

North Norfolk Local Plan Examination: Resumed Hearings

Agenda for Tuesday 8 April at 10 am

1. Introduction to the resumed hearings from the Inspector
2. Update statement from the Council
3. **Proposed Additional Housing Site at end of Mundesley Road, North Walsham**
 - a) Further development of North Walsham in principle & impact if any on viability & deliverability of existing allocations in the town
 - b) Selection of site for allocation.
 - c) Scheme concept. Highway access & relationship to town centre.
 - d) Ownership, site promotion & current planning application
 - e) Are the components of the proposal (number of dwellings, units of elderly care accommodation, amount of public open space etc) realistic and justified?
 - f) Have the impacts and effects of the development been properly taken into account, both in isolation and in combination with existing allocations in the town?
 - g) Impact on B1150 & its timing (nb Highway improvements at Coltishall & Horstead are already agreed)
 - h) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
 - i) How do the site-specific requirements for development of the site relate to those of the existing allocations in the town?
 - j) Given the components of the proposal and the site requirements, would development of the site be viable?
 - k) Is the site deliverable within the plan period and is the expected timescale for the development of the site set out in the Council's latest housing trajectory realistic?

Not before 2.30pm

4. **Proposed Additional Housing Sites at Hoveton: Land East of Tunstead Road (Extended Site) and Land at Stalham Road (to be discussed together)**
 - a) Selection of site for allocation.
 - b) Scheme concepts. How do the sites relate to each other? Should they be allocated & planned together with one policy?
 - c) Ownership, site promotion & current planning status

- d) Are the components of the two proposals (number of dwellings, units of elderly care accommodation, amount of public open space etc) realistic and justified?
- e) Have the impacts and effects of the developments been properly taken into account?
- f) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the two sites justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
- g) Given the components of the two proposals and the site requirements, would development of the two sites be viable?
- h) Are the sites deliverable within the plan period and is the expected timescale for the development of the sites set out in the Council's latest housing trajectory realistic?

North Norfolk Local Plan Examination: Resumed Hearings

Agenda for Wednesday 9 April at 9.30am

1. Proposed Additional Housing Site at Runton Road/Clifton Park, Cromer

- a) Selection of site for allocation.
- b) Scheme concept.
- c) Ownership, site promotion & current planning status
- d) Are the components of the proposal (number of dwellings, amount of public open space etc) realistic and justified?
- e) Have the impacts and effects of the development been properly taken into account? Those raised include landscape impact, coalescence of settlements, wildlife/biodiversity & proximity of Cromer WWTW.
- f) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
- g) Given the components of the proposal and the site requirements, would development of the site be viable?
- h) Is the site deliverable within the plan period and is the expected timescale for the development of the site set out in the Council's latest housing trajectory realistic?

2. Proposed Extended Housing Site West of Pine Tree Farm, Cromer

- a) Selection of site for allocation.
- b) Scheme concept.
- c) Ownership, site promotion & current planning status
- d) Are the components of the proposal (number of dwellings, units of elderly care accommodation, amount of public open space etc) realistic and justified?
- e) Have the impacts and effects of the development been properly taken into account? Impact on Grade II Pine Tree Farmhouse.
- f) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
- g) Pedestrian & cycle access
- h) Given the components of the proposal and the site requirements, would development of the site be viable?

- i) Is the site deliverable within the plan period and is the expected timescale for the development of the site set out in the Council's latest housing trajectory realistic?
- j) Should adjacent land next to Roughton Road be included?

3. Proposed Extended Housing Site at Astley School, Briston

- a) Selection of site for allocation.
- b) Scheme concept.
- c) Ownership, site promotion & current planning status
- d) Are the components of the proposal (number of dwellings, amount of public open space etc) realistic and justified?
- e) Have the impacts and effects of the development been properly taken into account?
- f) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
- g) Given the components of the proposal and the site requirements, would development of the site be viable?
- h) Is the site deliverable within the plan period and is the expected timescale for the development of the site set out in the Council's latest housing trajectory realistic?

Not before 1.00 pm

4. Proposed Extended Housing Site South of School Road, Ludham

- a) Selection of site for allocation.
- b) Scheme concept.
- c) Ownership, site promotion & current planning status
- d) Are the components of the proposal (number of dwellings, amount of public open space etc) realistic and justified?
- e) Have the impacts and effects of the development been properly taken into account? Foul water drainage.
- f) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
- g) Given the components of the proposal and the site requirements, would development of the site be viable?

- h) Is the site deliverable within the plan period and is the expected timescale for the development of the site set out in the Council's latest housing trajectory realistic?

