

Ref.	Date	Name/Dept.	Organisation	Address	Postcode	Section	Support	Oppose	Supp w. mods	Comments	Reasons
HINP1	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	General				✓	A policies map has not been provided with the submitted Neighbourhood Plan. There are a number of policies in this Neighbourhood Plan where the Council considers that it would be beneficial to be able to refer to a policies map, in order to aid clarity in decision making.
HINP2	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Page 61 – Policy HING2: Location and scale of new housing			✓		A consistent reference to the Settlement Boundary as suggested in our previous comments has mostly been addressed. However, there is still reference to a ‘development boundary’ in the second paragraph under ‘Scale’. The Council considers that this should be amended for consistency. The final paragraph lacks clarity in terms of how it relates to national and local exception policies that would allow housing outside defined settlement boundaries, specifically whether the purpose of the term ‘essential need’ is intended to add a further restriction to the application of those policies. Exception policies contained within the Greater Norwich Local Plan are strategic policies with which the Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity.
HINP3	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Page 70 – Policy HING4: Design			✓		The Council made several representations on this policy during the previous, Reg. 14 consultation. One of these related to point (ii) under ‘Layout’, which states that ‘new development at the edge of the settlement must not impede the quality of the existing outward views into the Norfolk countryside’. The Council considers that there is still an issue of clarity as regards this point. Is the policy requirement that views for existing residents should not be impeded, or does this mean that development should take advantage of these views and orientate new buildings, so that their inhabitants can also experience them? Development that takes place on the edge of a village will by its nature impact the views from existing properties. The purpose of the planning system is to protect views that are objectively important in the public interest, such as the protection of important public views through policy HING19, rather than necessarily to protect the current views of the countryside experienced of one or group of private individuals. If the intention is to protect the current views experienced by individual properties, irrespective of the objective importance in the public interest then the Council considers that such proposals would not be in accord with national planning legislation. To ensure the policy is in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 16(d) of the NPPF, the Council consider this statement should be revised in a manner consistent with the following : ‘Any perceived loss of residential amenity, such as loss of outward views into the countryside, resulting from development should be taken into account with appropriate mitigation measures put in place.’
HINP4	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Page 87 – Policy HING9: Allocation of land for community uses (page 83)			✓		Despite being, in principle, supportive of this aspiration, the Council has previously raised planning concerns regarding this allocation policy which do not appear to have been directly addressed by any discernible changes in the submitted version of the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, the Council re-iterates its concerns, below. The Council has not been able to identify evidence that demonstrates that the site is reasonably likely to come forward for the development being outlined. The site is not owned by the Town Council and whilst is has been stated that the landowner has been consulted, there is no evidence that the landowner has provided consent for a particular proposal to be delivered. In addition, the site assessment clearly shows that there are considerable vehicular access issues as regards the site and yet it has been allocated for a potential car park and a mix of community uses of unspecified scale and intensity of use. The GNLP Appendix B, included in the Site Assessment document, clearly states that the site was not allocated in the GNLP due to Attleborough Road being too constrained and not suitable. This concern has been repeated in the Neighbourhood Plans own Site Options Report, which states that “existing site assessment evidence and site visit indicate the site is not suitable for development with access from Attleborough Road including the community uses sought due to potential vehicular access constraints”. The Council has not been able to identify any evidence within or supporting the Neighbourhood Plan that indicates these issues have been explored and that it has been identified that such constraints can be adequately addressed. Also, it is clearly stated in both the site assessment and the supporting text that the potential for pedestrian connectivity to the town centre would require third party land, which again cannot be guaranteed. While the Council does not object to the principle of pedestrian connectivity and agrees that this should be delivered as part of such a scheme, as outlined previously, the absence of evidence brings into question the suitability of the land for the uses proposed and whether there is a reasonable prospect that the site will be developed for the uses proposed. Due to the apparent absence of evidence that constraints can be overcome and that there is a reasonable prospect that the site can be developed for the uses proposed, the Council considers that this policy does not currently meet the requirements of paragraph 16(b) of the NPPF, which states that Plans should ‘be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable.’ It is also not in accord with paragraph 31 which requires all policies to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. In addition, the policy text does not clearly state what mix of community uses the land is actually proposed to be allocated for. As such and as written, the Council does not consider that the policy as drafted meets the requirements of paragraph 16(d) of the NPPF that requires policies to be “clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”. For these reasons the Council does not consider that the current policy meets the basic conditions. Should evidence not be available to justify the allocation of land for a specific use, that is defined with sufficient precision, then it may be appropriate to amend the allocation to a criteria-based policy that would allow for the delivery of the uses the Neighbourhood Plan wishes to achieve outside of the defined settlement boundary, should a demonstrably suitable and deliverable site be able to be identified in the future.
