.16 Policy LP17 Environmental Assets - East Marine Plans Supporting Policies:

[BIO1](#): Appropriate weight should be attached to biodiversity, reflecting the need to protect biodiversity as a whole, taking account of the best available evidence including habitats and species that are protected or conservation concern in the East Marine Plan and adjacent areas (marine, terrestrial).

[BIO2](#): Where appropriate, proposals for development should incorporate features that enhance biodiversity and geological interests.

[ECO1](#): Cumulative impacts affecting the ecosystem of the East Marine Plans and adjacent areas (marine, terrestrial) should be addressed in decision-making and plan implementation.

[MPA1](#): Any impacts on the overall Marine Protected Area (MPA) network must be taken account of in strategic level measures and assessments, with due regard given to any current agreed advice on an ecologically coherent network.

[SOC3](#): Proposals that may affect the terrestrial and marine character of an area should demonstrate, in order of preference:

- that they will not adversely impact the terrestrial and marine character of an area;
- how, if there are adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area, they will minimise them;
- how, where these adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area cannot be minimised they will be mitigated against;
- the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.

**Sustainability Appraisal:**

**Draft Policy LP17 - Environmental Assets - Green Infrastructure, Historic Environment, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity**

The changes to the policy recommended have no material impact on the scoring – it remains as having a likely positive effect.

LP17: Environmental Assets - Green Infrastructure, Historic Environment, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity																							
Policy	SA Objective:																				Overall Effect		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		+	-
LP17	0	0	+	++	++	+	++	0	0	++	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	+15	0	Likely Positive Effect +15
CS12	0	0	+	++	++	+	++	0	0	++	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	+15	0	Likely Positive Effect +15
No Policy	-	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+/-	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	+10	-4	Likely Positive Effect +6

**Appendix 1: Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:**

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Nature of Response</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Consultee Suggested Modification</b>	<b>Officer Response/Proposed Action</b>
Historic Environment Planning Adviser, East of England Historic England		See updated comments at: 988		
Planning Campaigns Consultant CPRE Norfolk	<b>Object</b>		6.4.14 - It would be helpful for some definition or explanation of what is meant by "more strategic gain can be made" at the end of this paragraph.	Agree this can be explained.
Planning Advisor Environment Agency	<b>Support</b>	We support this policy; it complies with the Defra 25 Year Plan. The policy supports the net gain approach which aims to leave the natural environment in a better state through the development process, by restoring or creating environmental features that are of greater value to both people and wildlife.		Support noted and welcomed.
Mrs Sarah Bristow	<b>Object</b>	6 Environment - 6.4 LP17 Habitat - It is not sufficient simply to replace established trees with the same number of trees elsewhere; a habitat includes the undergrowth and that, together with the trees have taken years to provide a safe habitat for wildlife and birds. There is no mention of, say, a swift or owl box policy nor provision of holes in fences and access tunnels or runs to enable ground-based animals and hedgehogs to live alongside new developments. This is extremely important in a rural environment.		Noted. These measures are being included in the supporting text to Policy LP16.

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
		<p>Notably 6.4.3 The Council will work to the NPPF to ensure that our historic sites, buildings, biodiversity and geodiversity are protected and that opportunities for enhancement sensitive to the area and feature are grasped. Was felt to be a weak statement which needs to be substantiated. It is very much open to misinterpretation in many ways. Destroying rich, mature habitats should be taken seriously and the correct professionals consulted and appropriate surveys undertaken at all times.</p>		<p>Noted. Protection of heritage has been strengthened with new separate policy.</p>
<p>Parish Clerk Castle Rising Parish Council</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>LP17 fails to attach sufficient weight to the protection of natural and heritage assets. It does not distinguish between assets of international and national standing and those of more regional/local interest. It fails to prioritise the avoidance of adverse impacts on such assets over mitigation and compensation, which are lesser options and assume a level of harm that could otherwise be avoided. There should be no reason to consider allocations or other policies that would lead/likely to cause harm to recognised heritage or other assets.</p>		<p>Noted but disagree.</p>
<p>Norfolk County Council (Infrastructure Dev, Community and Env Services)</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>6.4.1 This list should also acknowledge the presence of the large number of non-designated heritage assets that exist within the Borough. This is particularly important as there are no specific policies relating solely to the historic environment. It should be clear in the Review that both designated and non-designated heritage assets will be considered as required by NPPF paragraphs 193-197.</p> <p>Policy LP17 3.</p> <p>The wording could be amended as follows to keep it in line with</p>	<p>The wording of LP17 3 could be amended as follows to keep it in line with NPPF:  'Development should seek to avoid, <u>and where this is not possible justify</u>, mitigate or compensate for, any adverse impacts on biodiversity,</p>	<p><b>Agree – amend wording of LP17 3 as suggested.</b></p>



Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
		<p>NPPF; Development should seek to avoid, <u>and where this is not possible justify</u>, mitigate or compensate for, any adverse impacts on biodiversity, geodiversity and heritage as well as seeking to enhance sites through the creation of features of new biodiversity, geodiversity and heritage interest.</p> <p>It is unclear what is meant at the end of this paragraph by the 'creation' of new geodiversity and heritage interest. Sites of this type cannot necessarily be created in the same way that biodiversity habitat can. The wording here may need to be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Policy LP17 6.</p> <p>The wording of this paragraph largely duplicates that of paragraph LP17 3. The County Council's comments on LP17 3 also apply here.</p>	<p>geodiversity and heritage as well as seeking to enhance sites through the creation of features of new biodiversity, geodiversity and heritage interest.'</p>	<p>Agree – delete 'geodiversity and heritage'.</p> <p><b>Agree - delete duplicate wording in LP17 6 and move remaining text to the end of LP17 3.</b></p>
<p>Norfolk County Council (Infrastructure Dev, Community and Env Services)</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>In addition to F2.2, the Historic Environment team are aware of other allocated sites in the Local Plan Review for which the archaeological status has changed (where an archaeological evaluation has been carried out but where further archaeological fieldwork is required). It will take additional time to review all of these in detail, but we can provide comments to the Borough separately, so the policy wording can be revised where appropriate. It should be noted that the absence of a specific policy or text description requiring an archaeological assessment or field evaluation at a particular allocated site, should not be taken as an indication that no archaeological assessment, field evaluation or other archaeological work is required, either prior or subsequent to the granting of planning permission. The Historic Environment Record is constantly being updated - New discoveries</p>		<p>No change appears to be required.</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
		are made and existing sites and buildings can be reinterpreted. The implementation of new national or local historic environment guidance and policy can lead to reassessment of the significance of individual or groups of heritage assets. Consequently, the baseline archaeological information against which the historic environment implications of an allocated site needs to be assessed will change throughout the lifetime of the Plan depending when it comes forward for development.		
Lord Howard, Castle Rising Estate	<b>Object</b>	LP17 fails to attach sufficient weight to the protection of natural and heritage assets. It does not distinguish between assets of international and national standing and those of more regional/local interest. It fails to prioritise the avoidance of adverse impacts on such assets over mitigation and compensation, which are lesser options and assume a level of harm that could otherwise be avoided. There should be no reason to consider allocations or other policies that would lead/likely to cause harm to recognised heritage or other assets.		Noted but disagree.
Conservation Officer Norfolk Wildlife Trust	<b>Mixed</b>	We support the overall approach of this policy but are concerned at the wording of section 2 which does not appear to offer sufficient safeguard to ensure that environmental assets are safeguarded from inappropriate development, and is also at odds with the avoid, mitigate and compensate hierarchy set out in the following policy paragraph. The emphasis of this policy should first be on safeguarding the existing environmental assets in the district, through only permitting development which can robustly demonstrate that it is able to avoid or mitigate any impacts. There should be a presumption against proposals which damage the recognised environmental assets set out in this policy, unless it can	Revise the policy wording to provide clearer protection for environmental assets.  Paragraph 6 appears to mostly duplicate paragraph 3 and could be combined.  Development Proposals	Unclear as to the wording sought by the objector.  <b>Agree - delete duplicate text in 6 and add remainder to 3.</b>  A map of the Breckland

