Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan 2025-2040

Consultation Statement

Regulation 15 version
September 2026

Introduction

This Consultation Statement has been prepared by Hoveton Community Council in support of the Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan 2025–2040. It sets out the consultation undertaken at the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission stage, summarises how residents, stakeholders and statutory consultees were invited to comment, and explains how the issues raised have informed amendments to the final version of the Plan.

The statement also summarises the earlier engagement undertaken during preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, demonstrating how community views and stakeholder input have shaped the development of the Plan.

This Consultation Statement has been prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The Neighbourhood Plan

The Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan covers the period 2025–2040 and applies to the parish of Hoveton. The parish sits within two local planning authority areas: North Norfolk District Council and the Broads Authority.

The Plan sets out a vision, objectives and planning policies to guide future development within the neighbourhood area. Once made, the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the statutory development plan for the area and will be used in the determination of planning applications alongside national planning policy, the North Norfolk Local Plan, the Broads Authority Local Plan and other relevant development plan documents.

The Plan addresses a range of locally important planning matters, including housing, design, brownfield land, community facilities, infrastructure, transport, the natural environment, walking and cycling, heritage, the local economy and climate resilience.

Earlier engagement and preparation of the Plan

Preparation of the Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan has been informed by community engagement, local evidence gathering and stakeholder input prior to the Regulation 14 consultation.

Hoveton Community Council established a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to help guide preparation of the Plan. The Steering Group considered evidence, reviewed local issues and helped develop the draft vision, objectives and policy approach.

Earlier engagement included:

- household survey work;
- a business survey;
- engagement at local events, including community engagement events held in the parish;
- engagement with young people;
- targeted discussions with local organisations;
- Steering Group meetings to review evidence and develop the Plan;
- review of local evidence, including housing need, design, heritage, key views, green spaces, transport, infrastructure, flood risk and the natural environment.

Through this engagement, residents and local organisations were invited to identify the issues, places and priorities they considered most important for Hoveton. Key matters raised during plan preparation included traffic congestion, drainage and sewerage infrastructure, walking and cycling, the village centre, community facilities, housing, design, green spaces, landscape, the Broads, heritage and the local economy.

This feedback helped shape the vision, objectives and policies within the Regulation 14 draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Overview of the Regulation 14 consultation

The Regulation 14 consultation on the pre-submission version of the Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan was undertaken from 31 March 2026 to 1 June 2026 in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The Regulation 14 consultation provided an opportunity for residents, businesses, landowners, stakeholders and statutory consultees to comment on the draft Plan before it was finalised for submission.

The consultation documents included the Regulation 14 draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting evidence documents, including the Evidence Base, Design Guide, Housing Needs Assessment, environmental screening report, Local Green Space evidence, Key Views Assessment and Non-Designated Heritage Asset assessment. [Check final list of documents before publication.]

Consultation methods

The consultation was publicised through a range of methods to ensure that residents and stakeholders had the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan.

How people were consulted

- The draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents were made available on the Hoveton Community Council website.

- A consultation leaflet was produced to publicise the Regulation 14 consultation, explain the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan and set out how people could respond.
- Paper copies of the Plan were made available to view at Hoveton Village Hall, Roys Service Desk, Abbotts Estate Agents, Larry's Pizzeria and Wroxham Library.
- A Community Open Day was held at Hoveton Village Hall on Saturday 25 April 2026 between 1pm and 5pm.
- Statutory consultees and other stakeholders were sent an email including a link to the draft Plan and supporting documents.
- Local residents were invited to comment on the draft Plan through the online survey or by completing a paper survey.

Methods of response

Responses could be submitted by:

- online survey
- completed paper survey, returned to the boxes provided at the locations where paper copies of the Plan were available
- email to Hoveton Community Council
- written representations submitted directly to the Council

Who was consulted

The consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 14 requirements and included the local community, statutory consultees and other stakeholders whose interests may be affected by the proposals contained within the Plan. There was a leaflet that was delivered to all households.

Statutory and non-statutory consultees

The draft Plan was circulated to statutory consultees and other stakeholders, including organisations responsible for planning, transport, environmental protection, health, utilities, infrastructure, sport, community safety and the Broads.

Responses were received from the following organisations and stakeholders:

- Anglian Water
- British Pipeline Agency (BPA)
- Broads Authority
- Broads Society
- Environment Agency
- Greene King
- National Gas Transmission
- National Highways

- Norfolk and Suffolk Integrated Care Board / Integrated Care System
- Norfolk Constabulary
- Norfolk County Council
- Norfolk Wildlife Trust
- North Norfolk District Council
- Public Health
- Sport England

Local community

Responses were received from local residents through the online consultation survey and by email. A total of 20 SmartSurvey responses were received. Most respondents identified that they lived in Hoveton, with some also identifying other interests, including working in Hoveton, being a landowner, an agent or responding on behalf of an organisation.

One further resident response was received separately by email during the consultation period. This response commented positively on the draft Plan overall but suggested that the Plan should address agricultural land and the agricultural industry more directly.

A collective response was also received from five former members of the Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. The response raised both policy matters and process matters, including sewerage and foul drainage infrastructure, traffic congestion and road safety, housing mix, Key Views, Non-Designated Heritage Assets and governance matters.

All responses received during the Regulation 14 consultation have been reviewed by Hoveton Community Council. The main issues raised and the way in which they have been considered are summarised in the following sections and detailed in the appendices to this Consultation Statement.

Summary of issues raised

This section summarises the key issues raised during the Regulation 14 consultation. A detailed schedule of responses, together with the Community Council's response and any proposed changes to the Plan, is provided in the appendices to this Consultation Statement.

Overview of responses

Responses were received from residents, statutory consultees, infrastructure providers, landowners, local organisations and other stakeholders. A group response was also received from a group of former members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

The responses comprised:

- 19 resident survey responses, including online responses and paper responses entered into SmartSurvey;
- 1 separate resident response received by email;
- 1 collective response from five former members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, supported by three appendices;
- 15 statutory consultee and stakeholder responses.

Summary of resident responses

A total of 19 survey responses were received. All respondents identified that they live in Hoveton. Some respondents also identified other interests, including working in Hoveton (2 people), being a landowner (2 people), and being an agent (1 person). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each of the proposed policies in the Regulation 14 draft Plan and were also invited to provide written comments.

Overall, resident responses showed a g**enerally positive view of the Neighbourhood Plan**, with most respondents indicating that they were generally in favour of the Plan. Support was expressed for a range of policy areas, particularly those relating to brownfield land, community facilities, the natural environment, walking and cycling, heritage, the local economy and climate resilience.

Some responses, while supportive of the Plan overall, **raised concerns about specific policy areas or asked for policies to be strengthened**. The most common themes in written comments were the need to manage the impacts of planned housing growth, protect village character, prioritise brownfield land, address traffic congestion, improve walking and cycling routes, ensure sewerage and drainage infrastructure is delivered before new homes are occupied, protect green spaces and views, and support local services and facilities.

A resident response identified a need for allotments in Hoveton. The Steering Group discussed this and noted that there are currently no allotments within the parish, with some residents using facilities in nearby settlements. Supporting text has therefore been added to recognise local interest in allotments and community growing spaces, and to encourage consideration of suitable opportunities as part of future development or open space provision.

One further resident response was received separately by email. This response was generally positive about the draft Plan but suggested that the Plan should address agricultural land and the agricultural industry more directly. This has been considered alongside the other resident responses.

Resident feedback has informed the review of the Plan alongside comments from statutory consultees and other stakeholders. In response, the Plan has retained its

focus on brownfield regeneration, housing mix, community facilities, green spaces, important views, walking and cycling, heritage and the local economy. Supporting text has been strengthened in relation to infrastructure, drainage, wastewater, water quality, traffic, active travel, biodiversity and the Broads setting. However, some policies have been simplified, merged or deleted where they duplicated national policy, Local Plan policies or statutory regulatory processes. In these cases, the issues raised by residents remain recognised in the Plan, but are addressed through supporting text, community actions, Local Plan policy, statutory consultee advice or the planning application process rather than through separate Neighbourhood Plan policies.

The separate comment on agricultural land and the agricultural industry has been noted. National planning policy already recognises the value of the best and most versatile agricultural land, but the planning context has changed through the adoption of the North Norfolk Local Plan and its housing allocations. No separate agricultural land policy has therefore been added, but the Plan avoids allocating further greenfield land, supports brownfield regeneration, and seeks to ensure that planned development responds positively to Hoveton's landscape, biodiversity, infrastructure and climate resilience priorities.

Former Steering Group member response

A collective response was received from five former members of the Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. As a collective response it has been recorded separately from the general resident responses.

The response recognised the work undertaken on the Neighbourhood Plan but raised detailed concerns about sewerage and foul drainage infrastructure, traffic congestion and road safety, housing mix and affordable housing, the reduction in the Key Views evidence, the reduction and consistency of the Non-Designated Heritage Assets evidence, and governance/procedural matters.

The response was supported by three detailed appendices. Appendix 1 proposed a strengthened policy on sewerage and foul drainage infrastructure. Appendix 2 proposed a strengthened policy on highway capacity, access coherence and delivery. Appendix 3 raised governance and procedural matters relating to the operation of the Steering Group and the authorisation of the Regulation 14 draft.

These comments have been considered alongside all other Regulation 14 responses.

The representations submitted by former Steering Group members were carefully considered. Some matters raised have been addressed in part through wider amendments to the Plan and supporting documents, including updated references to the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan allocations, strengthened supporting text on

infrastructure, drainage, wastewater, traffic, active travel, views and heritage, and clarification of the evidence supporting the final NDHA list. However, the detailed policy wording requested by the former Steering Group members has not generally been carried forward where it would have resulted in greater duplication of national policy and the strategic policies of the North Norfolk Local Plan and Broads Authority Local Plan, reduced flexibility in decision making, or introduced requirements beyond the scope of neighbourhood planning. This approach would have been inconsistent with advice received from North Norfolk District Council, the Broads Authority and other statutory consultees, which recommended that the Plan be streamlined, focused on locally distinctive matters and avoid unnecessary repetition of existing planning policy. The comments did not identify any deficiencies that required further modification of the Plan.

Stakeholder and statutory consultee responses

Responses were received from a range of statutory consultees, local authorities, infrastructure providers, landowners and other stakeholders. The responses showed broad support for the principle of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for Hoveton but also identified a number of issues where the draft Plan should be amended to improve clarity, avoid duplication with national and local planning policy, and ensure the Plan is capable of being used effectively in planning decisions.

The most detailed responses were received from North Norfolk District Council and the Broads Authority. Both authorities gave detailed comments on policy wording, the relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan and the adopted Local Plans, and the need to ensure that the Plan focuses on locally specific matters rather than repeating existing national or strategic policies. Detailed summaries of these responses, together with the Community Council's response and proposed changes to the Plan, are provided in the appendices to this Consultation Statement.

The main stakeholder and statutory consultee issues are summarised below. A full schedule of responses and proposed changes is provided in the appendices to this Consultation Statement.

