

# Breckland Local Plan Examination

## **Matter 5:**

**Housing: the settlement hierarchy and spatial distribution of new housing (Policies GEN 03, GEN 05, HOU 02, HOU 03, HOU 04 and HOU 05)**

**Breckland District Council**

**Hearing Statement**

March 2018

## Issues

### **5.1: Is the proposed distribution of housing supported by the Sustainability Appraisal, and will it lead to the most sustainable pattern of housing growth?**

- 1.1. Policy HOU 02 'Level and Location of Growth' has been developed in conjunction with Policy GEN 03 'Settlement Hierarchy'. Policy GEN 03 emerged from the Issues and Options consultation (LP/S/6), which asked the question 'what options should the spatial strategy for the district consider?' Four options were posed for consideration: A focused development pattern; a dispersed/scattered development pattern; a balanced development pattern and development of a new settlement or upgrading an existing settlement. The Preferred Directions consultation (LP/S/8) reported that the majority of respondents were in favour of a balanced development pattern across the district.
  
- 1.2. 78% of the proposed development through the local plan is focused towards the Market Towns of Dereham, Swaffham and Watton and the Key Settlements of Attleborough and Thetford. These locations represent the most sustainable settlements in terms of services and facilities; public transport etc. 15% of the development within the district is then targeted towards Local Service Centre villages. These are villages which, as identified through the Local Service Centre Topic Paper (LP/H/3), have all of the following categories of services/facilities: Public transport, a community facility, employment, a shop/post office and a school. Only 7% of the development within the district would then be focused towards villages with boundaries. These are settlements that have three of the five services that a Local Service Centre must have.
  
- 1.3. This approach is supported by Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3, Page 157), which indicates that the distribution proposed scores more positively than the alternative options proposed. The alternative options seek to distribute housing equally across each tier of settlement type and to promote higher levels of growth to the Market Towns. Focusing more development to the Market Towns could lead to a greater risk of pressure on water resources, fluvial and sewer flood risk and reducing the amount of open space. Alternatively, focusing more development to Local Service Centres will potentially have negative impacts from increased visual impacts on the surrounding landscape and increased numbers of residents needing to commute to significant facilities like hospitals, senior schools etc. The Sustainability Appraisal concludes by stating that *"The proposed approach which distributes growth across*

*the sustainable settlements in the District should provide the most sustainable development by taking into account the suitability of areas to accommodate development, offering opportunities to support the local economy in more rural areas and not reducing the easy access to open spaces in and around Key Settlements and Market Towns.”*

1.4. The Council consider that the proposed housing distribution is supported by the sustainability appraisal and will lead to the most sustainable pattern of housing growth.

**5.2: Is the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy GEN 03 justified and based on robust evidence? Is each settlement in the right category?**

1.5. As set out in paragraph 1.1 in response to question 5.2 a balanced development pattern was the preferred option through the consultation process. It is also highlighted in paragraph 1.2 that the majority of development is directed towards the most sustainable settlements within the district. It has also been highlighted in paragraph 1.3 that this is supported by the sustainability appraisal.

1.6. The Issues and Options Consultation (LP/S/6) set out information on the 14 Local Service Centres identified through the Core Strategy (LP/D/1) and asked whether the current definition of a service centre should be retained, whether the definition should remove the need for a population over 1000, or whether Local Service Centres should be defined around schooling and health provision. Respondents to this consultation, as set out in the Preferred Options consultation (LP/S/8), supported the option to define Local Services based around services and facilities regardless of population. As a result, the Preferred Directions Consultation identified 22 Local Service Centres based on the following criteria:

- A school;
- Shop / Post Office;
- Community Facility;
- Employment; and
- Public Transport.

1.7. Representations made through the Preferred Directions consultation provided further evidence around the categorisation of settlements and helped form an early

iteration of the Local Service Centre Topic paper. Following this consultation, a list of services and facilities within each settlement was sent to all Ward Members within the District asking for their feedback, the original email sent out has been included in Appendix 1 of this matter statement. Based on this updated information from Ward Members, the Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries consultation (LP/S/12) included all known information on all local service centres and provided details of all of the known services and facilities within all villages in the district. Again, responses from this consultation were used to update the Local Service Centre Topic Paper.