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
		<p>be demonstrated that there is an exceptional and over-riding public need for the development (as per NPPF paragraph 175) which cannot be met elsewhere in the district or adjoining areas (rather than just land within the applicant's control), and that up front compensation (measurably in excess of the losses that would occur) can be delivered before the development commences in order to ensure no net loss. In the majority of cases, the assets listed in the policy are irreplaceable.</p>	<p>in the SPA - for clarity this would benefit from the inclusion of a map showing the specific locations of the different zones.</p>	<p>SPA can be considered for inclusion.</p>
<p>Historic Environment Planning Adviser, East of England Historic England</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Object - This is a very broad policy covering Green Infrastructure, Historic Environment, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity. Whilst this may be acceptable as a Strategic policy, I would expect to see more detail in a Local Plan regarding heritage assets. The policy should also be locally specific. We would suggest that there should be separate policy/policies for the historic environment.</p> <p>In any event, suggest 'conserve' rather than 'protect' in bullet point 1 for greater consistency with the NPPF.</p>	<p>Separate policy/policies for the historic environment. Should cover designated (listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, scheduled monuments and conservation areas) and non-designated assets, and be locally specific. The policy/ies should also refer to the issue of settings. The issue of Heritage at Risk should also be addressed.</p>	<p>Agree - provide a separate heritage policy.</p> <p><b>Agree to change to 'conserve' rather than 'protect' in bullet point 1 for greater consistency with the NPPF.</b></p>
<p>Historic Environment Planning Adviser, East of England Historic England</p>	<p><b>Mixed</b></p>	<p>We welcome the reference to heritage assets. In first line change 'historic' to 'heritage assets'. 'Historic Parks and Gardens' should be 'Registered Parks and Gardens' and 'Scheduled Ancient monuments' should be 'scheduled monuments' - current preferred</p>	<p>Change 'historic assets' to 'heritage assets'.</p> <p>Change 'Historic Parks</p>	<p><b>Agree.</b></p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
		terminology.	and Gardens' to Registered Parks and Gardens' and 'Scheduled Ancient monuments' to 'scheduled monuments'.	
Historic Environment Planning Adviser, East of England Historic England	<b>Object</b>	Object - We welcome reference to heritage assets. However the tests are not exactly consistent with those set out in the NPPF.	Review wording for greater consistency with paras. 193 -197 of the NPPF.	New policy for heritage provided.
Parish Clerk Castle Rising Parish Council	<b>Object</b>	While Policy LP17 seeks to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets, it fails to attach sufficient weight to their protection. It does not distinguish between assets of international and national standing and those of more regional or local interest. Further, it fails to prioritise the avoidance of adverse impacts on such assets over mitigation and compensation, which are lesser options and assume a level of harm that could otherwise be avoided. Such hierarchies are essential parts of a fully considered policy. Hence, the greatest protection would (and should under the terms of national policy in the NPPF) be given to national level constraints, which should not be harmed other than in the most exceptional circumstances. The policy should not offer the potential for protection of environmental and heritage assets to be outweighed or for the public benefits of the development outweigh the loss of interest or significance. Given the choices open to the authority in the Local Plan Review, there should be no reason to consider allocations or other policies that would lead to		Disagree policies provide sufficient protection.