Policy clarity and conformity	**North Norfolk District Council** raised concerns that the draft Plan included a number of policies or criteria that duplicated matters already addressed through the North Norfolk Local Plan, the Broads Local Plan, national planning policy or separate regulatory regimes. It advised that the Plan should focus more clearly on locally specific issues and avoid vague or duplicated policy requirements which may add uncertainty in decision-making. **The Broads Authority** also made comments on wording, terminology and policy references, including the need to refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, update references to the Broads Local Plan Review, and describe supporting evidence documents in a way that avoids confusion

	with Supplementary Planning Documents. **Norfolk County Council** also commented on the wider policy context, including reference to the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the need to check National Planning Policy Framework paragraph references before submission.
Housing and site-specific policies	**North Norfolk District Council** raised detailed comments on the housing policies, including the need for Policy HNP1 to align with the housing mix requirements of the North Norfolk Local Plan. Comments were also made on the relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan, the Hoveton Housing Needs Assessment and Local Plan policies on affordable housing, housing mix and specialist housing. The **Norfolk and Suffolk Integrated Care Board** supported the recognition of links between health and housing and recommended stronger reference to accessible and adaptable homes, wheelchair accessibility and dementia-friendly design principles. Comments were also received on the site-specific policies for the Local Plan allocations east of Tunstead Road and off Stalham Road. **Anglian Water** noted that the strategic Local Plan allocations already include requirements relating to wastewater and drainage infrastructure and advised that duplication should be avoided.
Brownfield land, riverside redevelopment and the Broads	**The Broads Authority** provided detailed comments on Policy HNP4: Brownfield Land off Station Road, including the relationship with the adopted and emerging Broads Local Plan policies for the site. It recommended stronger wording on the retention and sensitive reuse of the cottages and stable buildings adjacent to the King's Head pub, and clearer cross-reference to heritage policy where proposals would affect these buildings. The Broads Authority also advised that flood risk wording should refer to national flood risk policy and the sequential approach where relevant. A representation was received on behalf of **Greene King** objecting to the proposed Local Green Space designation affecting part of the King's Head landholding and raising concerns about the relationship between that designation and the redevelopment potential of the wider site. Greene King also raised concerns about the cumulative effect of policy requirements affecting the Station Road riverside area, including viability, heritage, flood risk and Local Green Space matters.
Flood risk, drainage, wastewater and water resources	**The Environment Agency** highlighted the presence of Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the neighbourhood area, the need to apply national flood risk policy, and the importance of considering water resources, water efficiency and environmental permitting requirements near the River Bure and flood risk assets. **Norfolk County Council, in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority**, welcomed the inclusion of references to surface water flood risk, drainage, climate change and resilience, but provided detailed comments on how the Plan should address flood risk and

	sustainable drainage. **Anglian Water** supported the Plan's objective relating to resilient infrastructure and encouraged early engagement with Anglian Water on water supply and wastewater capacity. It also supported a SuDS-first approach and highlighted the importance of water efficiency in new development. **Norfolk Wildlife Trust** also supported the Plan's approach to drainage and water management, including SuDS, and recommended stronger measures on water efficiency, rainwater or stormwater harvesting, greywater recycling and reduced water use in new development. It noted that water efficiency can also reduce the volume of wastewater requiring treatment
Natural environment, biodiversity and the Norfolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy	**Anglian Water** supported the Plan's objective to protect and enhance the natural environment and noted the relationship with the Norfolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy and catchment-based environmental improvement work in the Bure catchment. **The Broads Society** strongly supported the Plan's overall approach to biodiversity, green corridors, Local Green Space, landscape, dark skies and access to the Broads. **Norfolk Wildlife Trust** also strongly supported the Plan's approach to ecological networks and local wildlife action, recommending that ecological networks should be clearly defined to include statutory and non-statutory wildlife sites, County Wildlife Sites, Roadside Nature Reserves, priority habitats and species. It also supported the community aspiration to encourage wildlife and suggested that the use of chemicals in public areas should be minimised. **North Norfolk District Council** and **the Broads Authority** advised that the biodiversity and ecological network policies should avoid duplicating national policy, biodiversity net gain requirements, Local Plan policies and the Norfolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy. The Plan has therefore been reviewed to ensure that the natural environment policies focus on locally identified green corridors, important local spaces and locally distinctive environmental considerations.
Local Green Space, landscape and views	Stakeholders generally recognised the importance of Hoveton's green spaces, riverside setting, landscape and relationship with the Broads. **The Broads Society** particularly supported the proposed Local Green Space designations, including Riverside and Pocket Parks and Lower Meadow, and welcomed policies relating to landscape, views and dark skies. However, objections and technical comments were also received. **Norfolk Wildlife Trust's** comments also supported the value of green spaces and community facilities where they protect and enhance biodiversity, including through opportunities to strengthen wildlife habitats within public and community spaces **Greene King** objected to the proposed Local Green Space designation affecting its land at the King's Head, arguing that it was inappropriate and would constrain redevelopment. **Norfolk County Council** advised that Local Green Space and other mapped designations should be

	considered carefully where they overlap with drainage, flood risk, highway or infrastructure interests. These comments have informed a review of the proposed Local Green Space boundaries and supporting evidence.
Heritage and non-designated heritage assets	**The Broads Authority** recommended that the Plan should make clearer reference to the cottages and stable buildings adjacent to the King's Head as Non-Designated Heritage Assets and should cross-refer to the relevant heritage policy. It also recommended stronger wording on the retention and reuse of these buildings as part of any comprehensive redevelopment. **North Norfolk District Council** and **Norfolk County Council** also made comments on heritage evidence, terminology and the relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan's heritage policy and national policy. The comments have informed a review of the non-designated heritage asset policy and supporting text, with the aim of ensuring that the policy recognises locally important heritage assets while remaining consistent with national planning policy.
Transport, active travel, health and community safety	Transport, movement and active travel were raised by several consultees. **National Highways** confirmed that it did not expect the draft Neighbourhood Plan to have a severe impact on the operation of the strategic road network. **Norfolk County Council** provided comments on transport, active travel and the need to ensure that policies are proportionate and capable of implementation. **Norfolk Constabulary** provided detailed advice on designing out crime and Secured by Design principles. It highlighted the importance of safe, secure and accessible places, including natural surveillance, lighting, defensible space, boundary treatment, safe parking design and the avoidance of layouts that create hidden or poorly overlooked spaces. **Public Health** signposted the Community Council to guidance on embedding health considerations in neighbourhood plans. The **Integrated Care Board** also commented on the relationship between housing, health, accessible homes and local healthcare infrastructure.
Community facilities, recreation and sport	**Sport England** advised that the Plan should reflect national policy on sport, recreation, open space and playing fields. It highlighted the importance of protecting existing sports facilities, using up-to-date local authority evidence on playing pitches and indoor or outdoor sports facilities where available, and ensuring that new development contributes appropriately to sport and physical activity provision where additional demand is generated. The **Integrated Care Board** also commented on healthcare infrastructure and noted that population growth, including planned housing growth in Hoveton, may increase demand for local health services. These comments have informed a review of the community facilities and infrastructure sections of the Plan.

Utilities and infrastructure	**National Gas Transmission** advised that a high-pressure gas transmission pipeline crosses, or lies close to, the neighbourhood area and provided guidance on consultation and safe working near its assets. **BPA** confirmed that it does not have pipelines in the Hoveton area and does not need to be consulted on future works in this area, although other pipeline operators may still need to be consulted separately. **Anglian Water** commented on water supply, wastewater, drainage infrastructure and early developer engagement. The **Environment Agency** also provided advice on water resources, abstraction licensing and work near main rivers or flood risk assets. These responses have informed a review of the infrastructure supporting text, with additional emphasis on early engagement with relevant infrastructure providers where development could affect capacity, safety or environmental constraints.

Overall, the stakeholder responses raised a number of detailed and technical issues. The Community Council has reviewed the Plan in light of these comments. The main changes proposed are intended to simplify the Plan, remove or reduce policy duplication, strengthen locally specific evidence and supporting text, update policy references, and ensure that the submitted Plan remains clear, proportionate and capable of being applied in decision-making.

A full schedule of responses and proposed changes is provided in the appendices to this Consultation Statement.

Appendix A: List of statutory consultees

Anglian Water
Ashmanhaugh Parish Council
Belaugh Parish Meeting
British Pipeline Agency Ltd
Broadland District Council
Broads Authority
Cadent Gas (Gas Distribution)
Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)
Defence Infrastructure Organisation
Environment Agency
Gardens Trust
Historic England
Homes England
Horning Parish Council
Marine Management Organisation
Member of Parliament for Broadland & Fakenham
Member of Parliament for North Norfolk
National Gas Transmission
National Grid
Natural England
Neatishead Parish Council
Network Rail (Infrastructure) Ltd
NHS Norfolk & Waveney Integrated Care Board (ICB)
NHS Norfolk & Waveney Integrated Care Systems
NNDC
NNDC (Member for Hoveton & Tunstead Ward)
Norfolk Constabulary
Norfolk County Council
Norfolk County Council Member for Hoveton & Stalham Ward
Public Health
Office of the Police Crime and Commissioner for Norfolk
Salhouse Parish Council
Sport England
Tunstead Parish Council
UK Power Networks
Water Management Alliance
Woodbastwick Parish Council
Wroxham Parish Council

Appendix B: Summary of responses from statutory and stakeholder consultation

Consultee	Issue / comment	Response	Detail
North Norfolk District Council	See Appendix C	See Appendix C	A detailed schedule of comments from North Norfolk District Council, together with proposed changes to the Plan, is provided in Appendix C.
Broads Authority	See Appendix D	See Appendix D	A detailed schedule of comments from the Broads Authority, together with proposed changes to the Plan, is provided in Appendix D.
Anglian Water	Supported the objective to provide resilient infrastructure, including drainage, sewage infrastructure, utilities and digital connectivity. Suggested that the Plan could encourage water-efficient development. Encouraged early engagement with Anglian Water to assess infrastructure capacity and identify requirements for water supply and wastewater networks. Supported the natural environment and climate resilience objectives and highlighted the relationship with the Norfolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy, the Bure catchment, SuDS, sustainable water management and water efficiency.	Noted	Supporting text has been reviewed to strengthen references to early engagement with Anglian Water, water supply, wastewater capacity, SuDS and water efficiency where appropriate. The Plan has also been reviewed to ensure that it refers to the Norfolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy and recognises the importance of catchment-scale environmental improvement. Some policy wording has been simplified where matters are already addressed by national policy, Local Plan policies or separate regulatory processes.
British Pipeline Agency (BPA)	Confirmed that BPA does not have any pipelines in the Hoveton area and does not need to be consulted on future works in this area. Noted that other pipeline companies may be affected and may need to be consulted separately.	Noted	No change identified.
Broads Society	Generally supported the overall vision, objectives and policies of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. It particularly welcomed policies relating to design, transport, drainage and nutrient neutrality, biodiversity and green	Noted	Support welcomed. The Plan has been reviewed following consultation responses, particularly from the local planning authorities. Some policies supported by the Broads Society have been revised, merged or deleted to avoid duplication with

	corridors, ecological networks, Local Green Spaces, landscape and views, dark skies, access to the countryside and the Broads, non-designated heritage assets, sustainable tourism, flood risk, climate adaptation and low-carbon design.		national policy, the North Norfolk Local Plan, the Broads Authority Local Plan and statutory regulatory processes. The Plan continues to recognise the importance of Hoveton's Broads setting, biodiversity, green corridors, Local Green Spaces, important views, dark skies, active travel, access to the countryside and the Broads, heritage, sustainable tourism, drainage, flood risk and climate resilience.
Environment Agency	Noted that parts of the neighbourhood area are within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and advised that national flood risk policy, including the sequential approach, should be applied where relevant. Highlighted the importance of water resources in a water-stressed area, water efficiency, checking water supply capacity, and considering environmental permitting requirements near main rivers and flood risk assets.	Noted and agreed in part	Comments noted. The Plan has been reviewed to avoid duplicating national policy, Local Plan policies and statutory regulatory processes. No new policy has been added, but supporting text has been amended to recognise the importance of watercourses, the wider chalk stream catchment and the wetland habitats of the Broads, and the need for these to be protected and enhanced through future development.
Greene King	Objected to the proposed Local Green Space designation affecting part of its landholding at the King's Head. Considered the designation inappropriate and unjustified, particularly where land is hard surfaced, in active pub or car park use, private land, or forms part of land identified for brownfield redevelopment. Also raised concerns that the designation would constrain the viability and deliverability of redevelopment. No objection was raised to the principle of Policy HNP4: Brownfield Land off Station Road, but amendments were requested to ensure consistency with Broads Authority Local Plan policy, to address viability and to review wording on the former cottages, key views and river views.	Noted and agreed in part	Comments noted. • LGS1 boundary reviewed and amended to avoid including buildings, car parking areas, pub curtilage or land covered by the Broads Local Plan allocation. • Policy HNP4 has been retained because it provides appropriate local guidance for the comprehensive redevelopment of a prominent riverside brownfield site. The policy does not require views to be improved but does require development to respond positively to identified views. No further viability wording has been added, as viability is already considered through the planning application process where relevant.

