

**Minutes of the Meeting of Winterton-on-Sea Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group  
Wednesday 4th September 2019 7pm Winterton Village Hall**

**Present:** Mark Bobby  
Nigel Coe  
Neil Punchard  
Alec Sutton  
Claire Thompson  
Jane Roberts  
Mark Thompson (Small Fish)  
Louise Cornell (Small Fish)  
Catherine Moore (Parish Clerk)

**1. Election of Chairman**

It was **agreed** to elect Neil Punchard as Chairman, proposed by Alec Sutton, seconded by Mark Bobby, all in favour.

**2. Apologies**

There were no apologies for absence.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest for items on the agenda.

**4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2nd April 2019 were **agreed**.

**5. Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising from the last meeting.

**6. Draft Neighbourhood Plan - Comments from Stakeholders**

Mark Thompson and Louise Cornell presented the comments from Great Yarmouth Borough Council and the Broads Authority, giving their recommendations for action (see Appendix A).

It was noted that the Council Tax figures showed that a third of properties in Winterton-on-Sea were registered as second homes, although it was not known how many of these were actually holiday lets which weren't paying business rates.

It was suggested that the community policy relating to parking could be expanded to include creative solutions for parking using local facilities.

**7. Next Steps including Consultation**

It was **agreed** that Collective Community Planning would make the amendments to the draft, which would be brought back to the next meeting. The Regulation 14 consultation (six week period, including the community and statutory stakeholders) would take place at the mid to end of October, and would involve an open day, the Plan being available electronically and in hard copy around the village, and would need a specifically worded questionnaire. Once completed, all representations would have to be considered individually. The Clerk was asked to put together a timetable for the consultation, and a plan for advertising and practical matters.

**LC**

**Clerk**

**8. Any Other Business**

None.

**9. Next Meeting**

Wednesday 2nd October 2019, 7.30pm at Winterton Village Hall

The meeting closed at 8.50pm.

**CHAIRMAN**

## Winterton NP

**Potential changes to pre-submission document for consultation (for discussion at Steering Group on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> September 2019)**

<p><b>Section 2</b></p> <p>GYBC have suggested that reference is made that this neighbourhood plans contributes to the achievement of sustainable development as described in the NPPF (paragraph 8). This will help to demonstrate that the Basic Condition has been met.</p> <p><b>CCP view - Not essential, but could add a new section on other plans</b></p> <p>GYBC have suggested that reference is made to local planning authorities and over-arching strategic plans and the strategic policies within them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Yarmouth Borough Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Adopted Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2015)</li> <li>o Emerging Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Revised Housing Target</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Broads Authority <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Plan(s)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>This will help to demonstrate that the Basic Condition in having regard to strategic policies has been met.</p> <p><b>CCP view - could be helpful to make suggested change in new section on other plans</b></p>
<p><b>HO1: Settlement boundary and residential development</b></p> <p><b>Just CCP suggestion...</b></p> <p><b>Add following supporting text before the policy:</b>  <b>“The identified housing requirement is likely to be zero. Therefore, and in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF, “the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement.” The neighbourhood plan does not plan to allocate land for residential development, but is supportive of small-scale development within the settlement boundary, as well as conversions and exception sites outside of the boundary. It therefore has policies that should result in the housing requirement (of zero) being exceeded over the plan period.”</b></p> <p>GYBC suggestion re Figure 3 - Show only the development limits that you want to apply as per the policy. The Borough Council can provide a map with just the emerging Local Plan Part 2 Limits (black dotted line) if this is the boundary that you are seeking to apply?</p> <p><b>CCP view – make clear that the policy is not seeking to apply any development limit, that is for the local plan. Add also some text about seeing the latest version of the local plan.</b></p> <p>GYBC - Note, the neighbourhood plan policy will also be treated as being out of date where there is a lack of five-year housing land supply or failure to meet the Housing Delivery Test</p> <p><b>CCP view – probably, but could be worth seeing what the examiner says</b></p> <p>GYBC - Part B 5i-iii – it is unlikely that these criteria will prohibit sites exceeding these thresholds.</p> <p><b>CCP view – that will be down to the decision maker when determining a planning application</b></p> <p>GYBC - Page 9, final paragraph. Missing text? Sentence finishes with a comma.</p> <p><b>CCP – replace comma with full stop</b></p> <p>GYBC - Footnote 1 Typo – boundary</p>

