

## North Norfolk Local Plan Examination: Resumed Hearings

Tuesday 8 to Friday 11 April 2025

Following the initial examination hearings held during the period January to March 2024, the 'Post Hearings Letter' dated 24 May 2024<sup>1</sup> set out the main soundness issues raised by the plan which needed to be addressed before the examination could proceed. The Council has sought to address these issues and after the necessary consideration published a series of proposed changes to the plan for public consultation during the six-week period 6 November to 18 December 2024. A total of 492 representations were received from 325 individuals or organisations.

The Council has now considered these representations and, subject to a number of detailed amendments, confirmed in a letter dated 28 January 2025 their view that the various changes should be made to the plan to address the soundness issues. Since substantive representations have been received, resumed hearings will be required to cover the new matters raised in the Autumn 2024 consultation. ***Please note that matters covered during the initial hearings will not be revisited unless directly affected by the new proposals.***

At the outset of the resumed hearings, the Council will be invited to provide a general update for the Inspector and other participants to cover any significant changes in circumstances that have occurred since the close of the initial hearings. This should include the latest position with regard to the development of the major allocations at Fakenham and North Walsham and progress in addressing the challenges of nutrient neutrality in the district and how this might affect the timescale for the implementation of affected sites. A written statement made available a week in advance would be helpful.

All those who made relevant comments on the new proposals during the latest consultation period will be entitled to speak at the resumed hearings if they wish but there is no need to do so as the written representations already submitted will be fully taken into account. Duplication and repetition will not be permitted, so those wishing to make similar points should appoint a spokesperson or seek to input into the views of a representative body such as a town or parish council where these are appearing. ***Further statements are not invited in the lead up to the resumed hearings as participants can rely on their recent representations.***

The matters, issues and questions which are for consideration at the resumed hearings and will form the agenda to guide the discussions are attached together with a draft timetable. The latter may change and participants should therefore keep in touch with the programme officer. Those wishing to attend should register their interest with the programme officer by 5pm on Friday 28 February, stating which of the 11 sessions they wish to attend.

The resumed hearings will be held in the Committee Room, Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer NR27 9EN.

*David Reed*

INSPECTOR

15 February 2025

---

<sup>1</sup> Not released until 19 July 2024 due to the general election.

# Matters, Issues and Questions for Resumed Hearings

## Matter A: Additional Housing Sites

Issue: Whether the additional housing allocations now proposed are justified and consistent with national policy and whether the site-specific policies for the allocations would be effective.

Standard Questions for each additional housing site:

- a) Are there any current planning applications under consideration?
- b) Have the impacts and effects of development been properly taken into account?
- c) Are the components of the proposal (number of dwellings, units of elderly care accommodation, amount of public open space etc) in the first sentence of the policy for the site justified?
- d) What form would the public open space take?
- e) Having regard to these components, is the estimate of site capacity justified?
- f) What is the land ownership position and is the site currently being promoted by a developer?
- g) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
- h) Given the components of the proposal and the site requirements, would development of the site be viable?
- i) Overall, 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? Has the landowner/developer confirmed this?

### A.1 Cromer

A.1.1 Are the additional housing allocations for Cromer the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?

#### A.1.2 Land at Runton Road/Clifton Park (C10/1)

Standard Questions a) to i) plus:

Landscape – including coalescence of settlements

Wildlife/biodiversity

Proximity of Cromer WWTW

#### A.1.3 Land West of Pine Tree Farm (Extended Site) (C22/4)

The previous site was discussed during the initial hearings.

Standard Questions a) to i) plus:

Impact on Grade II listed Pine Tree Farmhouse

Addition of adjacent land?

## **A.2 North Walsham**

A.2.1 Is the additional housing allocation for North Walsham the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?

### **A.2.2 Land at End of Mundesley Road (NW16)**

Standard Questions a) to i) plus:

Overall demand for new housing in the town & impact on viability of existing allocations

Highway access & relationship to town centre

Infrastructure requirements in isolation & in combination with existing allocations

Impact on B1150 (nb Highway improvements at Coltishall & Horstead are already agreed)

## **A.3 Hoveton**

A.3.1 Are the additional housing allocations for Hoveton the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?

### **A.3.2 Land East of Tunstead Road (Extended Site) (HV01/C) together with Land at Stalham Road (HV06/A)**

These sites are adjacent to each other. The former site and its proposed extension was discussed during the initial hearings but there may be new points. Given their close connection the two sites should be discussed together.

Standard Questions a) to i)

## **A.4 Stalham**

A.4.1 Are the additional housing allocations for Stalham the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?