National Gas Transmission	National Gas Transmission identified the presence of the Bacton to Yelverton high-pressure gas transmission pipeline within the neighbourhood area and provided asset safeguarding information. No changes to the Neighbourhood Plan were requested.	Noted	Comments noted. No specific amendment to the Neighbourhood Plan is proposed. In response to consultation comments the infrastructure section has been reviewed and amended.
National Highways	Confirmed that the draft Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to have a severe impact on the operation of the Strategic Road Network and offered no further comment.	Noted	No change required. Any future planning applications with potential implications for the Strategic Road Network will be considered through the development management process.
Norfolk and Suffolk Integrated Care Board / Integrated Care System	Supportive response. Advises that planned housing growth is likely to increase demand on health and care services. Support for policies on housing, community facilities, safe and sustainable transport, Local Green Spaces, active travel and flooding / sustainable drainage. Encourages accessible and adaptable housing, dementia-friendly design, prevention of damp and mould, inclusive green spaces, wayfinding to health services, emergency vehicle access and climate resilience.	Noted and agreed in part	Support noted. The Plan already supports smaller and more accessible homes, protects community facilities including health facilities, promotes active travel, protects Local Green Spaces and recognises flooding, drainage and climate resilience issues. Following wider consultation, relevant policies and supporting text have been reviewed and amended where appropriate, while avoiding duplication with Building Regulations, Local Plan policy and health service planning processes. No separate health infrastructure policy is proposed.
Norfolk Constabulary	Provided detailed advice on Designing Out Crime, Crime Prevention through Environmental Design and Secured by Design principles. Highlighted the importance of safe, secure and accessible places, including natural surveillance, lighting, defensible space, clear sight lines, boundary treatments, appropriate permeability, safe parking, play and leisure area design, CCTV where appropriate and avoidance of hidden or poorly overlooked spaces. Encouraged future planning applications to work towards Secured by Design standards.	Noted	Support noted. The comments primarily relate to the application of Secured by Design principles and crime prevention through environmental design. It is considered that these matters are addressed through Policy HNP6 the Hoveton Design Guide and national planning policy. No further changes are proposed.

Norfolk County Council - Strategic Planning / Minerals and Waste	Suggested that the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan should be referenced in the section explaining the development plan context.	Agreed, added	Supporting text amended to refer to the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan as part of the development plan.
Norfolk County Council - Strategic Transport / Highway Authority	Objected to the designation of Local Green Space where it includes adopted highway land or highway verges.	Noted	Local Green Space boundaries have been reviewed to identify any overlap with adopted highway land or highway verges. Boundaries have been amended where necessary to avoid designating functional highway land as Local Green Space.
Norfolk County Council - Lead Local Flood Authority	Welcomed the Plan's recognition of surface water flood risk, drainage, sustainability, climate change and resilience. Suggested that the Plan could refer to flood risk guidance from the LLFA, Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Boards, and noted local surface water flow paths, ordinary watercourses and areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3.	Noted, wording updated	The importance of flood risk, drainage, climate resilience and Sustainable Drainage Systems is recognised. To avoid duplication with national policy, Local Plan policy and statutory drainage assessment processes, flood risk and sustainable drainage are now addressed through supporting text in the infrastructure section and a community action on infrastructure, flooding and drainage
Norfolk County Council - Fire and Rescue Service	Advised that new development can affect fire and rescue demand and response requirements. Comments covered developer contributions where justified, fire hydrant provision, fire appliance access, refuse and recycling storage, sprinkler expectations where access distances are exceeded, and safe installation of PV arrays, domestic energy storage systems and electric vehicle charging points.	Noted	Comments noted. These matters are principally addressed through Building Regulations, planning application consultation and detailed design processes. No specific amendment to the Neighbourhood Plan is proposed.
Norfolk County Council - Historic Environment	Noted that non-designated heritage assets have been selected using Historic England criteria but queried whether Historic Environment Record data had been obtained. Recommended reference to Historic England Advice Note 11 on neighbourhood planning and the historic environment.	Noted, wording updated	The heritage evidence and non-designated heritage asset work have been reviewed. Supporting text has been amended to clarify that the assessment was informed by local evidence, site assessment, the Norfolk Historic Environment Record and relevant Historic England guidance.

Norfolk County Council - Education	Objected to the proposed designation of Broadland Ormiston High School Fields as Local Green Space, noting that the land is in educational use and designation could prevent or limit future school expansion or development. Requested removal of LGS7 from the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted, removed	Comments noted. The proposed designation of Broadland Ormiston High School Fields has been reviewed in light of the objection and LGS7 has been removed from the Plan.
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Norfolk Wildlife Trust expressed broad support for the Plan and a number of its policies. Suggestions relating to biodiversity, drainage, water efficiency and sustainable drainage were carefully considered.	Noted	However, no further amendments are proposed as these matters are either already addressed elsewhere within the Plan, covered by strategic policies in the North Norfolk Local Plan and Broads Authority Local Plan, or would introduce unnecessary duplication. The Plan has been reviewed and streamlined in response to comments from the local planning authorities and statutory consultees. Some comments relating to deleted policies have been superseded by subsequent revisions to the Plan.
Public Health, Norfolk County Council	Provided a response signposting the Community Council to the Health in Neighbourhood Plans guidance, which supports communities to embed health considerations in neighbourhood plans and includes examples of good practice.	Noted	Support noted. Norfolk County Council Public Health did not raise any objections to the draft Neighbourhood Plan and referred the Steering Group to the Health in Neighbourhood Plans guidance. No amendments proposed.
Sport England	Advised that the Plan should reflect national policy and guidance on sport, recreation, open space and playing fields. Highlighted the importance of protecting existing sports facilities, using up-to-date local authority evidence on playing pitches and indoor or outdoor sports facilities where available, and ensuring that new development contributes appropriately to sport and physical activity provision where additional demand is generated.	Noted	Support noted. Sport England did not object to the draft Neighbourhood Plan and highlighted the importance of protecting and enhancing opportunities for sport, recreation, active travel and healthy lifestyles in accordance with national planning policy. The Steering Group considers these matters are addressed through policies relating to community facilities, Local Green Spaces, active travel and access to the countryside and the Broads. No changes proposed.

Appendix C: Detailed Consultee Responses (North Norfolk District Council)

Issue / comment	Response	Detail
General - NNDC raised general concern that the draft Plan included several policies that duplicated national policy, the North Norfolk Local Plan, the Broads Local Plan or separate regulatory regimes.	Noted, amended where relevant	Plan reviewed to reduce duplication and focus more clearly on locally specific matters. Some policies have been simplified, merged or deleted where appropriate.
General - NNDC advised that national policy references should be checked before submission, particularly in light of changes to national planning policy.	Noted	National policy references reviewed and amended where necessary, including references to the NPPF.
NNDC Strategic Housing welcomed the aim of supporting smaller and more affordable homes, but recommended clearer reference to older persons' accommodation, specialist housing and affordable housing mechanisms.	Noted, supporting text amended	Housing supporting text amended to better reflect the need for suitable homes for older people and those with support needs. The Plan continues to rely on Local Plan affordable housing policy for qualifying sites.
Policy HNP1 - Housing was considered to conflict with Local Plan Policy HOU2, particularly in relation to housing mix and the use of specific percentages from Figure 9.	Agreed, policy wording updated	Policy HNP1 wording amended to avoid conflict with Local Plan policy. Revised wording refers more generally to local housing needs and the most up-to-date evidence.
Para 47 - supporting text should clarify the affordable housing requirements that apply to the Hoveton allocations through the Local Plan.	Agreed, text updated	Supporting text amended to refer to the relevant Local Plan affordable housing requirements.
Para 46 - the housing section should distinguish more clearly between general housing and specialist / elderly accommodation on allocated sites.	Noted, text amended	Supporting text amended to clarify the role of specialist elderly accommodation within the Local Plan allocations.
Policy HNP2 Land east of Tunstead Road - too detailed in places and includes criteria that duplicates or conflicts with the Local Plan allocation policy. Included comments on housing mix, open space, transport, drainage, wastewater, heritage and landscape.	Noted, policy text amended	Policy wording amended to focus on locally specific matters including design, landscape, settlement edge, local character, walking and cycling, and heritage setting. Duplicative or conflicting criteria have been removed or reworded.

Policy HNP3 Land off Stalham Road - considered to duplicate parts of the Local Plan allocation policy and to be too restrictive in relation to design and layout.	Agreed, policy text amended	Policy NP3 simplified to focus on high-quality design, integration with surrounding development, landscape boundaries and safe walking and cycling connections.
Policy HNP4 Brownfield Land off Station Road - should be checked for consistency with the Broads Authority Local Plan.	Noted	Policy reviewed alongside the Broads Authority response and amended where appropriate.
Plan should acknowledge that future housing requirements may change through a future Local Plan review.	Noted, text added	Supporting text amended to acknowledge the potential for future Local Plan review work and the need for continued engagement with NNDC.
Policy HNP5 - Backland and Infill Development - conflicts with Local Plan Policy HOU2.	Agreed, policy wording amended	Policy amended so that any locally specific housing mix wording applies only where it does not conflict with Local Plan Policy HOU2.
Policy HNP6 Design - includes some duplicated or unclear criteria, including on landscape, views, flooding, signage and private/shared outdoor space.	Agreed, policy wording amended	Policy simplified and focused on locally distinctive design, layout, scale, landscaping, walkability, local character and the Hoveton Design Guide.
Policy HNP7 Prioritising Brownfield Development - considered to go beyond what a neighbourhood plan can reasonably require	Agreed, amended	Policy amended to take a more positive approach to the regeneration and reuse of previously developed land, rather than requiring sequential delivery.
Policy HNP8 Small Brownfield Sites in the Village Centre - duplicates Local Plan and national policy.	Agreed, policy deleted	Policy deleted and relevant content incorporated into the revised brownfield regeneration policy where appropriate.
Policy HNP9 Community Facilities - duplicates Local Plan policy in part, although NNDC noted that named local facilities may provide local detail.	Noted. Retained but amended.	Policy retained but simplified. The list of facilities has been reviewed and revised to ensure it relates to appropriate community facilities.
Policy HNP10 Village Hall and Broadland Youth and Community Centre - more appropriate as a site allocation if redevelopment of the site is intended.	Noted. Policy retained.	Policy is not intended to allocate the site or establish that redevelopment should take place. There is no defined scheme, site assessment, or evidence of availability/deliverability to support a site allocation. Policy retained but amended/tightened to provide clear framework for considering any future proposals.