5. Proposed Additional Housing Sites at Stalham: Land at Brumstead Road & adjacent to Ingham Road (Extended Site) (to be discussed together)

- a) Selection of sites for allocation.
- b) Scheme concepts.
- c) Ownership, site promotion & current planning status
- d) Are the components of the two proposals (number of dwellings, amount of public open space etc) realistic and justified?
- e) Have the impacts and effects of the developments been properly taken into account?
- f) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the two sites justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
- g) Given the components of the two proposals and the site requirements, would development of the two sites be viable?
- h) Are the sites deliverable within the plan period and is the expected timescale for the development of the sites set out in the Council's latest housing trajectory realistic?

6. Proposed Additional Housing Site West of Langham Road, Blakeney

- a) Selection of site for allocation.
- b) Scheme concept.
- c) Ownership, site promotion & current planning status
- d) Are the components of the proposal (number of dwellings, amount of public open space etc) realistic and justified?
- e) Have the impacts and effects of the development been properly taken into account? Landscape impacts.
- f) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
- g) Given the components of the proposal and the site requirements, would development of the site be viable?
- h) Is the site deliverable within the plan period and is the expected timescale for the development of the site set out in the Council's latest housing trajectory realistic?
- i) Should occupancy be limited to principle dwellings only?

7. Proposed Extended Housing Site at Cromer Road & Church Lane, Mundesley

- a) Selection of site for allocation.
- b) Scheme concept.
- c) Ownership, site promotion & current planning status
- d) Are the components of the proposal (number of dwellings, amount of public open space etc) realistic and justified?
- e) Have the impacts and effects of the development been properly taken into account?
- f) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
- g) Given the components of the proposal and the site requirements, would development of the site be viable?
- h) Is the site deliverable within the plan period and is the expected timescale for the development of the site set out in the Council's latest housing trajectory realistic?

North Norfolk Local Plan Examination: Resumed Hearings

Agenda for Thursday 10 April at 9.30 am

Small Growth Villages

Issue: Whether the additional small growth villages proposed and their boundaries are justified and would be effective; also whether the proposed increase in growth of the small growth villages from 6% to 9% over the plan period is justified and would be effective.

1. Does the evidence justify the inclusion of the additional villages in the Small Growth Village category, and should any others be included?
2. Are there any village specific issues, eg scale or location of growth or detailed definition of settlement boundaries:
 - a) Beeston Regis
 - b) Erpingham
 - c) Felmingham
 - d) Great Ryburgh
 - e) Itteringham
 - f) Langham
 - g) Neatishead
 - h) Northrepps
 - i) Stibbard
 - j) Tunstead
 - k) Worstead
3. Is the proposal to increase the growth in small growth villages from 6% to 9% justified and would be effective? Given the possible uncertainty, how reliable are the 894 dwellings planned to come forward under the revised policy?
4. Should the figure for Badersfield (Scottow) be discounted by 50% as suggested?

Not before 1.00 pm:

Miscellaneous Questions for the Resumed Hearings

Housing Trajectory

1. In the light of the up-to-date circumstances in the district and the site-by-site discussion of the additional housing sites, is the latest housing trajectory produced by the Council for the revised plan period 2024-40 justified by the evidence? How has the revised trajectory for both large and small sites been affected by the need to secure nutrient neutrality and is this realistic?

Overall Housing Provision

2. In the light of the latest position in the district and the site-by-site discussion of the additional housing sites, would the plan be effective in providing at least 8,900 dwellings¹ over the plan period 2024-40? If there is a shortfall, or a shortfall emerges in due course, how should this be addressed in the plan?

Five Year Housing Land Supply

3. Does the plan provide for a sufficient supply of deliverable housing sites against the five year housing land supply requirement for at least 3,144 dwellings² over the initial five-year period 2025-30? Has the need to secure nutrient neutrality been sufficiently taken into account? If there is a shortfall, how should this be addressed in the plan?

Habitats Regulation Assessment

4. Does the Habitats Regulations Assessment (including the August 2023 and October 2024 addendums) identify the likely significant effects of the plan on the various European nature conservation sites and carry out the necessary appropriate assessment? In relation to each impact pathway and each affected site, are suitable and effective mitigation measures identified and deliverable? Does English Nature agree with the HRA findings? (nb Issues relating to individual sites will be dealt with under those sites)

Closing Comments from the Council

Closing Comments from the Inspector

¹ The overall requirement over the plan period 2024-40. 16 years x 557 dpa. See post hearings letter paragraph 14

² Shortfall in 2024/25 from latest trajectory 557 - 348 = 209. 5 years x 557 = 2,785. Total requirement 2,994 plus 5% buffer = 3,144 dwellings (Housing Delivery Test result now adjusted so buffer 5%).