1.8. The final version of the Local Service Centre Topic Paper (LP/H/3), published in July 2017, sets out the methodology used and sets out definitions around each of the criterion. This was applied to every settlement in the district to ensure that classification of services and facilities was uniform across the district. The study provides a robust analysis of all the villages within the district and their categorisation as Local Service Centres, villages with boundaries and villages without boundaries.

1.9. The Council considers that the settlement hierarchy set out in GEN 03 is justified and based on robust evidence and that each settlement is in the right category.

**5.3: Is the reliance on two large Strategic Urban Extensions to deliver 50% of the housing over the Plan period justified?**

1.10. The Local Plan seeks to distribute housing to the most sustainable locations within the district. It is considered that Thetford and Attleborough represent the two most sustainable towns within the district. Both of these have proposed Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs). Thetford SUE is proposed for 5,000 dwellings and Attleborough SUE for 4,000 dwellings. The further benefit to these developments is that they have the critical mass to provide further services and facilities, making them, by their nature, more sustainable.

1.11. The Preferred Directions consultation (LP/S/8) set out that 68% growth would come forward in the Key Settlements. Following this, the housing trajectory set out the delivery rates of the Sustainable Urban Extensions, indicated that some of the development would come forward beyond the plan period. As a result of this and to reflect the Local Plan's strategy to deliver development in the rural areas, the

Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries consultation (LP/S/12) proposed that 50% would come forward in the Key Settlements.

1.12. The Thetford SUE was allocated through the Thetford Area Action Plan (LP/D/3) and has outline planning permission for 5,000 dwellings<sup>1</sup>. Part of the site is also subject to a reserved matters application for the first phase of 343 dwellings<sup>2</sup>, which is yet to be determined. The housing trajectory, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LP/V/1), demonstrates that 3,250 dwellings will come forward during the plan period. This is supported by a Statement of Common Ground – Breckland District Council and Pigeon Thetford Ltd.

1.13. The Landscape Character Assessment Settlement Fringe Study (LP/E/2) illustrates that the SUE is located within an area of lower landscape sensitivity compared to the rest of Thetford. There are a number of environmental constraints regarding Thetford with the Stone Curlew buffer covering the areas to the south and east of the town, as evidenced in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (LP/S/4). Through the Council's SHLAA (LP/H/5) only one alternative site was submitted in Thetford, which was considered to be 'Non Deliverable'. In terms of Thetford, the SUE remains the most sustainable approach to housing delivery over the plan period.

1.14. The Attleborough SUE emerged through the Attleborough and Snetterton Heath Area Action Plan (ASHAAP), which was underway when the Council halted development of the ASHAAP to progress work on the single local plan. The Attleborough SUE is subject to a planning application for 4,000 homes<sup>3</sup>, which has yet to be decided. The housing trajectory, as set out in Appendix 2 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LP/V/1), demonstrates that 2,650 dwellings will come forward during the plan period. Attleborough Land Limited support this through comment 342 of the Pre-Submission Publication Full Representation Schedule (LP/S/25).

---

<sup>1</sup> Breckland District Council website (2018) 3PL/2011/0805/O [Online] <http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningDetails?reference=3PL/2011/0805/O&from=planningSearch> [Accessed 23/02/2018]

<sup>2</sup> Breckland District Council website (2018) 3PL/2017/1576/D [Online] <http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/showDocuments?reference=3PL/2017/1576/D&module=pl> [Accessed 23/02/2018]

<sup>3</sup> Breckland District Council website (2018) 3PL/2017/0996/O [Online] <http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningDetails?reference=3PL/2017/0996/O&from=planningSearch> [Accessed 23/02/2018]

1.15. The Location for the Attleborough SUE was developed through consultation on the ASHAAP. Through the Issues and Options Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/7) a number of options were assessed against the sustainability criteria with the proposed SUE being the most sustainable option. The Landscape Character Assessment Settlement Fringe Study (LP/E/2) illustrates that the SUE is located within an area of lower landscape sensitivity compared to the rest of Attleborough. In terms of Attleborough, the SUE remains the most sustainable approach to housing delivery over the plan period.

