

Responses to Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan

Additional Focused Consultation

Publicity period: 11 December 2024 to 5 February 2025.

Published 4th March 2025



Responses

Anglian Water	3
Carlton Colville Town Council	4
Historic England	5
Lowestoft Town Council.....	6
Marine Management Organisation	7
National Highways	10
Natural England	11
Suffolk County Council (Neighbourhood Planning)	12
Suffolk County Council Directorate of Public Health and Communities	13
Water Management Alliance	14

What is the purpose of this document?

The Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan has undergone an examination and the Independent Examiner published their report on 15th January 2024. The Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council (the Local Planning Authorities) have proposed to make modifications to the Neighbourhood Plan which differ from those recommended by the Examiner.

The Local Planning Authorities publicised the proposals to make modifications to the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan which differ from those recommended by the Examiner and invited representations between 11th December 2024 to 5th February 2025. This document contains all representations received during this publicity period.

Anglian Water

Thank you notifying Anglian Water on the additional focused consultation on the proposed amendments to the neighbourhood plan. I am writing to confirm we have no specific comments or views to make on these proposals.

Carlton Colville Town Council

We accept the modifications proposed by East Suffolk Council following discussions between ourselves and the planning department. As an overall comment we would like to register the following:

Community Engagement Definition and Approach

To ensure transparency, consistency, and effective collaboration, any consultation conducted by developers with the general public should be guided and facilitated by the Town Council. As elected representatives of the community, the Town Council is best positioned to coordinate engagement efforts, ensuring that all voices are heard and community interests are accurately represented.

Historic England

Having reviewed the proposed modifications, we do not consider it necessary for Historic England to provide further detailed comments at this time. We would refer you to any previous comments submitted at Regulation 14 and 16 stages, and for any further information to our detailed advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your neighbourhood plan, which can be found here:

<https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/>

Lowestoft Town Council

Lowestoft Town Council's Planning Committee considered the Additional Focused Consultation of the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan and had no objections.

The Planning Committee would like to commend the level of detail in Section 6 Environment and Section 4 Design and Layout, which the Committee felt was of an impressive standard.

Marine Management Organisation

We have no comments on the **Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan – Additional Focused Consultation document**.

However, please see below suggested policies from the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans that we feel are most relevant to **Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan document**.

These suggested policies have been identified based on the activities and content within the document entitled above. They are provided only as a recommendation and we would suggest your own interpretation of the East Marine Plans is completed:

- **EC1:** Proposals that provide economic productivity benefits which are additional to Gross Value Added currently generated by existing activities should be supported.
- **EC2:** Proposals that provide additional employment benefits should be supported, particularly where these benefits have the potential to meet employment needs in localities close to the marine plan areas.
- **EC3:** Proposals that will help the East marine plan areas to contribute to offshore wind energy generation should be supported.
- **SOC2:** Proposals that may affect heritage assets should demonstrate, in order of preference:
 1. that they will not compromise or harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage asset
 2. how, if there is compromise or harm to a heritage asset, this will be minimised
 3. how, where compromise or harm to a heritage asset cannot be minimised it will be mitigated against or
 4. the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate compromise or harm to the heritage asset
- **SOC3:** Proposals that may affect the terrestrial and marine character of an area should demonstrate, in order of preference:
 1. that they will not adversely impact the terrestrial and marine character of an area
 2. how, if there are adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area, they will minimise them

3. how, where these adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area cannot be minimised they will be mitigated against
4. the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts
 - **ECO1:** Cumulative impacts affecting the ecosystem of the East marine plans and adjacent areas (marine, terrestrial) should be addressed in decision-making and plan implementation.
 - **BIO1:** Appropriate weight should be attached to biodiversity, reflecting the need to protect biodiversity as a whole, taking account of the best available evidence including on habitats and species that are protected or of conservation concern in the East marine plans and adjacent areas (marine, terrestrial).
 - **BIO2:** Where appropriate, proposals for development should incorporate features that enhance biodiversity and geological interests.
 - **CC1:** Proposals should take account of:
 - how they may be impacted upon by, and respond to, climate change over their lifetime and
 - how they may impact upon any climate change adaptation measures elsewhere during their lifetime Where detrimental impacts on climate change adaptation measures are identified, evidence should be provided as to how the proposal will reduce such impacts.
 - **GOV2:** Opportunities for co-existence should be maximised wherever possible.
 - **GOV3:** Proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:
 1. that they will avoid displacement of other existing or authorised (but yet to be implemented) activities
 2. how, if there are adverse impacts resulting in displacement by the proposal, they will minimise them
 3. how, if the adverse impacts resulting in displacement by the proposal, cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated against or
 4. the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts of displacement
 - **TR1:** Proposals for development should demonstrate that during construction and operation, in order of preference:

1. they will not adversely impact tourism and recreation activities
 2. how, if there are adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities, they will minimise them
 3. how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated
 4. the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts
- **TR2:** Proposals that require static objects in the East marine plan areas, should demonstrate, in order of preference:
 1. that they will not adversely impact on recreational boating routes
 2. how, if there are adverse impacts on recreational boating routes, they will minimise them
 3. how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated
 4. the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts
 - **TR3:** Proposals that deliver tourism and/or recreation related benefits in communities adjacent to the East marine plan areas should be supported.

Further points to note

- As Carlton Coville’s remit is a coastal town and adjacent to coastal waters, the local plan has elements of marine influence, and should therefore have consideration to the [East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans](#), especially when mentioning anything coastal, river or tidal themed.
- **Introduction** - Within the above-mentioned document, you make no reference to the Marine Management Organisation or the relevant [East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans](#). We welcome the mention of the East Marine Plans and any policies within the plan which you may deem as relevant, and recommend is it placed in this section

As previously stated, these are recommendations and we suggest that your own interpretation of the East Marine Plans is completed. We would also recommend you consult the following references for further information:

[East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans](#) and [Explore Marine Plans](#).

National Highways

In relation to the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan, our principal interest is in safeguarding the operation of the SRN in the vicinity of the Carlton Colville area, which includes the A47 and A14.

National Highways has previously provided response under Regulation 14 and 16, where we have stated that the Neighbourhood Plan area of interest is remote from the SRN. Consequently, the relevant policies set out are unlikely to have an impact on the operation of the trunk road and therefore National Highways offered no additional comments.

Having reviewed the recently submitted documents related to the additional focused consultation, we note that the scale of growth remains negligible to impact the nearby SRN. Any new planning application will be assessed accordingly to consider the impact on the nearby SRN.

Consequently, National Highways considers the changes highlighted in the recent document to not result in a significant impact on the operation of the SRN and therefore National Highways offers no additional comments.

Natural England

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.

Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species.

Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission standing advice.

We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.

Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.

Suffolk County Council (Neighbourhood Planning)

Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council (SCC) on the Additional Focused Consultation concerning modifications proposed to the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan by the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council, which differ from those recommended by the Examiner at examination.

SCC has no objections to the modifications proposed by East Suffolk District Council and Broads Authority.

Suffolk County Council Directorate of Public Health and Communities

Thank you for offering Public Health and Communities the opportunity to comment on the Additional Focussed Consultation.

In review of the modifications, PH&C support the LPAs Proposed Alternative Modifications 1, 4, 5 and 8 as they support the case for active travel prospects in development. We also support the LPAs Proposed Alternative Modification 11 regarding inclusions for inclusive access and active travel within the Carlton Colville Country Park.

We have no other comments relating to the remaining proposed modifications.

Water Management Alliance

Thank you for consulting the Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland Internal Drainage Board on the Carlton Colville Neighbourhood Plan.

Carlton Colville falls partially within the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland Internal Drainage Board (WLYLIDB) and therefore the Board's Byelaws apply to any development within the Board's area.

The principal function of the IDBs is to provide flood protection within the Board's area. Certain watercourses within the IDD receive maintenance by the Board. The maintenance of a watercourse by the IDB is an acknowledgement by the Board that the watercourse is of arterial importance to the IDD.

Main Rivers within the IDB are regulated by the Environment Agency. Therefore, I recommend that an applicant proposing a discharge or any other works affecting a main river to contact the Environment Agency.

The area outside the Boards' IDDs falls within the Boards' watershed catchments (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). The Board will comment on planning for all major developments (10 or more properties) within the IDD watershed that are likely to discharge surface water into a watercourse within the IDD. Under certain circumstances, some major developments outside the IDD boundary may also be regulated by the Board's byelaws. We request that the Board is consulted as any planning application comes forward relating to any of the identified allocation sites. For any development site, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy.