Policy HNP12 Safe and Sustainable Transport - too broad/should not require all development to provide a Transport Assessment. Transport matters already addressed through the Local Plan allocation policies.	Agreed, policy wording amended	Policy amended to avoid duplication with Local Plan while retaining locally specific support for safe, sustainable and well-connected movement, and to take a more proportionate approach.
Policy HNP13 Drainage, Wastewater and Nutrient Neutrality - duplicative of Local Plan policy and separate regulatory processes.	Agreed in part, policy replaced with community action	Policy deleted and replaced with a community action. Local concerns retained in supporting text and community action wording.
Policy HNP14 Digital Connectivity - considered to duplicate Local Plan policies.	Noted, deleted	Policy deleted. Supporting text retained where appropriate to record local concern about digital connectivity.
Policy HNP15 Utilities and Services - unclear and potentially unreasonable in relation to impacts on existing users and networks.	Agreed in part – policy replaced with community action	Policy deleted and replaced with a broader community action on infrastructure capacity and engagement with providers. Supporting text retained to emphasise importance to local residents.
Policy HNP16 Biodiversity and Green Corridors - duplicates wider biodiversity, ecological network and biodiversity net gain policy in places.	Noted, policy wording amended	Policy revised to focus on locally identified green corridors and their role in maintaining and enhancing ecological connectivity.
Para 132 - NNDC advised that supporting text should not introduce unclear policy requirements outside the policy wording.	Agreed, deleted	Agreed. Paragraph deleted.
Policy HNP17 Ecological Networks, Buffer Zones and Cumulative Impacts - considered duplicative and unclear, particularly in relation to buffers, ecological assessments and cumulative impacts.	Agreed, policy deleted	Policy deleted. Relevant locally specific content has been incorporated into the revised green corridors policy where appropriate.
Policy HNP18 Local Green Space - further review required, particularly where sites already have Local Plan protection or where boundaries/evidence may not fully meet national policy criteria.	Agreed in part.	Local Green Space evidence and boundaries reviewed. Supporting text amended and site boundaries amended where necessary.

NNDC raised particular concerns about LGS4, LGS9 and LGS10.	Agreed in part.	These sites have been reviewed against the national Local Green Space criteria. • LGS9 (now LGS8) and LGS10 (now LGS9): boundaries and evidence have been amended where appropriate. • LGS4: The Community Council has reviewed NNDC's comments but considers that the site should remain designated as Local Green Space. The assessment has been strengthened to explain more clearly why the space is demonstrably special to the local community.
Policy HNP19: Landscape and Views was considered to duplicate Local Plan landscape policies in part, and the evidence for important local views required clarification.	Noted, policy wording revised	Policy revised to focus more clearly on identified Important Local Views and Hoveton's local landscape setting. The Key Views evidence has been reviewed to improve clarity.
Policy HNP20: Dark Skies was considered too broad and should recognise that some lighting is outside planning control.	Agreed, policy amended and supporting text added.	Policy and supporting text amended to apply where planning permission is required and to refer to national guidance and Local Plan policy on light pollution.
Policy HNP21: Flooding and Sustainable Drainage This policy area is covered by national and local plan policy and technical assessment processes, and the policy brings no local consideration.	Agreed, policy deleted, supporting text added.	Policy deleted to avoid duplication. Relevant supporting text moved into infrastructure section, alongside text on water capacity, drainage and wastewater. Infrastructure community action amended to cover flooding and drainage, including monitoring local concerns, advocating for investment & supporting flood resilience.
Policy HNP22: Active Travel Network should be proportionate and capable of implementation.	Agreed in part. Policy wording updated.	Policy reviewed and amended so that requirements apply where relevant to the proposal and its context.
Policy HNP23: Access to the Countryside and the Broads should be consistent with environmental protections and Local Plan policy.	Agreed, policy wording updated.	Policy reviewed and amended to clarify that access improvements should be sensitively designed and should avoid harm to landscape, biodiversity, tranquillity and designated habitats.

Para 173 - NNDC advised that it does maintain records of locally listed buildings / non-designated heritage assets, although these are not published as a formal list and instead appear through its public access mapping. NNDC advised that heritage assets identified through the Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan process may be added to this dataset.	Noted, wording updated.	Text amended to clarify that both the Broads Authority and North Norfolk District Council identify non-designated heritage assets. And to note that heritage assets identified through the Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan process may be incorporated into this wider dataset where appropriate.
Policy HNP24: Conservation and Design team support the buildings identified within the NNDC administrative area being treated as locally listed buildings / non-designated heritage assets.	Support noted.	Assets identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process may be incorporated into NNDC's wider locally listed building / non-designated heritage asset dataset where appropriate.
Policy HNP24: Non-Designated Heritage Assets and the Heritage Assets Report require review to correct terminology, asset classification and consistency with national policy.	Agreed. Heritage Assets Report reviewed and amended.	Table 2 and introductory text amended. The Heritage Assets Report has been amended to distinguish designated assets, non-designated heritage assets and Historic Environment Record entries more clearly.
Policy HNP25: the policy should be clearer about where commercial uses are supported, particularly in relation to the defined village centre, and should align more clearly with Local Plan Policy E3. It also advised that wording on loss of business premises, infrastructure and design should be reviewed.	Agreed in part, policy wording and supporting text amended.	Paragraph 188 and Policy HNP25 amended to align with Local Plan Policy E3 and the defined village centre. The revised policy provides clearer support for local business space, existing commercial premises, active village centre uses, compatible home-based businesses and high-quality design.
Policy HNP26: noted that some changes of use affecting upper floors may be permitted development and queried the meaning of "non-active use". It advised that supporting text should explain this more clearly and refer to Local Plan Policy E4.	Agreed, policy and supporting text amended.	Paragraph 190 and Policy HNP26 amended to refer to Local Plan Policy E4, clarify that some changes of use may fall outside planning control, and explain the policy's role where planning permission is required. Revised policy wording supports effective use of upper floors while protecting active ground-floor uses, amenity, access, character and heritage.
Policy HNP27: advised that the policy did not align clearly with Local Plan Policies E6 and E8, particularly because it appeared to apply across the whole parish.	Noted, wording amended.	Policy wording amended to provide more focused local guidance.

Policy HNP28: NNDC advised that the policy did not appear to add location-specific considerations.	Agreed, deleted. Supporting text added.	Policy deleted. Supporting text incorporated into the infrastructure section and community action. Emphasis on how climate change relates to Hoveton's local flood risk, drainage, water management, green infrastructure and infrastructure resilience.
Policy HNP29: NNDC advised that the policy did not add local considerations.	Agreed, deleted. Supporting text added.	Policy deleted to avoid duplication with national policy, Building Regulations and Local Plan policy. The Plan retains concise supporting text recognising the importance of climate resilience, energy efficiency and low-carbon design where relevant to Hoveton's local context.
NNDC advised that the Design Guide should be clear in status and should not create confusion with the development plan.	Noted.	Supporting text amended to clarify the status of the Design Guide as supporting guidance to be read alongside the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan policies.
NNDC advised that the Key Views Assessment should better explain the methodology and justification for selected views.	Agreed in part.	Key Views Assessment reviewed and amended to improve explanation of the selected views and their planning relevance.
NNDC advised that the Local Green Space Assessment should better justify the proposed designations and consider existing protections.	Agreed in part.	Local Green Space Assessment reviewed and amended where appropriate, including review of boundaries and supporting justification.

Appendix D: Detailed Consultee Responses (Broads Authority)

Issue / comment	Response	Detail
Para 14 - the Plan should refer to the NPPF as well as the Local Plans.	Noted, updated.	Supporting text amended to refer to the National Planning Policy Framework where appropriate.
Para 15 - the Local Plan for the Broads is at examination and that the Plan should be updated to reflect this.	Noted, updated.	Supporting text amended to update references to the Broads Local Plan Review.
Para 18 - the evidence documents should not be described as “supplementary documents”.	Noted, updated.	References amended to “supporting documents” where appropriate.
Paragraph 44 – suggested changes to wording on self-build and custom-build housing.	Noted, amended.	Supporting text amended to clarify the description of self-build and custom-build housing.
Paragraph 48 – change reference to figure 4.	Amended.	Figure reference corrected.
Policy HNP1 - suggested that part of criterion a) may be more appropriate as supporting text.	Noted.	Policy HNP1 has been revised in response to NNDC comments. No further change required.
Noted that repeated policy headings across page breaks were confusing.	Noted, changed.	Repeated policy header rows removed where appropriate.
Paragraph 49 - site is in the adopted Broads Local Plan as HOV3 and in the emerging Local Plan as PUBHOV3.	Noted, updated.	Supporting text amended to clarify references
Policy HNP4 - wording on the buildings adjacent to the King’s Head should take a stronger approach to retention and sensitive reuse and cross-reference heritage policy.	Agreed, updated	Paragraph 51 and Policy HNP4 amended to identify the buildings as NDHA and support their retention and sensitive reuse, subject to local and national policy.

Policy HNP4 - flood risk wording should refer to national flood risk policy and the sequential approach.	Agreed, updated.	Policy HNP4 amended to refer to national flood risk policy, including the sequential approach.
Policy HNP4 - noted that it may reconsider the area covered by emerging Policy PUBHOV3	Noted.	No change proposed at this stage.
Policy HNP5 - suggest “if required” be added to the biodiversity net gain reference.	Noted.	Policy HNP5 has been revised in response to NNDC comments which addresses this point too.
Policy HNP6 - suggested adding wording on rationalising signage to reduce visual clutter.	Agreed – community action added	The signage criterion has been removed from Policy HNP6 following NNDC consultation comments. Community Action has been added to address this.
Policy HNP7 - queried how the brownfield-first wording	Noted.	Policy HNP7 has been substantially revised in response to NNDC comments.
Policy HNP8 - policy should refer to relevant retail and local centre policies in NNDC/Broads Local Plans.	Noted.	Policy HNP8 has been deleted and relevant content merged with the revised brownfield policy.
Paragraph 106 - queried reference to a strategic nutrient mitigation programme	Noted, updated.	Supporting text amended to refer more generally to nutrient budgets/appropriate mitigation where required.
Para 46-48 – suggested adding in reference to Hoveton House estate	Agreed, added.	Reference to Hoveton House estate added to supporting text.
Policy HNP14 – queried wording of final part of the policy, referring to digital infrastructure being “sensitively designed”	Noted.	Policy HNP14 has been deleted following NNDC consultation comments to avoid duplication with existing policy. Relevant supporting text on digital connectivity has been retained in the infrastructure section.
Natural environment section - the Plan should refer to the Norfolk LNRS/clarify how Figure 16 relates to it.	Agreed. Updated.	Supporting text amended to include LNRS explain how Fig16 complements wider habitat networks/priorities.