1.16. Both Attleborough SUE and Thetford SUE are subject to planning applications. The Thetford SUE is supported by a statement of common ground and the Attleborough SUE is supported through representation through the Pre-submission publication. Therefore, the reliance on these two large Strategic Urban Extensions over the plan period is justified.

#### **5.4: Is Policy GEN 05 justified and consistent with national policy?**

1.17. The purpose of settlement boundaries is to define the area which is acceptable, in principle, for further development. Beyond the settlement boundaries the wider area is largely defined as the countryside, which is subject to a greater degree of protection in order to preserve the rural character of the District. Settlement boundaries have been defined in line with policy GEN 03 and HOU 02, seeking to ensure that only those settlements with the greatest level of services have settlement boundaries. This is supported by the robust evidence set out in the Local Service Centre Topic Paper (LP/H/3), as detailed in responses to questions 5.1 and 5.2.

1.18. The approach set out in GEN 05 is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The core planning principles set out in paragraph 17 set out that: Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value; planning policies should encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed; and *“policies should actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable”*. Furthermore, paragraph 55 states that *“to promote sustainable development in rural area, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural*

*communities*". It is considered that the policy provides a flexible settlement boundary policy that is conformity with national policy.

1.19. The Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3, Page 140) assesses the policy positively, setting out that other policies in the plan require the retention of settlement boundaries where there are services and facilities. As a result, new development will be well located to services and facilities. The policy scores positively when compared to the alternative option, which is not to include a policy regarding settlement boundaries, as this could lead to development coming forward in less sustainable areas.

1.20. The policy seeks to define areas which, in principle, are acceptable for further development. This policy is in line with the settlement hierarchy as set out in GEN 03, seeking to direct development towards the most sustainable locations. The Council consider that the policy is justified and is consistent with national policy.

**5.5: Is the Percentage of Growth split across the settlement hierarchy identified in Policy HOU 02 justified and how has it been established?**

1.21. The local plan seeks to deliver the most sustainable approach to development outside the strategic urban extensions of Attleborough and Thetford, achieving a more balanced approach in housing development between rural and urban areas in line with the Strategic vision. Informed by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process, the Council has identified, as an important element of the settlement hierarchy, a desire for a level of growth across a network of Local Service Centres in the rural areas. In essence this reflects a bottom up approach considered to support sustainable development in the District providing the desired balanced between economic, environmental and social factors.

1.22. As identified in Paragraph 1.1 of this statement, the approach to a balanced pattern of growth was developed through the Issues and Options consultation (LP/S/7). The Preferred Directions consultation (LP/S/8) set out that 68% growth would come forward in the Key Settlements, 18% in the Market towns; and 14% in the Local Service Centres. Following this consultation, the housing trajectory set out the delivery rates of the Sustainable Urban Extensions, indicated that some of the development would come forward beyond the plan period. As a result of this and to reflect development in the rural areas, the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries consultation (LP/S/12) proposed the following level and location of

growth: 50% in the Key Settlements; 28% in the Market Towns; 15% in the Local Service Centres and 7% in 'Villages with Boundaries'.

1.23. The 15% target for Local Service Centres was calculated on the basis that each settlement will see new allocations at a level broadly equivalent to 10% based on the estimated number of households at the start of the plan period (2011). This figure has been derived from the population information in the 2011 census data and applying a household multiplier figure of 2.3 people per household<sup>4</sup>. This approach ensures that all Local Service Centres, which have the services and facilities to be defined as Local Service Centres, develop sustainably over the plan period.

1.24. In line with the Council's aspirations for balanced growth, a further 7% is proposed to come forward within 'Villages with Boundaries'. This figure allows for a small increase in windfall development to come forward over the plan period and reflects the levels of development that has been coming forward since 2011. Policy HOU 04, sets out that each of the settlements within this category would see a maximum of 5% growth coming forward over the plan period, following the adoption of the plan. Cumulatively, the proposed 5% growth in each of the Villages with Boundaries, makes up the 7% overall figure. This provides a figure of 150 dwellings that are anticipated to come forward over the plan period; reflective of the levels of development that have been coming forward since 2011.

