

Ref.	Date	Name/Dept.	Organisation	Support	Oppose	Supp w. mods	Comments	Reasons
HING9.1	25/04/2025	John Henderson				✓		<p>The revised policies are clearer and more precise following receipt of the Inspector's comments. The follow up feasibility study for Ladies Meadow provides much needed clarity on some of the issues.</p> <p>I would make two comments.</p> <p>The revised policy makes clear that suitable mitigation must be provided to ensure proposals fit with it's surrounding environment. However I still feel that this lacks the intention and focus on mitigating the impact of the proposals on the local residents that adjoin the meadow. I would recommend a further line in the policy that states that proposals must include suitable mitigation to offset the light and noise disturbance from any proposals to the neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Talking to local residents they are unaware of the proposals to further intensify the use of the footpath between Rectory Gardens and The Fairland. It appears to be only me that reads parish minutes and is aware of these consultations. As this is a fairly new proposal that wasn't available in the original consultation I would recommend that local residents adjacent are made aware of this proposal more directly and given the opportunity to respond to this further consultation. I'm trying my best but haven't spoken to everyone.</p>
HING9.2	07/05.2025	Lily Brough-Steele	Water Management Alliance				✓	Having reviewed the details specific to Policy HING9, I can confirm the Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board has no additional comments to make. Please refer to the Board's comments previously submitted on 23/08/2023 under our ref 23_2491_P.
HING9.3	19/05/2025	Philip Porter	National Highways				✓	<p>It has been noted that once adopted, the Neighbourhood Plan will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Where relevant, National Highways will be a statutory consultee on future planning applications within the area and will assess the impact on the SRN of a planning application accordingly.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above comments, we have reviewed the document and note that the details set out within the document are unlikely to have an severe impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment.</p>
HING9.4	28/05/2025	Lorraine Houseago	Norfolk Historic Environment Record				✓	Thank you for consulting with us about the above neighbourhood plan Reg 16 consultation. We have no comments to make.
HING9.5	31/05/2025	Geoff Bedford					✓	<p><i>N.B. The following is a summary. Refer to submission for full response details .</i></p> <p>1. Housing Growth - while many of the conclusions appear reasonable, the studies and figures fail to take into account the effects of housing growth during the GNLP planning period. Significant growth will be taking place in Hingham and the surrounding area during the plan period, in addition to the Government's plans for additional housing which require an updated GNLP. These households will produce some 15-20,000 extra cars in our area of interest. This growth will impact increasingly on The Fairlands junction and existing parking within the town. The infrastructure effects of the inevitable increasing traffic warrant early and greater attention.</p> <p>2. Footpath/Cyclepath safety - the proposed footpath/cyclepath from the Rectory to Ladies Meadow is of concern: the increasing popularity of electric scooters, if permitted here, would risk physical confrontations with pedestrians and is not recommended.</p> <p>3. Parking management - how will "town centre" visiting drivers be stopped form taking local residents parking spaces attending functions at Ladies Meadow? And vice versa. Are the 40 spaces mentioned just for residents? Is this enough? What maximum number of spaces (overall) are planned/can be tolerated given the land should also be 'sustainable' for future generations to use?</p> <p>4. Footpath review - A comprehensive review of Fairland footpaths, crossings, and waymarking is recommended before finalising the detail of the Rectory-Ladies Meadow path. This aligns with Recommendation 13 from the 2020 Hingham Road Safety Campaign report to Hingham Town Council (HTC). Review should include the intermittent pedestrian access from Watton Road to Lincoln Hall, Library, and Market Place, the widening of the narrow Church Street footpath; and a pedestrian-controlled crossing on the B1108 for those with mobility issues. Footpaths should be widened to modern standards, especially at waymarked crossings. Increased pedestrian use is expected, and current conditions often force people into the road. Alternative surface treatments should be used to highlight both primary and secondary pedestrian crossings—potentially extending to areas like the Market Place and Norwich Street.</p> <p>5. Traffic calming - Raised tables (with gentle surface treatments) are suggested on the B1108 in association with recommended crossing near the Lincoln Hall/Library crossing to support mobility-impaired users and alert drivers to the junction. Wymondham is a good example of effective implementation.</p> <p>6. Long-term planning - the 2020 Road Safety report produced by Hingham Road Safety Campaign was proposed as a 'Part 2' plan to cover infrastructure and safety improvements not addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan. Together the documents could form a comprehensive 'Town Plan' to be jointly negotiated with funding bodies. There has been no clear response from HTC or SNC on this proposal.</p>
HING9.6	03/06/2025	Carry Murphy	Anglian Water				✓	Anglian Water has no specific comments to make on the proposed modifications to Policy HING9: Allocation of land for community uses.