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
		or be likely to cause harm to recognised heritage or other assets.		
Norfolk Coast Partnership (AONB)	<b>Object</b>		6.4.1 - mention 'Heritage Coast' in list.	<b>Agree.</b>
Parish Clerk Gayton Parish Council	<b>Object</b>	<p>6 Environment, 6.4 LP17 Habitat</p> <p>It is not sufficient simply to replace established trees with the same number of trees elsewhere; a habitat includes the undergrowth and that, together with the trees have taken years to provide a safe habitat for wildlife and birds. There is no mention of, say, a swift or owl box policy nor provision of holes in fences and access tunnels or runs to enable ground-based animals and hedgehogs to live alongside new developments. This is extremely important in a rural environment.</p> <p>Notably 6.4.3 The Council will work to the NPPF to ensure that our historic sites, buildings, biodiversity and geodiversity are protected and that opportunities for enhancement sensitive to the area and feature are grasped. Was felt to be a weak statement which needs to be substantiated. It is very much open to misinterpretation in many ways. Destroying rich, mature habitats should be taken seriously and the correct professionals consulted and appropriate surveys undertaken at all times.</p>		<p>Noted. These measures are being included in the supporting text to Policy LP16.</p> <p>Noted. Protection of heritage has been strengthened with new separate policy.</p>
Parish Clerk West Winch Parish Council	<b>Object</b>	West Winch Parish Council is concerned that mass development will impact on the Grazing Commons (which are historic and have been mentioned in the Domesday Book). West Winch Common is a County Wildlife Site and the River Nar is an SSSI site. NPPF 1.5 para 170 (e) refers, also NPPF 174 (a) and (b).		Site specific comment – no change required to the policy.
Parish Clerk Holme-	<b>Object</b>	(para 6.4.4) The Footprint Ecology surveys were not		The Norfolk-wide GI and

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
Next-The-Sea Parish Council		<p>comprehensive as suggested in the supporting text. They were carried out at selected locations and designed to focus on the impacts of new housing on visitor pressure on the Protected Sites (which is not to criticise their considerable value). The study did not presume to look at the impacts of the much more significant growth in tourism and this is something which must be taken into account and a baseline established against which future monitoring and the impact of mitigation measures can be assessed. Only once this comprehensive baseline is established can a meaningful framework for the interpretation of project-level HRA be defined and the cumulative impacts of growth be understood. (Para 6.4.11) The mitigation charge of £50 per house should be re-examined in relation to the effectiveness of measures implemented to date and the much higher charges implemented elsewhere in the country (e.g. the Dorset Heaths). How will ongoing impacts be dealt with that require recurrent expenditure? Better integration with tourism policy is needed. It is unreasonable to place the whole burden of these costs on developers/business. A tourism tax/levy would help pay for mitigation of impacts on the environment and shift the whole issue of tourist development to a new and much more sustainable level. Such taxes are widely used throughout Europe.</p> <p>Policy wording makes no reference to conserving and enhancing the AONB landscape which NPPF (para 172) recognises as having the highest status of protection and where the scale and extent of development should be limited.</p>		<p>RAMS study is dealing with these issues. The findings will influence the final version of this policy.</p> <p>A separate, new AONB policy is included in the revised Plan.</p>
Breckland District Council	<b>Support</b>	We welcome the references to the Breckland SPA throughout the Local Plan and support the overall aims of policy LP17 which seeks		Noted - The existing Monitoring and Mitigation