1.25. Development in the Local Service Centres and Villages with Boundaries is justified as part of the balanced approach to growth. The approach to Local Service Centres has been maintained throughout the process as a key aspect of the balanced strategy. Growth in Villages with Boundaries furthers this balanced strategy across the district. This approach is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal for Issues and Options, which looked at differing approaches (LP/S/7, Page 80) and the Pre-submission SA (LP/S/3, Page 157), which assesses the final development pattern against the alternatives of increased development in the Market Towns and increased Development in the Local Service Centres. These percentage splits in the Local Service Centres and Villages with boundaries are therefore key to create a balanced approach to development.

---

<sup>4</sup> Office for National Statistics (2013) [Online] <file:///C:/Users/james.mann/Downloads/2011%20Census%20Population%20and%20household%20estimates%20for%20the%20United%20Kingdom,%20March%202011.pdf> [Accessed 16/02/2018]



1.26. The Key Settlements of Attleborough and Thetford and the Market Towns of Dereham, Swaffham and Watton represent the most sustainable locations for new development. The Thetford SUE was allocated through the Thetford Area Action Plan (LP/D/3) and has outline planning permission for 5,000 dwellings<sup>5</sup>. Part of the site is also subject to a reserved matters application for the first phase of 343 dwellings<sup>6</sup>, which is yet to be determined. The Attleborough SUE emerged through the Attleborough and Snetterton Heath Area Action Plan (ASHAAP), which was underway when the Council halted development of the ASHAAP to progress work on the single local plan. The Attleborough SUE is subject to a planning application for 4,000 homes<sup>7</sup>, which has yet to be decided. The 50% figure is based on the housing trajectory that sets out the amount of dwellings expected to come forward from the two SUEs. Both of these are supported by individual Statements of Common Ground, which illustrate their deliverability.

1.27. It was proposed in the Preferred Directions consultation (LP/S/8) that 18% of development was proposed to come forward in the Market Towns. However, due to delivery rates of the SUEs, as previously mentioned, a revised distribution was proposed, setting out that 28% of the development would come forward in the Market Towns. The Key Settlements and the Market Towns make up the most sustainable locations within the District and the percentage change within these settlements does not diverge from the approach to achieving balanced growth across the district; 78% of growth is still proposed to come forward in the most sustainable locations.

1.28. The approach set out in HOU 02 is supported by Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3, Page 157), which indicates that the distribution proposed scores more positively than the alternative options proposed. The alternative options seek to distribute housing equally across each tier of settlement type and to promote higher levels of growth to the Market Towns. Focusing more development to the Market

---

<sup>5</sup> Breckland District Council website (2018) 3PL/2011/0805/O [Online] <http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningDetails?reference=3PL/2011/0805/O&from=planningSearch> [Accessed 23/02/2018]

<sup>6</sup> Breckland District Council website (2018) 3PL/2017/1576/D [Online] <http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/showDocuments?reference=3PL/2017/1576/D&module=pl> [Accessed 23/02/2018]

<sup>7</sup> Breckland District Council website (2018) 3PL/2017/0996/O [Online] <http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningDetails?reference=3PL/2017/0996/O&from=planningSearch> [Accessed 23/02/2018]

Towns could lead to a greater risk of pressure on water resources, fluvial and sewer flood risk and reducing the amount of open space. Alternatively, focusing more development to Local Service Centres will potentially have negative impacts from increased visual impacts on the surrounding landscape and increased numbers of residents needing to commute to significant facilities like hospitals, senior schools etc.

- 1.29. The percentage growth across the settlements has been established through consultation in line with the Council's strategic vision: to see a balanced approach to development across the district. Setting targets across the district, commensurate with the level of services and facilities is considered to be justified.

