



Attleborough

Neighbourhood Plan

2016 - 2036



Consultation Statement

**Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan
Regulation 15 Consultation Statement
February 2017**

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this document:

AHG Attleborough Heritage Group

ANP Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan

ANPSG Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

ATC Attleborough Town Council

BC Breckland Council

LGA Local Government Association

NCC Norfolk County Council

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

SAC Special Area of Conservation

SEA Strategic Environmental Assessment

SFRA Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

SME Small and Medium-sized Enterprises

SUE Strategic Urban Extension

Contents

Section 1		Page
1	Consultation process for the Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2016	5
Section 2		12
2	Formal Consultation for pre-submission July – August 2016	
3	Summary of the main issues and concerns	
4	Summer 2016 consultation responses: more detail	
5	Detailed comments on the policies	
6	Changes to the Plan	
7	Next Stages in the ANP consultation	
Appendices		
A	Reg 14 Consultation events and distribution	32
B	Key Meetings & consultations 2013-2016	42
C	Responses to Reg 14 consultations and how addressed	
	C1 Responses to Key organisations' comments	48
	C2 Responses to BC comments on policies	53
D1	D1 Consultation Responses to the Drop in at the Town Hall 24 and 25 October 2015	78
D2 & D3	Separate pdf Consultations re SUE run by Attleborough Land (not part of the ANP consultation but related)	
	D2 Community Planning Process Consultation Event Attleborough Land 2010	
	D3 Attleborough Land workshop October 2016	

Section 1 Informal Consultation

1. Consultation process for the Neighbourhood Plan

1.1 The 1990 Town & Country Planning Act amended by the 2011 Localism Act allows the production for the Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan (ANP). This Act has a set of regulations that Attleborough Town Council must follow.

1.2 Attleborough Town Council together with Besthorpe Parish Council and Old Buckenham Parish Council applied for designation of a Neighbourhood Plan Area, supported by a map of the intended area and supporting statement, in August 2013. Following the receipt of the application and supporting documents BC undertook public consultation for a period of six weeks, closing on 27 September 2013, and in accordance with Regulation 7.(1)

1.3 Old Buckenham Parish Council wrote to the Council within this period to advise that, on further consideration, they had decided to withdraw their involvement in the joint preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan with Attleborough Town Council and Bestthorpe Parish Council.

1.4 Attleborough Town Council subsequently advised BC that this does not give rise to concerns to them in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. No other representations were received during the consultation period


1.5 On 11 November 2013 BC approved the designation of a Neighbourhood Plan Area for Attleborough Town Council and part of Besthorpe Parish Council as shown on the Designation Map (BC reference ABNP1).

1.6 In October 2013 the initial decision to run the Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan (ANP) was taken by Attleborough Town Council (ATC). A Steering Group was set up (ANPSG), and subsequently seven Theme Groups as subgroups to the Steering group were established.

Initial Consultation

1.7 The choice to hold the first ANP public meeting in Attleborough Academy, and gather views of the schoolchildren on a Student Activity Day on 11 October 2013 reflects the emphasis on getting the future citizens' views. The revitalised Attleborough & Snetterton Business Forum heard a presentation in May 2013 on the decision to create the ANP, and became very active. Local businesses expressed a clear need for immediately available and suitable space to expand as Snetterton was not offering the right quality or location. The ANP formed a Communications Group for organising consultation, managed by the Lively Crew, which set up Attleborough Matters, a 32-page colour magazine hand distributed to over 5,000 households in Attleborough,

paid for by advertising to fund the production costs. Each issue presented ANP Themes, the background and options, and invited residents to get more closely involved. All the editions can be obtained electronically in the ATC web site and there are copies in the Attleborough Library. To reach sports clubs, meetings were held in April and May 2015, and there was also a consultation with the Academy on the potential for joint sports facility provision. A series of consultation activities took place in the schools, sports clubs and with a wide range of organisations and individuals.



ANP Designation Map

Informal consultation event October 2015

1.8 In October 2015 over the weekend of 23 to 25 October informal consultation took place on the ANP in Attleborough Town Hall, seeking views on the aims and objectives, vision and themes. Feedback forms requested comment and whether there was support for the Vision, Objectives and Themes.

Attendance (registered):

Thursday	34 attendees (sports and social clubs)
Saturday	197 attendees (Public drop in)
Sunday	286 attendees (Public drop in)


Attleborough Matters issue no 5 gives photos and information on this consultation weekend.

1.9 Following the informal consultation the ANP Steering Group and its Theme Groups considered policies and options to deliver the ANP objectives, vision and mini-visions under each Theme. Details of the meetings are in Appendix B. The evolution of the ANP from vision to individual theme mini-visions was then checked against the comments from this consultation. The full spreadsheet of comments is available from ATC. A report prepared in 2015 set out the early stages of consultation, and was made available to anyone interested during the pre-submission consultation in 2016. This Consultation Statement briefly summarises the early stages in this chapter, but the full report is still available.

1.10 In March 2016 a request for a Screening Opinion on the ANP was sent to BC, and a response was received on 16 March, as set out in Appendix, but the conclusion was “an SEA scoping report should be incorporated with the SA and accompany the Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan”.

1.11 The map of options for consultation was prepared for the ANP by BC. It was available on the ANP web site, at the drop in weekend and in Attleborough Matters.

1.12 In October 2015 the drop in at the Town Hall was a well-attended weekend, and there was support for emerging policies, see Appendix D1. However, whilst overall concepts were broadly liked, there was concern about how they could be delivered. Also there was local support for seeking a better quality of new buildings, in particular for the Academy, as an inspiration for young people, and “unique responses and not for “catalogue’ houses”. Sustainable buildings were also supported: “principles and concepts should underlie all development, they underpin the vision and we should not be deflected from them.”



Map used in Autumn 2015 consultation showing sites for options


Attleborough Matters

1.12 The publication has been well received in the community. It was the first method of communicating the ANP mentioned at both consultation weekends, as the media which was read and which got people along to the event. Attleborough Matters issue 3 gave details of how to take an active role in the NP. Pages 4-5 in Issue 5 summarised the 2015 consultation weekend.





Student work at Attleborough Academy and primary schools was part of consultation.

Examples on following pages – thank you to the contributors.



Above and left: Work from Primary schools.

Below: Academy students



A walk to join up existing farms in Attleborough

Next Step

1.13 Regulation 14 required the Town Council to carry out a minimum period of six weeks formal public consultation on the draft Plan before finalising it and submitting it to Breckland Council. Part 2 of this report sets out:

- Details of what consultation was undertaken and who was consulted; up to the formal stage and during the formal stage
- An overview of the consultation responses; with details in the Appendices,
- An explanation of how the Plan was changed in light of responses and comments received over the consultation period, with policy response details in the appendices C1 and C2.

Section 2 Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 15 Consultation

2. Formal Consultation for pre-submission July – August 2016

2.1 Pre-submission consultation and publicity under The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 Regulation 14 was carried out from 7 July to 17 August 2016. The ANP consultation launch was announced on the front of the Attleborough & Wymondham Mercury on 7 July 2016. Posters and a banner were placed around the town, and a special edition of the free magazine Attleborough Matters was sent out to 6,000 households in Attleborough postcodes, with details of where to read the Plan and how to send responses, summaries of the main policies and the policies map, and a tear out feedback form. Details of where to view the Attleborough pre-submission consultation document were also published on the Neighbourhood Plan page of the ATC web site, and the Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan page on the BC website. Hard copies of the plan were also available to be viewed at the library, doctors' surgery, town hall, heritage centre and the Tourist Information Centre (TIC). A poster attached to windows of shops gave information on how to respond to the ANP and the date by which to respond. A hard copy file (kept in the Town Hall with a copy in the Library) was available of the individual supporting documents.

2.2 The draft Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the ANP were also available for consultation during the same six week period, together with the summary of the Evidence Base. Details are in the appendices to this Consultation Statement and to the SA & SEA.

2.3 A full list of all the consultation events is set out in the Appendix. Copies of the ANP were sent both by e-mail and in the post to the following consultees: Historic England; Natural England and the Environment Agency, Breckland Council, Norfolk County Council, South Norfolk District Council and the surrounding Parish Councils. Copies were sent to all the known agents for landowners and site promoters: George Freeman MP, Breckland Council, CEO, Leaders and Deputy's, EDP, Archant, and residents that had left their email address at the last consultation.

2.4 There was also a drop in public viewing at the Town Hall on the weekend 13th / 14th August 2016 attended by an estimated 200 people, and 116 left names and comments, but the exhibition was also seen by many more who did not register. The Strategic Urban Extension (SUE) promoter's agent also visited the exhibition by appointment on the following Monday. Photographs of the drop in exhibition material are in Attleborough Matters issue no 9, pages 4-5.

2.5 To reach those unlikely to make the effort to go to the Town Hall, members of the ANP Steering Group (ANPSG) attended the Carnival on 9-10 July 2016 and engaged with residents there. Members of the ANP Steering Group also attended Attleborough Academy on a series of morning Assemblies to explain the ANP to the school students and to engage with them. Reaching young people through consultation led by Attleborough Academy. We used Group Call to text out awareness of the plan: 686 text messages; 6 Voice Mails viewed by up to 595 students. Also five Assemblies discussing the Neighbourhood Plan were delivered.

2.6 The feedback forms requested comment by theme and policy, so required considerable effort to complete. The earlier consultation feedback had been more general. Whilst 116 feedback forms were completed, in some only one question was answered, and not all respondents gave age and gender information. However of those giving the information, the gender balance was reasonable, 47% male 51% female, but in terms of ages, whilst Attleborough does have a considerable older population, they were somewhat over represented, with 71% of those giving their age being 50 and over, and no feedback came from the age group 13 to 20. As there have been several exercises at the Academy and the street walk by the Lighthouse Trust we have been able to get their feedback in other ways.

2.7 To reach a younger audience the ANP Communications Group set up a Facebook page for the ANP, and its visit statistics show a spike in interest at the start of the consultation period. The residents of Attleborough made more visits to the Facebook site, for example 521 visits in week of June 13th, compared to 11 in the previous week. Total likes in weeks without consultation promotion were stable with smaller spikes, for example in the weeks July 9 (317 total page likes) and July 4 (308 total page likes) in 2016. <https://en-gb.facebook.com/AttleboroughNeighbourhoodPlan/>



Left: Photo at consultation weekend. Right: Leaflets for Reg 14 stage consultation



Photo from The Drop-in exhibition in the town hall. Example of display: proposal for Indoor Sports Hub

Draft ANP Map used in Reg 14 consultation



Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan

Proposals Map
 June 2016

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
|  | Town Centre Boundary |  | Open Space |
|  | Settlement Boundaries |  | Linear Park |
|  | Primary Shopping Area |  | Local Open Space |
|  | Preferred Growth Location (SUE) |  | Existing Employment Area |
|  | Link Road |  | Existing Housing Permissions |
|  | Significant Tree Avenues |  | Area of Search for Employment Land |



Contains Ordnance Survey data. © Crown copyright and database right. Attleborough Town Council 0100056423

3. Summary of the main issues and concerns

3.1 Issues and concerns were raised in previous consultations over the history of the ANP, and even before at a consultation weekend event - organised by John Thompson for the SUE promoters Ptarmigan – that took place in 2010. To briefly summarise, some of the main problems that emerged from the early consultations included a lack of balance between new homes and local jobs, the one-way road system with a heavy traffic flow through the centre, a lack of leisure facilities and public transport services, and schools in need of investment.

3.2 As the ANP process started, Theme Groups focussed on: transport, education and the local economy, sporting facilities and the heritage assets, meeting with a wide range of organisations and individuals as set out in the meetings list in Appendix B. From these meetings three major issues for the ANP emerged:

- Need for more land to be allocated for employment use in Attleborough to meet the objective of balancing the strategic urban extension housing growth with some potential to access jobs, so Attleborough did not become simply a commuter dormitory town.
- The need for more space at Attleborough Academy because of housing growth, both in the SUE and also because increases in houses were inevitable as developers gained planning permissions and implemented them elsewhere on the town's fringes whilst there was no up to date Local Plan. However to create space a site was therefore required urgently for relocating a primary school currently next to the Academy.
- The town centre congestion issue continued to be seen as a very high priority to solve, but without a Link Road for through traffic no one saw a solution being possible. However the Link Road would not happen without the SUE growth in housing.

3.3 Consultations in 2013-2015 helped to set the vision, core objectives and topics for investigation by the Theme Groups. The formal consultation also sought detailed comment on the policies.

3.4 In the consultation there was general support for the emerging idea of a Linear Park to serve many functions: opportunities for children to play in a natural environment; linked walks; a wildlife corridor between Hargham Woods and Decoy Common; a landscape and wildlife corridor following the route of the Attleborough Stream; and using the space to also provide Sustainable Drainage Systems and water management for the new development. Cycling and walking routes to schools, shops and the train station should be possible, both through the park and across it and across the rail line to connect the SUE to the rest of

Attleborough. A new sub group of the ANP Steering Group is being formed to progress the project.

4 Summer 2016 consultation responses: more detail

Comment on the Overall Plan

4.1 The detailed points and concerns of landowners, agents and the statutory consultees are set out in Appendix C, whilst a general analysis of public responses is given here. This comment summarises one frequently voiced area of concern: the timing for delivery of infrastructure. “The infrastructure should be on a "no money for community infrastructure then no houses" basis. Community infrastructure must keep up with the new houses and not be allowed to slip due to funding issues, delays etc. On this basis, I find most of the ANP to be easily acceptable. I am confident the houses being built will offer good, mixed and tasteful residential areas for the community.”

4.2 The general comments often demonstrate strong insight into how all the policies are interlinked. The issue of binding the new and old parts of the town together continues to be a concern. The Linear Park could be a unifying theme or emphasise the divide, as suggested in this quote: “I greatly appreciate the emphasis on green infrastructure and the proposals for the Linear Park. It is clearly important that such considerations go hand in hand with major housing developments and this has been recognised. I have some concern that the Linear Park will act as a boundary between the older and newer part of town and that it might feel more like a ‘run’.”

