

## **Brennan, Charlotte**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 18 September 2018 07:08  
**To:** Mann, James  
**Cc:** Programme Officer; Susan Warren; Bambridge, Gordon  
**Subject:** Fw: Local Plan Queries

18 September 2018

Dear Mr Mann,

I do not appear to have had a reply to my e-mail to you of 13 August, reproduced below.

The opportunity of meeting on 3 September has clearly passed. I will be attending the Local Plan Hearing this morning. I trust you will be able to answer the queries in my e-mail during the session on Matter 4. Hockering PC really does need to understand exactly what the effect of the Local Plan will be upon future house-building in the village, and needs to be convinced that there has been a transparent, consistent and legal process involved in establishing that plan.

At present, we do not have that conviction.

I hope to see you at the meeting this morning.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Hawker  
Hockering Parish Council

**From:**  
**Sent:** Friday, August 31, 2018 1:19 PM  
**To:** [James Mann](#)  
**Cc:** [Jon Berry](#) ; [Gordon Bambridge](#) ; [Susan Warren](#) ; [Programme Officer](#)  
**Subject:** Local Plan Queries

My apologies – due to a quirk of Microsoft Outlook, an earlier version of this e-mail was sent to other recipients. I have requested them to delete that e-mail. Hopefully this will arrive at its intended recipients.

31 August 2018

F.A.O. Mr James Mann, Senior Planning Policy Officer, Breckland Council

Dear Mr Mann,

### **Local Plan**

Thank you for your e-mail of 13 August, replying to mine of 23 July to Charlotte Brennan.

Response to my question 1) c: You have not satisfactorily answered this major query.

Under 1) c(i) You have stated that the 68 was an error: 88 is the number which is intended to be in the local plan.

Under 1) c (ii) You seem to be saying that the calculation in the latest iteration of the local plan, to which I refer in 1b, is completely flawed, as, despite all the 'lot of work' you say has been done to establish it, a 'large amount of planning permissions' have been granted in Hockering, as a result of the 'lack of a 5-year housing land supply'. Was the assessment of this 5-year housing supply not part of the 'lot of work' carried out earlier? Updated Policy HOU2, which you mention, quotes a general increase in housing for service centres as 10%; this is not specific to Hockering. So why has the 10% figure been ignored in calculating allocations for Hockering?

This is entirely at odds with Ms Brennan's statement in her e-mail to me of 26 July, where she states, in point 4.: '...the map . . . includes the proposed site allocation, which, *along with the existing commitments and completions since the start of the Plan Period* (my emphasis), would deliver the proposed 10% growth.' Clearly, as I have explained above, Hockering has got many more than the proposed 10% already.

If this error was known, why has this not been noted, and the calculation reworked in the latest local plan document? It makes no sense. I understand how the previous figure of 25 was calculated. You have not explained how the 88 has been arrived at. Please do so.

You state that granting of planning permissions in Hockering is 'ongoing, alongside the local plan'. Then what is the point of the local plan? If, at any point between now and 2036, officers or councillors consider that a 5-year housing land supply is unavailable, will the local plan be set aside, and planning permission granted?

Query number 4). I confirm that I have received a telephone response from Jon Berry regarding my query no 4), in which he admitted that the access arrangements in the outline application 3PL/2017/1534/O were NOT the only issue to be determined; the number of houses was also an issue, and therefore my request for a reduction in number of houses could have been considered by councillors. Mr Berry accepted that this was an error.

I am afraid that I do not consider that my other question, 3), has been answered adequately:

How can I be assured that the inspector has understood my queries and reservations regarding:

- a) the classification of Hockering as service centre,
- b) the number of houses Hockering is allocated
- c) the relevance of a settlement boundary
- d) whether 'lack of 5-year housing land supply' will always trump the local plan. If so, how is that lack to be calculated?

All I have at present is Ms Brennan's assurance that the inspector has indeed understood and will address these queries. If he has, I do not see why, after so many weeks have passed, and when he is holding further sessions, he has not been able to give an indication of his opinion on these matters. At the hearing of 7 June, I was given to understand that the inspector had been promised a resolution to the query regarding the mismatch of numbers of houses, by the end of June. If he had received the same information as I had received at that time, I do not understand how he could have come to any conclusion other than mine, i.e. that the query had not been satisfactorily answered, and that the mismatch needs to be addressed by a change to the plan wording and calculations.

Again, I ask what facility there is for the inspector to indicate his understanding of the situation ?

I am due to attend the planning committee meeting on Monday 3 September, and if there is an opportunity for us to meet and discuss these topics after that meeting, I would welcome that.

I look forward to your response.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Hawker  
Hockering Parish Councillor

**From:** [Mann, James](#)  
**Sent:** Monday, August 13, 2018 2:01 PM  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Queries

Dear Mr Hawker,

I have provided a response to your question C i and ii. I believe that the other questions had been answered and that the Inspector will make a decision through his final report on the Local Plan.

**Response to point C i)**

Through the Regulation 19 Pre-submission Publication an error was made within the text, Policy HOU 02 as set out within the plan set out that 88 dwellings would come forward and this should have been reflected in the introductory text to Hockering. This figure has been updated through the Council's Main Modification table (LP/S/24BB – modification reference MA/H/HOC/A) to reflect completions and commitments to March 2018.

**Response to point C ii)**

The methodology sets out the proposed allocation as of February 2016. The idea being that in order to positively prepare to meet our Objectively Assessed Need (the overall number of houses that are to be delivered within Breckland) we needed certainty in order to begin work on the assessment of allocations. As you can appreciate, a lot of work has to go into site assessments, sustainability appraisals, historic characterisation studies, etc. The need set out at 25 (the 10% figure) was set out within the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries Consultation as the proposed allocation and then carried forward through the Pre-Submission Publication.

Hockering has seen a large amount of planning permissions and this is something that is ongoing, alongside the local plan. This is largely as a result of the lack of 5 year housing land supply. However, once the Local Plan is adopted the Council will be able to demonstrate a 5 Year Housing Land supply and development that is not in conformity to policies within the plan would not be expected to be permitted.

I hope that this goes some way in helping to alleviate your concerns regarding this. If you have any follow up questions I am happy to try my best to answer those.

Kind regards,

James

**James Mann** BA (Hons) DipUD MSc MRTPI | Senior Planning Policy Officer | **Breckland Council**  
Tel: 01362 656873 DDI: 01362 656290  
[www.breckland.gov.uk](http://www.breckland.gov.uk)



\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail are confidential, represent only the views of the sender expressed to the intended recipient and are not intended to impose any legal obligation upon Breckland Council.

If you are not the intended recipient, you are asked to notify the sender and delete the message as soon as possible.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.