HINP5	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Page 77 – Policy HING5: Historic environment			✓		The Council raised a concern during the Reg. 14 consultation regarding point (b) of this policy, where it refers to the use of reclaimed materials. Generally, the use of reclaimed materials is discouraged in new buildings/extensions as this can lead to the creation of demand for materials that results in other heritage assets being demolished to meet the supply. This statement remains in the policy of the submitted Neighbourhood Plan and the Council re-iterates its objection to the inclusion of this point, within the context of the historic environment. Although the broader concept of re-using materials from a sustainability point of view is understood, the presence of this point within a policy relating to the historic environment implies that materials could be reclaimed from historic structures and/or buildings, which may well be heritage assets. Historic England advise against using reclaimed materials for repairs of heritage assets - <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/your-home/maintain-repair/materials/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/your-home/maintain-repair/materials/</a> In addition, the Council previously raised a concern that a focus in HING5 on preserving the town’s Georgian heritage risks ignoring other key elements of the town’s heritage which do not date from the Georgian era. On this basis, the Council would recommend re-wording the first sentence of paragraph 3 of the policy to read, ‘New development must avoid or fully mitigate any potential harmful impact on heritage assets with particular consideration given to preserving Hingham’s Georgian heritage.’ The Council considers that these changes are necessary in order for the policy to contribute to sustainable development, as required by the Basic Conditions.
HINP6	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Pages 96/97 – Policy HING12: Improving access and safety			✓		The Council considers that Figure 18 should be cross referenced within the policy wording, so as to provide clarity and guidance to developers and decision-makers (in accordance with paragraph 16[d] of the NPPF) as to the layout of the existing footpath and cycleway network within the parish.
HINP7	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Page 97 – Policy HING13: Protecting and enhancing Public Rights of Way			✓		The Council has previously commented that Public Rights of Way are overseen by Norfolk County Council and, while South Norfolk Council would support the protection and enhancement of this network, we would expect NCC to comment on specific proposals. The Council also consider it necessary to make a greater distinction in this policy between Public Rights of Way and the general footpath network. The last paragraph of this policy conflates both of these; however, they are distinct from each other. The Council would recommend that the reference to Public Rights of Way in the final paragraph should be removed and this paragraph focus solely on the wider footpath network. This is necessary in order to provide clear guidance, in accordance with paragraph 16(d) of the NPPF.
HINP8	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Page 101 – Policy HING14: New and existing business			✓		The Council supports the protection of existing employment sites. However, the Council has previously questioned exactly how these sites will be protected in the future. This could be questioned if it is shown through marketing that the site is no longer viable in its current use. As written, the policy would prevent the site from being used for any other purpose and it does not provide any flexibility to respond to changing circumstances. The Council considers that it is necessary to address this point in order for the policy to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, in accordance with paragraph 16(a) of the NPPF.
HINP9	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Page 105 – Policy HING15: Retail and town centre			✓		The Council considers that it is necessary for that the policy makes explicitly clear the location in which it applies (Figure 44) as currently this is not clearly defined within the policy itself. This amendment will bring the clarity and precision required by the NPPF, including paragraph 16(d).
HINP10	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Page 107 – Policy HING17: Renewable energy			✓		The Council supports the consideration of renewable energy. However, as written, the policy appears to imply that ‘appropriate locations’ (as stated in the opening paragraph) may be separate from the criteria of the policy, which does not appear to be the intention. For clarity, the Council would considers it necessary to reword the final paragraph to state that ‘Proposals for the development of decentralised, renewable and low carbon sources of energy will be supported where they satisfy the following criteria’.