Natural environment section - the section should also address rivers and lakes.	Agreed, updated.	Supporting text amended to better recognise riverside, wetland and aquatic habitats.
Paragraphs 123-124 - queried wording relating to BeWILDerwood and suggested mentioning Broads Local Plan policy for BeWILDerwood	Agreed, updated.	Supporting text amended to clarify the role of BeWILDerwood within the wider wetland and woodland landscape, and to refer to Local Plan policy.
Paragraph 132 - queried meaning of development “near” ecological areas.	Agreed.	Paragraph deleted as part of wider amendments in response to NNDC feedback.
Policies HNP16 and HNP17 - queried the relationship between ecological networks and green corridors	Noted, amended.	Policy HNP16 has been revised to focus on the mapped green corridors. Policy HNP17 has been deleted based on NNDC comments to avoid duplication.
Figure 17 / Policy HNP18: queried Local Green Space boundary for Riverside and Pocket Parks as they extend into the Station Road brownfield site.	Agreed. Boundary amended.	The Local Green Space boundary and supporting evidence have been reviewed alongside other consultation comments. Boundaries have been amended where appropriate to ensure they do not extend into the brownfield site.
Policy HNP18 - the policy should support proposals to enhance Local Green Spaces.	Agreed, amended.	Policy HNP18 wording amended to support appropriate enhancement of LGS where consistent with designation
Policy HNP19 - suggest adding reference to harm to the character of the Broads landscape/waterscape.	Agreed in part.	Policy HNP19 has been revised in response to NNDC comments. Supporting text amended.
Policy HNP19 / Key Views - asked whether views up and down the river from Wroxham Bridge, or views from the river, should be considered important viewpoints.	Noted.	The Key Views Assessment has been reviewed. No additional view is proposed.
Policy HNP20 - the dark skies policy should first require justification for lighting.	Agreed, amended.	Policy HNP20 amended so that proposals must demonstrate that lighting is necessary if included.

Paragraph 148 - development does not necessarily have to pay a tariff for recreational impact mitigation, as mitigation may be addressed in other ways.	Noted, wording updated.	Supporting text updated to clarify that development must mitigate its recreational impacts, and that a tariff is one available mechanism for this.
Paragraphs 147-152 - recreational impact mitigation text may fit better with biodiversity / infrastructure content.	Agreed, moved.	Supporting text has been reviewed and moved to infrastructure section
Walking and cycling - the Three Rivers Way should be mentioned.	Noted, added.	Supporting text amended to refer to the Three Rivers Way.
Active travel / access policies - promotion of access to sensitive or protected sites should refer to Habitats Regulations Assessment where relevant.	Agreed, added.	Supporting text amended to explain that access and recreation improvements may require HRA or other ecological assessments.
Policy HNP23 - access improvements should be designed sensitively having regard to landscape, biodiversity, tranquillity and designated habitats.	Agreed, amended.	Policy HNP23 amended accordingly.
Policy HNP26 - criteria on new upper floors should be separated from those relating to existing upper-floor use.	Agreed, amended.	Policy HNP26 amended to distinguish between criteria for new/existing upper floors.
Policy HNP27 - queried the “or” structure of the policy.	Agreed, amended.	Policy HNP27 rewritten following feedback from NNDC and addresses this point.
Policy HNP28 - queried whether this was needed alongside Policy HNP21 on flood risk.	Agreed, deleted.	Policy HNP28 has been deleted following NNDC consultation comments. Relevant supporting text has been retained in shortened form within the infrastructure section where appropriate.
Heritage map - listed buildings should be checked, including the Old Vicarage, Leisure Hour and Church Farmhouse.	Agreed, updated.	Heritage mapping data updated and re-mapped

Figure 23 - Wroxham Bridge, a Scheduled Monument, is not shown	Agreed, added.	Scheduled Monuments added to the heritage mapping
Non-Designated Heritage Assets - suggested more detailed mapping for some assets, including the Wet Sheds, to make clear which buildings are being identified.	Noted.	The Heritage Assets Report already provides more detailed mapping for some assets.
Paragraph 201 - policy reference appears incorrect	Noted.	Supporting text has been deleted in response to NNDC comments.
Evidence Base – introduction wording on protected landscapes is confusing	Noted, amended.	Evidence Base wording amended re protected landscape and the Broads.
Evidence Base - references to the North Norfolk Local Plan should be updated now that it has been adopted.	Agreed, updated.	Evidence Base updated to refer to the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan.
Evidence Base - minor drafting issues/typos	Noted.	Drafting errors corrected.
Evidence Base - the LNRS should be referenced.	Agreed.	Evidence Base amended accordingly
SEA/HRA screening - comments on references to the Broads as a protected landscape, nutrient neutrality, RAMS and the relationship between access policies and Habitats Regulations Assessment.	Noted	Comments considered but no amendment to the SEA/HRA screening report is proposed as screening is underway.
Design Guide and code - comments on the treatment of waterside properties, riverside landscaping and examples of waterside development.	Noted.	Comments considered. The Design Guide is a supporting document and should be read alongside relevant Broads Authority design guidance for proposals within the Broads Executive Area.. No separate amendment to the Design Guide is proposed.

Appendix E: Stakeholder email

Dear Consultee,

Hoveton Community Council is undertaking Regulation 14 consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The consultation runs from 31 March 2026 to 1 June 2026

The Neighbourhood Plan sets out planning policies to guide development in the parish up to 2040. The Community Council is seeking your views on the draft plan and supporting evidence.

The Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents are available on the Council website: https://hoveton-cc.gov.uk/hoveton-neighbourhood-plan/

How to respond

Comments should be submitted by 5pm on 1 June 2026.

Responses can be sent by email to clerk@hoveton-cc.gov.uk

All responses received during the consultation period will be considered by the Community Council and used to inform the final version of the Neighbourhood Plan.

If you have any questions about the consultation, please contact me using the details above.

Thank you in advance

Clerk to the Council

Hoveton Community Council

Appendix F: Full text of the response from North Norfolk District Council

Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan

Pre-Submission Draft March 2026

North Norfolk District Council Response – May 2026

Thank you for consulting North Norfolk District Council, (NNDC) on the pre-submission version of the Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan (HNP).

Officers have previously made general informal comments on an earlier version of the HNP. It is noted that there have been a number of changes introduced across the policies and the supporting text. In particular, the duplication of a number of existing North Norfolk Local Plan (NNLP) policies and the inclusion of the strategic site allocations for Hoveton and further suggested criteria. the emerging HNP seeks to have fallen into the trap of seeking to provide policies across the board range of planning subjects, without any specific local additionality above the requirements already set out in the NPPF and or the adopted Local Plan even when many are already adequately addressed in the wider development plan. Often this leads to no additional considerations in the decision-making process only adding confusion due to the vague ness of language and / or the stipulation of lower or undefined requirements causing unnecessary delays in assessment of applications.

National policy in the form of the NPPF is changing and your attention is drawn to National guidance in the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) indicates in Policy- Making PM5: Neighbourhood plans

1. Neighbourhood plans allow local communities to plan positively for their areas by identifying and addressing community priorities that can be met or supported through the planning system. They should do this by:

a. Allocating land to meet the development needs of their designated area, where it is appropriate to do so; and

b. Setting out policies which address particular local issues, these should relate to site specific matters or, where appropriate, may cover wider issues such as the provision of infrastructure and community facilities, regeneration opportunities, design requirements (including design codes), local environmental improvements and the conservation of local heritage assets.

2. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than provided for in other parts of the development plan for the area. Preparing plans

PM6: General principles for plan-making (extract)

1. All plan-makers should, in preparing plans:

a. Only address matters, and include policies, that are necessary and relevant to the plan being prepared, and which avoid unnecessary duplication of other parts of the development plan;

b. Only include policies which extend beyond site or location-specific requirements where these are necessary and where plan makers consider there is a clear and justified reason for inclusion;

c. ***Not duplicate, substantively restate or modify*** *the content of national decision-making policies unless directed by other policies in this Framework*

It will therefore be important to reflect on the policies within the expected new and revised NPPF, which we are told will be in effect by the time the neighbourhood plan is submitted. if you do not seek to align with these there is the strong danger the HNP policies will be overridden by the new NPPF.

It is recognised that much hard work has gone into the preparation of the neighbourhood plan and in the main it seeks to deliver on the ambition of the steering group and that of the local community. However, there does remain some concerns around the inclusion of unnecessary policies, and or criteria in policies/ approaches that are already in the NNLP.

It is also noted that some of the policy areas continue to be justified by the inclusion of statements that the approach is/ has been supported at consultation events, however, such policies still need to be justified through a level of proportionate qualitative evidence.

PM 14: Examining spatial development strategies

Consistent with national policy – the strategy accords with the policies for plan making in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant, and does not duplicate, substantively restate or modify the content of national policies for decision-making.

General comments from Strategic Housing NNDC officers

We are pleased to see that Hoveton NP wishes to see homes that meet local need, are more affordable and smaller in size which meets North Norfolk DC requirements through the Local Plan. Shared Ownership for older people, looking to downsize, could also be a specific opportunity for the Hoveton community. North Norfolk DC would want to ensure this meets a range of defined older peoples support options. An example of this

can be found at the Extra Care development at Fakenham where there is affordable shared ownership, as well as affordable rented homes. 1. **We would recommend the NP references the need for good quality accommodation for older people with appropriate support needs that serves the local community through both affordable rent and shared ownership.**

Whilst the NP supports the need for affordable homes for local people, there is no detail as to how this can be achieved, if the community wishes this to be for those with a very local need. NNDC let affordable homes build on Allocated sites (through the Local Plan) to households from the Housing Register who have a local connection to the district and in highest housing need. Affordable homes built on Rural Exception Sites are allocated to households using the Local Letting Agreement. This Agreement ensures that households have a local connection to the parish and surrounding parishes. This connection is through current or former residency, employment or family connection. North Norfolk DC has a history of bringing forward Rural Exception Sites and welcomes the opportunity to bring these to our communities across the district. To ensure that the NP could deliver this to increase affordable housing provision for the parish, which is specifically for these local needs, **we would recommend a site is allocated through the NP to meet this specific need.** The brownfield or other infill sites in Hoveton are highly unlikely to be attractive to Registered Provider due to often higher costs to develop.