**5.6: Are the housing targets for additional dwellings in each settlement set out in Policy HOU 02 based on robust evidence? Exactly how have they been established?**

- 1.30. In forming the housing targets for additional dwellings in each settlement across the settlement hierarchy, the Council has considered a range of determining factors: The percentage split across the settlement hierarchy (which has been detailed in the response to question 5.5), land availability in the SHLAA (LP/H/5) and SHLAA addendum (LP/H/6) and infrastructure capacity as detailed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (LP/V/1). This has then been refined through the process of Sustainability Appraisal and presenting options at each of stage of consultation and through continual assessment of completions and commitments.

- 1.31. At each stage of the consultation process the Council has been working on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LP/V/1), which sets out the infrastructure required to facilitate and support the proposed development. At each stage of the consultation feedback has been received from statutory consultees regarding infrastructure. This feedback has helped to inform the housing targets for additional dwellings in each settlement.

- 1.32. This level of proposed residential development in the Key Settlements is in line with the Council's aspirations for the A11 Corridor. The Council's Vision and supporting Strategic Objectives as set out in the Pre-Submission Publication (LP/S/1) promote a strong focus on employment growth along the A11 corridor, whilst supporting sustainable development in these locations. In 2015 the Council commissioned the A11 Growth Study (LP/V/8) alongside Forest Heath and South Norfolk, which sought to secure substantial economic growth within the A11 corridor

and to align this with a significant increase in housing. Breckland Council is a founding member of the Cambridge Norwich Tech Corridor (CNTC) and commissioned a study entitled 'Economic Growth Potential of the Cambridge Norwich Technology Corridor' (LP/V/9), with one of the key aims of this study being to build on the work of the A11 Corridor Study and to proactively market key employment and housing along the A11 corridor between Cambridge and Norwich'. The Council's proactive role in progressing these studies highlights the Council's aspirations for the A11 corridor.

1.33. The Key Settlements of Attleborough and Thetford are within the A11 Corridor. Both Key Settlements contain proposals for large Sustainable Urban Extensions. The Thetford SUE was allocated through the Thetford Area Action Plan (LP/D/3) and has outline planning permission for 5,000 dwellings<sup>8</sup>. Part of the site is also subject to a reserved matters application for the first phase of 343 dwellings<sup>9</sup>. The additional dwelling figure proposed for Thetford through HOU 02 is 0. This is reflective of the fact that the Thetford SUE application is now included within the commitments. Appendix 2 of this Matter Statement highlights that 3,671 dwellings are proposed to come forward in Thetford over the plan period, 3,250 of these through the Sustainable Urban Extension. This figure is based on Appendix 1 of the IDP (LP/V/1) and is supported by the known infrastructure constraints and requirements. A statement of Common Ground has been developed with the developer – Breckland District Council and Pigeon.

1.34. The figure is further justified by the lack of alternative sites within the town. The SHLAA (LP/H/5) identified four sites in Thetford, one of which was the land that makes up the Sustainable Urban Extension, two were very small sites within the town centre and the final site was considered to be 'non-deliverable' due to the environmental constraints regarding the proximity to the Special Protection Area (SPA).

1.35. In Attleborough the proposed additional housing figure as set out in Policy HOU 02 is 2,650. This figure is reflective of the Appendix 1 of the IDP (LP/V/1),

---

<sup>8</sup> Breckland District Council website (2018) 3PL/2011/0805/O [Online] <http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningDetails?reference=3PL/2011/0805/O&from=planningSearch> [Accessed 23/02/2018]

<sup>9</sup> Breckland District Council website (2018) 3PL/2017/1576/D [Online] <http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/showDocuments?reference=3PL/2017/1576/D&module=pl> [Accessed 23/02/2018]

which illustrates that the Attleborough SUE will deliver 2,650 dwellings. Attleborough Land Limited support this through comment 342 of the Pre-Submission Publication Full Representation Schedule (LP/S/25) and the Attleborough SUE is now subject to a planning application for 4,000 homes<sup>10</sup>, which is yet to be decided.