Housing Allocations and the LP consultations – delivering infrastructure

4.3 Some residents and landowners are unaware the allocation of housing sites is being undertaken by Breckland Council (BC), as part of the emerging Local Plan (LP), and not through the ANP. ATC has responded on the LP consultation giving its site preferences, and ANPSG made recommendations on which sites to support at the last LP consultation in February 2016. As the LP is progressing with site allocations in parallel to the ANP the landowners and agents were referred to BC. Besthorpe Parish Council, which also has an area that is part of the ANP, responded to the recent Local Plan in the consultations in December 2016 to support certain housing allocations provided the Linear Park is delivered. Several consultees were unaware the ANP is not able to unpick the Core Strategy SUE area, and allocation of 4,000 homes to Attleborough, but the ANP continues its support for housing development being broadly south of the rail line as expressed by the ATC from 2008 onwards, so that the associated infrastructure requirements can be consolidated in the town and delivered through a single agreement tied to a masterplan for the SUE and agreed programme of delivery. Attleborough Academy responded to the LP consultation re the Indoor Sports Hub site allocated in the S106 agreement for the land to the north of Norwich Road.

The Vision & Objectives

4.4 Feedback on the vision is positive, but with a concern about its deliverability, and how the problem of increasing congestion with more housing would be addressed. There is support for requesting infrastructure to be provided in advance of the housing being occupied. “As much as I appreciate the desire to develop Attleborough and the surrounding areas, I feel the success of any development hangs on the need for significant investment in infrastructure prior to any further housing/industrial development getting the green light. The town suffers constantly with congestion (town centre and Station Road) and building the new school this year near the Skoda garage will only exacerbate this. The link road from Breckland Lodge to Bunns Bank has to be key. Having spoken to a council member on Saturday at the presentation it seems that this road is dependent on housing developers - they get their planning permission then they will contribute to the road. I appreciate that budgets are tight but it can't be up to housing developers to hold the town 'to ransom' in such a way, it's the tail wagging the dog? “ “It also isn't clear what form the link road will take - i.e. what speed restrictions will apply. Or even how it will be funded... As the SUE area obviously depends on access on the link road.”

4.5 The response to the ANP received from Pegasus Group on behalf of Hans House supported policies LE.P2; objective SLC 3 and policy SLC.P5, objective ESD1 and Policy ESD.P1. However they expressed only partial support for objective H1. They wish to seek a housing allocation but the ANP is not allocating housing sites because the decision on the SUE and other large housing allocations is a Local Plan matter, so their response was referred to BC. The ATC sent an e-mail to reflect this decision to the agents Pegasus Group acting for Hans House on 12 December 2016.

Options

4.6 Generally the preferred options presented have been endorsed in the consultation. Some of the points made in consultations in October 2015 were raised again:

- New large supermarket needed
- More facilities could be located in the SUE (where it would be easier to build without land constraints)
- A shuttle bus, especially between surgery/ station and town centre shops
- A new exit road towards Thetford if the Norwich Road development is built.
- As there is a northern boundary [to the town] of the A11 there is logic to continue to develop up to the A11 first.
- As the proposed Gaymer's Field extension's owners are not willing to sell, there could instead be options to explore additional land with Attleborough Land.

- Options for more existing open space owned by BC to be designated as Open Green Space and protected from development have been discussed. The ANP conclusion is given in Appendix C, but we suggest the sites to be designated should be pursued through the LP route, as the planning and property sides of BC have differing perspectives and it is not appropriate for the ANP to be used to try to resolve these issues.
- Road options: southbound exit to A11 from Mill Lane side of town
“I can't see in any documentation a proposal for southbound exit to A11 from Mill Lane side of town - is this not considered at all or is it me who simply can't find it? Road surveys must have picked up on the fact that the traffic wanting to join the southbound A11 has to filter through the town centre 1-way system to reach either the Queen's Square exit or the Stag exit. I am surprised to find no mention of this important potential additional solution of the existing congestion in any documentation.” “Link Watton Road and Norwich Road into the back of Queen's Square so they do not have to go around the one way system.”

5 Detailed comments on the policies

Local Economy

5.1 In the formal consultation feedback detailed comments there was support for LE.P2 (and for the Library to move to a central location and share facilities with the town council, archives and other community facilities), but the main concern at using the car park site for this is loss of parking. Any plans in the delivery strategy need to demonstrate how town centre parking will work, so we need the parking strategy. Limiting hours for parking on the town centre car park was suggested. The suggestion for the market to relocate was welcomed but there were some who did not support it moving. “Redevelop Queens Square car park site as an extension of the Town’s retail centre. Any redevelopment is anticipated to include other uses that support town centre retail together with other community uses and seek both replacement and additional car parking capacity (which could be located elsewhere)”. A brief to redevelop the site will be prepared with the relevant landowners”. This approach was supported in the response for Breckland Bridge, representing BC as landowner. The response by LANPRO to the LP consultation in December 2016 supports an additional car park with a footpath link to the town centre. The *Feasibility Study Attleborough Sports Hub*, 9 May 2016, Option 1 illustrates a 0.59 ha site for an Indoor Sports Hub (including space for a swimming pool) and 0.62 ha of parking (split into two sites, public parking linked by a footpath by the cemetery, to the north of the existing Academy playing fields, and a sports centre car park next to the main sports hall. Images of this were displayed at the Town Hall consultation weekend in August 2016.

5.2 Access to skilled jobs was recognised as key for retaining young people. The objectives for employment were again endorsed, with agreement to: not being a dormitory town; supporting smaller businesses; and linking schools to employment by

developing skills. The London Road area of search has support - just over 10 hectares of the area of search is now going forward with the landowners' agreement, although an adjoining area is not supported - for a B1 Business Park rather than the very low intensity B8 logistics uses, and providing a strong landscape strip along the entrance to the site so the setting of the listed pub is not harmed. Other ways to increase employment including promoting the town centre professional services cluster is supported in several consultation responses. There was also feedback suggesting that as the SUE is likely have at least 5,000 residents, it will need more attractions than a Linear Park and two primary schools, with decisions needed on the future site for a supermarket, and the right location for a possible local centre in the SUE. However the representation from Sainsbury's points out that a site for a new supermarket on the Banham Poultry site is already permitted.

Transport & Communications

5.3 There is support to create better cycling facilities: "Attleborough is also in need of better cycling facilities, at the moment local cycling is dangerous." Transport plans for the relocated primary school need to be deliverable. "My family is well aware of the plans for the new schools at opposite ends of the town - devastating effect on the town and traffic-wise and our ability to hold down jobs from Attleborough because of fitting everything in in the mornings. We decided to make full use of the new school at the earliest opportunity, which offers newer facilities and buildings."

Health & Social Care

5.4 With growing concern about health care, the ANP's preferred option for the enlarged GP surgery location at Station Road needs to be followed up and delivered. However, there was a suggestion that in the long term a second surgery may be worth considering. "I do not foresee a problem if the adequate facilities are met. If they are not then this will be a big problem for Attleborough, especially given the problem that Attleborough Surgeries already services much of the surrounding areas and it is difficult to get an appointment. A pity that family doctors and resultant continuity of care are a thing of the past (I have rarely seen the same doctor twice in Norfolk) but this is not a local issue. Currently we have to travel to Thetford to see an out of hours doctor. I think there is a strong argument for this to change given the expansion of the town. Perhaps building separate doctor's surgeries will be a benefit. Pharmacy and opticians are already quite good." "I believe it will be better to have a number of doctors surgeries rather than a central building. This will improve access from all parts of the town and reduce traffic."

Sports, Leisure and Community Facilities

5.5 Generally this section of the ANP policies was strongly supported, especially for the opportunity to link sports and health policies and the need for facilities for young people. In terms of social and community infrastructure there is support for increasing sports facilities and open space, and support for the Linear Park and a feeling there should be

more information about the SUE open space plans. The Linear Park has notably captured imaginations, but also some existing residents in Poplar Road requested specific personal engagement in the SUE masterplanning process. “I like the proposed sporting facilities and especially the Linear Park but sincerely hope these will come to fruition and aren't merely a tantalising suggestion to gain public support which will then be removed at a later date to accommodate more houses. We arrived in Attleborough nearly five years ago and one of the main reasons we chose to settle in the town was because of its close friendly community. I fear that this community spirit will be deep tested and stretched to the limits in the coming years. I hope councillors and planners consider all comments made with regards to this Neighbourhood Plan and not just cherry pick the ones that suit.” “Generally we are very concerned that the proposals appear to preserve and enhance the town centre and increase its facilities whilst building a very large housing estate (almost half the size of the largest estate in Europe) with no facilities except transport and a park.”

5.6 Concern continues to be expressed about there being no plans for a swimming pool. A typical comment is: “We need much, much better sports facilities. Wymondham, Dereham and Thetford are overcrowded and can only be reached by car: no good for low incomes. We need a swimming pool.” “Ensuring there are adequate, safe facilities to promote health and well being within Attleborough is essential for a long term reduction in health needs.” “I believe that Attleborough desperately needs additional sports facilities both indoor and outdoor. An all weather 'lit' football pitch and tennis/basket ball courts would be fantastic. These types of positive activities for teenagers may also reduce antisocial behaviour. At the moment the Town's football players are required to travel and pay to use facilities outside the area, making access difficult for those without transport. I also believe that Attleborough is crying out for a children's soft play area, and have looked into starting one up as a business, so would love a facility to assist this. Additionally I think a swimming pool would be perfect, as currently residents are also forced to travel afar to access these facilities; again inaccessible for some, and learning to swim is a vital life skill in my opinion.” “We do need leisure facilities helping learning to swim - fitness for old and young in a safe environment. We do not have access without going to Wymondham or Thetford for some facilities and those towns are growing too.”

5.7 “But strongly disagree with [Option for the Indoor Sports Hub SLC P1] the road and parking for the sporting facilities off Norwich Road are too close to Hammond Way/Bayfield and will cause noise and disruption to residents.” “SLCP.2 & 3 Good to see local sports clubs using Gaymer's Field and any development would be welcomed especially due to the Linear Park. Attleborough does have some good sports facilities but my family do not find the Park on Connaught Road [The Rec] to be adequate.”

Linear Park

5.8 “Policy SLC.P5 The Linear Park should be given early priority in the timescale to provide an early and visible 'win, win' benefit.” “It might be good for some areas to be

restricted from having dogs because on many occasions on Gaymer's Fields loose dogs have scared my children. I would like to see the schools getting involved in the design of the Linear Park including play areas."

Environment, Sustainability and Design

5.9 There is support for good design standards, with local distinctiveness and recognition that this will help the local economy and be sustainable. The policy to require Design Review and a Building for Life dialogue received some land agent objections on the grounds of expense to the developer, but there was support for sustainable construction to be part of policy, with clear guidance. "It is vital that the design and build of the SUE in particular is effectively planned taking these guidelines into account". "I'm not sure if it is within the remit of the team to determine the level of sustainability that the houses and new buildings are built to? There are a number of schemes such as home quality mark and BREEAM and contractors should be encouraged to build the new building to the highest levels possible. A lot of effort is going into sustainable design and urban planning - there should be as much effort put into the construction and the efficiency of the buildings also."

5.10 One young consultee who did give us a written response is very clear about the benefit of tree planting to capture carbon. The younger adult participants' responses showed they are in favour of new housing being of a higher standard, and building communities not just housing, so "our environment doesn't suffer and growth is sustainable". "Ensuring that building are of a design that reflects local style to maintain identity as well as being environmentally responsible and sustainable would be in the best interests for everyone and the town a place to draw people in and invest into." "More challenging design standards, low carbon, modular build. Build communities not just housing. Develop design standards." "Attleborough must remain a nice place to live. Care needs to be given to good quality design so that this remains a town to be proud of not another sprawling mess of houses".

5.11 Several comments were on the theme of correctly assessing the impact of surface water and then requiring development to provide adequate means of management. "ESD.P4 is very important as some areas of Attleborough are already prone to flooding in very wet weather. Need to protect our environment and current housing state." There was also strong support for the Linear Park's role as a green corridor for enhancing biodiversity and water management. Another area, Burgh Common, was also highlighted on this consultation response. "Land to the east of the B1077 from Bunns Bank through to Foundry Corner after Slough/Leys Lane turning should be a designated rec area and make sure Burgh Common and Westmoor Country Wildlife Site and the 18,000 trees with wildlife corridors are protected. Area is hugely beneficial for Attleborough residents. It has high diversity of wildlife that needs protection. Natural environment will be even more necessary when the population expands by such a large amount."



Burgh Common circa 1800 was an extensive area.

Source: Attleborough Heritage Group

Table Summarising Consultation Comments Received and Response made

Consultation Period: July to 17th August 2016

Feedback forms
completed

Theme		strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	Total responses
Overall							
Theme 1	number	26	38	11	7	0	82
	%	32	46	13	9	0	100
Theme 2	number	17	34	10	8	7	76
	%	22	45	13	11	9	100
Theme 3	number	32	24	12	5	6	79
	%	41	30	15	6	8	100
Theme 4	number	27	33	15	4	1	80
	%	34	41	19	5	1	100
Theme 5	number	29	36	14	2	1	82
	%	35	44	17	2	1	100
Theme 6	number	29	36	14	2	1	82
	%	35	44	17	2	1	100
Theme 7	number	34	30	8	4	1	77

	%	44	39	10	5	1	100
Believe							
overall	number	19	31	6	6	1	63
Plan works	%	30	49	10	10	2	100

Sustainability Assessment and Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment

5.12 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, state that submitted Plans need to be accompanied by a statement explaining how the proposed Plan meets the ‘basic conditions’ set out in Schedule 4B of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act. These basic conditions include a requirement to demonstrate how the Plan is compatible with EU obligations, which include finding if there is a need to undertake a Habitat Regulations Assessment.

5.13 The ATC made a Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion request to Breckland Council (BC). BC undertook a screening of the Strategic Environmental Assessment in March 2016. The Screening Opinion found a need for a Habitats Assessment Screening for the employment site allocation policy in the ANP once more information on the site to be allocated was available in the ANP. Breckland Council undertook a Habitats Regulation Screening exercise on the Reg.14 draft ANP to assess whether there are likely to be significant effects on European Sites as a result of the emerging policies set out in the pre-submission draft ANP that would necessitate the production of a full Habitat Regulations Assessment. The screening concludes that a habitat assessment will not be required as there are likely to be no significant negative effects on the European Designated Sites resulting from the Policies detailed within the draft Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, based on the submitted draft, a full Habitat Regulations Assessment is not required. Natural England responded to BC on 13th September 2016.

5.14 A draft Sustainability Appraisal of the ANP, carried out for the Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (ANPSG) was submitted to BC for detailed comment. A table of technical comments on the Sustainability Appraisal was received from BC and is being updated to reflect these and the recent changes in the ANP policies.