Table 1: Hoveton Draft Neighbourhood Plan – pre-submission version. General High level comments Planning policy with suggested considerations and amendments. (please also see separate housing colleagues comments and text in relation to the emerging changes in NPPF above)

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
Introduction		
Neighbourhood Planning		
Vision and Objectives		
Housing that meets Local Needs		
Policy HNP1	**Planning Policy comment:** This is in direct conflict with Policy HOU2 of the Local Plan. Policy HOU2 requires a mix of not less than 50% two or three bedroom properties in a mix comprising approximately 20% two beds and 80% three beds. This applies to development of 6+ dwellings. Requiring developments to prioritise 1-bedroom properties will shift the balance of housing mix. Additionally, Figure 9 is also in direct conflict with Policy HOU2, whereby the suggestion that only 17.4% of new housing should be 3-bedroom properties compared to what is required in Policy HOU2. Policy HNP1 needs to comply with Policy HOU2 and it is rather vague, expecting developments of all sizes to comply to very specific housing mix percentages as set out in Figure 9.	PolicyHOU2 of the local plan already prioritises 2 and 3 bedroomed homes and sets a specific target. HNP1 does not provide any further local qualifications to apply. The policy could add further considerations if it were to be separated into developments of 0-5 and then 6+, which is similar to Policy HOU2. This would then allow some more control within Policy HNP1 to dictate housing mix on a smaller scale as Policy HOU2 has no requirements for developments of between 0-5 dwellings. Furthermore, Policy HNP1 must also acknowledge Policy HOU2's requirement for affordable housing.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
Para. 46	it might be worth noting how much affordable housing is required for both allocations as expected through Policy HOU2.	Add affordable housing percentages as detailed in the Local plan i.e 35%
Para. 47	this is slightly misleading; it is not 240 new dwellings. The elderly care provision is a policy requirement whereby the best way to implement it will be discussed with the Council at an application stage but this could be either individual homes or a care home, or a mix of both. The paragraph should be re-written to separate the two.	Amend. It is 200 dwellings in total inclusive of Market Homes and Affordable Housing in addition to 40 dwellings equivalent of elderly care provision.
Policy HNP2	neighbourhood plan can add more detailed, site-specific criteria to a Local Plan allocation, provided it does not conflict with the Local Plan's strategic policies or undermine the allocation itself. Neighbourhood plans must meet the **basic conditions**, including being in **general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan**. [north-norfolk.gov.uk] In practice this means: **You may be able to:** • Add **more detailed criteria** to guide development of an allocated site • Clarify or **tighten qualitative aspects** (e.g. design codes, green buffers, access principles) • Address **local impacts** not fully specified in the Local Plan **You *cannot*:** • **Reduce or frustrate delivery** of the allocated site (e.g. making it undevelopable) • **Contradict key parameters** (e.g. materially lowering housing numbers where the allocation is strategic)	• Criterion A is in direct conflict with local plan Policy HOU2 and the housing mix requirements. This criterion would potentially raise viability concerns especially if evidence must be provided to support the need for 4+ bedroom properties. Policy HOU2 provides an appropriate balance between housing mix and viability. This criterion should be deleted. • Criterion B – This should be amended to state that building heights of 1-2 storeys will only be required around the edges of the development, particularly to the north, otherwise the density of the overall scheme will be very low and potentially risk the capacity not being achievable. • Criterion C – This is very similar to Criterion 4 and 6 of the local plan allocation policy – should be deleted to avoid confusion • Criterion D – Delete 'Provide multifunctional open space' – repeat of Criterion 4 of the allocation policy. Criterion D should not dictate what kind of suds features should be provided as this will be based on what features work best through evidence provided via the application. However the rest of Criterion D could be kept, perhaps the start of the criterion could be 'Open Space requirements should….' • Criterion E – this is very similar to Criterion 2 and 7 of the allocation policy. This policy is quite vague. Criterion 7 asks for

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	• Introduce policy that is effectively a **block or moratorium** on the allocation Question: Does the HHNA provide more evidence for the specific type of adult accommodation – the policy allows flexibility for discussion at application stage and should be left , however if there is evidence to support a particular type and need this can be put in the NP policy . This matter should be discussed with NNDC housing officers first	a transport assessment which will address almost everything mentioned in Criterion E. Either this criterion needs to be re-written to acknowledge this or be deleted. • **Furthermor**e, this policy cannot require traffic speed management or crossing measures as these have not been specifically referred to in the allocation policy and can only be required by the Highway Authority if deemed necessary through their review of the Transport Assessment any other supporting evidence at the application stage. • Criterion F – this is a repeat of Criterion 8 and 9 of the allocation policy. This criterion should not be identifying specific sud features to implement as the best most practicable approach will be identified through the application process as a better alternative may present itself. This should be deleted. • Criterion G – Historic landscape character needs defining, this seems to be blurring historic assets and landscape character together. Any application will only consider the impacts on relevant assets as expressed in the allocation policy and anything else identified by internal officers and Historic England, but this criterion could make reference to the conservation area if there is some concern over its impact.
Policy HNP3	Similar issues to the above. Review and revise the policy throughout .	Criterion B is a repeat of Criterion 7 of the Local plan allocation policy. It is also in conflict with Criterion 1 of the Local plan allocation policy. Criterion B should not be requiring the development to follow the same design and layout of Brooke Park given design practices have changed since the development was built and there could be ample opportunity to provide something significantly better and more appropriate . This criterion is

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
		restrictive not positively prepared and retrograde and should be deleted. Criterion C should be amended to reference the opportunity to connect to existing pedestrian access already provided within Brook Park which would be achieved anyway via local plan policy HV01/C. The reference to the wider village is too vague, the applicant cannot provide new connections through the entire settlement. This line should be deleted. The first line of Criterion D should also be deleted. Criterion E should be deleted as explained above.
Policy HNP4	This site is not an allocation in the NNDC Local Plan however, given the comments above, this policy should be reviewed to make sure the requirements do not conflict with requirements set out elsewhere and the Braods Authority LP	Double check local plans allocation requirements.
Para. 55 & 56	It is true that no further sites are required to meet the housing requirements set out in the local plan, however through the NP there is an opportunity to meet additional need both locally and strategy. Since the local plan was written the government has amended the standard methodology for assessing housing need which has resulted in an increase of approx 67% for North Norfolk . with the Council being examined against the world target the LPA are now required to start to plan for the new target. There is therefore an opportunity for the NP to influence future growth by seeking to specifically allocate housing sites and influence the next round of Local Plans. The text could be amended to take account of the fact that the government has recently set a new housing target for North Norfolk which we are required to meet through a Local Plan Review which is commencing this year. The Council will be looking at additional growth throughout the district, therefore,	Add context around new housing growth targets, and how the NP will work with the Council to achieve them.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	this assessment could be reviewed to help support the Council for the future, as more sites will be required in Hoveton. It should be noted that although the council in 2025 can demonstrate a 7 yr HLS the council do not expect to hold onto the 7 Yr housing land supply for long due to future land supply and the impacts of the Housing delivery tests – this test is set around housing delivery against annual requirements over the preceding three yrs and shortfalls in delivery need to be made up and added to the requirements. More information on this test is published on the councils local plan monitoring pages	
Backland and Infill Development		
Policy HNP5	Conflicts with Policy HOU2.	Criterion a) should be amended to reference where development is between 0-5 dwellings, to avoid conflict with NNLP Policy HOU2.
Design of New Development		
Policy HNP6	The policy needs to state 'relevant' proposals... See separate comments on the Hoveton Design Guide. a) Duplication of HNP19. b) Duplication of HNP19 b). c) Duplication of HNP21. g) much of the signage referred to appears to relate to the public realm. Please explain where the guidance is for Officers to operate the criterion. j) does not add any local consideration over and above national and local policies.	Some duplication to consider and potentially delete where appropriate. Consideration of supporting evidence for signage and amenity space requirements.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	k) where does it explain what is considered to be a 'sufficient' level of private and shared outdoor space?	
Redevelopment of Brownfield Land		
Policy HNP7	Please note each application is determined on its own merits. National policy directs that brownfield land is preferential. However, policy cannot dictate that brownfield sites are developed ahead of greenfield sites, as it depends on the specific circumstances.	The policy needs rewording to provide general support for brownfield development. However, this is a duplication of national policy and is not needed. Perhaps a better way of adding local considerations is through identifying local brownfield sites and stipulating planning criteria that should be addressed if an application should come forward.in order for that application to be supported.
Small Brownfield sites in the Village Centre		
Policy HNP8	The principle of development is already established through NNLP Policy SS1 and national policy. What is meant by a small site/ threshold?	As with policy HNP7, the NP would be better off identifying the particular sites and listing specific policy requirements for each. If the policy is to remain, the details of what are small sites will need to be defined. Note alignment with NNLP Policy HOU2.
Enhancing Community Facilities		
Policy HNP9	The policy appears to duplicate the adopted NNLP policy HC3, although specific facilities are named. The term 'Community facilities' usually relates to buildings and so the recreation ground is not appropriate in the list. It is appropriately protected as an Open Land Area in the NNLP and is proposed as a LGS under NP Policy HNP18.	Review policy in light of comments and consider deletion or amendment.
Policy HNP10	if there is a desire to see this site redeveloped in some way, then the Neighbourhood Plan should allocate the site. This	Add site as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	would be a proactive approach to growth and support the Council's future housing needs.	
Policy HNP12	this policy needs to set out a minimum threshold otherwise it is expecting any and all development to provide a transport assessment which is significant piece of work that would not be required for most development and is unreasonable. The policy is also not positively worded- ie it does not seek positively to facilitate growth but seeks to block it through negativity rather than seeking it to address the isseus **The Local Plan expects transport assessments to be undertaken for larger schemes only and this is supported by Criterion 5 of Policy CC9**. The need for a TA should be set out either through Local Plan allocation requirements or, at the request of the Highway Authority. This criterion should be deleted. Additionally, there is already a requirement in the site-specific policy for both Hoveton allocations to address the issue of the double mini roundabout. Asking for this to be looked at in this policy will only conflict with the findings of the TA undertaken for the allocations at the application stage and, realistically, any mitigation measures will only be affordable through large scale developments such as the two adopted allocations. Criterion d) duplicates the requirements of NNLP policy HC7.	Criterion a), b) and d) should be re-written or deleted.
Drainage, Wastewater and Nutrient Neutrality		
Policy HNP13	This policy is largely unnecessary and if it is to remain, needs to set out some thresholds for different types of development. Anglian Water are a statutory consultee and will be involved in	Review policy, delete if necessary.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	all relevant application responses, it is therefore unclear what 'demonstrate' means in this regard. Anglian Water will always provide feedback based on the latest and most up to date information. It is not for an applicant to evidence this information themselves. A lot of these requirements are picked up in the adopted NNLP Policy CC7.	
Digital Connectivity		
Policy HNP14	Duplication of NNLP policies HC5 and HC6. In particular, the second paragraph of the policy does not appear to align with Policy HC5.	Review policy in light of comments and delete, as appropriate. To remove conflict
Utilities and Services		
Policy HNP15	What is meant by existing users? Or networks The obligation for a proposal is to seek the necessary infrastructure to serve the scheme (which may include off-site mitigation). As written criterion a) would be unreasonable.	Amend introduction and criterion a).
Natural Environment		
Policy HNP16	General comments: The Policy does not refer to Figure 16 which identifies the location of the proposed green corridors. a) Largely duplicates elements of NNLP Policies CC10, CC11, ENV4 and ENV8 (3b&c). Any off-site measures will be informed by the Norfolk Local Nature Recovery Strategy, as there is a duty to 'have regard' and soon to be strengthened to 'take account' of the LNRS under the Environment Act 2021. It appears that the proposed green corridors have been informed by some	Suggest amendments to policy text in consideration of comments.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	of the same data as the Norfolk LNRS (from the NBIS) and as such, the proposed corridors b) Duplicates elements of NNLP Policies CC10, CC11, ENV4 and ENV8 (3b&c). The term 'green infrastructure' needs to be properly defined in the supporting text and glossary. That way the mention of some types of green infrastructure can be taken out of the policy. How will a Planning officer know how to apply the requirement for 'the right tree in the right place'? c) Duplicates NNLP Policies CC10, CC11, CC12, ENV4 and ENV8 (3b&c). d) Duplicates NNLP Policies CC11, CC12, ENV4 and ENV8 (3b&c). e) In order for this criterion to be applied the areas of land identified as green corridors will need to be accurately mapped. f) Duplicates NNLP Policy ENV5.	
Para. 132	The paragraph does not form part of the policy and therefore, it's requirements cannot be demanded, particularly as it refers to being 'near' ecological areas, but only names one of them.	The land would need to be within the NPA in order for Policy HNP16 to apply.
Policy HNP17	General comment: Duplicates some of Policy HNP16 and could cause confusion for Officers understanding and applying the two policies. The green corridors referred to would need to be accurately mapped, as highlighted above. The NPPF is about to be updated. Therefore, it will be short sighted to quote NPPF paragraphs within the Policy. For example, Para. 191 of the NPPF(2024) relates to the Heritage Coast. a) duplicates NP Policy HNP16a) and e) and NNLP Policies CC11, CC12 and ENV4.	Amend in light of comments.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	b) duplicates NP HNP Policy HNP16b) and NNLP Policies CC1, CC12 and ENV4. c) There is no supporting text to provide and explain the evidence supporting the requirement for buffer zones and what level of development proposal they would apply to. d) Duplicates NNLP Policies CC11 and ENV4. e) Duplicates NNLP CC13, ENV4, and ENV5 and appears to overstep what is required through an ecological impact assessment, in accordance with BS42020:2013 and CIEEM Best Practice Guidelines. f) This requirement needs to be phrased to include 'where appropriate.' g) Does the identify the wildlife corridors this criterion refers to? What is the best practice guidance referred to? This will need to be identified in the supporting text. h) It is not clear what is expected to be submitted to satisfy this criterion and there is no explanation in the supporting text.	
Local Green Space (LGS)		
Policy HNP18	General comments: The LGS assessments have only appear to have been carried out using the 3 criteria set out in para. 107 of the NPPF (2024). It is considered important to understand whether the sites selected have other designations, to avoid duplication. For example, LGS1, 2, 3, 5, 8 and 9 are designated as Open Land Areas under NNPLP Policy HC2, which under criterion 5 has the same protection from development.	Para 133 – 135 and subsequent photo's tect should be amended to acknowledge that some of the sites are already designated in the adopted local plan on the proposals mapping and are covered under an existing open space policy in the adopted local plan. An appendix should be included with the NP to show any LGS designations on separate maps and detailing the evaluation in order that the sites can be accurately identified and that it is clear why they have been designated.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	In relation to the other proposed designations, LGS4 and LGS10: LGS4 – whilst the small area associated with the village sign may be seen as special to the local community, the wider grass and tree verge along the south side of Horning Road does not appear to be demonstrably special to the local community in terms of local significance or local in character. LGS9- the narrow area of land (footpath?) between the dwellings between Meadow drive and St. John's Way. LGS10 – other than the southern area adjacent to the river Bure (and a small area of trees within the site) the site is an agricultural field which fails all of the tests of the LGS. In addition, it should be noted that the NPPF specifically steers communities away from designation of large tracts of land. LGS10 – Lower meadow is considered to be a large tract of land and appears to be in agricultural use apart from the limited area alongside the River Bure and an area of trees. Given its use and the size of the area, this proposed designation would not meet the LGS criteria. **The evidence going forward will need to confirm that the landowners have been informed of the proposed LGS designations. It is not clear in the LGS supporting document that this has been part of the process so far**.	The following proposed sites do not appear to meet (or part of the site does not meet) the NPPF criteria and so their removal is recommended: LGS4: the wide grass verge part of the proposed site that runs along the south side of Horning Road; LGS9: narrow footpath(?) between the dwellings on Meadow Drive and St. John's Way. LGS10 –the agricultural field (majority of the site).
Landscape and Views		
Policy HNP19	The policy covers two matters - landscape and key views. Landscape: b) duplicates NNLP policies ENV1 and ENV8 and appears to cover the matter of buffer zones in NP policy HNP17.	Delete the policy in relation to the NNDC related views and in relation to the landscape criteria, which cumulatively are covered by NNLP policies ENV1, ENV2 and ENV8.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	General comment: The policy duplicates NNLP Policies ENV1 and ENV2, which protect the landscape character and the special characteristics of The Broads National Park. **There is no clear methodology** that has been applied to identify the proposed key views – it appears that the views have been decided from a list submitted through the survey and then not evaluated against any justification / evidence . Many of the views overlap with proposed designations of Local Green Spaces and also known heritage assets. Views 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 fall within or adjacent to the North Norfolk district. It is not clear from the Views assessment document what the 'key characteristics, focal points and overall composition' (other than the church) an Officer would need be conserving in the operation of criterion a). See also comments on the HNP Hoveton's Key Views below.	
Dark Skies		
Proposed additional supporting text	He policy seems to be a general policy across the whole of the parish and built-up area and elements may not be appropriate . It should be noted that a balance needs to be struct especially in the urban areas. The supporting text could refer to the latest guidance produced by the MHLG which can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/light-pollution. This new comprehensive guidance looks at how to consider light within the planning system. The guidance covers: • What light pollution considerations does planning need to address? • What factors can be considered when assessing whether a development proposal might have implications for light pollution?	Suggest the supporting text refers to and the policy takes account of the government guidance. Add qualifying text explaining that a lot of external lighting (particularly anything retrofitted) is usually permitted development and therefore cannot be controlled through the planning system. Add further explanation that link to the policy requirements in order that Officers can clearly apply the policy.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	• What factors are relevant when considering where light shines? • What factors are relevant when considering when light shines? • What factors are relevant when considering how much the light shines? • What factors are relevant when considering possible ecological impacts of lighting? • What other information is available that could inform approaches to lighting and help reduce light pollution? The supporting text could helpfully qualify that the majority of external lighting (particularly anything retrofitted on buildings) is permitted development and cannot therefore be controlled. The supporting text also needs to explain the requirements of the policy. For example, what are the local landmark views that criterion b) refers to?	
Para. 142	It would be appropriate to also mention that the NNLP has a policy that protects environmental quality, including dark skies within the North Norfolk district and The Broads – Policy CC13, criterion 3.	For balance, include text regarding NNLP Policy CC13 Protecting Environmental Quality, criterion 3.
Policy HNP20	The policy seems to be a general policy across the whole of the parish and built-up area and elements may not be appropriate. It should be noted that a balance needs to be struct especially in the urban areas. The policy needs to clarify that it's talking about external lighting in criteria a), b) and c). b) Reconsider use of term 'avoid' on its own. Government advice seeks to avoid, minimise and mitigate. Also see comment above about the need for clarity over the environmental or character assets the criterion is referring to. c) duplication of NNLP policies CC13, ENV2, ENV4 and ENV6	Amend criteria a), b) and remove criteria c) and d).

