

NORTH NORFOLK LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION - MATTER 5: PLACES & HOUSING SITES Hearing Statement by Define on behalf of Trinity College Cambridge

5.3 FAKENHAM

5.3.3 Land North of Rudham Stile Lane (FO1/B)

Question a: Has the site been allocated previously or is it a new allocation?

Site FO1/B forms the western extent of Land North of Rudham Stile Lane that was originally allocated for mixed use development (Policy FO1) within the adopted Site Allocations DPD (February 2011).

As explained within representations to the emerging North Norfolk Local Plan (NNLP), Trinity College Cambridge (TCC) owns circa 17.7ha (two thirds or 67%) of the overall site area of allocation FO1/B, comprising the eastern extent of the allocation and the majority of land that lies alongside the A148. The remainder of land within allocation FO1/B comprises Fakenham Sports & Fitness Centre, Fakenham Rugby Union Football Club and a single agricultural field that separates these two facilities, all of which are owned by other parties.

Question b: Does the site have planning permission and/or are there current applications under consideration?

Site FO1/B does not have planning permission and no application has been submitted to date. It is anticipated that an outline planning application would be submitted in relation to land owned by TCC in the near future post adoption of the LP.

Land to the east of FO1/B forming the remainder of previous allocation Policy FO1 noted above has the benefit of outline planning permission (NNDC Ref: PO/17/O680). An application for the discharge of pre-reserved matters conditions is currently being considered by the LPA (NNDC Ref: CD/23/2197). This will be followed by reserved matters submission for the first phase of development, which will secure the primary highway infrastructure to enable reserved matters to be submitted for both residential and employment development phases.

The above outline planning permission includes the development of a road to enable future vehicular access to allocation FO1/B that connects to the new roundabout to be constructed along the A148. Sensitivity testing carried out as part of the Transport Assessment to support the outline application for development to the east considered the impact of an additional 500 dwellings coming forward on Site FO1/B

Question c: Are any modifications suggested to the policy or text, or the site boundaries?

The proposed modifications to the policy text set out in Appendix K: Schedule 4 – Schedule of Proposed Additional Minor Modifications the Core Submission Documents reflects the representations submitted on behalf of TCC and aim to allow for TCC's landholding to come forward independently of the remaining land within FO1/B, given this is not within TCC's control.

Question d: Have the impacts and effects of development been properly taken into account?

Various site assessments were undertaken to support the original allocation of the site (FO1) and summarised in the Development Brief (as approved June 2014) including topography, archaeology and cultural heritage, landscape and ecology, landscape character, visual appraisal, visual, movement, utilities, and facilities.

Whilst that document is now dated and further detailed assessments will be required to support the masterplanning of the site, the detailed site surveys and assessments that have been carried out in relation to land to the east have not indicated any more significant constraints to development. Indeed, that outline planning application and associated highways and drainage strategies were prepared on the assumption that development of site FO1/B would be forthcoming in future.

It should be noted that Nutrient neutrality measures will need to be implemented, but again based on the detailed discussions that have taken place in relation to the mixed use development of land to the east of the site that benefits from outline planning permission, this is not considered to be an obstruction to development.

Question e: 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?

A site capacity assessment has been carried out on a proportionate basis. Based upon TCC's land interest, it is estimated that circa 400 dwellings plus a proportion of elderly person units (up to 100 units) can be provided, with associated infrastructure. Should the remaining land come forward for development, however, the overall site could accommodate the scale of development stated in the Policy FO1/B (as Proposed Modification) namely 560 dwellings plus 100 units of elderly persons' accommodation.

Question f: What form would the public open space take?

Whilst no masterplan has been prepared to date for the land within TCC's control, it is anticipated that public open spaces would reflect the approach to development to the east, comprising formal and informal amenity areas, incorporating native landscape, community garden landscape, play areas and allotments (as appropriate), as well as sustainable drainage features.

No outdoor sports provision is proposed, assuming the retention of existing sports facilities within the wider site allocation.

Question g: Having regard to these components, is the estimate of site capacity justified?

Given the responses to Questions d and e, it is considered that the estimated site capacity is justified, subject to a proportionate approach being taken should the leisure and recreation uses be retained on site along with the intervening land as described in response to Question a.

Question h: What is the land ownership position and is the site currently being promoted by a developer?

The land as shown on the Landownership Plan (ref: DE_003_FO1-B) is owned by TCC and has been consistently promoted for development, which is intended to be delivered by a third party developer.

Question i: Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?

We consider additional clarity on the definition of "elderly persons' accommodation" and "specialist elderly persons accommodation" (as referenced under Policy FO1/B), which is to be considered under Matter 3 at the Examination, will be beneficial in offering greater certainty to the overall strategy and delivery across sites in that regard.

Spatially, however, we consider the site-specific requirements are justified, subject to the proposed modifications to the policy text set out in Appendix K: Schedule 4 – Schedule of Proposed Additional Minor Modifications the Core Submission Documents.

Question j: Given the components of the proposal and the site requirements, would development of the site be viable?

Based upon the capacity and site assessments carried out to date, development of the site is considered viable

Question k: 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 updated housing trajectory realistic? Has the landowner / developer confirmed this?

The revised trajectory proposes initial delivery of housing development within the site from 2032/33 (totalling 10 dwellings), with delivery by 2039/40. Given the established approach to associated infrastructure delivery on land to the east of the site, this timescale is considered realistic and has been confirmed by TCC as landowner.

Define Planning & Design Ltd
3rd January 2024