

## North Norfolk Local Plan Examination Agenda for Matter 10

**Wednesday 6 March 2024 at 9.30 am**

### **Matter 10: Delivering Well Connected, Healthy Communities (HC policies)**

Issue: Whether the policies to deliver well connected, healthy communities are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

1. Does Policy HC1 need to be clarified for effectiveness? Is a reduction in the threshold for an HIA to 250 dwellings justified? Should there be a threshold for non-allocated sites to be justified? In (1), how do the two sentences relate together? In (2), how is 'major development' defined?
2. Should Policy HC2 refer to the definition of major development in the NPPF rather than developments of 11 or more dwellings/1000 sq m? Are the open space requirements in Appendix 2 and Table 3 justified? How would financial contributions to off-site open space be calculated?
3. Is all the land designated as open land areas and local green spaces on the policies map and thus within the scope of Policy HC2(5) justified?
4. What is the distinction between the two designations? How have they been selected? Which sites have been carried forward from previous plans and which are new?
5. Consideration of areas subject to objection. These include:  
Land at The Pastures, Blakeney  
Land at Hempstead Road & A148 Holt  
Land at Sheringham House  
Land off Warren Road, High Kelling  
Land at Mill Road, Wells .  
Are any other sites the subject of objection?
6. Is the wording of Policy HC2 sections 4 & 5 justified and effective?
7. Is the wording of Policy HC3 justified and effective? In Policy HC3(2b), should criteria (a) and (c) be combined for clarity and thus effectiveness? Should criterion (b) be strengthened to demonstrate alternative modes of operation are not viable? Is it justified for the footnote to require marketing to comply with best practice guidance that does not form part of the plan?
8. In Policy HC4(1a), is it justified to require compliance with infrastructure requirements set out in supplementary planning documents that do not form part of the plan? In 4b, is it justified to require the highest viable level of affordable housing? Should there be a reference to Policy HOU2 which sets out affordable housing requirements? Should 6 state proposals not accompanied by a viability assessment will be required to be policy compliant?
9. Does the Plan Wide Viability Assessment (Document I11) properly assess the impact of the policies of the plan on the economic viability of development so as to not

undermine the deliverability of the plan? (NPPF paragraph 34) Does it properly assess the costs of development including affordable housing, biodiversity net gain, energy efficient standards, accessible & adaptable homes, minimum space standards, electric vehicle charging and digital infrastructure?

10. Policies HC5 and HC6. Is the requirement for a Digital Infrastructure Connectivity Plan in paragraph 5.5.3 to assess compliance with these two policies justified for all proposals over 100 sq m?
11. Policy HC7 – is it justified for HC(7) (4) to require compliance with the North Norfolk Design Guide when this does not form part of the plan?
12. Is all the land safeguarded by Policy HC8 clearly shown on the policies map? Should land between Walsingham and Wells, and at Wells, as suggested by representations, be included?