<b>CCP – correct accordingly</b>
<b>Policy HO2: Housing mix</b>
<p>GYBC have asked what the evidence is for the mix being required, such as 25% being smaller homes.  <b>CCP view - The evidence from the census is that the greatest need is for smaller homes and for homes suitable for older people, and this was supported by consultation feedback. Add some of this evidence under the policy.</b></p> <p>GYBC have asked whether the policy considered viability of development schemes for this requirement? This mix could be costly for developers. Also concerned that the policy should build in some flexibility  <b>CCP view – The policy does provide for flexibility, stating, “unless clear evidence for an alternative mix is provided...” We could add something around diverging from the housing mix if it is shown not to be viable or there are other community benefits, just to add further clarity – this could be in the supporting text.</b></p> <p>GYBC have said that Part 2 cannot be reasonably enforced (for example: conversions through permitted developments, householder extensions etc.)  <b>CCP view – the policy is not concerned with householder applications (such as extensions) but new housing. Clearly it cannot apply to permitted development as indeed none of the development plan can be. No changes required, except maybe something in the supporting text.</b></p>
<b>Policy HO3: Affordable housing</b>
<p>GYBC have said that affordable housing is a strategic policy, and that this is set by strategic policy CS4 of the adopted Core Strategy - suggest removing first sentence in Policy HO3  <b>CCP view – the aim of the sentence (“Affordable housing will need to be provided in accordance with the prevailing policy in the most recently adopted local plan”) was meant to clarify that this is a strategic policy for the local plan. But can delete it.</b></p> <p>GYBC have said that on-site/off-site provision is adequately covered in Policy CS4  <b>CCP view – delete sentence related to on-site and off-site</b></p> <p>GYBC have said that the text on exception sites is covered by national policy  <b>CCP view – disagree as the policy specifies particular criteria. Leave as it is.</b></p> <p>GYBC have said that whilst affordable housing can be made available to local people in the first instance, a sequential approach is applied which could also mean it becomes available to people across the borough  <b>CCP view – the use of the term ‘local people’ is not meant to imply a restriction just to Winterton. So leave as it is but provide an explanation in the supporting text with reference to the sequential approach used by GYBC</b></p> <p>Broads Authority - para 4, second sentence – do you mean village or settlement boundary?  <b>CCP view – add reference to village centre policy at Figure 5</b></p>
<b>Policy HO4: Design</b>
<p>GYBC - What is ‘house types and layouts more obviously suited to holiday use’? There is no distinction within use classes – both are ‘C3’ dwelling house use. It will be hard to distinguish these.  <b>CCP view - Suggest that this is removed unless as a steering group we can propose some good and clear examples</b></p>
<b>Policy HO5: Principal Residence Housing</b>
<p>GYBC - How can this policy can be practically enforced? It will require a tight definition and clarity on the types of evidence that will need to be provided, for example, if a house is sold and then used as a second</p>