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	d) regarding lighting curfews, dimming or motion activated controls – firstly there is no direction for Officers to know where this would be appropriate. A planning condition covering this matter would be unenforceable.	
Flooding and Sustainable Drainage		
HNP21	This area is comprehensively covered in national and local plan policies and brings no additional value as written. Criterion a) contradicts national and local plan approach as well as LLFA guidance. Proposals should prioritise the use of SuDs wherever possible and drainage strategies should be considered at the earliest stage of an application. But it is considered unreasonable that proposals will only be supported if they contain SuDs. The policy brings no local considerations.	The policy brings no further local considerations as written and should be deleted
Active Travel Network		
Policy HNP22	As written the policy does not qualify the type and size of development where the policy would be triggered. a) Needs to be qualified, by stating, 'where appropriate'. b) partly duplicates NNLP policy HC4 in relation to contributions, but specifically identifies where highway improvements are required. c) Partly duplicates NNLP policy CC9 but stipulates specific highway improvements. Again, reference to " where appropriate" should be added d) This appears to be covered in NP HNP23. e) Duplicates the requirements of NNLP policy CC9.	Amend and remove criterion d)

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
Access to the Countryside and the Broads		
Policy HNP23	The second sentence should say: Relevant proposals should include details of how they could enhance and improve the listed active transport routes.	Delete 2nd sentence and replace with: Relevant proposals should include details of how they could enhance and improve the listed active transport routes…..
Hoveton's heritage		
Para. 173	Contrary to the contents of this paragraph, NNDC does maintain a list of locally listed buildings (or NDHAs). Although this is not formally published in a list format, the LLBs are recorded and do appear on our public access mapping tool. It is expected that the LLBs identified through the HNP process would be added to this dataset.	The paragraph text should be updated to align with the text on page 4 of the associated Heritage Assets Report.
Policy HNP24	The Conservation & Design team are supportive of those buildings listed within the NNDC administrative area becoming LLBs – this follows earlier feedback offered to the planning agent.	Support of the identified buildings for local listing.
Local Businesses and Services		
HNP25	General comment: There does not appear to be any spatial designation of where commercial uses will be supported, which if applied parish wide, could be contrary to national and local plan policies in relation to sustainable development. b) is at odds with NP policy HNP25c) which allows the loss of business and service premise. c) what is meant by business and service promises – it could suggest that any vacant commercial unit (in the centre of Hoveton) does not need to be retained for commercial purposes. This is contrary to national and NNLP policies.	The policy and or supporting text should be linked to the Local plan policy E3 and the supporting text set out in para 8.3.1 in the adopted local plan Criterion a) – c) relate to the designated village centre as defined by the NNLP policies map in order to align with national and local policy. Review b), c) and e) in light of comments and amend/ delete, as appropriate.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	e) a developer will be obligated to provide infrastructure necessary for their proposal unless other off-site works are also required. f) is there any design guidance for commercial buildings?	
Upper floors in the Village Centre		
Policy HNP26	General comment\: Upper floors of commercial premises have a number of permitted development rights for change of use, where formal planning permission is not required. Applications for external alterations may only be required. What is meant by a 'non-active use'? This could helpfully be explained in the supporting text.	Add further detail in supporting text to aid explanation. Note / add reference to the use of upper floors in the primary shopping Area in local plan policy E4.
Sustainable Visitor Economy		
Policy HNP27	The policy does not align with NNLP policies E6 and E8, particularly as it appears to apply to the whole parish.	Review policy in light of comments and consider deletion/ amendment.
Climate resilience		
Policy HNP28	The policy does not appear to add any location considerations.	Review policy and delete, as appropriate.
Energy Efficiency and Low Carbon Energy		
Policy HNP29	The policy does not add any local considerations.	Review policy and delete, as appropriate.
Appendix A		
Glossary		
Supporting Documents		
Hoveton Design Guide	• Para 1.4 – Things have moved on considerably since this text was written. Hence, the Government has recently consulted on a new draft Design and Placemaking Planning Practice	All subsequent references to the draft NN design guide therefore need to be removed.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
	Guidance document, whilst at a local level we have adopted the new local plan and decided not to pursue the "emerging" North Norfolk Design Guide. • Para 1.8 – There is considerable concern around Burnt Fen Way being included as having good design. Particularly when it comes to the actual architecture, the scheme is an average volume housebuilder type of development which mixes standard house types and delivers only modest levels of visual • Para 3.1, 2nd para – The way it is written, the text here makes it sound as though the existing flat roofs make a positive contribution to the creation of varied and interesting streetscapes. In reality, these are generally regarded as substandard forms of development which are typically discouraged in section 3.6 of the adopted North Norfolk Design Guide. • Para 3.1, 3rd para – There is a very fine line between aligned setbacks and coherent streetscapes and bland uniformity and regimentation. Often, it is the street scenes which are most varied and layered which people find most interesting and characterful. • Para 4.1, page 43 – In the examples, the value in highlighting dark concrete tiles is questioned as an aspiration in rural areas? Also in Figure 40, the tiles shown do not appear to be 'plain' tiles, as they appear to have a profile (which incidentally does not seem to match local pantiles). Additionally, a weatherboarding example should ideally have been chosen which does not simultaneously show a disproportionately wide garage door (Figure 39 refers).	It is therefore not considered to be the best exemplar to cite and should be deleted. The risk is that someone with an inappropriate flat roof extension will use this paragraph to justify their own proposals. Suggest deletion of text. Therefore, caution is required in adhering to this design approach and in referring to a development such as Two Saints Close with its rather predictable/one-dimensional arrangement of mid-late c20th bungalows. Consider review of this matter. Consider replacement image.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
Heritage Assets Report	Table 2: the following entries do not match the NPPG definition of what can be considered a designated heritage asset: - 9 – The estate setting of Hoveton Hall is only an ungraded registered park and garden. It should therefore appear in a separate list of existing undesignated heritage assets. 10 - Pedunculate oak tree. 15 – Site of roman villa. Unclear where this is as the link does not open but it's definitely not a scheduled monument. Unnumbered entry – Site of Medieval Hall at Home Farm. This is merely a record on the Norfolk Historic Environment Record rather than a scheduled monument. The record number is also 8298 rather than 9298 as stated. 22 & 23 - both are Norfolk Historic Environment records rather than scheduled monuments. 26-28 – These are all locally listed buildings and are therefore undesignated heritage assets. They should therefore be part of a separate table in order to avoid confusion. 29 & 30 – These are both Historic Environment Records (HERs) rather than scheduled monuments. In addition: 6-8 - Hoveton Hall and its ancillary outbuildings have been included in Table 2 but they lie outside the parish of Hoveton and therefore the Neighbourhood Plan Area. 17, 19 and 24 - are all grade II* listed buildings rather than grade II. The same applies to 7 if that is being considered part of the NP area. Whilst Wroxham Signal Box is a grade II listed building, it is not a scheduled monument as well. The additional reference to the HER record is therefore potentially confusing.	Amend Table 2 accordingly.