### **A.4.2 Land at Brumstead Road (ST04/A)**

Standard Questions a) to i)

### **A.4.3 Land adjacent Ingham Road (Extended Site) (ST19/B)**

The previous site was discussed during the initial hearings.

Standard Questions a) to i)

## **A.5 Blakeney**

A.5.1 Is the additional housing allocation for Blakeney the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?

### **A.5.2 Land West of Langham Road (BLA01/B)**

Standard Questions a) to i)

Landscape

Principle dwellings only?

## **A.6 Briston**

A.6.1 Is the additional housing allocation for Briston and Melton Constable the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?

### **A.6.2 Land at Astley Primary School (Extended Site)**

The previous site was discussed during the initial hearings.  
Standard Questions a) to i)

## **A.7 Ludham**

A.7.1 Is the additional housing allocation for Ludham the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?

### **A.7.2 Land South of School Road (Extended Site) (LUD01/C)**

The previous site was discussed during the initial hearings.  
Standard Questions a) to i)  
Foul Water Drainage

## **A.8 Mundesley**

A.8.1 Is the additional housing allocation for Mundesley the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?

### **A.8.2 Land off Cromer Road & Church Lane (Extended Site) (MUN03/A)**

The previous site was discussed during the initial hearings.  
Standard Questions a) to i)

## **Matter B: 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.

B.1 Does the evidence justify the inclusion of the additional villages in the Small Growth Village category, and should any others be included?

B.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

B.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?

B.4 Should the figure for Badersfield (Scottow) be discounted by 50% as suggested?

## **Matter C: Miscellaneous Questions for the Resumed Hearings**

### Housing Trajectory

C.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<sup>2</sup> 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

C.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 dwellings<sup>3</sup> 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

C.3 Does the plan provide for a sufficient supply of deliverable housing sites against the housing requirement for at least 3,342 dwellings, plus any shortfall from 2024/25<sup>4</sup>, 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

C.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)

---

<sup>2</sup> Not yet available

<sup>3</sup> The overall requirement over the plan period 2024-40 - see post hearings letter paragraph 14

<sup>4</sup> The initial five-year requirement for the period 2025-30 – see letter dated 10 January 2025

# **Draft Timetable for the Resumed Hearings V4 5 March**

## **Tuesday 8 April 10am**

Introduction from Inspector & Council Statement

Matter A: Additional Housing Sites

### **Land at end of Mundesley Road, North Walsham (Session 1)**

Attendees:

Jerome Mayhew MP

Glavenhill/Lanpro Planning

Paul Heinrich

North Walsham Town Council

B1150 special interest group

Cllr Kate Leith

John Ford

Angela Powles

North Walsham West Consortium/Bidwells LLP

Richborough Estates/Boyer Planning

Gladman Planning

Not before 2.30pm:

### **Land East of Tunstead Road and at Stalham Road, Hoveton (Session 2)**

Attendees:

Hoveton Parish Council

FW Properties/Bidwells LLP

## **Wednesday 9 April 9.30 am**

Matter A: Additional Housing Sites continued

### **Land at Runton Road/Clifton Park, Cromer (Session 4)**

Attendees:

David Dewbery

Jill Boyle

Pigeon Investment

### **Land West of Pine Tree Farm, Cromer (Session 5)**

Attendees:

Innova/Corylus Planning

Lisa Rieffel

### **Land at Astley School, Briston (Session 7)**

Attendees:

Dr Whitehead obo Mike Frosdick

Not before 1.00pm:

**Land South of School Road, Ludham (Session 8)**

Attendees:

Ludham Says No

DL Ritchie/ARPlanning

**Land at Brumstead Road & adjacent to Ingham Road, Stalham (Session 3)**

Attendees:

Barratt David Wilson Homes/Bidwells LLP

J Simmons & B Wright/Ceres Property

**Land West of Langham Road, Blakeney (Session 6)**

Attendees:

Pigeon Investment

**Land off Cromer Road & Church Lane, Mundesley (Session 9)**

Attendees: None registered

**Thursday 10 April 9.30 am**

**Matter B: Small Growth Villages (Session 10)**

Attendees:

Tunstead Parish Council

Halsbury Homes/Pegasus Planning

Glavenhill/Lanpro Planning

White Lodge (Norwich)/Lawson Planning

Alan Smith

Catfield Parish Council

Sasha Walton

Not before 1.00pm:

**Matter C: Miscellaneous Questions (Session 11)**

Attendees:

Halsbury Homes/Pegasus Planning

North Walsham West Consortium/Bidwells LLP

Richborough/Boyer Planning

Larkfleet/Lanpro Planning

Cornerstone Planning

Closing Comments from Inspector

**Friday 11 April 9.30 am** Reserve session if needed

NNDC attend all sessions