1.36. 28% of the Local Plan's housing growth is proposed in the Market Towns, which are considered to be the most sustainable locations alongside the Key Settlements. The proposed figures were consulted upon through the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries consultation and the Pre-Submission publication, with feedback from statutory consultees regarding the infrastructure. Individual targets for Dereham, Swaffham and Watton as set out in the Preferred Directions consultation were considered to be too low in regards to the size of the settlements and the amount of land availability highlighted in the SHLAA (LP/H/5). As a result of this the proposed targets were increased and set out in the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries consultation and then Policy HOU 02 in the Preferred Directions consultation (LP/S/1). Table 1 highlights that the proposed allocations (additional dwellings) are proportionate to the size of the settlement and the known infrastructure constraints, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LP/V/1), the Water Cycle Study (LP/E/5).

**Table 1: Population and proposed growth in Dereham, Swaffham and Watton**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Population 2011 Census</b>	<b>Proposed Allocation (additional dwellings)</b>	<b>Total Proposed Housing Growth (including proposed allocations and completions and commitments)</b>
Dereham	18,609	750	1,766
Swaffham	7,258	525	1,619
Watton	7,202	250	1,634

<sup>10</sup> Breckland District Council website (2018) 3PL/2017/0996/O [Online] <http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningDetails?reference=3PL/2017/0996/O&from=planningSearch> [Accessed 23/02/2018]

- 1.37. The Preferred Directions consultation (LP/S/8) set out three options: Specific targets for Local Service Centres; no targets for individual Local Service Centres; and a higher amount of development in these areas. The Preferred approach was to set specific targets for each of the Local Service Centres. This was calculated on the basis that each settlement will see new allocations at a level broadly equivalent to 10% based on the estimated number of households at the start of the plan period (2011). This figure has been derived from the population information in the 2011 census data and applying a household multiplier figure of 2.3 people per household<sup>11</sup>.
- 1.38. The approach to giving each settlement a specific figure was proposed through the Preferred Directions Consultation (LP/S/8) in order to allow certainty to service providers and statutory consultees when responding to the iterations of the consultation. Information provided through the consultation process has led to changes regarding the categorisation of settlements. Throughout the process the Council have also continued to update 'completions' and 'commitments' figures in each Local Service Centre. In some cases where completions are commitments have increased significantly throughout the plan making process the Council has taken the decision not to allocate in these locations. A good example of this is Great Ellingham. In the Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries consultation (LP/S/12) it was reported that there were 48 completions and commitments and the Local Plan was proposing to allocate 40 dwellings at this time. However, in the Pre-Submission Publication (LP/S/1) there were now 184 completions and commitments. The decision was taken that no further allocation should be made in this location.
- 1.39. It is considered that the additional dwelling targets for each Local Service Centre, supported by the Water Cycle Study (LP/E/5) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LP/V/1) along with feedback through consultation and regular analysis of completions and commitments are based on robust evidence.
- 1.40. The final category, 'Villages with Boundaries', is proposed to receive 7% development through the plan period. It is indicated that 150 dwellings will come forward during the plan period. A proposed amendment is detailed in the response

---

<sup>11</sup> Office for National Statistics (2013) [Online] <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/populationandhouseholdestimatesfortheunitedkingdom/2011-03-21> [Accessed 16/02/2018]

to Matter 5.11, which sets out a detailed methodology as to how a maximum of 5% in each of these settlements will meet the 150 dwelling target.

1.41. The Council consider that the housing targets for each settlement have been formed in line with the settlement hierarchy and have been based on land availability in the SHLAA and SHLAA update, known infrastructure constraints set out in the IDP and analysis completions and commitments figures. These figures, based on robust evidence, have been subject to public consultation at each stage in the plan making process.

**5.7: How have the completions / commitments (2011-2017) for each settlement been identified? Is there evidence to suggest that the existing commitments will be implemented as anticipated?**

1.42. The completions figures are based on annual monitoring work undertaken by the Planning Policy Team at the end of each financial year. This information is then used to update the Authorities Monitoring Report and the Five Year Land Supply Statement. The commitments are updated when a planning application is granted. Information for both completions and commitments is updated in an Access database held by the Planning Policy Team. For each settlement a query is run from the Access database, which accurately reports the number of completions and commitments for each settlement at that point in time.