Policy, Paragraphs (page/s)	Comments	Suggested amendments
Hoveton's Key Views	No clear methodology has been applied to identify the proposed key views. Table 1 lists those views nominated by the local community, where confirmation of selection or an explanation as to why the proposed view has not been chosen. The descriptions quote NPPF references to the protection of heritage assets.	A landscape character assessment of the parish should be used to identify any locally special landscape areas.
Hoveton's Local Green Space Assessment	See comments to Policy HNP18. In particular, LGS4, 9 and 10 (as entire sites) do not appear to meet the LGS criteria of the NPPF.	Consider reviewing LGS4, 9 and 10 as it appears that the NPPF criteria have not been met as explained at Policy HNP18.

Appendix G: Full text of the response from the Broads Authority to the consultation

Sent: 30 April 2026 14:09
To: 'clerk@hoveton-cc.gov.uk' <clerk@hoveton-cc.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Hoveton Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

Many thanks for consulting us.

Please find our comments below.

Neighbourhood Plan

- Para 14 – Neighbourhood Plans need to reflect the policies in the NPPF as well.
- Para 15 – The Local Plan for the Broads is at examination.
- Para 18 – I wouldn't say the other document are supplementary documents – sounds a lot like Supplementary Planning Documents and could cause confusion. Maybe call them supporting documents.
- Para 44 – First part – all houses are built for those who live in them. Perhaps in relation to self/custom build you might want to say something like 'built with involvement of those who will live in them'.
- Para 48, p21: says that the proposed housing sites are shown in Figure 3 but I think its figure 4.
- Policy HNP1 part a – suggest the second part is supporting text rather than policy text.
- It is confusing to have the same title repeated for a policy that spills over two pages. The policies are highlighted blue and that shows they are a policy.
- Para 49 – the brownfield land off Station Road is in the adopted Local Plan and is policy HOV3. It is in the emerging Local Plan for the Broads and that reference is PUBHOV3.
- Page 23, Policy HNP4: I would suggest that the 'where practicable' in para 51 and policy HNP4 b and d in relation to the retention of heritage assets on the King's Head site should be removed. The forthcoming Local Plan takes a stronger stance on the re-use of existing buildings, rather than demolition and there are also tests in the existing and forthcoming Local Plan policy DM11 (PUBDM13) Heritage Assets, which would need to be met, as well as requirements in the NPPF. I would suggest that part b of the policy should read: 'Retain and sensitively reuse the existing cottages

and stable buildings adjacent to the King's Head pub'. If it is felt necessary, it could go on to state, 'Development resulting in harm to or loss of these buildings would only be acceptable where it meets the tests set out in the Broads Local Plan Policy PUBDM13'.

- Policy HNP4, g – perhaps say that proposals meet national flood risk policy requirements as well as resilience.
- Policy HNP4 – for your information, we intend to reconsider the area to which PUBHOV3 applies. It may be that we accept that the Former Hotel Cottage stays as a car park. There is a planning application in with us now. It seems the car park is well-designed and well-used. This is all to be confirmed and you will of course be consulted on any modifications to the Local Plan. But I just wanted to mention this potential change.
- Policy HNP4 part b – I would suggest that reference to the Local Plan for the Broads is made at the end of this in some way. Our criterion on this is a bit stronger and in the emerging Local Plan, we introduce stronger stance on re-use and on demolition. As written, without some reference to that, this criterion may conflict with the Local Plan for the Broads.
- Page 23, para 51: You should state that the Kings Head cottages and stables are considered Non-designated Heritage Assets in the Neighbourhood Plan and cross-reference to policy HNP24, the objectives of which would also need to be met.
- Policy HNP5 e – did you want to say 'if required' after the reference to BNG? I am aware that, for example, the size of schemes to which BNG applies is going to change.
- Policy HN6: Design g) In parts of Hoveton the number of signs leads to visual clutter and reduces the effectiveness of the signs. Would it therefore be worth adding something to state that existing signage should be rationalised and consolidated to reduce visual clutter?
- Policy HNP7 – I am not sure what this means in practice: 'Where both brownfield and greenfield development options are available and deliverable, preference will be given to proposals that make effective use of brownfield land'. The two allocations are on greenfield land as I understand it. And the general thrust is perhaps along the lines of the more houses the better. I am not sure what this part really means and what a Development Management Officer will do with it.
- Policy HNP8 – you should refer to the retail policies of the NNDC and BA Local Plan and also policy HOV5 and PUBHOV5 and any NNDC equivalent.
- Para 106 says 'Applicants must calculate a nutrient budget for their development and secure appropriate mitigation, whether through on-site measures such as 41 42 wetlands, tree planting or nutrient-removal SuDS, off-site land-use changes, or through participation in the Broads Authority's strategic mitigation programme'. The Broads Authority does not have such a programme. What are you referring to here?
- Page 46-48: The Hoveton Hall estate is mentioned several times, but would it also be worth mentioning the Hoveton House estate (which includes Bewilderwood but lots of other land), another large estate in the Hoveton NP area?
- Policy HNP14, third part – 'and sensitively designed' part does not read well. Maybe it is a new sentence that requires such infrastructure to be sensitively designed.

- Para 123 says ‘the site’ – is it linked to BeWILDerwood? Should 123 form part of 124 for continuity?
- Did you want to mention that there is a detailed policy relating to BeWILDerwood in the Local Plan for the Broads?
- Natural Environment section – this does not mention the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) for Norfolk that has been in place for some time now. This is a key bit of data and a very important strategy that needs to be included in this section. How does Figure 16 relate to the LNRS?
- The Natural Environment Section is almost entirely about the terrestrial habitat but there is almost nothing about the rivers and lakes.
- Para 132 – what does ‘near’ mean?
- Page 52, Figure 17 – appears to show part of the Station Road brownfield site covered by policy HNP4 as Local Green Space (site 1). Perhaps the boundary needs to be more closely drawn to the riverside walk / Riverside Park area?
- HNP16 and 17 need to refer to the LNRS.
- Policy HNP17 – what are Hoveton’s Ecological Networks? Are these mapped? Figure 16 is called green corridors. Or are A and C of the policy the ecological networks?
- Page 56, Policy HNP18: should this include some words to state that proposals to enhance these spaces would be welcomed and supported? There are some spaces that would benefit from enhancement.
- Page 60, Policy HNP19c: add ‘harm the character of Broads landscape **or waterscape’**
- Policy HNP20 – this goes straight into lighting design rather than seeking justification for lighting in the first place.
- Page 59-60, Would views up and down the river from Wroxham Bridge not be considered important viewpoints? Or views from the river?
- Para 148 – the developments don’t have to pay the tariff; they might want to address the mitigation in another way. The issue is that they need to mitigate for their impact and the tariff is likely to be easiest and potentially most cost-effective way of doing it.
- Paras 147 to 152 seem to fit with policy HNP16 part f.
- The 3 rivers way is a prominently signed cycling route, but it doesn’t seem to get mentioned, should it be?
- Policy HNP22 part d and HNP23– need to refer to HRA when promoting access to potentially protected sites. You kind of refer to it in part d of HNP23, but you might want to talk about it in supporting text and in HNP22 and refer to HRA?
- Policy HNP26 f – this is not really related to the other bullets. The other bullets refer to existing upper floors whereas f relates to new – suggest this becomes its own section.

- Is there a community action relating to working with those buildings with upper floors about the potential for better use of the upper floors?
- Policy HNP27 c – this is written as an 'or' policy. Isn't the ideal outcome that the public realm and signage and walking and cycling connections are all improved?
- Policy HNP28 includes flood risk, but there is policy HNP21. Why are both needed? Could they be combined to have one policy on flood risk?
- Page 70 – I would suggest that they check the listed buildings as it is currently incorrect. They have shown the Old Vicarage as being grade II listed but it is not listed at all but they have not shown Leisure Hour or Church Farmhouse which are listed. I would suggest they refer to Historic England's website 'Search the List' and do a map search here.
- Page 70, figure 23 is supposed to shown designated heritage assets, but it does not show Wroxham Bridge which is a scheduled ancient monument and is therefore a designated heritage asset.
- Page 71-72, Non Designated Heritage Assets: It would be useful if more detailed mapping can be provided for buildings such as no. 21 Wet Sheds so we can be certain which sheds you are referring to (it is noted that they are shown in more detail in the NDHA assessment).
- Para 201 – HNP18 is on Local Green Spaces.
- Policy HNP28 is mostly about flood risk. It is only part d that is about other issues.

Evidence

- Introduction, end of para 2 says 'Although a neighbourhood plan has little role to play in the protection of national landscape designations, it is still worth including such evidence as it is useful context that helps people to gain a greater understanding of their area'. Part of the Neighbourhood Area is a protected landscape, so this sentence is confusing..
- Page 16 – above map 4 – and throughout - the Local Plan for North Norfolk has been adopted now.
- Page 18 has a random snippet 'In the Broads Local Plan'
- Page 19 says 'The draft Local Plan' – which Local Plan is that?
- Page 23 and 24 – you might want to focus more on 2011 Census for travel to work. I know that is what the county councils do.
- There is no reference to the LNRS

SEA and HRA Screening

- Page 32, Figure 17, g – don't forget to mention that the Broads is a protected landscape wit the status equivalent to a National Park.

- HRA screening – do you need to mention Nutrient Neutrality and RAMS?
- Policy HNP22 part d and HNP23– need to refer to HRA when promoting access to potentially protected sites. You kind of refer to it in part d of HNP23, but you might want to talk about it in supporting text and in HNP22 and refer to HRA? Might need mentioning in the HRA screening.

Design Guide

- It is not considered that 3.1 Building line, Setback and Layout adequately covers those properties that are positioned adjacent to the water (quite a number of properties in Hoveton). They should either be amended to cover these sites or the BA Design Guide and Code should be referred to for properties in the BA area.
- Page 37, 3.3 Landscaping: This doesn't adequately cover the riverside landscape.
- Page 43, Figure 39 – I would suggest that this is not the best example of a waterside development. I have attached a photo of a couple of better schemes (not necessarily the best photos) which are more akin to the sort of development we would wish to encourage.