Historic England comments

5.15. Historic England responded in November 2016 to the SA. “Whilst we are pleased to see the assessment of the impact upon the setting of the White Lodge Public House, along with the outline proposals for mitigation, the analysis of the impact upon the setting of this listed building should be expanded upon.” They also suggest a new section is added to the ANP. “We are disappointed to see that despite some encouraging policies within the Neighbourhood Plan, there is little reference to them in the Sustainability Appraisal. Both

the SA and the Neighbourhood Plan would be strengthened with the inclusion of a Historic Environment Sub Section.” The proposed employment site should take account of its proximity to the listed White Lodge PH.

6 Changes to the Plan

6.1 The key responses other than from public feedback, in the summer 2016 are set out in **Appendix C1** (many respondents) and **Appendix C2** (BC responses re policies) and the proposed changes to policy to respond to these comments. At a meeting on 21 February 2017 the responses set out in Appendix C and suggested ways to accommodate changes in the draft ANP to submit to BC were endorsed by the ANPSG, with minor changes to the wording of the two transport policies to make them clearer.

6.2 There are several changes to the Policies Maps. The changes are set out briefly here:

a. The site A for additional employment land is smaller. The site was assessed by BC as “reasonable” for employment use but not for housing in the Issues and Options stage of the Local Plan. The land not being put forward will remain as agricultural land, forming part of the green gateway to Attleborough.

b. The ANP originally suggested “Gaymer’s Field Sports Hub Extension” as an extension site D to allow for the playing pitch numbers required as Attleborough grows. The owner wishes to retain the land just to the south of Gaymer’s Fields as existing use i.e. in private agricultural use, so its use for sports will not be pursued. However, two areas are offered by Attleborough Land, and whilst not physically connected, they are both sufficiently close to Gaymer’s Field that they would be worth considering instead for additional playing pitch locations. These are in the Policies Map.

c. The extent of the SUE is we understand to be smaller, as the promoter is not pursuing some of the southernmost areas. However as we need to conform to the Core Strategy 2009 map of Attleborough strategic policy, we are not amending the boundary. The link road route that the land promoter will submit for planning is also different from that suggested by BC, but will also remain as in the 2009 Core Strategy Plan. We understand, if they are to be altered in the Local Plan, these strategic boundary changes can be amended in the ANP by BC. The ANP should show the same indicative route as the Local Plan, but if this is not available the logic is to use a link road route that is promoted as deliverable by the SUE promoters.

d. Discussions continue on an area of search for a housing with care location, on land in Norwich County Council (NCC) ownership, but as a deal is not agreed, it is therefore not shown in the ANP Policies Map.

e. The uses to be sought within site B were discussed at a meeting of ANPSG members with ATC and BC, who were concerned as landowners as displaced car parking use on

land in BC ownership needs to have a new location. As landowner, BC seeks to be fully involved in the emerging site brief, to understand the quantum of development and uses and to have details on why these are a better use of public land than the car park. BC as landowner also wishes to have details of where the displaced parking would be re-provided. “I understand you are looking at a retail development, community facility, possibly a library and increasing the car park in the Queens Square area to service the growing town. I further understand that the ANP team has a strategic view but you may be looking for an agreement in principle as to the use of Breckland Council’s assets, notably the car park, before you can consider if it is deliverable in the ANP.” The workshop held with other landowners on 1 August 2017 suggested there was support for using this site more intensively. However the ‘masterplan’ submitted by Hans House developers to the Local Plan consultation does not have support from the landowner or from Attleborough Academy, and is not in line with the aspirations of the ANP for the town centre where a library and theatre are suggested. For the moment the car parking would be diverted – except for short stay – to a site some 8 minutes walk away on land to the north of the Academy Playing Fields see para 5.1 above. A further workshop is recommended to carry the ideas for this important town centre area forward.

Options – to move the Academy, to create a shared Sports Hub

6.3 The suggestions to look at entirely relocating the Attleborough Academy were put to NCC and the Academy, but in response, on 24 August 2016 the Principal confirmed: “To move the Academy would cost upwards of £30 million - it is a non-starter”. The Indoor Sports Hub for a combination of use by the Academy and the public is still under discussion, with a feasibility study under way on the possible location on land between the Academy and the A11, as part of housing development permission to Gladedale (now called Avant) allowed at appeal on 27 January 2016. In response to the proposal for a road access: “The only road that would be considered would be on the tranche of land behind the current playing fields. In the feasibility study this road would access the proposed Indoor Sports Arena but would effectively be a ‘dead end’. The possibility of a long stay car park for the town is included at the end of this access road in the feasibility study.” Neil McShane Principal Academy 24 August 2016. In the consultation for the emerging LP the position was updated: “This representation is being made on behalf of Attleborough Academy Norfolk (AAN) and the Transforming Education in Norfolk (TEN) Group in relation to land off Norwich Road, Attleborough. They are investigating the possibility of utilising land between the current AAN site and the A11 for sport and leisure purposes, which would be linked to the AAN campus as well as providing public and community usage. The land has been offered to the Town Council and AAN as part of a S106 Agreement (November 2015), which is linked to the approved permission for a residential development on land off Norwich Road”. Edward Tyrer Lanpro for Attleborough Academy: Breckland Local Plan Interim Consultation: Land off Norwich Road, Attleborough

Policy option - To give detailed design policies and principles for the SUE

6.4 The detailed design of the SUE will be a matter for BC to address. The ATC supports the approach as quoted here. “The [Breckland] Council’s preferred approach is to require the developers of the Urban Extension to prepare and submit a masterplan as part of any planning application. A masterplan would frame the delivery of the planned growth to the south of the town and the Council will work with the developers to prepare this. To supplement and guide the masterplan in order to achieve the satisfactory delivery of the planned growth, the Council could include a policy on design options. The policy could take into account the following key principles:

- Ensuring integration into the existing town, preventing further elongation of the settlement away from the centre, reducing travel distances to new and existing services and amenities and integrating the new and existing communities
- Protect, and where possible, enhance the character of the town centre.
- Protect land with high environmental and landscape sensitivity.
- Locate in areas at least risk of flooding.
- Make efficient use of greenfield land.
- Incorporate a new distributor road.
- Enhance pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre.
- Enhance and create new connections between green spaces within the town. It will also be necessary for the Urban Extension to provide new open spaces”.

Reference: BC Breckland Local Plan Issues and Options October 2014 Cabinet Preferred Option: Design Principles for the Urban Extension Paras 8.45 – 8.49 P 79.

We understand that the LP would be the correct document to include improved standards across the whole of Breckland. The ANP would call for the design principles to apply, to be part of the planning process not just in the SUE but generally to all significant developments in Attleborough.

Option to include Biodiversity Objectives

6.5 The ANP core objectives were derived from the Vision, and have been subject to a long period of consultations as set out above, and have been amended through consultations with Attleborough residents: the objectives and their wording have been subject to two years of consultation and are therefore the outcome of public opinion, it is therefore clear how the public require biodiversity to be in the ANP. Conserving wildlife and creating natural play are two aspects to recently supported Play Policy objectives of

the ATC that imply biodiversity, and the Linear Park policy for both informal recreation and wildlife habitats, especially incorporating water management has great support. ATC can promote biodiversity on its own local open spaces and allotments through the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006): S.40: (1) “Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Conserving biodiversity includes restoring and enhancing species populations and habitats as well as protecting them.” Source: Habitat Regulation Assessment Regulation 32 Habitats. A separate document called *Linear Park Consultation*, available on request at the Town Hall shows how clearly biodiversity is embedded in the vision and the support for this project.

Option to include a Heritage Assets sub-section

6.6 Historic England expressed disappointment there was not a dedicated heritage asset section to the ANP, see letters at the end of the SA/SEA. The ANP vision and objectives are clear this is a strand to run through the whole ANP so extracting all heritage policy into one section was not feasible. The AHG *ANP Character Assessment* November 2015 has been supplemented with a map of the non-listed heritage assets, set out at the end of the Appendices. Policies in the NPPF and the policies used by BC for the TPOs, applications in the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings would be duplicated in the ANP, and provided the emerging LP when approved gives them weight, the ANPSG recommends that these policies can be relied upon without the need to duplicate them in the ANP. NPPF para 17 is to be followed:

- “conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.”

How the plan has changed - BC and other key responses to the formal consultations


6.7 A full response to the comments on the ANP policies from the formal consultation, and proposed changes in the wording is available as two tables:

- ANP consultation responses draft 220816 picking up on key comments to change the plan
- ANP reg 16 proposed policy changes – in response to the detailed comments from BC.

6.8 There were changes to the Map showing site allocation, Linear Park approximate alignment, town centre boundary, and changes to site A, B, C and D.

6.9 ANPSG members had earlier consultations on Open Space and informal recreation and the relevant BC Core Strategy and Parish Schedule maps are referred to in the email correspondence in Appendix C.

New ANP Policies Map 1 on next page illustrates changes made.



Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan

Policies Map 1
 February 2017

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
|  | Town Centre |  | Significant Tree Avenues |
|  | Preferred Growth Location (SUE) in Local Plan |  | Linear Park |
|  | Site B |  | Local Open Space |
|  | Link Road (indicative) |  | Employment Sites Existing and Permissions |
|  | Outdoor Sports Hub |  | Existing Housing Permissions |
|  | Pavilion and Car Park |  | Area of Search for Employment Land |
|  | Area of Search for Indoor Sports Hub and Parking for Town Centre |  | Footpath Links |
|  | Open Space in Local Plan | | |

0 1 km



Contains Ordnance Survey data. © Crown copyright and database right. Attleborough Town Council 0100056423

7. Next Stages in the ANP consultation

7.1 A Regulation 16 Submission Draft ANP is now available to be signed off and submitted to BC, along with this Consultation Statement, the Designated Area Map and Basic Conditions Statement.

7.2 Under Reg 16 Breckland Council will be publicising the plan proposal.

“Regulation 16. As soon as possible after receiving a plan proposal, which includes each of the documents referred to in regulation 15(1), a local planning authority must—

(a) publicise the following on their website and in such other manner as they consider is likely to bring the proposal to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area—

(i) details of the plan proposal;

(ii) details of where and when the plan proposal may be inspected;

(iii) details of how to make representations;

(iv) a statement that any representations may include a request to be notified of the local planning authority’s decision under regulation 19 in relation to the neighbourhood development plan; and

(v) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the plan proposal is first publicised; and

(b) notify any consultation body which is referred to in the consultation statement submitted in accordance with regulation 15, that the plan proposal has been received”.

7.3 Subsequent stages: The Examiner will be appointed. Following examination there could be further changes, then the ANP will go to Referendum for approval.

Appendix A Full details of Consultation events and consultees Reg 14 Consultation Stage

1. ANP –Events 7th July - 17th August 2016 Consultation 6 week period

Date	Day	Location	Activity
			To reach those not likely to visit the Town Hall
9	Sat	Carnival	
10	Sun	Carnival	Trade stand
			Engaging Children and their families
13	Weds	Attleborough Junior School	TC presentation to Assembly - 404 children
13	Weds	Academy - parents evening	Display in place
14	Thurs	Academy School Assembly	NM presenting
15	Fri	Academy School Assembly	NM presenting
18	Mon	Academy School Assembly	NM presenting
19	Tues	Academy School Assembly	NM presenting
20	Weds	Academy School Assembly	NM presenting
22	Fri	Ignite - young people	Engagement whilst walking streets

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

01-Aug	Mon	Town Hall	Special landowners and NCC workshop on town centre site B
5	Fri	Church Luncheon Club	Presentation
12	Fri	Town Hall - Clubs	For groups and other organisations
13	Sat	Town Hall - Public	Drop in public exhibition with ANP SG members present
14	Sun	Town Hall - Public	Drop in public exhibition
15	Mon	Town Hall	AL agent invited to view exhibition

2. List of ANP distribution and consultees sent copies

Distribution of ANP				
Place	Print or Electronic (E/P)	Type	Details	No.
Attleborough Academy	P and E	School	Reception display and Canteen display	4
ANP Steering Group	E	ANP team	All	25
Attleborough Infants School	E	School	Mrs Harvey	1
Attleborough Mercury	E	Press	Stuart	1
Attleborough Town Councillors	E	Council	All	15
Besthorpe Parish Council	P	Council		1

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

Boxing Club	E	Sports Club	Colin Kilby	15
Breckland Council - Planning	E	Council	Phil Mileham	1
Breckland Lodge	P	Hospitality	CK	1
Breckland Lodge	E	Hospitality	Colin Kilby	100
Businesses	E	Business	ASBF	79
Businesses	E	Business	Breckland Directory	458
Chair ANPSG	P	ANP Team	Tony Perkins	1
Church - St Marys	P	Church	Pat/Elizabeth Burrows	1
Connaught Hall	P	Community Hall		1
District Councillors	E	Council	All	6
Doctors x 2	P	Doctors	Lucy Mclean	3
George Freeman	E	MP	MP	1
Gt Ellingham Parish Council	P	Council	Tony Perkins	1
Heritage Centre	P	Community Hall	Cliff Amos	1
High Street - Retail	E	Retailers		tbc
Junior School	P	School	Assembly	1
Library	P and E	Library		5
Lighthouse Church	P	Church	Rob Trevet	1
Norwich Road Nursery School	E	School		1
Old Bucks Parish Council	P	Council	Terry C	1

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

EDP	E	Press	Archant	1
Sainsburys	P	Retailer	Store Manager - Mark Standley	1
Town Council	P	Community Hall	Tourist Info Office	2
Town Council	P	Council	Copy with staff	3
Town Hall Requests	E	Various	Sarah Watts	44
Banham Zoo	E	Tourist Attraction	Lynne Wilshaw	1
Bingham Hall Associates	E	Business	Sarah Robinson	1
Dingles	E	Business	Sophie	1
Eastern Attachment	E	Business	Phil Leslie	1
Hamilton Acorn	E	Business	Roy	1
Heather Nunn Accountants	E	Business	Heather Nunn	1
Lee and Plumpton	E	Business	Ken Seaman	1
Lidl Staff	E & visit	Business	Manager	1
Plandescil	E	Business	Sarah Riley	1
Sainsburys Staff	E	Business	Mark Standley	1
Barkers Print	E	Business	Colin Barker	1
M&A Partners	E	Business	Vanessa Leverett	1
Pete Beales	E & visit	Business	Simon	1
Dodds Stores	E	Retailer	Stephen	1
Sure Start	P	Community Hall	Reception	1
Kerry Butcher Accountants	E	Business	Kerry Butcher	1