HINP11	10/05/2024	Place Shaping Team	South Norfolk Council	Horizon Centre, Peachman Way, Norwich	NR7 0WF	Para 7.8 (page 58)				✓	Typo: The word ‘are’ is missing from the final sentence.
HINP12	13/05/2024	Joint Estates & Facilities	Norfolk & Suffolk Constabularies	Norfolk Constabulary, Estates & Facilities Dept, Jubilee House, Falconers Chase, Norwich	NR18 0WW	General			✓		The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) gives significant weight to promoting safe communities (in section 8 of the NPPF). Nationally the Police have sought to provide advice and guidelines to support and create safer communities, most notably reflected in their ‘Secured By Design’ initiative which seek to improve the security of buildings and their immediate surroundings to provide safe places to live. In terms of creating and maintaining safer communities in your area, it is requested that the Neighbourhood Plan satisfactorily addresses NPPF provisions by including: - A Neighbourhood Plan objective to ‘Create and maintain a safer community and reduce crime and disorder’. - The Neighbourhood Plan policy to include ‘All new developments should conform to the ‘Secured by Design’ and the Neighbourhood Plan will ‘Support development proposals aimed at improving community safety’. - The Neighbourhood Plan to recognise that ‘Police infrastructure to be supported and provided to enhance community safety and reduce crime and disorder’. Where your Neighbourhood Plan identifies new residential dwellings and / or commercial development are planned to be provided in the area, this will result in an increase in the population and local employment which will add some pressure to existing police resources in the area. To address this, further upfront investment may be required to enhance police provision and infrastructure. If additional provision / infrastructure is not partially funded and delivered through the planning system (including through development plan policy provision), the consequence is that additional pressure will be placed on existing police resources in your area. We trust that these matters can be incorporated into your Neighbourhood Plan objectives / policies.
HINP13	15/05/2024	Operations (East)	National Highways	Woodlands, Manton Lane, Bedford	MK41 7LW	General				✓	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. Notwithstanding the above comments, we have reviewed the document and note the details of set out within the draft document are unlikely to have an severe impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment.

HINP14	17/05/2024	Planning Central	Sport England	Sport Park, 3 Oakwood Drive, Loughborough, Leicester	LE11 3QF	General				✓	<p>N.B. The following is a summary. Please see full response for details.</p> <p>It is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 102 and 103. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document - <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</a></p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded - <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</a></p> <p>A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area.</p> <p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity.</p>
HINP15	04/06/2024	Quality & Environment	Anglian Water	Lancaster House, Ermine Business Park, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire	PE29 6XU	General				✓	<p>Anglian Water has previously submitted comments on the pre-submission version (Reg 14) of the neighbourhood plan. We welcome the amendments in the submission version of the neighbourhood plan, following our comments and recommended changes.</p> <p>I can confirm, I have no further comments to make and wish the neighbourhood plan group every success in taking this forward.</p>
HINP16	07/06/2024	Partnerships Team	Historic England	Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge	CB2 8BU	General				✓	<p>We are pleased to note the historic environment features throughout the Plan, and in particular, we welcome the inclusion of Section 2, and Policy HINGS which includes both designated and non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Having reviewed the plan and relevant documentation we do not consider it necessary for Historic England to provide detailed comments at this time. We would refer you if appropriate to any previous comments submitted at Regulation 14 stage, and for any further information to our detailed advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into a neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/</a></p> <p>We would be grateful if you would notify us on <a href="mailto:eastplanningpolicy@historicengland.org.uk">eastplanningpolicy@historicengland.org.uk</a> if and when the Neighbourhood Plan is made by the council. 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>
HINP17	13/06/2024	Sustainable Development Officer	Water Management Alliance	Pierpoint House, 28 Horsley's Fields,	PE30 5DD	General				✓	<p>Having reviewed the submission, I can confirm that Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board have no additional comments to make further to the comments previously submitted on 23/08/2023.</p>