HING9.7	04/06/2025	Debbie Mack	Historic England			✓		<p>Historic England has no in principle objection to the Council's proposed alternative modification to the policy on the basis of new evidence having been presented following receipt of the examiners report.</p> <p>We welcome criterion d of the policy which mentions the Church. We would recommend adding reference to the Conservation Area into this criterion.</p> <p>We welcome the reference in paragraph 8.27 to the adjacent Conservation Area and nearby church and need for careful consideration of heritage implications for any proposals.</p> <p>To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.</p>
HING9.8	09/06/2025	Sally Wintle	Natural England				✓	<p><i>N.B. The following is a summary. Refer to submission for full response details.</i></p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the additional information as part of the submission.</p>

Ref.	Date	Name/Dept.	Organisation	Support	Oppose	Supp w. mods	Comments	Reasons
HING9.9	09/06/2025	Alison Doe	Hingham Town Council	✓				<p><i>N.B. The following is a summary. Refer to submission for full response details.</i></p> <p><u>Why the policy is needed</u> The Neighbourhood Plan runs to 2043. Allocating land for community use is essential to meet future needs as Hingham grows. Community consultation identified key shortfalls—aging Lincoln Hall, no off-road public parking, inadequate library and council facilities, and limited cemetery space. The town centre suffers from unregulated, congested parking. There’s no designated parking for events or the church, and concerns exist about Hingham being used as a “park and ride.” The Greater Norwich Local Plan didn’t address these community needs, so the Neighbourhood Plan has a role to play in addressing the issues. More housing, in addition to GNLP allocation, is expected in Hingham and Breckland area, increasing pressure on local infrastructure. Provision for new/improved facilities is essential. Without policy HIN9, the plan may fail at referendum, risking the loss of a community-led planning framework.</p> <p><u>Why Ladies Meadow?</u> The land, owned by the Diocese of Norwich, is well-placed to serve St Andrews Church and the town centre with much-needed car parking and improved pedestrian access. The proposed car park would reduce congestion and improve safety, especially around the Fairland junction. A strip of adjacent garden land could link Ladies Meadow to the existing footpath network, enhancing access to the cemetery and reducing pedestrian risk on Attleborough Road. No other suitable sites were identified during the Neighbourhood Plan’s call for sites. Although previously considered for housing in the GNLP, the site was ultimately discounted. However, the initial assessment concluded, <i>‘the site is considered to be a reasonable alternative as a smaller part could be acceptable for residential allocation, if careful consideration is given to design’</i> . There is therefore a concern it could be reallocated for housing in future Local Plan revisions, which would remove the opportunity to use it for vital community facilities.</p> <p><u>NCC Highways concerns</u> The feasibility study demonstrates that the site constraints can be overcome. The Town Council has a history of collaboration with NCC Highways and has invested in road safety improvements through the Parish Partnership scheme. Amendments have been proposed to HING9 to address concerns, though NCC Highways remain unsupportive, citing traffic concerns at the Fairland junction and lack of deliverability of proposals. The Town Council believes that there is a lack of consistency/dialogue in the messaging between different officers at NCC Highways—it is not a major development but a modest proposal for much-needed community facilities. Throughout previous NP Reg. 14 and Reg. 16 consultations, NCC Highways had not raised representations objecting to the allocation of land in HING9.</p> <p>There’s no evidence HING9 would increase traffic at the Fairlands junction; in fact, it may reduce it by intercepting vehicles earlier. Discussions with Highways (following the Fairland/Parking feasibility study) concluded that, due to low serious accident numbers, NCC would not support engineered safety improvements to the junction - hence the Town Council applying for Parish Partnership funding for a Vehicle Activated Collision Avoidance Scheme. The Council continues to pursue highway safety improvements, including speed limit reductions and vehicle-activated signage.</p>
HING9.10	09/06/2025	Alasdair Hain-Cole	Environment Agency				✓	We have reviewed the documents, as submitted, and have no objection to the proposed modifications.
HING9.11	09/06/2025	Richard Doleman	Norfolk County Council		✓			<p><i>N.B. The following is a summary. Refer to submission for full response details.</i></p> <p>The Examiner recommended deleting Policy HING9 due to concerns about its deliverability within the Plan period, particularly around pedestrian access and the overall feasibility of the proposed community uses. Since the Examiner’s report of September 2024, the further work asked for by the Examiner to develop the pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access to the site has been carried out. That work has been shared with the Highway Authority and there have been detailed discussions with South Norfolk Council to consider proposals to provide safe highway, pedestrian and cycle access to the site.</p> <p>This proposal has been thoroughly considered and taken through the County Council's internal process for considering allocations and applications. There remain significant concerns over the allocation and more information gathering is required before the Highway Authority would support allocation of the site in the Hingham Neighbourhood Plan, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- A continuous and suitable pedestrian link on Attleborough Road is not achievable.- Pedestrian access to the site from Church Street depends on third-party land with no guarantee of availability.- The Attleborough Road/Church Street junction has poor visibility and cannot be meaningfully improved to render it suitable for the intensification of use engendered by this proposal.- Visibility at the site access is uncertain due to mature trees in the vicinity. The plan provided isn't clear on this. <p>Further evidence is required that these issues can be satisfactorily overcome before the Highway Authority would support allocation of the site in the Hingham Neighbourhood Plan. As a result, the Highway Authority objects to the allocation of the site in the Neighbourhood Plan and agrees with the Examiner’s conclusion that no safe, deliverable access solution has been found. The Highway Authority does not consider that there is any suitable wording for Policy HING9 that would resolve the situation.</p> <p>However, it does acknowledge the importance of the issue and would support a criteria-based policy for bringing forward land for community uses outside the plan-making process, continuing to work with Hingham Town Council and South Norfolk Council.</p>