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

Town Hall Consultation	P	Council	weekend	20
Coakley and Cox Ltd	E	Business	Tim Cox	1
Attleborough Day Centre	P	Care	Emma	1
Consultees				
Anglian Water Services Ltd	E	Consultee	Carly Summers	1
ASD architecture Ltd	E	Consultee	Vince Douglas	1
Beryl Bunning	E	Consultee		1
Besthorpe Parish Council	P	Consultee		1
Breckland Council	E	Consultee	Robert Campbell	1
Breckland Council	E	Consultee	Cassie Mant	1
Breckland Council	E	Consultee	Ralph Burton	1
Breckland Council	E	Consultee	Capita	1
Breckland Council	E	Consultee	Capita	1
Breckland Council	E	Consultee	Anna Graves	1
Breckland Council	E	Consultee	Charles Carter	1
Breckland Council - Leader	E	Consultee	William Nunn	1
BT PP LGO3	Not found	Consultee	Giles Ellerton	1
Business		Consultee		1
Carol Lynch	E	Consultee		1

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

NCC Children & Families	E	Consultee	Chris Hey	1
NCC Children's service re school	E	Consultee	Jane Blackwell	1
NCC Community and Environmental Services		Consultee	Richard Doleman	1
NCC Conservation	E and workshop	Consultee		1
County Wildlife Sites Officer		Consultee		1
NCC Cycling Officer		Consultee		1
Developers	E	Consultee	Taylor Wimpey, Bloor, Bovis Homes and Avant Homes	4
Education		Consultee		1
Edward Hare		Consultee		1
Environment Agency		Consultee		
Flood Risk		Consultee	Mark Ogden	1
Gaymers Field extension	telephone	Consultee	Owner of site	1
Great Ellingham Parish Council	E	Consultee	Mr James Watling	1
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	E	Consultee	Planning Policy Team	1
Heritage HERS	E	Consultee		1
Highways	E	Consultee	Luke Denney	1
Highways	E	Consultee	Paul Sellick	1
Highways Department	E	Consultee		1
Highways England	E	Consultee	Roger Chenery	1
Highways NCC	E	Consultee	Nick Tuper	1
Highways NCC	E	Consultee	Matt Worden	1

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

Historic England	E	Consultee		
Homes and Communities Agency	E	Consultee	Steve Collins	1
Jenny Manser		Consultee		1
Joe Mooney		Consultee		1
JTP	E and telephone	Consultee	Clare San Martin	1
King's Lynn & West Norfolk Council	E	Consultee	Geoff Hall	1
Libraries	E and workshop	Consultee	Jennifer Holland	1
Martin Dupee		Consultee		1
Mid Suffolk Council		Consultee		1
Mike Bardwell		Consultee		1
Morley Parish Council		Consultee	Mr Gareth Roderick-Jones	1
National Grid		Consultee	Shirley Percy	1
Natural England	E	Consultee		
Network Rail	E	Consultee	Mike Smith	1
BC Head Neighbourhood Plan	E and meetings	Consultee	Susan Heinrich	1
NHS Norfolk	E	Consultee	Robert Cooper	1
NHS Property Services Ltd	E	Consultee	Ian Burns	1
NorfolkSuffolk Gypsy/Roma/Trav	P	Consultee	Keren Wright	1
Norfolk County Council	E	Consultee	Stephen Faulkner	1
Old Buckenham Parish Council	E	Consultee	Mr James Watling	1
Paul Darby		Consultee		1

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

Paul Durrent		Consultee		1
Pegasus Group	E	Consultee	Gabrielle Rowan	1
PlanSurv Ltd.		Consultee	Adam Tuck	1
Public Health		Consultee	Martin Seymour	1
Public Rights of Way		Consultee		1
Quidenham Parish Council		Consultee	Mr Peter Lotarius	1
Remoir Properties		Consultee		1
Rocklands Parish Council		Consultee	Mrs Kim Rushforth	1
S106 Officer Breckland		Consultee		1
Safety		Consultee		1
Senior Historic /Environment		Consultee	Ken Hamilton	1
Senior Planner Minerals & Waste		Consultee	Richard Drake	1
Senior Planning consultant		Consultee	Richard Smith	1
Shropham Parish Council		Consultee	Mr R C S Plumbly	1
Snetterton Parish Council		Consultee	Mr R C S Plumbly	1
Social Care		Consultee	Mr J Becker	1
South Norfolk District Council	E	Consultee	Planning Policy Team	1
Sport, Leisure, Community		Consultee	Library Sarah Hassan (NCC)	1
Tony Watling		Consultee		1
UK Power Networks		Consultee	Ian Robertson	1
NCC		Consultee	Ian Parkes	1

Groups invited on 12 August 2016 ANP consultation evening

Below is the list of groups invited for the groups evening (**12 August 2016** 6.30-8.30pm in the Town Hall)

Group
1st Attleborough Scout Group
3D Line Dance Club
Academy of Gymnastics
Attleborough and District Horticultural Society
Attleborough and District Horticultural Society
Attleborough Archives
Attleborough Baptist Church
Attleborough Basketball Club
Attleborough Boxing Club
Attleborough Branch of Norfolk United Netball Club
Attleborough Branch of Norfolk United Netball Club
Attleborough Bridge Club
Attleborough Brownies, Rainbows and Guides
Attleborough Brownies, Rainbows and Guides
Attleborough Community & Enterprise Centre
Attleborough Community Car Service
Attleborough Community First Responders
Attleborough Gateway Club
Attleborough Heritage Group
Attleborough Library
Attleborough Methodist Church
Attleborough Players
Attleborough Shotokan Karate and Self Defence Club

Attleborough Snooker Centre
Attleborough Sports Hall
Attleborough Writers Club
Besthorpe Moto X & Quad Tracks
Breckland Astronomical Society
Breckland Flower & Garden Club
Buddhist Group
Chapel Road Parent and Toddlers
Civil Service Retirement Fellowship
Club 99
Coffee and Chat
Connaught Bowls Club
Gaymers Bowls Club
Gt Ellingham Scout Leader
Gym @ Amazon
Herlings Hockey Club
Invigorate Fitness
Little Acorns
R.A.O.B
Royal British Legion Attleborough
School of Ballet
Slimming World - Methodist Church
Slimming World - Scout Hut

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

Slimming World - St Marys Church Memorial Hall
Society for Disabled Artists
Sparklers
St Mary's Church
St Marys Youth Group
Suffolk and Norfolk Youth Action
The Army Cadets
The Lighthouse Charity
Vinnies Gym
Weight Watchers
Women's Institute & WEA (Workers Educational Association)
WRVS Housebound Readers
Zumba
Wymondham Rugby Club
Attleborough Carnival
Artline Group

Shootability
Martial Arts Group
Connaught Hall Committee
Probus Club
Town Twinning
Attleborough & Wymondham Talking Newspaper
Choir
Christ Community Church
Attleborough Community Hub
Attleborough Town FC
British Red Cross
Sandra Boatman Dance Classes
Pilates
Old Buckenham Cricket Club

Extra Locations where ANP consultation was announced

Sainsburys on Thursday 11th August, 10am – 2pm to engage with their customers

Appendix B Key Meetings

Time and Date	Location	Theme	Summary
2008 - 2012			
Pre the ANP			
October 2010	Attleborough Town Hall	Community Planning Process Consultation Event Attleborough Land	See Appendix D2 summary pdf
26/05/11	Attleborough Town Hall	BC Growth Programme Manager held Q&A on expansion	
14/07/11	Attleborough Town Hall	Attleborough expansion became a standing item on ATC Agenda and Council set up Attleborough Development WG	
2011/12	Various	Workshops on education, transport, health and housing in support of ASHAAP	
2013			
May 13		Letter from ATC to Community groups	Invite to become involved in helping to produce NP
0800, 29/05/13	Breckland Lodge	Attleborough and Snetterton Heath Business Forum	Presentation on ATC plan to proceed with NP
1830, 23/07/13	Attleborough Town Hall	Attleborough NP Steering Group	Initial meeting
09/08/13	Attleborough Town Hall	NP Area and Statement sent to BC	Statutory consultation period
14/08/13	Attleborough Town Hall	Press release sent to EDP/Mercury	Announcement that NPA sent for consultation
1830, 03/09/13	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
Sep/Oct		Press release to Radio Norfolk/EDP/Mercury	Publicity for NP launch events on 11/12 Oct
Sep/Oct	Attleborough	Leaflet drop to households	Publicity for NP launch events on 11/12 Oct
11/10/13	Attleborough High School	ANP Launch event - Student Activity Day	Students give their views on future development
12/10/13	Attleborough High School	ANP Launch event – General public	Public views
18.15, 24/10/13	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
2014			
1830, 18/02/14	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

1830, 25.03/14	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
1830, 06/05/14	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
1830, 24/06/14	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
17.00, 17/7/14	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Meeting Chaired by George Freeman MP	
1830, 24/07/14	London Tavern	ANP Steering Group	
02/09/14	Attleborough Town Hall	Briefing meeting for Sports and Leisure Study	Consultant Torkildsen Barclay appointed
1830, 16/09/14	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
Sep 14		Launch website with Business Group Plan	
13.00, 20/9/14	Breckland Lodge	ANP Communication Strategy Group	Informal discussion on communications strategy
1830, 14/10/14	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
1830, 25/11/14	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
2015			
18.30, 6/1/15	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
17.30, 14/1/15	Breckland Lodge	Attleborough Business Forum	Presentations and commentary from George Freeman on Economic Development and Business requirements for Attleborough
15.00, 30/1/15	Attleborough Town Hall	Greater Attleborough Development Partnership	
18.30, 17/2/15	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	Update on progress
16.00, 24/2/15	Attleborough Academy Norfolk	ANP Education	Meeting with the Heads of Attleborough Academy and Junior School and Vera Dale
07.30, 25/2/15	Snetterton Race Circuit	Attleborough and Snetterton Business Forum	
13.00, 25/2/15	Doe Lane	ANP Planning Meeting with Breckland Council	
15.00, 25/2/15	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP External Working Group	
15.00, 4/3/15	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Employment WG	
18.30, 9/3/15	Attleborough Town Hall	ATC Planning & Highways Committee	
19.00, 9/3/15	Attleborough Town Hall	ATC Full Council Meeting	Update and progress and funding
18.00, 12/3/15	Attleborough Town Hall	Attleborough Retail Forum	
18.30, 17/3/15	Attleborough Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

15.00, 18/3/15	Norfolk County Council	Education in Attleborough	Meeting Steve Hicks
16.00, 19/3/15	Attleborough Town Hall	Meeting with Town Clerk regarding ANP Web Site and Consultation Programme	
15.00, 27/3/15	Attleborough Town Hall	Developers Sub-Group: Meeting with Bidwells and John Thompson & Partners representing Attleborough Land Ltd	Update on Attleborough Land Ltd proposals and programme. Draft master plan to be consulted on in summer 2015. Issues with Transport studies and Network rail. Agreed to work to similar programme and consultation periods.
18.00, 8/4/15	Breckland Lodge		Meeting with Thetford Town Council to discuss Neighbourhood Plans
19.30, 11/4/15	Connaught Hall	Attleborough Heritage Group	
18.30, 13/4/15	Attleborough Town Hall	Planning & Highways Committee	
19.00, 13/4/15	Attleborough Town Hall	Full Council	
18.30, 24/4/15	London Tavern	ANP	Sports options consultation with sports clubs
18.00, 30/4/15	London Tavern	Attleborough Retail Forum	
18.30, 5/5/15	Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
18.30, 19/5/15	Attleborough Academy	ANP	Sports & Leisure Consultation meeting
18.30, 33/07/15	Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	
18.30 10/06/15	Town Hall	ATC/ BC councillors	S106
18.30, 28/07/15	Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	A meeting prior to the Steering Group meeting, between Bruce Giddy, Managing Director of Hans House Group and key members of the Steering Group.
18.30 06/10/15	Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	Activities undertaken Sept - Oct 2015 Update of Health Sector report and requirements for land options and assessment. Presentation to Business Forum. Meeting with Cllr. Jolly, Chair of Breckland Economic Development. Meeting with District Councillor Karen Pettit on additional funding opportunities from Breckland. Meeting 9th September Phil Mileham and Iain Withington (BC) to discuss emerging policy, focus on employment requirements, land allocation and policy development. Valerie Watson-Brown and Colin Kilby consultation

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

			requirements, programme, costs, resources and methodology, both for October and December events. Meeting Charles Campion (JTP and Ptarmigan) SUE. Meeting Neil McShane Sports Centre, and possible informal park at land adjacent to A11, link road and additional parking.
23-25 October 2015	Town Hall	Drop in public exhibition on ANP	Collection of feedback on forms. See Appendix D1.
18.30 17/11/15	Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	Activities Nov 2015 ANPSG members at Attleborough Academy 5 morning assemblies from 30th November about ANP and Junior School drawing competition for 7-10 year olds. Xmas edition of Attleborough Matters summary of the consultation. S106 for GP facilities. Need for Breckland-wide sports study identified. Town Character Assessment under way to give evidence for heritage policy. Meeting Phil Mileham & Steve Hall re Open Space and Sports BC assessments.
09.30-12.00 11/12/15	Town Hall	ANP workshop	Draft design policy discussed and BC emerging LP policies.
2016			
12.01.16	Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	11th January to 22nd February draft LP consultation
Jan 2016			Meeting with Chris Hay NCC re new location for Primary School and sports requirements Attleborough Academy
01/02/16	Town Hall	Presentation on Open spaces	District & Town Councillors present. Proposed adopting Growing in the Community and the Fields In Trust national benchmarks. Town Council to become involved in the production of Section 106 agreements. Discussed appointing a consultant to audit all play spaces, equipment access and signage.
09.02.16	Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	LP consultation 14 January at Town Hall

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

11/02/16	Town Hall	Presentation	Presentation and discussion on NP to Town Council & Steering Group & BC representatives
15/02/16	Scout Hut	Steve Hall met Scout Group	Scout Group want to stay in current location
15/02/16	Town Hall	ATC Planning Committee Response re LP	
22/02/16	BC offices	BC S106	Cllr. Perkins, Ms. Lopes and Mr. Hall meeting Neil Langley BC regarding Section 106 contributions.
29/03/16	Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	Discussed ANP Projects, timetable
16 March 16	email		Consultation response from BC on the SA/SEA screening request.
31/03/16	Attleborough Library	Library provision	Jennifer Holland BC & Sarah Hassan Library on possible relocation of library.
18/04/16	Town Hall	Traffic schemes	Richard Doleman & Ian Parkes NCC presentation on town centre traffic improvement options
29/04/16	NCC	NCC land	Meeting with Janet DeSousa NCC on Library, Blue Light Services, Education
29.04.16	Town Hall	ANPSG members with NCC Property	Mr. Hall, Town Clerk, Cllr. Perkins and Cllr. Tyrer and Mr Middleton met with Bill Blackaby Norfolk Property Services (NPS) re land for Primary School and employment sites on London Road.
7 June 2016	Town Hall	ANP Steering Group	Agreed draft ANP for consultations, Discussion on how to involve ATC in S106 negotiations.
8 July 2016	Town Hall	Market location	Terry Staff (Market), Richard Doleman (NCC) and 3 ANPSG members.
1 August 2016	Town Hall	Consultation workshop on use land behind Queen's Square and on car park. First ideas for Queen's Square site.	Queen's Square and car park workshop. Attended by NCC Conservation and Highways staff, Library staff, (part) Lloyds Pharmacy manager, GP surgery Manager, Bruce Giddy Hans House (part) Town Clerk and Sarah Watts, assistant, Terry Cracknell, Elizabeth Burrows, Tony Perkins (ANPSG). Facilitators: Liz Wrigley (Core Connections) and Stephen Procter (Procter & Matthews)
13 & 14 August 2016	Town Hall	ANP consultation drop in weekend	Consultation Weekend took place Saturday 13th August 9am-12am and Sunday 14th August 11am-3pm.