HINP18	17/06/2024	G. Bedford	Resident			Vision (page 48) and Consultation Statement response 57 (page 149 of Consultation Statement)			✓		<p>I agree that the NP Vision for Hingham looks rather bland and could be applied to almost any modest sized town.</p> <p>Suggested alternative Vision -</p> <p>"Hingham is a former market town with a historic conservation area at the centre of a caring community. It provides residents an attractive, green and pleasant environment with an eclectic mix of housing, often reflective of its gradual growth as a rural hub of social, farming and business activity.</p> <p>Now designated a 'key service centre' for the surrounding area, housing or industrial/commercial development will be in harmony with this historic role but will emphasise sustainability, good design, layout and environmental sensitivity with the necessary accompanying community and hard infrastructure to support this. Attention will be given to improving Hingham's identity with consideration being given to a more focused central community hub along with associated visitor amenities.</p> <p>Interconnectivity within and outside the town will be improved to encourage safe walking, cycling and general access especially for those with mobility issues. Amenities that provide social, sporting or leisure activities across the ages, and that complement the growing tradition of Hingham being a caring community, will be encouraged and supported.</p> <p>The provision of well considered green spaces will contribute to this and special regard will be given to extending these where possible for the benefit of our natural flora and fauna, residents and visitors.</p> <p><b>To maintain Hingham's pleasant character and quality of life, the growing problem of town centre car parking needs urgent resolution, in association with other road safety and traffic calming issues."</b></p>
HINP19	17/06/2024	G. Bedford	Resident			Non-planning community aspirations' (page 52) and Consultation Statement response 61 (page 149 of Consultation Statement)			✓		<p>SNC have suggested that the valuable resident survey work undertaken by the NP Steering Group to understand all that's good or should be better about life in Hingham should be represented somehow in the final plan as an associated "to do list". I totally agree. The NP is a planning development document but we all know that these things depend to a huge degree the all encompassing infrastructure investment, as well as the natural environment. And, to be successful, before development rather than "sometime"! Somehow these two have to become proper bedfellows not distant cousins!</p> <p>Five years or so ago I led a small group of concerned residents and set up the Hingham Road Safety Campaign (HRSC), focused primarily of the longstanding speeding and safety issues on the B1108 Watton to Norwich arterial road. It had the support of many residents, the police, Community SpeedWatch, Highways, the Hingham Society, the Church and financially by a grant from the Town Council. After much research and comment by residents, in 2020 it produced a 30 page report to the Town Council. It proposed that the findings, once discussed and improved as necessary by the Town Council, and others, should form the basis of a strategic statement of intent, alongside the NP, as a complete TOWN Plan. A former rather simpler holistic town plan was produced itself by the Town Council in 2015.</p> <p>Most regrettably, after publication, the Council declined to engage with the small team producing the plan to develop it further and it was eventually batted into the court of the Hingham NP steering group who in turn said "not our function". Since then, as you may know, the TC have set up a Highways, Transport and Environment Working Party with wide powers to consider, inter alia, the area covered by our (HRSC) and the Resident Survey findings. This group appears to be a legitimate home for the legacy of our report to inform its deliberations.</p> <p>To date, although we have suggested a way the resident survey findings might now be tackled, prioritised, adopted (or not) and fed into such a Town Plan' (inside or outside the NP), we have not had an answer.</p> <p>These views are expressed in Response 36 on page 143.</p>
HINP20	18/06/2024	M. Verlander	Avison Young (on behalf of National Gas Transmission)	3 Brindleyplace, Birmingham	B1 2JB	General				✓	<p>National Gas Transmission has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.</p> <p>About National Gas Transmission - National Gas Transmission owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.</p> <p>Proposed sites crossed or in close proximity to National Gas Transmission assets:</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission's assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure. National Gas Transmission has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>National Gas Transmission provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/network-route-maps">https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/network-route-maps</a></li> </ul> <p>Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Gas Transmission infrastructure.</p> <p>Distribution Networks</p> <p>Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting: <a href="mailto:plantprotection@cadentgas.com">plantprotection@cadentgas.com</a></p>