1.43. The NPPF states that *“sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, there is no longer a demand for the type of unites or sites have long term phased plans”*. In line with this definition the Council carry out the monitoring of sites on an annual basis and where permissions have expired these are removed from the completions figures. This process has been carried out through the various iterations of the local plan making process.

1.44. The Council's Five Year Land Supply statement (LP/H/7) is evidenced by contacting the developers of all major sites to further test deliverability, as set out in Chapter 3 of the statement regarding Housing Supply. Developers are contacted regarding individual sites and asked to provide information regarding the actual and projected number of dwelling completions for the . Responses through this process provide further evidence regarding the deliverability of sites.

1.45. Although it is not envisaged by the Council that any commitments will lapse, settlement boundaries provide further certainty over the deliverability of planning permissions. At the point of the publication of the Pre-Submission Publication (LP/S/1), the settlement boundaries as identified on the Policies Maps (LP/S/2) were updated to include current planning permissions. This would ensure that, if a planning permission were to lapse, the land would be included within the settlement boundary, establishing the principle of development. This would provide a further level of certainty around the delivery of commitments through the lifetime of the plan making process.

1.46. In addition, the Council are seeking to proactively deliver committed sites. This will be further supported by the Local Plan Implementation Strategy (LP/S/1, page 225-226) and proposed modifications which will strengthen the policy (see the Councils response to Matter 19 Monitoring Framework).

1.47. The Council, through contacting developers as part of the Five Year Land Supply topic paper and through settlement boundaries has evidence to suggest that the existing commitments will be implemented as anticipated.

**5.8: Is the Plan positively prepared and justified, insofar that there is a reliance on windfall developments (under Policy HOU 03) coming forward to meet the housing target for some Local Service Centres?**

1.48. The Local Plan seeks to meet the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) in full and to do so in a sustainable manner appropriate for the rural nature of the district, in line with the Vision and Objectives.

1.49. The local plan has been positively prepared to meet the housing need in full. The Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) requirement, as set out in Policy HOU 01, is for 612 dwellings per annum, amounting to 15,298 new dwellings over the plan period. Policy HOU 02 demonstrates that 15,950 dwellings will come forward through the plan period, providing a 4.3% buffer. However, in order to ensure that the figures are as up to date as possible it is proposed to update the table in HOU 02; this is included as Appendix 2 of this statement. Appendix 2, details that 16,675 dwellings will come forward through the plan period, providing a 9% buffer against the OAN figure.

- 1.50. Of the 16,675 dwellings proposed, 5,069 represent new allocation through this Local Plan, 30% of the total development proposed to be delivered during the plan period (not including Thetford, which was allocated through the Thetford Area Action Plan (LP/D/3). This illustrates that in terms of allocations through the plan, the plan has been positively prepared.
- 1.51. As set out in paragraph 1.1 of Question 5.1 the level and location of growth has been formed through the consultation process in line with the Council's Vision and informed by the Sustainability Appraisal. Through the Preferred Directions Consultation (LP/S/8) it was determined to set individual targets for each of the Local Service Centres as well as the Market Towns and the Key Settlements.
- 1.52. In a few Local Service Centres, as detailed in the response to Question 5.9, not enough suitable sites were identified to meet the need in full. It is also highlighted in Question 5.9 that the Council made exhaustive efforts to find alternative sites. The Council conducted two formal 'call for sites', held 32 public consultation events around the district, gave the opportunity for further sites to be submitted through three Regulation 18 Consultations, including a targeted call for sites in areas where sites were not identified.
- 1.53. However, where the housing need could not be met in full, Policy HOU 03 seeks to meet this need. It should be noted that Policy HOU 03 accounts for only 139 of the 16,675 dwellings to come forward over the plan period, less than 1% of the overall housing delivery. The Local Plan seeks to allocate a total of 5,069 dwellings throughout the plan period, of these only 289 are proposed to come through criteria based policies HOU 03 and HOU 04. This represents 5% of all allocations and just 1.6% of development overall. This illustrates that although sites have not been proposed to meet the housing need in full in some of the local service centres, there is not an over-reliance on windfall development to meet the overall housing need.
- 1.54. This approach is further justified by the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/2), which set out, as detailed in the response to question 5.1, that the approach of a distributing growth across the sustainable settlements within the District should provide the most sustainable development. This approach also scored more positively than the reasonable alternatives, which were to increase development



within the Market Towns or focusing more development in the Local Service Centres.