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

15 August 2016	Town Hall	Exhibition and ANP policies	John Long Attleborough land planning agent met with assistant to Town Clerk to view exhibition.
24 August 2016	Town Hall	Employment	Lindy Warmer BC Roger Morfey consultant, Clerk & assistant ATC. Agreed no B8 or distribution hubs wanted. BC “developers will build what is required”. ANP policy B1 & B2 only.
30 08 16	BC Cabinet	ANP	Matthew Barnard chaired Cabinet meeting on 30 August 2016 where the ADP was represented. Tristan Ashby was assigned to work as a BC representative for the ANP.
6 and 25 October 2016	Town Hall	BC Local Plan consultation	Local Plan consultation 19 September to 31 October, two drop-in sessions as part of a rolling consultation process at Attleborough Town Hall.
9 November 2016	Town Hall	Attleborough Land SUE Stakeholder Update Workshop	Consultation event and exhibition run by developer promoting the SUE. Tony Perkins, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Chair, then gave a presentation outlining the Plan themes and manifesto. This was followed by a brief presentation of the proposals for Attleborough SUE, given by Marcus Adams of JTP. Four workshop themes were explored, with facilitators from Ptarmigan/ Attleborough Land and their Planners Bidwells, architects JTP and engineers MLM. See names below.

Transport & Movement Craig Neilson (Ptarmigan Land) Rupert Lyons (TPA) Emma Chung (JTP) Community Amenities John Long (Bidwells) Charles Wheatman (Ptarmigan Land) Placemaking Marcus Adams (JTP) Leigh Yeats (JTP) Aimee Fowler (Bidwells) Landscape & Drainage Neil Tully (JTP) Graham Hopkins (Hopkins Ecology) Vanessa Roll (MLM).

Appendix C1 Responses from key organisations

Name	Response	Action suggested, approved at 6 March 2017 ATC	Agreed ANP SG/ ATC
Attleborough Land	Change SUE boundary to coincide with the land AL is promoting Change to link road route Initial response to the Design Review is 'should be independent' and 'should be convened by BC as a part of pre-application planning'.	Seek BC agreement to this change. Collect information as an electronic file from BC modify Policies map. Link road illustrative shown as dashed line as agreed Agree the two changes suggested and add to text on the design review.	Leave as is. Discussed 15 08 16 (meeting notes available)
NCC	Suggest adding a specific Green Infrastructure policy and referring to the Tas Valley Way. NCC NPS do not agree with quality of building being high as adds to cost.	Existing policy Green Infrastructure Tas Valley Way not referred to as not referred to by public in consultations – is it even known about in local community? NPPF para 58 and planning policy guidance paras 56 to 68 support seeking high design quality. Raise size of development needing to go to review to “50 homes or 5 ha of other uses, and smaller sites if particularly sensitive”.	
South Norfolk DC	Refer to the A11 Growth Corridor as a growth catalyst	Add to the ANP	
Pegasus for Hans House	Add in the site they are promoting	Refer them to the emerging Local Plan as the appropriate vehicle for promoting major housing development and associated infrastructure.	
Taylor Wimpey	As above	As above	
Diocese of Norwich	Concern at loss of trees as consequence if Rectory Wall removed for traffic improvements. Trees protected as in a Conservation Area.	The traffic improvement scheme is not promoted by the ANP but is a discussion option from NCC. Five replacement trees would be required if any are removed if the ANP policy is approved.	Representative contacted and reassured August 2016.
Breckland Bridge/ The Land Group	On behalf of BC as landowner, concern the site B does not include retail. Also request the town centre boundary include the sports hall as a theatre, as this is a town centre use.	Typo, should include retail use, as is clear in description of town centre policy, i.e. grow retail in the town centre first, rather than creating out of town retail area. Include Sports Hall in town centre boundary but for D1 uses only.	

Anglia Water	Refer to the Breckland Water Cycle Study to inform SuDS policy.	Ask BC for a copy of this document.	
Owner site D	Not interested in selling site.	Delete site from Policies map and delete the policy.	Attleborough Land has offered alternative space.
Mr Gaymour, Banham Zoo	Skills will be required if zoo expansion is successful, tourism base worth noting.	Note the Zoo as regional tourist attraction could support Attleborough expanding its complementary tourist facilities such as hotels and restaurants. Skills will be required in tourism management, as well as veterinary and animal conservation skills.	Noted, involve in implementing policies and projects.
Environment Agency	Support for objectives, especially CO9 & 10 and ESD4 & 5. Advises: “Any activities should not cause deterioration in the status of the River Thet, or prevent it from reaching ‘Good status’, which is the overarching objective of the Water Framework Directive. Norfolk County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted on SuDS proposals. The location of development should take into consideration the relative availability of existing developed water resources. The timing and cost of infrastructure improvements will be a consideration. This issue should be discussed with the water company. Every opportunity should be taken to build water efficiency into new developments, and innovative	Add this wording to the objective to protect and enhance surface and groundwater bodies in ANP text. Also add “Any new SuDS should be constructed in such a way that they do not present an increased risk to groundwater and the wider water environment”. Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-principles-andpractice-gp3 . We welcome the EA’s commitment to innovation, and note their recommendation of grey water recycling provided it is achieved in a safe and hygienic manner. The advice on waste and contamination management seems more appropriate for BC development managers when assessing planning applications.	Liaise with BC NCC and EA. Run joint design workshop with developers? Simple cost effective surface water management recommendations, low maintenance that can be integrated with landscape management work.

	approaches should be encouraged”.		
Highways England	The Neighbourhood Plan refers to the improvements on the A11 trunk road but these improvements were completed many years ago and capacity has grown since then, so any increase in traffic and road usage will need to be measured and Highways England would expect to be fully consulted on any major developments that will impact on the A11 trunk road.	Noted. Add to the wording “Highways England would expect to be fully consulted on any major developments that will impact on the A11 trunk road” on the employment site allocation policy criteria.	
Breckland Council	A fully consolidated response was sent from BC following a delegated decision on 9 August 2016,	See Appendix C2 and email comments at the end of this table. Map changed to Policies Map, and Town Centre Map added.	
	The ANP undertook an SA/SEA on its objectives in 2015, then on its policies in 2016, but BC scoping opinion required more information about the Site A and its impact on European Directive protected sites.	BC confirmation that no Habitats Assessment is required received October 2016. See email at end of document and in SA/ SEA.	
	Repeats of BC LP policy	Retain these until LP is adopted.	
	BC was not convinced about the Housing with Care , confusing it with care homes.	Housing with Care is a key policy in the ANP, arising from detailed research into the ageing demographic and the local gap between supply and growing housing needs. We will describe it better.	Also objectives to deliver / support delivery of care home and dementia care were supported in public consultation. Discussions with potential landowner underway.
	BC wants more explicit references to biodiversity in objectives and criteria for policies on the Linear Park.	Theme Groups reflect the community’s requirements and the intention to be bio-diverse is clear from the work for the Theme Group and descriptions of nature being	NPs do not have to designate priority habitats or Habitats of principal importance. The Habitats Assessment sets out what is

<p>“e. Incorporate Habitats of Principal Importance or local biodiversity Priority Habitats”, also suggests criteria should be included for dog walking circuits to ensure they do not interfere with these new designated areas. Refer to the 2015 BC Open Space Assessment when justifying statements about the lack of a park or sufficient informal recreation in Attleborough.</p>	<p>integrated. ANPSG will work with Norfolk Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>Dog walking is a management issue.</p> <p>The citizens of Attleborough state there is no Park that they recognise as one, and therefore this is a reasonable evidence base, and does not require the BC Open Space Assessment to justify this statement. The Rec has no park-like informal recreation or stimulating play experiences (see consultation comments). Support for creating the Linear Park and reconfiguring the Rec to informal open space uses in the long term when the Sports facility is transferred to Gaymers’s Field is strong evidence – they don’t have a Park and residents know what a Park and informal open space should contain.</p>	<p>already designated. Reference can be made to the BAP for ATC’s allotments at http://www.norfolkbiodiversity.org/actionplans/habitatactionplans/allotment.aspx</p> <p>The ANP can help address local complaints to the ATC about the lack of dog walking circuits but they do not have to be positioned in wildlife sensitive areas.</p> <p>The lack of what the local residents require as a Park is clear in the consultations. Any comment that the residents evidence should be backed up by a survey suggests a deep distrust of local knowledge and an existential problem.</p>
<p>Flooding & Surface water management – to expand to cover more than SuDS alone.</p>	<p>Amend to refer to SFRA 2016 “...there will be a particular need to manage surface water runoff” in the initial description.</p>	
<p>Design guidance, use of an independent design review process.</p>	<p>Agreed to changes to make policy: Suggest a protocol to use Independent design review (e.g. using the charity Design SE to organise it), working with the BC planners at pre-application stage, on all sites of 50 homes or more, and non housing sites of 1 ha or more, and smaller ones in particularly sensitive locations. Disagree that seeking better design if done early adds to cost: it can save on costs of poor designing. NPPF fully supports design review in para 58.</p>	<p>The ANP requires developers to “respond to local character and history, as set out in the Landscape Character Assessments and the AHG evidence base, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. We refer to the UEA Enterprise Centre for appropriate innovation in this specific sub regional location, for example in</p>

	<p>Concern at the tree replacement policy of requiring five trees if one removed, and suggest it should only apply to ATC owned land. Suggestions also include: a site size cut off; including references to BC practice; excluding any trees in the CA from this policy (as it conflicts with BC policy to only replace the single TPO tree).</p> <p>There is also the suggestion to only allow native trees.</p>	<p>The policy helps address climate change (fast CO2 absorption in years 10 to 50 of a tree’s lifetime) as well as to give the town the best chance to continue to have mature trees into the next century. The CA heritage assets include mature trees, so ANP is adding to the policy implementing the CA. It will cover private gardens so restricting species too strongly seems a little harsh. Elsewhere TPO trees will be easy to track. BC officers would be required to also implement ANP policy. If the site is agreed to be really too small to take five small trees as they grow, then thin down in say 50 years time, by a condition or agreement four can be planted in the proposed Linear Park or Attleborough Wood on Gladedale land that is to be given to the community behind the Academy under a S106 agreement.</p>	<p>use of lime render, local timber, thatch and brick.</p> <p>We will include the words in the text: “with preference for replacement trees to be locally characteristic native trees. Refer to the BS standard for protection of trees.” Woodland Trust has recommendations on native tree choices for small gardens that the residents can be recommended to use by BC planning officers. Free additional trees could be made available for the off site planting if small whips used instead of larger standards – as the cost is so much less, and the community and schools could be involved in planting.</p>
<p>Historic England</p>	<p>We are disappointed to see that despite some encouraging policies within the Neighbourhood Plan, there is little reference to them in the Sustainability Appraisal. Both the SA and the Neighbourhood Plan would be strengthened with the inclusion of a Historic Environment Sub Section</p>	<p>The NPPF and BC Local Plan and Core Strategy have such policies already.</p>	<p>Add the list of archaeology sites to Evidence Base, and refer to White Loge HERS listing in the ANP policy and in the SA.</p>

Appendix C2 Regulation 14 Responses in detail from Breckland Council

Policy No	Text of draft ANP	Text suggestion from BC	Recommendation
LE-P1	Support allocation of 10 ha site (site A on map) on London Road for SME-sized employment users, with access from London Road,	Mitigation? Boundary screening, frontage development, layout thoughts as gateway site? (note response also incorporates the response to Historic England and the EA	Amend policy text with criteria
LE-P2	Redevelop Queens Square car park site for uses that support town centre retail and other community uses, and seek both replacement and additional car parking capacity. (See Policy Map Town Centre site B)		Key site, held one workshop and meeting with BC as landowner, needs brief, as how take forward needs a debate. Include in policy to prepare a site development brief jointly with the landowners: BC, Attleborough Academy, GP Practice and Lloyds Pharmacy, and to work with the Library (NCC) and ATC. Include library site as part of the policy, also consider massing and heights, response as in the Conservation Area, is a housing reuse appropriate e.g. for the GP surgery site, to include retail. Demonstrate link to overspill car park, and key desire lines for pedestrians. Theatre in the sports hall. Needs access, fronting current car park so reorganisation of space.