HINP21	19/06/2024	Lead Local Flood Authority	Norfolk County Council	County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich	NR1 2DH	General - flooding	✓				<p>The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) welcomes that the Hingham Neighbourhood Plan (Submission Version) and its proposed policies retain references to flooding from various sources such as surface water and fluvial flooding and to the implications of climate change. It is noted that some reference is also now included within the document to groundwater flooding. Of the 22 policies proposed, Policy HING1: Sustainable Development, Policy HING4: Design, Policy HING18: Local Green Spaces, Policy HING20: Biodiversity, Policy HING21: Climate Change and Flood Risk and Figures 4, 22, 23, 24 and 45, are of most relevance to matters for consideration by the LLFA.</p> <p>The LLFA further welcomes references retained in the document to the Hingham Neighbourhood Plan and its proposed policies complimenting Strategic Planning Policies (at both Local and National Levels).</p> <p>The LLFA also welcomes reference retained in the document to the need for guidance of relevant Agencies including the Norfolk County Council LLFA, the Internal Drainage Board and Environment Agency, being adhered to in respect of flood risk management, drainage and flooding matters. It is further welcomed that some EA mapping for fluvial flood risk, showing a small area in the south-east of the Parish being located within Flood Zone 3, has been included within the latest document (Figure 24), with Figure 22 showing river (fluvial) flooding and Figure 23 identifying areas of surface water flooding.</p> <p>The LLFA are aware of AW DGS records within the Parish of Hingham however, this will need to be confirmed with/by Anglian Water.</p> <p>According to LLFA datasets (extending from 2011 to present day) we have no records of internal flooding and 4 records of external/aneecdotal flooding in the Parish of Hingham (one additional external record than at the time of our response to the Regulation 14 consultation). The LLFA highlight the importance of considering surface water, groundwater and flooding from ordinary watercourses within the Neighbourhood Plan in the best interest of further development in the area. We note that all external flood events are deemed anecdotal and have not been subject to an investigation by the LLFAWe advise that the LLFA publish completed flood investigation reports at <a href="https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/38645">https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/38645</a>.</p> <p>According to Environment Agency datasets, there are significant areas of localised surface water flooding (ponding) and surface water flowpaths present within the Parish of Hingham.</p>
HINP22	19/06/2024	Lead Local Flood Authority	Norfolk County Council	County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich	NR1 2DH	General - surface water risk and drainage			✓		<p>The LLFA still recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan document would benefit from reference being made to the 'Norfolk County Council LLFA Statutory Consultee for Planning: Guidance Document (the latest being Version 7.0 published in May 2024 regarding surface water risk and drainage for any allocated sites or areas of proposed development, available from the "Information for developers" section of the Norfolk County Council website.</p>

HINP23	19/06/2024	Lead Local Flood Authority	Norfolk County Council	County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich	NR1 2DH	General - flood risk mapping			✓		Whilst the LLFA note that some flood risk mapping has been included in the document, the LLFA recommend that mapping be provided for all sources of flooding including groundwater, with any mapping covering the entirety of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Information on this and associated tools/reference documents can be found at: • GOV.UK - Long Term Flood Information – Online EA Surface Water Flood Map ( <a href="https://www.gov.uk/check-long-term-flood-risk">https://www.gov.uk/check-long-term-flood-risk</a> ) • Norfolk County Council (NCC) – Flood and Water Management Policies ( <a href="https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/article/39011/Flood-and-water-management-policies">https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/article/39011/Flood-and-water-management-policies</a> ) • Norfolk County Council (NCC) – LLFA Statutory Consultee for Planning: Guidance Document ( <a href="https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/38642">https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/38642</a> )
HINP24	19/06/2024	Lead Local Flood Authority	Norfolk County Council	County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich	NR1 2DH	Climate change and flood risk' (page 129)	✓				The LLFA welcome the retention of references in the document to flood risk and climate change, the inclusion of the 'Climate Change and Flood Risk' Section, and in particular Proposed Policy HING21: Climate Change and Flood Risk which refers to the need for developments to consider flood risk and drainage, along with the implications of climate change. The LLFA further welcomes references made to ensuring new developments do not exacerbate existing flooding or drainage problems or lead to new ones, either through surface water run-off or displacement, and that development proposals should include appropriate drainage details that conform to the relevant standards of bodies such as the LLFA.