<p>home – what action can be taken?</p> <p><b>CCP view – it will be down to council enforcement for a breach of a planning condition</b></p> <p>GYBC - New unrestricted second homes will not be supported at any time’ – this may not be supported by an Examiner or Planning Inspectors</p> <p><b>CCP view – Sedgeford NP uses identical wording and has just been passed at the examination, so suggest leaving it as is.</b></p> <p>GYBC - Further evidence may be required – e.g. scale of impact, change over time, appropriateness over whole neighbourhood plan area</p> <p><b>CCP view – there is some evidence presented, but some additional evidence will be valuable to include alongside the policy</b></p>
<p><b>Policy HO6: Tourist accommodation</b></p> <p>GYBC - Suggest replacing ‘encourages’ with ‘supports’, and ‘supported’ with ‘permitted’</p> <p><b>CCP view – agree with change to ‘supports’, but not with change to ‘permitted’.</b></p> <p>GYBC - Potential typo – reference to HO4 (Design) not HO3 Affordable Housing?</p> <p><b>CCP – make change accordingly</b></p>
<p><b>Policy E1: Protecting and Enhancing the Environment</b></p> <p>GYBC ask, what is a demonstrable ecological gain? – It would be good to provide some practical examples. How will this be measured?</p> <p><b>CCP suggestions:</b>  <b>Policy currently reads, “Policy E1.</b>  <b>“Any development coming forward within the Neighbourhood Plan area is expected to result in a demonstrable ecological gain.....”</b></p> <p><b>Suggest changing to:</b>  <b>“Any development coming forward within the Neighbourhood Plan area is expected to result in a demonstrable NET ecological gain OF AT LEAST 10%.....” and we could add something about this being in line with any relevant government legislation and guidance.</b></p> <p><b>Add following supporting text after the policy:</b>  <b>“Biodiversity net gain can be assessed and measured using DEFRA’s biodiversity metric. The Neighbourhood Plan felt it important to specify a percentage gain as a minimum to avoid proposals seeking to exploit the aim of the policy by providing negligible net gains of, for example, 0.1%. 10% has been chosen as reasonable as this was the minimum net gain proposed by the Government in its consultation on the matter by DEFRA in December 2018 and this is likely to be carried forward in legislation. The provision of habitat, whether on-site or through off-site arrangements or contributions, can be part of a multi-functional scheme that, for example, also delivers landscaping or open space.”</b></p> <p>GYBC says it is extremely important that any development proposals do not adversely affect the SAC</p> <p><b>CCP view – could add something about the SAC</b></p> <p>GYBC says that as currently worded, this policy will support development on sites of the highest biodiversity importance (Winterton-Horsey SAC &amp; SSSI) where there is evidence of an enhancement. Allowance for development should <u>only</u> be made where a proposal will specifically aid the conservation of the site.</p> <p><b>CCP view – agreed and make change accordingly</b></p>
<p><b>Policy E2: High grade agricultural land</b></p> <p>GYBC - What is ‘significant development’? and given that most land is either high grade or environmental</p>