			Queen’s Square Workshop 1 August 2016 available from ATC.
LE-P3	Planning permissions will be resisted which would result in the loss of existing local shopping facilities within the defined town centre boundary.	Should be positively worded (i.e. what will be supported). Don’t know how this is implementable in context of GPDO.	<p>Planning permissions will be supported which satisfactorily demonstrate that they do not adversely impact on existing local shopping facilities within the defined town centre boundary. Changes under GPDO will have much less impact on overall floorspace loss so not of such concern.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>Marketing by applicants prior to changes is often not done rigorously and the businesses in the Town Centre need to retain a critical mass to attract custom, which if lost, would affect ability to be a viably large town centre for the growing town, as required in the NPPF. There are tests to apply. The Business Forum will be well placed to assist in marketing. See para 26 of NPPF and guidance: “Local planning authorities should assess and plan to meet the needs of main town centre uses in full, in broadly the same way as for their housing and economic needs, adopting a ‘town centre first’ approach and taking account of specific town centre policy. In doing so, local planning authorities need to be mindful of the different rates of development in town centres compared with out of centre.</p> <p>Therefore suggest BC as LPA can use this set of tests to resist</p>

			significant changes. The applicant has to demonstrate it meets tests, not the Town Council.
LE-P4	Support proposals for a new superstore subject to the completion of the Link Road and town centre traffic improvements and better pedestrian rail crossings	Supermarket on Banham site has consent. This is not conditional on the link road so references to 'subject to link road' or some such in the policy should be deleted.	Accept, but observe that a new supermarket to serve the enlarged population will require HGV access and customer parking, and will clearly add to the existing traffic congestion both for servicing and for customer access. ANPSG to discuss with BC if it can have a condition to require a traffic impact assessment and timed routing through the town centre to avoid the key am and mid pm school peaks.
LE-P5	Primary retail frontage should be changed in Attleborough to allow both sides of Exchange Street to fall into Prime Frontage, as should the retail units on Queens Road opposite the Car Park and Lidl.	Is this a recommendation to the Local Plan or a policy change as it doesn't appear on your policies map? Suggest leaving this to Local Plan.	Retain, show on Town Centre Policies Map so the town centre survives and thrives.
LE-P6	Uses that complement the Town Centre will be supported in the SUE.	Policy not required as would be contained in LP policy and national guidance.	See <i>town centre first</i> emphasis of our policies above,. Our objection to the Core Strategy is the large amount of new retail in the SUE compared to the existing town. Suggest retain ANP policy at least until a satisfactory alternative

			Local Plan policy is adopted.
LE-P7	Support will be given to planning applications for improving town centre premises located in older buildings such as around Queens Square, in Defiant Precinct and other yards, and the villas on Connaught Road and High Street, where these are in employment use already.	Need to define 'improving' as very subjective. Physical improvement, or improvement through alternative use?	Make clear. Physical improvements will be encouraged, Justification In Conservation Area, character on approach roads is defined by substantial villas – too large for a single family and traffic impact is high: noise, air pollution etc – but these are handsome premises, and B class professional services use helps maintain them. Cluster can remain strong. Again the test is NPPF policy of vibrancy of town centre as it grows.
H-P1	Permissions for windfall housing should be on appropriate sites within the existing town boundary.	Repeats policies in Local Plan	Retain. Very happy to remove when Local Plan is approved (same as above). Will help future debate on key sites such as the Library in the scenario that it moves onto the site B in the ANP, releasing the existing site for redevelopment. Justification If we are to progress two or three key sites in the town centre the owners (e.g. NCC) need confidence they will get housing value on vacated sites. But happy to be guided on this.
H-P2	Seek timely infrastructure provision to serve the new development to ensure housing	Sufficient infrastructure to mitigate 'its' impact. Not sure this policy will add to	Very happy to remove when Local Plan is approved, with policy PD11, but ANPSG would wish to continue to be closely involved in emerging SUE parameter plans, and funding discussions to

	is well integrated in the town. Housing proposals will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that there is also sufficient infrastructure, services and community facilities available, or to be provided using funding that is agreed to be given within appropriate timescales to support the new development.	what is in the Local Plan.	<p>deliver key social infrastructure, sports, informal open spaces, Linear Park, the emerging ATC play strategy etc. and transport interventions (transport hub, cycling paths, walking to school and work etc.)</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>The entire ANP is adding to what is in the Local plan policy and will assist to obtain the placemaking required for this major extension.</p>
H-P3	Provide a balanced housing mix to address the demographic changes and to address the need to attract further economic development across all tenures.	How will this be evidenced?	<p>The policy under Health & Social Care for the dual registered facility is a special housing requirement and part of the ANP policy on delivering health and social care as providing homes with care available will help relieve pressure on hospital beds. Cross-refer to the HSC policy? Of its nature, this policy will rely on annual monitoring to demonstrate evidence of meeting the mix for example moves that release family homes currently lived in by older residents, as well as measuring success with the objective of supporting people to stay at home rather than recover in hospital.</p>
H-P4	Planning applications from house builders should use a Building for Life dialogue	Policy rather than reasoned justification should state that BFL costs	<p>Agree. Planning applicants for new dwellings should use a Building for Life dialogue process to improve local placemaking on all sites of 10 homes or more. There will be an expectation that</p>

	<p>process to improve local placemaking on all sites of 10 homes or more. See also Policy EDS-P6.</p>	<p>to be borne by the applicant and should recognise that there may be implications on scheme viability. Should not state applications from ‘house builders’, but rather ‘applications for new dwellings’ or similar.</p>	<p>developers will commission independent pre-application design reviews, in liaison with the local planning authority, for major development applications, such as the SUE and other housing development, the dual registered high dependency unit, and on other sites above 1 ha.</p> <p>See also Policy EDS-P6.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>Assessment costs an applicant between 600 and 6000 pounds depending on complexity, and usually if done early will lead to cost savings and faster permissions. Design quality is an NPPF requirement.</p>
T-P1	<p>The proposed location of link roads, improved connections for walking and cycling and new crossings over the rail line should be set out in new housing development masterplans, outline and detailed applications and s106 agreements.</p>	<p>Policy isn’t needed as it is repeating what will be in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Very happy to remove when Local Plan is approved and contains the policy.</p> <p>Justification to keep it meanwhile is that there are detailed discussions on a number of scheme options being held with the developers that affect our policies, such as walking and running, cycling, scooting and riding links to and through the Linear Park, that should be in the masterplan.</p>
T-P2	<p>The Town Council would require link road applicants to</p>	<p>Applicant for the SUE (a proxy for Link Road)</p>	<p>Agree, reword ‘should demonstrate how they will not add to’</p>

	<p>demonstrate how their proposal for the design and timing of implementation of the scheme reduces congestion in the town.</p>	<p>doesn't have to demonstrate how it reduces congestion in the town centre, only has to demonstrate that it doesn't adversely impact the network (excl. Background growth) and mitigates its own growth. This follows principle that development only has to mitigate its own impact not the ills of the past.</p>	<p>instead of 'reduce', town centre congestion.</p> <p>Three reports were produced by Capita to demonstrate three aspects of managing growth in traffic. None can stand alone as we understand, so the Link Road, modal shift ,and town centre road change projects are all interlinked.</p> <p>Justification: The NCC presentations and the three related transport reports all show a close relationship between what is done in the town centre and the rest of the Link Road and other interventions.</p> <p>Timescale to provide the Link Road will be an important aspect to demonstrate mitigation. Negotiating timing for and the spend profile of funding is related to this.</p>
T-P3	<p>Support will be given to implementing designs that promote safety for all in schemes improving walking and cycling connections over the rail lines.</p>	<p>Wording is too ambiguous.</p>	<p>Reworded.</p>

T-P4	To work up designs for the town centre roads to ensure congestion does not worsen in the town centre or on links to town from the SUE, from recreation grounds, from employment sites and from schools.	Road design undertaken by NCC as LHA and will be subject to consultation with relevant stakeholders including ATC. Therefore, suggest policy is not required.	Agreed. Delete. However the community requires information on the road schemes so suggest the solutions proposed be part of exhibitions and publicity through the ANP process including during lead up to referendum. Delivery Strategy item?
Obj Top left of page 27	Develop jointly with BC and NCC a parking strategy and implementation plan for the town centre which supports the viability and vitality of the town centre as well as promoting sustainable transport use.	This appears to be a policy and should be treated as such.	Agreed, will become new T-P4, but also it is a Delivery Strategy item. “T-P4 Develop jointly with BC and NCC a parking strategy and implementation plan for the town centre which supports the viability and vitality of the town centre as well as promoting sustainable transport use. “
ED-P1	Pre-school provision should be shown as allocations in masterplans and phasing plans for the growth in homes and be facilitated by developers.	Not needed as Local Plan would seek such, as would NCC as part of any major planning application.	Retain as a policy, as LP very unlikely to go into this level of pre-school provision detail, for all children not just public sector. Justification: Need to see the private sector response as well as NCC, as the population’s employment opportunities are so closely linked to access to good quality childcare. Research by ANPSG shows adequate provision at present but needs monitoring for a

			town doubling in population.
HS-P1	Allocate a suitable site to accommodate a dual registered care facility for around 65 beds.	Is there a site to allocate, if so can it be shown are there any alternatives?	No site as yet - at present negotiation is underway - in interests of both transparency and confidential negotiations a balance must be struck.
HS-P2	Deliver a new joint GP surgery and primary care provision on a site on Station Road close to the rail station where there is an existing GP surgery, NHS clinic and additional land, releasing the existing Queen's Square surgery site for redevelopment (ANP Policies Map /Town Centre map site B).	Probably sensible to have this as an objective rather than an absolute deliverable. Alternatively, re-word policy to 'Support a new joint GP surgery'.	Change policy wording 'Deliver' to 'Support' but retain as site in Town Centre Policies Map 2, as it is a key deliverable. Justification One of the key requirements of the ANP is delivering more GP provision and releasing the Queen's Square town centre site for new development.
SLC-P2	Allocate a new Outdoor Sports Hub based at Gaymer's Field with a new Pavilion incorporating changing, storage, parking and social facilities, and an Artificial Games Pitch (AGP).	Replace 'allocate' with 'seek contributions to deliver' in first sentence.	Retain 'allocate'. Add 'and seek S106 contributions from all applications of 50 units or above or 1 ha in size or above'. Justification ATC manages the use of the land, so it is reasonable to suggest it will also allocate its use.

			<p>Note re Delivery Strategy:</p> <p>Need to agree with BC on which are the five chosen pooled sites for the S106 (SUE will be one) and how a pooled contribution works in practice. Logically we should choose the five largest LP allocations in Attleborough? We should have evidence to set a fixed fee per dwelling based on the study of costs by July 2017?</p>
SLC-P3	Allocate additional land adjoining Gaymer's Field for sport and recreational use.	How much land is proposed to be allocated? Policy wording needs to be tied back to 'as identified on the policies map' or similar. Suggest strengthening the justification to enhance robustness.	<p>Agree. Add 'as allocated as an Outdoor Sports Hub on the Policies Map (site D and extensions)' to the policy.</p> <p>Add: "ANPSG will set up a mechanism to work with developers to deliver the Outdoor Sports Hub on sites to be allocated through the SUE masterplan and planning application S106 agreements".</p> <p>Delivery Strategy Action: Seek Ptarmigan data on size of suggested sites.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>Clarification of the Policy location.</p>
SLC-P5	Specify the required outdoor play facilities (NEAP+ and for young and old adults) at the Recreation Ground on Station	O/S and play standards will be set out in the Local Plan. What is the additionality that the NP is	<p>Note words were lost from policy in error, it should say 'and <u>informal recreation</u> for young and old". Although old adults could well ask for appropriate 'play' facilities to use? They might be a feature in future Health City planning standards so we could</p>

	<p>Road to be implemented once it is freed from formal sporting uses.</p>	<p>seeking? If there is nothing beyond what will be in the Local Plan then the policy would be repetitious and should be deleted.</p>	<p>do this innovatively? A Play Policy has been adopted by ATC.</p> <p>Say 'Specify and Implement' rather than 'specify'. Town Council policy and delivery. ATC's Play consultant's report outlines the deficiencies and the modern approach to play and recreation proposed standards, including stimulating informal nature play. There may therefore be other locations than just Station Road.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>The Play consultants will put forward a strategy to deliver additional facilities over the LP standard. New spaces and retrofitting existing ones is needed to tackle obesity and provide access to nature, which will aid mental and physical health for all ages, and we would be working on a new approach where standards are not yet set. The LP has no adult informal recreation standards. We are located close to the new GP surgery and will be linking up health and informal recreation e.g. scoping an area for open-air exercise classes in dog-free zones.</p>
SLC-P6	<p>Safeguard the location for a new Linear Park as broadly shown on the Proposals Map, interconnected with routes to encourage walking and cycling.</p>	<p>Has landowner discussion taken place and any 'agreement' been secured?</p>	<p>Process has started on Linear Park delivery mechanisms, with options discussion with Ptarmigan, e.g. a community land trust or as part of the charity to deliver healthcare.</p> <p>Seeking to agree an allocation on the Policies Map, with the SUE promoters Ptarmigan/ Attleborough Land currently shown as</p>

			indicative'. Outside the SUE a similar process is under discussion e.g. see Besthorpe Parish Council Local Plan site allocations response re ensuring Linear Park delivers the link to Decoy Common through developable land.
SLC-P7	Seek allocations and financial contributions from developers for new community facilities to be set out in their approved S106 delivery schedules.	This will repeat what will be in Local Plan and secured through a legal agreements. Therefore, the policy is not required. However, if kept, is there any detail on type of community facilities? If retained, the policy should also make reference to the pooling restrictions and or Cil regs 3 tests.	Very happy to remove when Local Plan is approved and demonstrates all the requirements are set out. The entire ANP is the detail of required facilities: economic; social and environmental. See above re pooling decisions required.
SLC-P8	Seek site allocations for new allotments in the SUE Masterplan.	Delete words 'site allocations' and replace with Seek XX ha of land for new allotment provision within the SUE', again making sure this is evidenced.	Use the allotment standards the ATC wishes to apply for policy - x homes y allotments ratio, multiplied by allotment size. Provide in phases as population grows, so not seek site x ha but seek to grow sites at rate of y ha per person. Justification Town Council is responsible for allotment policy and provision, so should be party to the detailed masterplan discussion on allocation,

			timing, accessibility etc. Evidence base of required standards produced by the Sports Theme Group, gives the figures for x and y.
SLC-P9	Work with landowners to allocate a future cemetery site.	This is probably an aspiration/ objective rather than a policy.	Retain, a Town Council requirement and site search underway. ATC needs to set out its criteria to guide the process. Justification This is high priority as existing burial land is running out.
SLC-P10	Work with landowners to seek a new co-located venue for a Town Hall, Civic Centre and Heritage Centre, including a new library.	This is probably an aspiration/ objective rather than a policy.	Keep as a policy. Allocated site B in town centre Policies Map. Justification This is the best site in the whole town centre, and the key to making Attleborough a vibrant place to visit and use when it has a 20,000 plus population using the town. See NPPF for why need to retain policy for key town centre uses to create a destination: events, leisure, meeting and socialising. Delivery strategy to prepare a brief with landowners, potential users and BC and NCC. Timescale is fluid, medium to long term, may be phases, e.g. phase 1 when GP surgery goes to Station Road. Action: Hold a second workshop on the site to evolve ideas; a brief, and project plan, ensuring the BC as landowner is invited a

			month in advance this time!
ESD-P1	Prepare a strategy for Green Infrastructure: the proposed Linear Park; to waymark paths and green the links from the town centre to Gaymer's Field; from the Linear Park to The Recreation Ground along marked public footpaths; and to provide a continuing link of green infrastructure through to Decoy Common in the North East and to Hargham Woods in the South West.	Should this strategy be completed ahead of adoption to inform the plan? Or is there any other initial evidence that can be referenced to justify the policy?	Do not consider that a strategy in more detail than the policy should have to be decided now. The SUE will develop over the next 20 plus years and a suitable design should be allowed to evolve with flexibility to bring in new ideas and techniques for integrating SUDS, and managing water wildlife and people. Initial evidence of need is in the Sports Consultant's report and the consultation that has been very positive about delivering a Linear Park. The exact routes and waymarking will be worked out with Ptarmigan / Attleborough land, the Norfolk Wildlife Trust other landowners and local residents, and should be in the masterplan. NCC has offered to help.
ESD-P2	For every tree felled, replacement planting by at least five trees, of various sizes, will be sought either on the same site or as close as is feasible.	Needs to be more specific i.e. for <i>planning applications</i> that would result in the loss of a tree.....	In response to the suggestions to be more specific add to apply for major planning applications, and also Applications For Tree Works in the CA, and for trees with TPOs and for all tree works on ATC open space sites. For planning applications and felling requests under TPO tree/ CA legislation approval is required already that would result in the loss of a tree, whose girth exceeds 75mm at 1.5m above ground. This policy adds that replacement planting by at least five trees, of various appropriate species and sizes, will be sought. This could be on adjacent land in the