HINP25	19/06/2024	Lead Local Flood Authority	Norfolk County Council	County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich	NR1 2DH	HING4: Design (page 70) and HING21: Climate change and flood risk (page 130)	✓				Furthermore, the LLFA welcomes references retained in Policy HING4: Design and Policy HING21: Climate Change and Flood Risk to the use of SuDS systems and recognises the benefits of new developments incorporating SuDS to help reduce run off rates by providing attenuation by storing water to help slow its flow, improve water quality by filtering pollutants and avoiding environmental contamination to clean water, whilst also providing benefits for biodiversity. It is noted that Policy HING4 also recognises the need for sustainable drainage systems to be well designed to integrate into the landscape and where used, SuDS should not be included in the open space calculation for the site. Reference is also made to avoiding the inclusion of features in new developments such as non-porous materials for driveways and pavements to help reduce issues such as surface water pooling and localised flooding. The LLFA particularly welcomes the retention of Policy HING21: Climate Change and Flood Risk which highlights the benefits of including SuDS features such as lagoons and wetland features on drainage and flood risk, and the wider amenity, recreational and biodiversity benefits of doing so. The LLFA also welcome that Policy HING21 has been enhanced from the previous version with the policy text now making specific reference to developments seeks to achieve the four pillars of SuDS, namely water quality, water quantity, amenity and biodiversity.
HINP26	19/06/2024	Lead Local Flood Authority	Norfolk County Council	County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich	NR1 2DH	HING18: Local Green Spaces (page 111)				✓	The document proposes 15 no. open spaces which are identified in Policy HING18: Local Green Spaces, Figure 45 and Appendix C. The LLFA note some proposed Local Green Spaces Designations have been removed since the publication of the Regulation 14 document. It is understood that designation of LGSs provides a level of protection against development. The LLFA do not normally comment in LGSs unless they are/are proposed to be part of a SuDS or contribute to current surface water management/land drainage. If it is believed that a designated LGS forms part of a SuDS or contributes to current surface water management/land drainage, this should be appropriately evidenced within the submitted Neighbourhood Plan. The LLFA have no comments to make on the proposed LGSs in the plan.
HINP27	19/06/2024	Transport	Norfolk County Council	County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich	NR1 2DH	HING18: Local Green Spaces (page 111)		✓			The following proposed LGS designations are dedicated highway: 2. Grass area at the junction of Hall Lane and Hall Close 3. Grass verge of west side of Dereham Road 10. Green space at Hardingham Street and Admirals Walk 11. Green space at Dereham Road near junction with Greenacre Road The proposed LGS designations 2, 3, 10, and 11 are on dedicated highway land. The Highway Authority objects to these LGS designations as they could be seen as conflicting with the powers of the Highway Authority and could be used to frustrate operations within public highway.
HINP28	20/06/2024	Planning & Advocacy	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Bewick House 22 Thorpe Road Norwich	NR1 1RY	HING18: Local Green Spaces (page 111)	✓				We support this policy and the identified 15 Local Green Spaces. Green spaces provide important habitats for wildlife and can act as wildlife corridors.
HINP29	20/06/2024	Planning & Advocacy	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Bewick House 22 Thorpe Road Norwich	NR1 1RY	HING20: Biodiversity (page 128)			✓		We welcome the preamble wording which includes reference to important wildlife sites within the NP area. However, we would also recommend including a list of all the Priority Habitats which are found in the NP area in this section. (MAGIC maps identifies a number of Priority Habitats within the NP area.) We are also pleased with the careful consideration given to the policy wording regarding 'Tree Planting' and 'Wildlife measures' and the inclusion of wording referring to the creation of new wildlife corridors.  We support the following aim in section 11.23: 'Policy HING20 below seeks to protect locally designated sites such as County Wildlife Sites from development that would damage their wildlife value.' As County Wildlife Sites (CWS) are some of our most valuable wildlife areas we therefore recommend that the first paragraph of the policy specifically includes reference to County Wildlife Sites and Priority Habitats, for example: 'All development proposals will be expected to protect, improve and enhance existing ecological networks, wildlife corridors (such as the area around Sea Mere), Priority Habitats and species in the parish. Important sites for wildlife, including County Wildlife Sites, must also be protected and opportunities taken for enhancement.'  To further strengthen protection for County Wildlife Sites and other important habitats within the NP area, we recommend policy wording to incorporate 'buffer zones'. These are designed to protect sensitive landscape patches and areas of high biodiversity from the impacts of development. We therefore recommend the following additional policy wording, or similar: 'Buffer zones should be considered and encouraged around sensitive sites, where appropriate, and where this will provide ecological benefits.'  We advocate the addition of green roofs/walls to buildings as they provide many benefits: increasing biodiversity, reducing run-off, improving air quality and improving thermal performance by providing shading and insulation which contributes to greater energy efficiency. (NPPF Para 164) We therefore recommend that this is considered in the policy wording, particularly with respect to any new community buildings.  (Please also see Part 2 of our response to the Biodiversity policy.)