<p>sensitive, the policy might be too restrictive</p> <p><b>CCP view – change ‘significant’ to ‘major’, so that minor development is not captured by the policy. Could also have some wording about whether the plot is a viable arable parcel or not</b></p> <p>Broads Authority - suggest a map is included to show the grades. As worded it slightly contradicts our strategic policy SP4. We class 3a as most versatile as well as 1 and 2.</p> <p><b>CCP view – add map and change text so as not to refer to ‘best and most versatile’, but refer specifically to grades 1 and 2 only</b></p>
<p><b>Historic Environment</b></p> <p>Page 16/17, GYBC suggests expanding on importance of the church as a Grade I listed building, e.g. the highest significance (only 2.5% of those buildings listed nationally). This will help to demonstrate that the Basic Condition in having special regard to historic features</p> <p><b>CCP view – agreed and amend accordingly</b></p> <p>GYBC - Page 18 - Potential typo – Figure 3 does not provide a spatial definition of the Historic Village Centre, should this refer to Figure 5?</p> <p><b>CCP view – Amend accordingly</b></p>
<p><b>Policy E3: Promoting Winterton-on-Sea’s Heritage</b></p> <p>GYBC - Suggest re-wording to explain that historic character is defined particularly by the Conservation Areas and the Historic Village Centre (i.e. they are separate designations and areas).</p> <p><b>CCP view – redraft to make this clear</b></p>
<p><b>Policy E4: Flooding and Drainage</b></p> <p>GYBC - Surface water drainage strategy should not be required in areas of low flood risk – this seems excessive. Only where there is evidence of specific issues should further information be sought. Suggest consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority (Norfolk County Council) and Anglian Water on the wording of this policy. This policy would be particularly burdensome for small and low risk developments</p> <p><b>CCP view – see what LLFA says, although they did help with the wording, but maybe make clear that the strategy should be proportionate to the risk and size of development</b></p> <p>Broads Authority - bullet point 4 – does this mean that SuDS should be designed in at the start? This could be better worded.</p> <p><b>CCP view – needs re-wording to improve clarity</b></p>
<p><b>Policy CA2: Economic development</b></p> <p>Broads Authority - bullet one, does this mean off road?</p> <p><b>CCP view – could include off-road or dedicated on-road facility, so re-word</b></p>
<p><b>Policy CA4: Investment in Open Space</b></p> <p>GYBC - Contributions must be directly related to the development</p> <p><b>CCP view – Agreed. Clarify in text</b></p> <p>GYBC - The emerging draft LPP2 sets out detailed open space requirements</p> <p><b>CCP view – make reference in the supporting text?</b></p> <p>GYBC - A new public car park is not considered appropriate for the spending of open space contributions (if the spaces are accessible locally to residents – why do they require parking provision?).</p> <p><b>CCP view – He is right and it might be best to take this out</b></p> <p>GYBC - All developments – has any viability testing been undertaken?</p> <p><b>CCP view – change to ‘relevant’ development (relevant to be defined in the local plan)</b></p>

<b>Community policy: On Street Parking</b>
<p>GYBC - Such policies tend to get separated (to the back of the document) from the neighbourhood plan policies to avoid confusion. There could, however, be a link in the supporting text to this ambition.</p> <p><b>CCP view – makes more sense to leave where it is, but maybe have it in a different colour?</b></p> <p>Broads Authority – what is a community policy?</p> <p><b>CCP view – explained earlier in the document, but could cross-refer to that or add a footnote</b></p>
<b>Policy TR1: Public car parking</b>
<p>GYBC - Suggest some re-wording: “Proposals for change of use and development of existing car park sites will be supported...”</p> <p><b>CCP – make change accordingly</b></p> <p>GYBC – suggest amend wording, “Proposals for additional public car parking outside of the village centre will be supported in principle where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will not increase traffic through the centre of the village; and</li> <li>• It is well located to provide a reasonable alternative to on-street parking”</li> </ul> <p><b>CCP view – make change accordingly</b></p>
<b>Policy TR2: Residential car parking standards</b>
<p>GTBC - Will require evidence for these standards and consideration of viability. Suggest consultation with NCC Highway Authority</p> <p><b>CCP view – NCC will be consulted. Need to add text related to car ownership levels, outward commuting, quality of public transport, on-street parking by residents etc to provide support for the policy</b></p>
<b>Policy TR3: Walking</b>
<p>GYBC - Contributions and improvements must be proportionately related to the development</p> <p><b>CCP – add something to the supporting text</b></p> <p>GYBC - Suggest consultation with NCC Highway Authority/public rights of way</p> <p><b>CCP view – NCC highways will be consulted</b></p>
<b>General - maps</b>
<p>GYBC - The Borough Council could assist further with mapping (potentially more detailed mapping bases, will also require your OS licence number having signed up to the mapping licence agreement). Include a north point and scale to the maps</p> <p><b>CCP view – the licence information is included, but it is ‘open source’. Take them up on the offer though for those maps that will be part of what they call ‘policies maps’ such as local green spaces</b></p>

Note: The Broads Authority provided more feedback than indicated in the above table, but apart from the comments in the above table, they were either a repeat of GYBC’s comments, typo type comments, or suggestions to refer to the Broads Authority and its local plan. The typo-type changes and references to the Broads Authority will just be made without bothering the Steering Group.