

North Norfolk Local Plan Examination: Matter 8 Agenda

Thursday 25 January at 9.30 am

Matter 8: Employment Policies & Allocations

Issue: Whether the plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the overall provision of employment land, employment policies generally and whether the proposed new allocations are justified and effective.

Employment Land – Policy E1

1. Should the 6 ha Holt employment site be deleted from the plan on the grounds it is unavailable? If so, what are the implications of this for employment land provision? Is replacement land required, and if so, where?
2. Is the designation/allocation of 272.07 ha of land and allocation of 17.43 ha of new land as specified in Policy E1 (6 ha less if the Holt site is removed) justified and sufficient to meet identified employment needs in the district over the plan period 2016-36, including any necessary flexibility?
3. What would be the implications if the plan period were extended to 2040? In that scenario, should any further employment land be allocated?
4. Would the distribution of existing and allocated land across the district meet the needs of the various different settlements and sub areas:
Eastern Area
Western Area
Central Area

Employment Allocations

5. Are the employment allocations in the plan the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of the varying needs across the district, site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?
6. Land East of Bradfield Road, North Walsham (2.4 ha): Are the proposed access arrangements justified and would they be effective? Would a new railway bridge be required, and would this be deliverable? If not, is this site well located in relation to the highway network?
7. 7 ha of the mixed-use allocation West of North Walsham: For effectiveness, should the 7 ha proposed for employment use be allocated as such? Is it the land shown as employment in the September 2023 development brief? Is its development phased with, or linked to the housing in any way? What is the land ownership position north of Cromer Road? Would the land north of the railway require a new railway bridge, and if so would this be deliverable? If not, is it well related to the town?
8. What is the rationale for 1 ha of employment land within the Stalham allocation North of Yarmouth Road & East of Broadbeach Gardens? Which part of the site is envisaged for such use?

9. 28.8 ha allocation at Tattersett Business Park: Are the restricted range of uses proposed for the site, and the requirement to demolish an equivalent amount of existing floorspace, justified?

Employment Policies E2-E9

10. Are Policies E2 – E9 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Are any main modifications necessary, and if so what should these be?
11. In Policy E2 is clause (1) to protect Employment Areas, Enterprise Zones, Employment Allocations and Mixed Use Allocations for employment use justified, consistent with national policy and would it be effective?
12. Are the criteria for new employment development in Policy E2 clause (2) justified and would they be effective?
13. Is Policy E2 clause (3) for employment generating uses on Former Airbases and in the Airbase Technical Areas justified and is the restriction on new floorspace justified? Should there be some flexibility to capitalise further on these sites?
14. In Policy E4 are the local impact thresholds justified?
15. Is Policy E6 too restrictive, unnecessarily constraining sustainable rural tourism?