

## MATTER 5: HOUSING ALLOCATION – HOVETON RESPONSE

I will briefly summarise our concerns made at the start of the Examination process, in EH011m.

Our major concern relates to the proposal for an enlarged site, HV01B, as now being promoted by FW Properties, in Main Modification 13.1/01.

However, some of our concerns also apply to HVo1A.

Agreed, we need houses in or near the village of Hoveton, with some of that being affordable housing and some as older persons housing with support.

However, a potential 20%+ population increase as a result of the larger HV01B site is unacceptable given our particularly poor infrastructure.

Not all shortcomings can be addressed though developer contributions.

We feel similar infrastructure constraints and Broads proximity ruled out our conjoined village, Wroxham, from having any housing allocation, with housing in Broadland DC more sensibly placed in better locations.

We seek recognition of Hoveton is a Broads village, experiencing heavy tourism in summer and also a regularly flooded village centre in winter.

We are certain that HVO1B in particular, and even HVO1A, without consultation, are unacceptable within our village.

We suggest modification HVO1B should be not taken any further forward, and that this wish would be confirmed by any public consultation locally, as I will explain later.

### **Rackheath development – impact on development in Hoveton**

We have raised concerns that the NNDC LP has not properly considered the GNLP's 4000 dwelling allocation, for nearby Rackheath. For many of our services locally, this development is already having an impact, as houses there are already now being occupied. This is impacting on our roads, and has meant our schools and our health centre are already now operating well over capacity, with any plans to improve them, many years away.

We are seeing that the delivery of infrastructure for the 'growth triangle' West of Norwich is not able to keep pace with the housing being built. Hoveton's schools, medical facilities and retail services are already having to support the growth in Rackheath, with this set to further impact over the next decade.

This means that LP delivery of **any** further housing in Hoveton should be delayed until well into the period of the upcoming North Norfolk local plan, and linked to following delivery of capacity building for both our junior and secondary schools, and also of our health centre.

### **Choice of site in draft LP**

Major infrastructure challenges face any development in Hoveton.

The associated economic and environmental impact of mitigating for those infrastructure challenges, are immense.

These challenges have been recognized in other Broads villages, but not in Hoveton. Within Hoveton, NNDC has then chosen a greenfield site, HVO1A, without fully reflecting on available brownfield sites during the allocation process that would allow for some growth in the centre of Hoveton.

For example, there was seemingly no recognition of the Broads LP allocation of the Greene King owned riverside/ waterside land proposed for development (the BA covers about 1/3 of Hoveton).

We also already have the Tilia site, also on the Tunstead Road (25 units), which has been stalled due to concerns, mainly linked to Sewage capacity and ability to tackle Nutrient Neutrality requirements.

### **Additional impact of larger site – HV01B**

The new and larger site being proposed under the major modification extends much further into **open countryside** (with a 65% size increase). HV01b is now adjoining onto site allocations ruled out by NNDC for being too remote and which will negatively impinge on the countryside.

A bigger site such as HV01B, as recently being launched as a LP modification 1 3.1/01, will increase biodiversity net loss and increase challenges to nearby parks and plantations. We have already shown that this aspect was not well addressed in the draft LP. Further HV01B environmental/ biodiversity impacts are as yet unknown.

We all agree that a further **sewage** pipeline is needed. Our key concern is that developer should not use the pipeline needed for more houses in bargaining for achieving a larger development. This seems to be a common theme with developers, and one that FH properties are seemingly not immune from, based on EDP articles.

As stated in our recent exchanges with the developer, capacity at Belaugh WWTP is now at the Technical Achievable Limit. Tanker lorries already transport untreated sewage to Whitlingham daily. Together with other Broads WWTPs along the Bure, the existing WWTP plant is unable to properly function in flood conditions.

Belaugh funding to address Nutrient Neutrality is not yet secured.

There is also currently no firm guarantee of increased capacity at Belaugh WWTP or any clear confirmation that what is proposed for Nutrient Neutrality treatment at WWTPs can be delivered soon.

**ALL** Sewage issues will have to be sorted before any development is agreed, and also point to a later timing for any HV01 development.

It also seems unlikely that necessary **road** improvements can be delivered, to adequately deal with the existing bottleneck over the narrow bridge.

We certainly need pre-agreement to fund the changes needed to the existing double mini roundabouts, as the A1151 is now at capacity, with about 4.5m vehicles per year, and the mini roundabouts are now causing unacceptable delays, for increased traffic being now generated locally.

There is also a need for a safe exit from the HV01 development onto the Tunstead Road, with a roundabout or similar, together with a pedestrian crossing on the Stalham Road.

NNDC have previously presented a strong case for no development being allowed without all these roundabouts being funded by the developer through s278, as for the refused Persimmon application .

### **Reaction to more housing/ larger site (HV01B)**

NNDC have taken forward representations made by the developer as a major modification, so far without any public consultation. Or even having broadcast what was to be proposed as a MM at the examination.

HPC held a briefing on the NNDC LP proposals last week. This was provided due to wanting to ensure our recent knowledge was now shared with residents. 120 persons++ attended, including DC councillors and a representative of FH properties. When asked, not one person was in favour of the extended site now being proposed as a MM. Everyone applauded and fully backed the HPC response. Comment/attendance lists are available.

We suggest it is important to resist any increase in site size, beyond that in HVO1 in the draft LP, albeit about which we/ residents have already raised concerns, in the original Jan 22 consultation. We feel NNDC must resist the push towards achieving greater numbers and that's why it is important that the policy for HV01 is retained as 'up to 120 dwellings'. This is of particular relevance with the developer pushing to extend the HV01 site now, and asking to remove the 'at least 150 units' limit, and likely to argue for more units/ less affordable housing later.

We know this only an outline layout from FW properties, but we also have concerns that the layout submitted by FW (p377 of the submissions at regulation 19 consultation stage) show houses/ gardens up to within about half a tree circumference of the Northern border, of an enlarged site. There is no longer a soft border to fields to the north of the site, or showing a genuine concern with preserving wildlife species.

This plan also shows 70 units of housing with care – another increase on 40 old persons originally proposed.

We also see that the main entrance is shown as a gap in the hedge – with no safe entry/ exit, such as a roundabout, being provided.

We feel that the Inspector is being put in an unfair position in being asked to consider allowing the MM as described in HV01B, - which will likely to result in adverse headlines & risk bringing the LP into disrepute.

We feel that our situation is similar to that of Heidi Bailey, a resident of Brooke, in South Norfolk, when FW properties was pushing for more development there. After FW having received 238 objections, she was quoted as saying to the EDP that: *'I believe that this would be a huge mistake for the village. There is no infrastructure to cope with the number of potential residents, and this will have an enormous detrimental effect on the original community. I believe this to be fuelled by greed and greed alone.'*