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
		<p>to restrict development within 1,500m of the Breckland SPA and that beyond the SPA, a further 1,500m buffer will also be applied to areas where qualifying features are known to exist. This policy approach is broadly similar our own, however, it is worth noting that policy ENV03 of our emerging local plan requires a Monitoring and Mitigation Framework to ensure that no adverse impact on the integrity of Breckland SPA will occur due to urban effects and recreational pressure arising from proposed growth. The Framework will consist of measures that monitor and address recreational pressure from proposed development, including the creation of an advisory group. Partnership working with King's Lynn and West Norfolk will be an important aspect of this framework and will enable more detailed consideration of proposed developments and refinement of the type of monitoring that needs to be put in place and any mitigation required to address identified impacts of development, both on an individual site level and the consideration of cumulative pressure.</p>		<p>Strategy and the emerging Norfolk-wide GI and RAMS study are dealing with these issues. The findings will influence the final version of this policy.</p>
<p>Planning Secretary Kings Lynn Civic Society</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Heritage - We feel the Local Plan is extremely 'light touch' on historic and cultural heritage matters. Other Local Plans we have reviewed often have a whole section on 'historic environment' and several specific policies on heritage assets. West Norfolk and King's Lynn has a tremendous historic wealth that must form part of our economic and social development strategy going forward. We were very disappointed to note that the Borough appeared to support de-listing of a formerly listed structure last year – and trust that this does not set a precedent. We would like to see Neighbourhood Planners encouraged to develop specific heritage policies and to identify 'local lists' of sites and structures of heritage importance. We would like to see the Borough make it clear that enforcement procedures and compulsory purchase</p>		<p>New, separate heritage policy included.</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
		orders will be used where owners fail to safeguard and maintain structures with heritage significance. We would like to see planning policy that encourages residential use of space over shops and other listed buildings in the town.		
Consultations Team Natural England	<b>Object</b>	Protected Landscape - We are concerned that the Local Plan does not include a specific policy for the Norfolk Coast AONB. Natural England expects the Plan to include strategic policies to protect and enhance valued landscapes, as well as criteria based policies to guide development. We advise the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to take into account the relevant Management Plan for the area. For Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the LPA should seek the views of the AONB Partnership. Development proposals brought forward through the Plan should avoid significant impacts on protected landscapes, including those outside the Plan's area and early consideration should be given to the major development tests set out in paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We highlight paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that the scale and extent of development within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be limited. NPPF policy affords protection for designated landscapes which provides a default of no major development within an AONB unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.	Natural England advises the inclusion of a policy specific to the AONB, in accordance with our advice above, this could be included within Policy LP17 and cross-referenced in Policies LP15 and LP21. In our view this is required to ensure that the Plan is sound with regard to compliance with paragraph 172 of the NPPF	A new, separate AONB policy is included in the revised Plan as suggested by the Norfolk Coast Partnership.
Consultations Team Natural England	<b>Mixed</b>	Natural England supports and welcomes the Council's commitment to a cross boundary approach to recreational disturbance and Green Infrastructure (Para 6.4.13). We strongly advise that this is incorporated in the wording of Policy LP24 and referenced in LP17. We propose that wording for the strategy is consistent in Local	Whilst we appreciate the inclusion of Breckland SPA in policy we suggest that either all European sites are	Agree – include 'European Sites' section and cross-reference to LP24.



Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
		<p>Plan Policy across Norfolk Authorities. We welcome that bullet point 3 requires application of the ecological mitigation hierarchy. However we suggest minor amendments to ensure that avoidance measures are implemented wherever possible. Mitigation measures should be used where it is not possible to avoid adverse impact. Compensation measures should only be used as a last resort.</p>	<p>listed, or a dedicated section for European Sites is included in policy wording. We agree with the inclusion of site specific information for Breckland SPA but suggest that this is added under the European Sites section as a bullet point or within the supporting text. We advise that the Local Planning Authority amend the wording to provide further detail as demonstrated in Policy CS 2 (page 38) Forest Heath Local Development Plan. We also suggest that the planning authority liaise with West Suffolk Council for inform nest attempt and buffer data to feed into the Local Plan HRA/SA and any other necessary assessment.</p>	

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
Consultations Team Natural England	<b>Object</b>		<p>Soils - The Local Plan should give appropriate weight to the roles performed by the area's soils. These should be valued as a finite multi-functional resource which underpins our wellbeing and prosperity. Decisions about development should take full account of the impact on soils, their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver.</p> <p>The Plan should safeguard the long term capability of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification) as a resource for the future in line with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph</p>	Agree - Include soils and best and most versatile agricultural land in policy and supporting text.

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/Proposed Action
			170. This is referenced in Policy LP21 – Renewable Energy, which is welcomed, but this needs to apply to all relevant development. Perhaps this could be included with Policy LP17 Environmental Assets.	