HINP30	20/06/2024	Planning & Advocacy	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Bewick House 22 Thorpe Road Norwich	NR1 1RY	HING20: Biodiversity (page 128)			✓		Part two of response to Biodiversity policy -  he State of Nature report highlights the significant historical losses that have occurred across the UK and safeguarding what remains of our natural heritage is a vital cornerstone in nature's future recovery. The Environment Act 2021 makes a 10% biodiversity net gain mandatory. However, given the pressures facing biodiversity, we recommend a greater ambition of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain should be encouraged to provide greater confidence in genuine gains for biodiversity and ensure the successful recovery of nature in Norfolk. Natural England's biodiversity net gain study (Vivid Economics, June 2018) considered the impacts on the economics and viability of development and concluded that a biodiversity net gain requirement was not expected to affect the financial viability of housing developments (up to 20% biodiversity net gain scenario); it also suggests there is a strong case for greater ambition. (State of Nature 2023 - report on the UK's current biodiversity)
HINP31	20/06/2024	Planning & Advocacy	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Bewick House 22 Thorpe Road Norwich	NR1 1RY	HING21: Climate change and flood risk (page 130)			✓		The UK government has committed to reach net zero emissions by 2050. This policy will be important in helping to tackle climate change at a local level and contribute to the goal of net zero emissions. We therefore support the policy wording regarding climate change in principle, but recommend stronger policy wording to ensure that it is robust and effective, for example, rather than 'Proposals are encouraged...', we recommend the following: 'Proposals must include....'  We support the policy wording relating to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS). SuDS are important in reducing flood risk, reducing pollution downstream and locally, increasing biodiversity and when used effectively can provide habitat connectivity.
HINP32	20/06/2024	Planning & Advocacy	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Bewick House 22 Thorpe Road Norwich	NR1 1RY	HING22: Dark skies (page 134)			✓		Due to the known adverse impacts on nocturnal wildlife from light pollution, we welcome the focus on Dark Skies and minimising adverse effects on wildlife , but recommend the following additional wording which is more detailed and specific to ensure robust protection for wildlife: 'Development proposals should demonstrate compliance with best practice guidance for avoiding artificial lighting impacts on bats: ' ( <a href="https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/">https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/</a> ) . Where lighting cannot be avoided altogether in proposals then it must be designed to avoid light spill onto wildlife roosts, foraging habitat, and commuting routes for bats, birds, and other species.'
HINP33	21/06/2024	Consultations Team	Natural England	Hornbeam House Crewe Business Park Electra Way Crewe Cheshire	CW1 6GJ	General				✓	N.B. The following is a summary. Please see full response for details.  Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.  Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. 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 following information.