			<p>applicant’s control, or on land owned by ATC, BC, NCC or the local schools if not practical on the application site.</p> <p>Justification: CO2 capture, aesthetic impact, future proofing the landscape for the next generation, meeting the request in the ANP consultation for many more trees.</p> <p>Trees in a Conservation Area have equivalent to TPO protection if their girth exceeds 75mm at 1.5m above ground. Any works to trees within a Conservation Area or with a TPO attached must submit an Application for Tree Works to BC prior to undertaking any works on them.</p>
EDS-P3	Prepare a Design Guide jointly by the developers and the Town Council for the SUE and other new development	The SUE application will be expected to be accompanied by an outline masterplan and could, through the design brief submitted with the application, include character areas, and parameter plans that would form part of the approved plans for reserved matters applications to follow.	<p>Typo: should read "Prepare a Design Guide jointly by the developers, BC and the ANPSG ..."</p> <p>The ANP policies should be applied in preparing the stages of design guidance.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>There are very good examples of urban extensions with design codes, parameter plans etc. that are rigorously applied, however the ANPSG / AHG can operate a strong steer on the local character that should be welcomed by all parties.</p>

		<p>BDC as LPA could lead on the preparation of design guidance <i>if required</i> and this approach could enable it to have greater weight as unclear how much weight a locally prepared design guide outwith the NP would have.</p>	<p>NPPF guidance paragraph 58 is a national policy commitment to design quality. The “if required” is not an adequate safeguard of good design: the ANP policy <u>does</u> require it, and requests BC to take this approach. However developers’ commitment to preparing the input is equally important, and some have demonstrated this at the stakeholder update workshop held by Attleborough Land on 9 December 2017 at Attleborough Town Hall.</p> <p>Delivery: Design workshops and reviews, together with clear public involvement are hallmarks of good local governance and citizen participation that are strands of the Localism Act.</p>
EDS-P4	<p>Designate, (or if they are included in the Breckland Local Plan endorse) Local Open Spaces, and improve them:</p>	<p>These are existing zoned open space on the Policies map (except Decoy Common). Therefore, you don’t need to include the existing ones in policy to ‘endorse’ them. Suggest policy is deleted. Evidence of delivery of extension to Gaymers is</p>	<p>Decoy Common and Gaymer’s Field extensions to be specified as Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>The Local Plan can replace this policy once approved, if it includes them. BC as a landowner is seeking to avoid designating several local open spaces in its own 2015 Open Space schedule, as set out in an email of 17 January 2017.</p>

		needed (i.e this could be a 'project' for inclusion in latter part of the plan to which BDC will seek contributions.	Ptarmigan/ Attleborough Land is considering the Gaymer's Field extensions for inclusion in their planning application and would be asked concur with also including them in the ANP. See comment above under Sports facilities re delivery. Wholehearted involvement and support as well as contribution is sought.
EDS-P5	<p>To designate the following "Significant Tree Avenues" in Attleborough and to work with landowners to protect, maintain and renew them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Station Road alongside Connaught Hall site B. Rectory Gardens alongside Surrogate Street <p>See Policies Map 2 Town Centre.</p>	Rectory Gardens – Need to think about how this squares with NCC proposals for improvements to surrogate street, which have been supported by Attleborough Development Partnership (including the NPs representative).	<p>The ATC and ANPSG had not endorsed the NCC junction B proposal, merely received it. The rationale for taking out the wall on Surrogate Street for the traffic scheme layout and its effect on the trees is yet to be supplied.</p> <p>Justification: reference to the AHG evidence on the significance of the tree avenues for the town's character, and in the Reg 14 ANP community support for the policy as trees are contributing to climate amelioration and aesthetic character on these heavily trafficked roads.</p> <p>Delivery: Note need to have trees and their Root Protection Zones plotted into Rectory Gardens wall and part of site town centre Junction Improvements Junction B NCC drawing PK6056 August 2016.</p>

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

Community Projects		Need to reference Regs 122 and 123 of CIL regs i.e. the three legal tests for obligations and the 5 obligation pooling cap.	Delivery strategy requirement to seek clarity as CIL abandoned by BC. Town Clerk can advise re discussions with S106 officer, who has since left. There is no mechanism currently to get the equivalent of 25% of CIL in towns with a made NP where no CIL operates.
--------------------	--	---	---

EW 190516 updated 180117 for ANPSG, endorsed then finalised 030317

Open Spaces - see table below also from same ANPSG decision.

Removal of Open Spaces - BC table in email of 17 January 2017

ANP Plan Ref	Is site owned by BDC?	Does BDC Planning have these allocated as Open Space?	Comment	ANP SG comment
A42	Yes	No	Would like to allocate this for Open Space in exchange for de-allocating A1	agreed
A1	Yes	Yes	Would like to deallocate this for Open Space in exchange for allocating A42	agreed
A49	Yes	No	Do no allocate as Open Space	agreed
A12	Yes	Yes	Would like north area allocated as Open Space only South area – fronting Yew Tree Road to be deallocated as Open Space	Not agreed
A26/1	Yes	Yes	Can remain as allocated Open Space	agreed
A13/2	Yes	Yes	Can remain as allocated Open Space	agreed
A45	Yes	No	Because current Local Plan does not have this allocated as Open Space – this needs to remain not allocated as Open Space	agreed
A33	Yes	Yes	Can remain as allocated Open Space	agreed
A47	Yes	No	Can be allocated as Open Space – this was adopted from a Developer as	agreed

Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (Reg 15)
January 2017

			Open Space – Local Plan not updated	
A29	Yes	Yes	Can remain as allocated Open Space	agreed
A38	Yes	Yes	Can remain as allocated Open Space	agreed
A46	Yes	No	Can be allocated as Open Space – this was adopted from a Developer as Open Space – Local Plan not updated	agreed
A34	Yes	Yes	Can remain as allocated Open Space	agreed
A40	Yes	Yes	Can remain as allocated Open Space (per plan below (north west site))	agreed
A41 (New Road)	Yes	No	See plan below – Only allocate east strip and north-east section as Open Space. South-east site (not highlighted in green on plan below) to not be allocated as Open Space. (the other A41 site marked is not owned by BDC)	Concern as to what developer is offering instead? This is a large open space to lose.



A41 New Road plan referred to above

Core Connections for ANPSG 18 01 2017

a. Housing sustainability standards

BC asked that we include the government's reference to their statement on not having a separate ANP standard relating to sustainable homes. This is the relevant speech: "Plan making From the date the Deregulation Bill 2015 is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings" <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/planning-update-march-2015>. The SA and SEA quote the full text concerning technical standards.

b. Reference to BC maps and open space policy – relevant email here

To: Colin Kilby , Jeremy Burton

Cc: Edward Tyrer

Subject: Mapping

I had discussions with Iain Withington who has pointed me in the direction of the following maps that show what Brecklands record of registered amenity/open space in Attleborough is. These are from the Core Strategy of 2009 and I have also included the Open Space Parish Schedule completed in 2015. How this compares with any TC records I cannot comment but would be useful to know. Anything not included in the Core Strategy documents means that it is not registered by Breckland and is therefore not recorded or officially recognised.

One of the discussions I had with Iain Withington yesterday was about informal Open Space (not play/sports/allotments or cemeteries). It would appear that previous adopted plans and development policies never included the national guidelines and therefore developers did not have to contribute to them. This would explain why Attleborough is so short of informal Open Space! It is imperative that ATC makes representation regarding this with regards to the Local Plan.

Hope this helps

Regards

Steve

The attached maps: Attleborough Proposals Map Core Strategy 2009 adopted December 2009 and the Town Centre inset to this map. Open Space Parish Schedule 2015 [A-C].pdf"

**c. BC response re Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment
Screening Determination Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan March 2016**

Phil Mileham <phil.mileham@breckland-sholland.gov.uk>

3/16/16

to Enquiries

Dear Gina,

Further to your correspondence with the Council and Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment screening request, based on the contents of your submitted screening document please find attached a copy of the response. I must also take this opportunity to apologise on behalf of the Council that this has taken longer to get to you than would have been ideal. As the Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment screening issue has now been considered, it would be advisable for us to discuss the scoping and appraisal stages and how these fit with plan preparation.

Quotes from the report:

“This Screening Report is designed to determine whether or not the content of the Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. It is based on the screening Opinion request of November 2015.”

It is down to the qualifying body to demonstrate how its plan will contribute to achieving sustainable development. It remains BC’s view that the Town Council produce a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in order to demonstrate how the Neighbourhood Plan contributes to sustainable development and that this should incorporate the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with the Act and Regulations. This means that in addition to environmental issues, on which a Strategic Environmental Assessment focuses, social and economic matters will also be addressed as part of the overall assessment of sustainability, within a single joint appraisal.

In relation to the first request the intention is that the allocation of the Strategic Urban Extension of residential development and associated Link Road is being brought forward through the emerging Local Plan. In supporting this, the [Attleborough] Neighbourhood Plan is in general

conformity with the Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan and there are no significant changes to the Development Plan. Any development of the existing employment land on London Road adjacent to the Taylor Wimpey site would be brought forward by the promoter, in this case, Norfolk County Council.”

2.8 If the Neighbourhood Plan is seeking a proposed policy to designate further employment land then it is considered that an SEA scoping report would be required to ascertain if the emerging plan is likely to have a significant effect on the environment. In this regard the Neighbourhood Plan is setting the Framework for future development consent of projects.

2.9 This report has been informed by the opinions of the Statutory consultees which were consulted between 11/02/2016 and 17/03/2016. Their comments appended to this report.

Table 1

Stage	Y/N	Reason
4. Will the Neighbourhood Plan, in view of its likely effect on sites, require an assessment for future development under Article 6 or 7 of the habitats Directive? (Art.3.2(b))	N	The NP is unlikely to have any substantial effect on the network of protected sites. A Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report (2013) and the Assessment of the Breckland Local Plan at Preferred Directions stage (2015) were carried out as part of Breckland District Council emerging Local Plan. The Preferred Directions HRA rules out recreational impacts on Swangey Fen , as a component of the Norfolk Valley Fens SAC as it lies at over a kilometre to the west of the town, has no public access, no roads and separated from the proposed urban extension by the A11.
6. Does the Neighbourhood Plan set the framework for future development consent of Projects (not just projects in Annexes to the EIA Directive)? (Art 3.4)	Y	The NP is to be used by Breckland District Council as part of the Development Plan in the determination of future planning applications.
8. Is it likely to have a significant effect on the environment	?	The Neighbourhood Plan seeks general conformity to the adopted Core Strategy and regard to the emerging Local Plan. A full SEA has been undertaken as part of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) while the emerging Local Plan itself provides the overarching framework for the actual level of growth and a full SEA is incorporated into the emerging SA.

The Neighbourhood Plan focuses on shaping how development comes forward and at this stage in the Screening Opinion intends on allocating land for employment use on London Road and or in the Strategic Urban Extension. The impact on the environment will depend on the proposals included within it.

The justification for this decision is given below.

The NP is a long term plan up to 2036. It does not seek to direct residential growth however it seeks to allocate employment land. The exact size and locations are yet to be decided. The impacts beyond the parish are thought unlikely to be significant, however judgement is reserved until the scale and nature of proposals is clear.

2.10 Statutory Responses on the SA/SEA Screening are given in the SA/SEA. Letters were received from Historic England and the Environment Agency. Natural England responded directly to BC on the HRA Screening Opinion to say no HRA was required.

2.11 The ANP has expanded criteria to include the setting of the heritage asset in the section on the Employment Land Allocation, and in the SEA. The SA refers to the *ANP Character Assessment* November 2015 carried out by the Attleborough Heritage Group. To complete the work as suggested in consultation, a map showing the location of the list of non-designated heritage assets in this report was also compiled, a copy of which is included in the SA/SEA document. The ANP has objectives relating to heritage asset but relies on policies in the BC Development Plan and emerging LP, and the NPPF, and does not require further policies except those relating to open spaces and trees. Whilst Historic England suggests a sub-section is created, without a specific ANP policy, this seems disproportionate. The SA/SEA includes information on archaeology. We agree with Historic England that the settings of heritage assets could be affected by the SUE development, but the process of producing the masterplan should incorporate these issues under emerging LP policy. The criteria for designing the Linear Park are also part of the masterplan and the suggestion to include respecting the settings of listed buildings can be added where relevant. In Policy LE.P5 the change from secondary to primary retail is already clear it is not affecting residential properties.

Appendix D1

Informal Consultation: Responses to the Drop in at the Town Hall 24 and 25 October 2015

Feedback from 80 responses were completed and analysed. The age range was from 10 to 89, although the majority were in the 50 to 65 and over 65 categories.

