

Diss & District Neighbourhood Plan Issues & Options Consultation (1) Results Summary: Brome and Oakley



Introduction

This is a two page summary which can be read alongside the longer more detailed report, available on the DDNP website parish page for Brome & Oakley, www.ddnp.info/brome-and-oakley. It provides an overview of results for the first of two Issues and Options Consultations, which ran across all parishes involved in the Neighbourhood Plan from mid-July to mid-August 2020. This consultation is one element of the evidence and assessment work which will help determine the final policies and site allocations. All of the evidence compiled to support the Neighbourhood Plan will be made publicly available on the website – www.ddnp.info

A total of 961 people took part in this first consultation across the DDNP area, with 43 taking part for Brome and Oakley.

Methodology

Respondents were asked to agree/disagree the extent to which the following list of local green spaces, important views and non-designated heritage assets were important to them. A benchmark of 80% agree/strongly agree has been applied to the data received. Those which didn't meet that 80% agreement benchmark are shown in italics. Suggestions for additional local green spaces and important views were also invited and are currently being considered for further consultation.

Local Green Space:

Of the nine green spaces put forward, two reached the 80% benchmark. Those that didn't reach the 80% benchmark are shown in italics:

BRO1: St Nicholas' Churchyard; BRO2: St Mary's Churchyard; *BRO6: Brome Avenue Permissive Path;*
BRO7: Brome Street Permissive Path; BRO8: Warren Hills Permissive Path; BRO9: Pound Plantation; BRO10:
Brome Field; BRO13: Woodland – The Grove; BRO16: Lower Oakley Field Margin

Important Views: None of those put forward in the survey and listed below reached the 80% benchmark:

1: Oakley Church from Brickleside; 2: Oakley Church from Warren Hills; 3: Oakley Park House from Oakley Mill drive; 4: Waveney meadows from Red Bridge; 5: Waveney meadows east of Billingford Bridge; 6: Waveney meadows west of Billingford Bridge; 7: The Grove from Lower Oakley; 8: Dove meadows south from Red Bridge; 9: View down the rise from Church Lane

*Additional local green spaces and views were suggested and are currently being assessed for suitability, and the shortlist for Local Green Spaces will be consulted on again during November 2020.

Non-Designated Heritage Assets: None of those put forward in the survey and listed below reached the 80% benchmark:

BO1 Moated Site SW of St. Mary's Church; BO2 Medieval moat east of St. Mary's Church; BO3 Devil's Handbasin; BO4 Brome Hall (site only); BO5 Nick's Lane. Site of deserted medieval village; BO6 Farmstead; Church Farm (50% remaining); BO7 Milepost on the A140; BO8 Red Bridge (remnant); BO9 Roman Road (remnant); BO10 Billingford Bridge; BO11 Dove Barn; BO12 Oaklands Farmstead; BO13 Outfarm Low Barn; BO14 Capon's Farmhouse/Long Beren (part); BO15 Pecks Farm (Brome Farm) (part)

Housing Growth/*alternative sites: The Parish Council had recommended allocation of a site for possible future development at Brickle Meadow (currently agricultural land) in Upper Oakley subject to conditions being imposed on the total number of dwellings.

- 37% of respondents for Brome and Oakley supported this site being allocated for housing.
- 54% did not support this site.
- 10% of respondents had no opinion

** A number of other sites were suggested during the consultation and are currently being assessed. Those that are considered potentially suitable for housing development will be consulted on again within the community.*

Walking and Cycling

82% of respondents agreed/strongly agreed with the introduction of a cycle path from the new roundabout (northern one) on the A140 to the junction with western end of Rectory Road Brome where it meets the B1077, as being a priority for improving walking and cycling links from Brome and Oakley into Diss.

What policies did respondents agree should be included in the DDNP?

- Strong guidance on **Housing Mix** as part of any future development: **76% agree**
- Ensuring **density** of new developments reflects the character of the surrounding area: **89% agree**
- The cascade used by South Norfolk Council for **affordable housing** should include mid-Suffolk parishes: **69%**
- That larger developments should set aside some plots for **self-builders**: **57% agree**
- A requirement for development to reflect the **Design Codes** for the area to reflect local identity and styles: **77% agree** (Design Codes for the area can be viewed at www.ddnp.info/documents)
- Protecting **dark skies** by limiting light pollution in certain areas: **92% agree**
- A requirement of developers to **improve areas for wildlife**, including creating new areas: **94% agree**

Traffic:

- Should the proposed allocation north of the cemetery in Diss provide a new road linking Shelfanger Road with Heywood Road? **46% agree**
- A requirement that any major development likely to impact **congestion on A1066** should assess and address the impact? **85% agree**
- Any development should provide measures to better manage **traffic speeds** through the villages in the Neighbourhood Plan: **85% agree**
- Diss Town Centre: Should the Plan have policies to support retail, enhance the town centre and make good use of empty shops? **89% agree**
- Should the Neighbourhood plan support the installation of new **broadband infrastructure**? **91% agree.**

Thank you to everyone who helped to promote the survey in Brome and Oakley, and to those who took part. Your input is very much appreciated.

The DDNP Steering Group November 2020