HINP34	24/06/2024	ICS Strategic Estates	Norfolk & Waveney Integrated Care System	-	-	General - healthcare				✓	<p>I write following the above consultation on behalf of the Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (ICS), incorporating Norfolk &amp; Waveney ICB, Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust and the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust.</p> <p>The local Primary Care Network (PCN) that would cover the health needs of Hingham residents is the Ketts Oak PCN, and is a collaboration between primary, secondary, community, social, voluntary, and mental health care providers to form an integrated health and social care service to patients.</p> <p>Hingham Surgery is the nearest Primary healthcare facility to the Hingham Neighbourhood Plan boundary and falls within the parishes catchment area. Having a GP practice within Hingham itself the next easily accessible GP practices closet to the area are situated in Watton and Wymondham. Residents new to the area will be required to register and visit a GP practice which would likely be at one of the above mentioned locations.</p> <p>In terms of premises space, Hingham Surgery is already constrained in terms of physical infrastructure capacity and with the addition of new developments in the surrounding area healthcare provision may not be sustainable. The PCNs are looking at ways to better integrate the community teams with Primary care provision.</p> <p>It is noted the household survey conducted indicated that residents would like to see an expansion to the Hingham doctors surgery. Objective 2 'Community Infrastructure' addresses and acknowledges this need and states that the Town Council will support health to providers in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of healthcare services across all health sectors for the parish residents through utilisation of (Local) CIL. This is supported by the ICS estates team.</p> <p>Section 2.27 'Public Transport' indicates that there are bus services in place to the major towns located outside the parish boundary which also host mainline train stations for access to Norwich and Ely. Maintaining and enhancing travel links to and from main towns and cities is vital to allow residents who do not drive to have access to healthcare services that may not be available in the Hingham parish.</p> <p>It should also be noted that, if unmitigated, the impact of developments on healthcare in and around the Hingham parish would be unsustainable, including that of Primary Care, Community Care, Mental Healthcare, and the Acute Trust.</p>
HINP35	24/06/2024	W. Nichols	Lanpro	6 Central Avenue, St. Andrew's Business Park, Norwich	NR7 OHR	Section 8 - Community infrastructure (page 79)		✓			<p>N.B. The following is a summary. Please see full response for details.</p> <p>My client Glavenhill Ltd is currently in dialogue with representatives of Hingham Cricket Club (HCC) to facilitate and enable the delivery of a new Centre for Cricket in Hingham on land off Hardingham Road. Our discussions to-date are well advanced and it is clear that the new Centre for Cricket off Hardingham Road will be a tremendous asset to both Hingham and Norfolk Cricket. As such Glavenhill working with Hingham Cricket Club supports emerging Policy HING1 within the Neighbourhood Plan. Glavenhill further supports emerging Policy HING6 and Policy HING7. Glavenhill can further confirm the view contained in paragraph 8.18 of the Neighbourhood Plan that states that a household survey conducted as part of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan has concluded that "high levels of support for formal sports" provision exists within the village is correct.</p> <p>Glavenhill does however wish to encourage the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Hingham Town Council to consider slowing down the current evolution of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan so that a series of late references to the new Centre for Cricket can be inserted into the document. The references should acknowledge Glavenhill and HCC's work to-date and that Site HNP2 off Hardingham Road could potentially be suitable for the development of the new Centre for Cricket. This late request is made as to-date Glavenhill's efforts to engage with representatives of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have been resisted pending the output of the work being undertaken by AECOM to assess the sites being promoted. Despite several requests to engage and understand the AECOM work and their findings, the outcome of this assessment work in relation to Site HNP2 was not known until the current Regulation 16 Neighbourhood Plan was published.</p> <p>To be very clear Glavenhill and its partners do not agree that Site HNP2 is inappropriate for the development of the new Centre for Cricket nor that any related and enabling development required is unsuitable due to its physical distance from the Town Centre, or due to as yet unspecified highways constraints as identified by AECOM. This simply doesn't make any sense and Glavenhill would request a meeting with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group / Hingham Town Council with a suitably qualified highway engineer and representatives of Hingham Cricket Club present to discuss the Centre for Cricket proposal, and how this could be facilitated to meet the high-level of support within the village and across Norfolk.</p> <p>Until such time as the requested meeting is facilitated with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, Glavenhill now wishes to object to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan on the basis that it doesn't fully address, nor contain, the most effective growth strategy for sport within Hingham (based on all the evidence put forward to-date and outlined in this letter). The submitted Neighbourhood Plan further does not comply with South Norfolk Local Plan Policy DM 3.16 entitled Improving the level of community facilities as no other sites within Hingham are suitable to meet the needs of HCC on which to develop the Centre for Cricket. Importantly, the Regulation 16 Neighbourhood Plan fails to maximise South Norfolk Council's strategic objective to encourage the development of healthy and active lifestyles within Hingham that could be enabled by the inclusion of the Hardingham Road site as the new Centre for Cricket in the final version of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>To resolve this objection Glavenhill would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Centre for Cricket proposals with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Hingham Town Council as soon as is practically convenient.</p>