Whilst the Board's regulatory process (as set out under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's Byelaws) is separate from planning, the ability to implement a planning permission may be dependent on the granting of any required Land Drainage Consents. Please see the list overleaf of the proposed sites for development which we consider may impact the Board's area. The Board would seek to comment on these should they come forward for planning permission, alongside an explanation of any potentially required consents should these sites be developed. Please note that this list is not exhaustive and the Board may or may not choose to comment on additional site allocations if and when more information is presented.

Whilst the Board's regulatory process (as set out under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's Byelaws) is separate from planning, the ability to implement a planning permission may be dependent on the granting of any required Land Drainage Consents.

Please see the list overleaf of the proposed sites for development which we consider may impact the Board's area. The Board would seek to comment on these should they come forward for planning permission, alongside an explanation of any potentially required consents should these sites be developed. Please note that this list is not exhaustive and the Board may or may not choose to comment on additional site allocations if and when more information is presented.

I also note that land at Oakes farm has been allocated within the Waveney (East Suffolk) Local Plan for a sports and leisure development. In order to avoid conflict between the planning process and the Board's regulatory regimes and consenting processes where developments are proposed within or partially within a Board's IDD, please be aware of the following:

Byelaw 3- Discharge of Surface Water into the Board's District

- If a development proposes to dispose of surface water via infiltration, we would recommend that the proposed strategy is supported by ground investigation to determine the infiltration potential of the site and the depth to groundwater. If on-site material were to be considered favourable then we would advise infiltration testing in line with BRE Digest 365 (or equivalent) to be undertaken to determine its efficiency.
- If (following testing) a strategy wholly reliant on infiltration is not viable and/or a development proposes to discharge surface water to a watercourse, the proposed development will require consent in line with the Board's byelaws (specifically byelaw 3). Any consent granted will likely be conditional, pending the payment of a Surface Water Development Contribution fee, calculated in line with the Board's charging policy (available at https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/WMA_Table_of_Charges_and_Fees.pdf).
- If a development proposes to discharge surface water to a sewer, I recommend that you satisfy yourselves that this proposal is in line with the drainage hierarchy (as per best practice) and is viable in this location.

Byelaw 3- Discharge of Treated Foul Water into the Board's District

- If a development proposes to discharge treated foul water to a watercourse, this proposal will require land drainage consent in line with the Board's byelaws (specifically byelaw 3).

Byelaw 10 & 17- Work's within 7m of Board Maintained Watercourse/s and Works within the banks of Board Maintained Watercourse/s

- Should any development include works within 7 metres of a Board maintained watercourse, consent would be required to relax Byelaw 10 (no obstructions within 7 metres of the edge of drainage or flood risk management infrastructure).
- If the proposal includes works to install services within, make excavations within, or otherwise alter the banks of the aforementioned Board Maintained Watercourse, consent will be required as per Byelaw 17 of the Board's Byelaws.

Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act (1991) and Byelaw 4- Alterations Proposed to a Watercourse

- Should any development include works to alter a Board maintained watercourse, consent will be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and byelaw 4).
- Should and works be proposed to alter a riparian watercourse, consent would be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and byelaw 4).

Page 3 Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland Internal Drainage Board

For developments outside a Board's IDD but within its watershed catchment, where surface water discharges have the potential to indirectly affect the Board's IDD, we would offer the following advice:

- If it is proposed that a site disposes of surface water via infiltration, we recommend that the viability of this proposal is evidenced. As such we would recommend that the proposed strategy is supported by ground investigation to determine the infiltration potential of the site and the depth to groundwater. If on-site material were to be considered favourable then we would advise infiltration testing in line with BRE Digest 365 (or equivalent) to be undertaken to determine its efficiency.
- If it is proposed to discharge surface water to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD, we request that this discharge is facilitated in line with the

Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible.

The reason for our recommendation is to promote sustainable development within the Board's Watershed Catchment therefore ensuring that flood risk is not increased within the Internal Drainage District (required as per paragraph 167 of the National Planning Policy Framework). For further information regarding the Board's involvement in the planning process please see our Planning and Byelaw Strategy, available online.

I recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan includes reference to the relevant regulators for drainage and flood risk (such as the Internal Drainage Boards, the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority). These agencies are in place to support the provision of sustainable development and reducing flood risk. As outlined above, works to watercourses (such as surface water discharges and/or any alterations of said watercourses) will require consent from the relevant regulatory body, therefore it would be beneficial for the regulators to be included in the plan.