Age range of respondents was in the following bands: 0-12 (2)13-20(1)21-35(4)36-49(6) 50-65(21) over 65 (23) not given (the rest)

Section 1 Overall Plan

1.1 Comments on the overall plan by younger respondents were more enthusiastic than older ones as captured by these views.

“The overview is really good and will bring the town up to date and to compete with neighbouring towns.” “All in all a good plan with a strong vision.” Age 21-35

1.2 Not surprisingly employment was a concern of younger respondents, but also there was a comment from a younger respondent on the market that has seeded in many minds since.

“We would like to be able to work near our home when we are grown up” Age 0-12

“I'm not sure where 'new employment' can be found when looking for work, I had to look towards Thetford or Norwich for a job.” Age 21-35

“The Market needs to improve, advertising all week to draw in the people who will then spend money within the town.” Age 21-35

1.3 Comments had some common themes. Three key comments were made many times:

- a. A strong feeling that Attleborough should plan for a swimming pool to serve the growing town, as populations using the alternatives at Thetford and Wymondham will also grow

- b. The Linear Park linking east to west Attleborough through the southern urban extension captured people's imaginations (with a suggestion to also complete a Ring around the town), and there was support for the proposed links over the rail line to the town centre.

- c. Support for improving health facilities, with the consolidation and expansion of an expanded doctors surgery practice onto a single site well supported.

1.4 There was broad agreement with the overall Vision, and support for the principle that growth of houses in Attleborough should be matched by growth in the supporting infrastructure for health, education, jobs, community, sporting and cultural facilities, green infrastructure and opportunities to walk and cycle on safe, pleasant routes.

Residential Allocations Southern Urban Extension (SUE)

1.5 The full extent of the growth area on the southern extension was a surprise to many. The implications of this growth formed the majority of comments under the Vision heading, with: “Expanding in the settlement area introduces problems with local transport, car parking and representation within the 'town hall' “ perhaps best summarising the range of reactions. Many responses suggest that this consultation exercise was a wake up call. All the work done by developers in public consultation on the proposed southern extension in 2010 is now many years ago and people have moved in, children grown up and the original consultation forgotten. A new consultation in 2016 on this area and a fresh Masterplan to show the SUE in the context of the ANP is needed, and should be held by the developer.

The process of producing the Neighbourhood Plan

1.6 Overall concepts were broadly liked, but there was concern about how they could be delivered. In particular the funding process was unclear, A question asked was would approving the Neighbourhood Plan enable Attleborough to retain more of its local taxes to spend on these proposals? A response to this question is still not clear.

Seeking more high quality design and sustainable buildings

1.7 Other new ideas and issues raised are set out in the more detailed report below. However it was clear there is some local support for seeking a better quality of new buildings, in particular for the Academy, as an inspiration for young people. Sustainable buildings were also supported. As evidence of a local desire to raise standards here this can be now discussed with the planning authority, who could use it as evidence of a request to seek higher standards, and apply this at the District wide level as a planning policy in the emerging Local Plan. There was a local recognition of the importance of maintenance of the environment and buildings, best summarised in this quote: "the quality of build is all-important".

Section 2. The Vision & Objectives

2.1 Feedback written on the vision is positive, but with a concern about its deliverability. A comment seemed to capture that the weekend has led to a "marked increase in public awareness in town and on its ambition for the future".

Design aspirations too low

2.2 An aspect of the vision suggested by one respondent was to have a new iconic building on the Academy campus, in great, modern design to inspire the students.

Section 3. Proposed Development Boundary (of the SUE)

3.1 This was accepted with comments that suggested that this consultation was "a wake-up" for many in the town on the scale of growth planned, and one comment in particular summarises this reaction: "I did not realise it was so big". It was "Scary but understandable" was another comment.

Section 4. Options

4.1 A comment suggested: “Still a lot of questions to be answered regarding these options, a lot of ifs and buts, hopes and dreams”. There were the following suggestions:

New large supermarket

More facilities could be located in the Strategic Urban Extension (where it would be easier to build without land constraints)

A shuttle bus, especially between surgery/ station and town centre shops

A new exit road towards Thetford if the Norwich Road development is built.

A toyshop

As there is a northern boundary of the A11, there is a logic to continue to develop up to the A11 first.

Section 5 Employment & Town Centre Issues

5.1 A key comment was: “Care needs to be taken to enhance the historic character of the town centre”, but also clear recognition of new housing growth needing the balance of growing the economy: “There needs to be much more in the way of employment options or the town becomes a dead town. People will just live here and income will be spent elsewhere. Also adds to traffic problem.”

5.2 A new supermarket was supported by some responses, but other comments suggested that smaller shops and town centre facilities should remain viable; a new large supermarket could damage them. Enlarging the car park could help as would more town centre shops to avoid people going elsewhere to shop. The market could be improved, and the historic centre enhanced. A suggestion to relocate the library was welcomed.

5.3 “Employment areas appear too small for the proposed number of houses.”

5.4 The objectives for employment were widely endorsed, with support for: not being a dormitory town; supporting smaller businesses; and linking schools to employment by developing skills: "the employment led approach is the right way forward to build a sustainable community".

Section 6. Housing

6.1 In the housing consultation responses people asked questions about how homes affordable by young people could be delivered, seeing this as a gap needing plugging. The idea of a retirement village was welcomed but a care home was thought to have the potential to attract people in

from other areas rather than meeting immediate local needs. As these residents could need a lot of healthcare, this would draw limited healthcare resources away from the existing town residents.

6.2 Comments on the Strategic Urban Extension (SUE) housing. Existing residents living in the area designated for the Strategic Urban Extension felt a bit isolated from the process and unsure about their future (specific comment from those in the cottages on Poplar Road and Flowers Lane).

6.3 A suggestion that a well-designed scheme here needs a Masterplan is a point well made. Unique responses and not "catalogue houses" was one request. "What makes Attleborough unique rather than a display of catalogue houses?" There was a plea for proper attention to providing adequate residents' parking spaces in new housing as well as delivering green space. Two car spaces per house as a minimum was suggested. Flexible housing for an ageing population was requested. The Linear Park "should certainly be pursued" in the SUE. More comment on the Linear Park is given in section 9 below.

Section 7. Transport & Communication

7.1 The transport section was on the whole less well received, with concern that the key congestion issue for the town centre was not resolved. As a town with poor bus connectivity, cars would remain the main method to access the town centre, so as the town grows more, extra central parking is needed, "town centre traffic and parking issues are critical."

7.2 However improving connections across the rail line for pedestrians and cyclists was supported, with one observation capturing similar comments made under other topics, that Attleborough is "one town, not two, both north and south of the rail line."

7.3 Banning parking on Church Street was suggested.

Section 8. Health & Social Care

8.1 With the majority of the responses agreeing that more local health facilities are needed, this section of the ANP was welcomed and there was a suggestion that a good partnership process should work, with the ANP consultation showing good evidence of local need.

8.2 Options were presented, the do-nothing one was not supported, but some commented that they needed more information or supported all the other options, however a Health Village was generally liked. One suggestion was to locate a Health Village in the new Strategic Urban Extension. The need for older people to have easy links to health facilities was made several times. Mental health should also be addressed. "It's great to see young mental health provision - need of has been acknowledged but I would like to see this extended beyond 'formal' to the informal emotional support, advice, careers, support etc. That is where research is lacking." The N&N hospital also needs to be able to absorb extra demand from a growing population.

8.3 The problems of existing GP capacity leads to "inability to get appointments" and even one family "opting to register in Wymondham", which illustrates the very immediate issues faced.

8.4 The potential in an expanded surgery for offering minor operations, physio and nursing facilities could be usefully explored. Rehabilitation after hospital discharge is another key area, along with day care and counselling.

8.5 Parking at the surgery, scooter access links from housing and better public transport to the town centre if the surgery moves to the Station Road area were suggested. A bus link to the N& N hospital is also needed from Attleborough. More doctors, longer opening hours and a free bus for elderly patients were all practical suggestions.

Section 9. Education

9.1 A comment suggested that to be sustainable young people and children should give their opinions on the ANP too, "as they will be the people we pass the bat to".

9.2 There were several suggestions supporting adult education provision, a suggestion for more than one secondary school and a request for home learning support.

9.3 Many respondents agreed more school provision was already needed, even before the large growth in houses starts. New schools were supported. There would be employment opportunities for local residents to be teachers in them.

9.4 Primary schools should locate in a walking distance of children, and pupil car pick-ups should be controlled, even banned.

10. Sports, Leisure and Community

10a. Indoor Sports Hub

10.1 Support was clear for providing more facilities, but support for sharing a centre between the school and the public was not universal. The reasons were varied, but one theme was capacity to help older people and those with health problems if the centres were available for use by these groups in the daytime. Several comments suggested a careful management programme could allow this to happen, (sessions at lunch times and after three in the afternoon would still be available even in a shared facility).

10.2 A swimming pool was widely requested, to meet health objectives and especially for exercise in the supporting water environment for older people. The residents of Attleborough should not have to travel to the facilities in Wymondham or Thetford, as neither is accessible by suitable public transport. Also if these two towns area also expanding, their facilities would become full before 2026 and planning for a pool for Attleborough makes sense. The theme of providing a swimming pool and a space for multi-use exercise for all ages, to be hired out for events, and with good transport links was carried through in comments on an indoor sports hub. A swimming pool was also suggested in the community facilities section of the feedback, to be for parents with babies and toddlers.

10.3 Young people need ore than just sports facilities. “While I recognise that a lot of good work has been done in regard to mapping existing sports facilities and future needs, there's very little for leisure facilities beyond sports, across the generations and specifically where I am concerned for young people.”

10.4 There are opportunities in the designs of community facilities for a policy to provide solar panels on the buildings and on shelters.

10b. Outdoor sports hub

10.5 This theme in ANP policy and proposals was well supported. Netball, football, tennis and basketball were suggested, and providing Astro Turf pitches. "Playhub at recreation ground excellent idea. Will it include indoor play?"

10.6 One respondent referred to horse riding, and there being only one bridle way in the area.

10c. Community facilities

10.7 "I like the theatre proposal" A theatre, linked with the school, was liked and it could also serve as a local cinema and concert venue. The friendly welcoming atmosphere such a facility can offer would combat loneliness.

10.8 There was also considerable support for additional community facilities, with suggestions including an extension of library hours, a theatre, and a venue large enough for craft fairs, weddings, and activities for 120 to 150 people. There was support for a facelift to Connaught Hall, and for facilities being open for youth use at weekends. One suggestion was to also open a community facility at the London Road end of town.

10d. Open Spaces

"Linear Park excellent idea - shuttle service could run along the linear path. What about young people volunteering with rickshaws to help elderly people."

10.9 The Linear Park was widely supported. The Linear Park was given a more friendly sounding name by a respondent as the "Green Way", and another suggestion was to complete a linear "ring", including cycle paths. Off road footpaths were also needed. Dog walking and "dog friendly exercise areas" were a repeated theme.

10.10 One respondent emphasised the need to also plan for local greens in the SUE. Calves Lane walk was referred to. "Safe places for walking and cycling with children" and "wheelchair friendly paths" are needed. Generally more children's play space was required and disabled children

need accessible play equipment. There was potential for development at Norwich Road to loose an attractive meadow with trees that could be a green space.

10.10 Green spaces should be considered for their potential to host community events.

Section 11. Environment, Sustainability and Design

11.1 Can Attleborough be a model for sustainability? Eco buildings were suggested. One response was that the ANP "principles and concepts should underlying all development, they underpin the vision and we should not be deflected from them." Another considered the quality of the build was all-important and maintenance would offer employment opportunities. This theme of training was picked up by another respondent, who suggested learning and skills development will be required for maintaining the green areas. High tech investments should be "spent wisely".

11.2 On the theme of green transport policy another respondent suggests car electric charging points are needed in the town.

11.3 One response referred to a vision for "trees, ponds, and calm areas to encourage wildlife". Another has a similar theme, for the rural nature of the town approaches to be maintained, another wanted trees to be given sufficient space in designs for the new homes.

Section 12. Next steps

12.1 The inclusive nature of the vision and policies was liked. There were several very positive remarks: " no negatives to proposals", "well put together" and the proposals "will make this town much better for the future." One respondent said "I have only lived here for five days, it looks good!"

12.2 Additional ideas were:
Improved street lighting
Park and ride

Pedestrianise a shopping street like in Diss
Charge for car parking, first hour free as in Wymondham and Diss.
More than one supermarket needed
Martial Arts provision needed, 360 to 480 potential users!
Commuter long stay parking
A wider road turn into Sainsbury's needed.

12.3 Concern was however expressed on the delivery, with a comment that Sports Centres run commercially could exclude all but the best paying sports, and a query whether the taxes taken in Attleborough would be spent in the town

Section 13. General feedback

“The key issue is transport and cars in the town centre. Have the council considered pedestrian areas in the centre like Diss? The explanation of changing people's behaviour not to drive is a myth!! It has not happened, the last 20 years trying to get people to car share and use bikes!”

The Excel spreadsheet of all the responses can be inspected at the Town Hall by appointment.

Poster used in Reg 14 Consultation

The poster features a blue and red wavy border at the top and bottom. At the top left, the word "Attleborough" is written in a large red font, with the tagline "my kind of town" in a smaller, cursive font below it. To the right is the coat of arms of Attleborough. The main text is centered and reads: "Working with the community, businesses and organisations to ensure the town continues to grow and prosper." Below this, it states: "The Attleborough Neighbourhood Plan is now in circulation and available to view at www.attleboroughtc.org.uk or at the following venues:" This is followed by a list of venues: "• The Town Hall • The Library • The Heritage Centre • The Tourist Information Centre". The dates "From Thursday 7th July to Wednesday 10th August 2016" are listed below. A green box contains the text: "It is essential we receive feedback on this document from the public". Another green box contains: "There will also be a public drop-in event at the town hall on Saturday 13th and Sunday 14th August from 11am – 3pm, where you will be able to meet members of the ANP Steering Group". Below this, it says: "Input from local businesses, organisations and residents is essential to ensure the plan moves forward and is implemented." A final green box at the bottom contains: "For more details and regular updates www.attleboroughtc.org.uk". At the very bottom, the phone number "Tel: 01953 456194" is displayed in a bold black font.

Attleborough Town Council | Town Hall | Queen's Square | Attleborough | NR17 2AF

www.attleboroughnp.org.uk enquiries@attleboroughtc.org.uk