1.55. The Local Plan has sought to plan positively for growth, providing a 9% buffer above OAN. The plan proposes to achieve this primarily, through allocating sites for development. The reliance on windfall accounts for less than 1% of the overall housing numbers. The Council consider the plan to be positively prepared and justified.

**5.9: What justification is there for the Plan not making provision for the identified housing target in some of the Local Service Centres (Kenninghall, Litcham, Mattishall, Necton, North Elmham and Old Buckenham)? What efforts were made by the Council to identify suitable sites?**

1.56. The Council carried out a call for sites in 2013 and again alongside the Issues and Options Consultation (November 2014-January 2015). Furthermore, sites could be submitted throughout the plan making process. During the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries Consultation (LP/S/12) a targeted call for sites was carried out in the Local Service Centres of Ashill, Banham, Mattishall and Old Buckenham. The rationale being that, at the time the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries document was consulted on, the housing requirement could not be met in these locations. During this consultation, sites were submitted in all of these locations and, as a result, the housing need for Banham and Ashill can now be fully demonstrated.

1.57. A targeted call for sites was not carried out in any of the other settlements as, at the point of the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries consultation the housing target could be met in every other location. However, consultation responses at this stage of the plan making process highlighted issues regarding the deliverability of sites. Due to the advance stage in the plan making process it was not possible to conduct further targeted call for sites in these locations.

1.58. The Local Plan making process has encouraged sites to be submitted throughout. The council undertook two formal 'call for sites' consultations along with a target call for sites through the plan making process. The following paragraphs detail those locations where the housing target has not been met in full and set out that every effort has been made by the council to identify suitable sites.

**Kenninghall**

- 1.59. The Local Plan sets a requirement for 68 dwellings in Kenninghall over the plan period. The Pre-Submission Publication document (LP/S/1) states that of these 68 dwellings there are currently 25 completions and 7 commitments, meaning 36 dwellings are proposed to come forward through the plan period. The Local Plan seeks to allocate 15 dwellings through Kenninghall Housing Allocation 1, meaning that 21 dwellings are proposed to come forward through policy HOU 03.
- 1.60. A total of 10 sites have been submitted in Kenninghall during the plan making process. Pages 461 and 465 of the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3) and Appendix 5 of the Site Selection Topic Paper (LP/H/4) provide an assessment of all of the sites submitted and sets out the justification for not allocating alternative sites through the Local Plan.
- 1.61. At the time of publishing the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries document (LP/S/12) it was proposed to allocate two sites, meeting the housing need in full. As such, a targeted call for sites was not conducted and no question was asked in the consultation document. Representations made during the consultation and further, subsequent, evidence provided in the Historic Characterisation study (LP/E/4) meant that site LP[051]008 could no longer be considered reasonable. The Council consider that the search for sites was extensive, but no further reasonable sites could be identified.

## **Litcham**

- 1.62. The Local Plan sets a requirement for 27 dwellings in Litcham over the plan period. The Pre-submission Publication document (LP/S/1) states that of these 27 dwellings there are currently 3 commitments and 2 completions, meaning 22 dwellings are required to come forward through the plan period. The Local Plan does not seek to allocate sites in Litcham meaning that the 22 dwelling target is proposed to be met through policy HOU 03.
- 1.63. A total of 7 sites have been submitted in Litcham during the plan making process. Pages 459 and 460 of the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3) and Appendix 5 of the Site Selection Topic Paper (LP/H/4) provide an assessment of all of these sites submitted and sets out the justification for not allocating these sites through the Local Plan.

1.64. At the time of publishing the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries document (LP/S/12) it was proposed to allocate one site, LP[054]005B, meeting the housing need in full. As such, a targeted call for sites was not conducted and no question was asked in the consultation document. Representations made during the consultation and further, subsequent, evidence provided in the Historic Characterisation study (LP/E/4) meant that site LP[054]005B could no longer be considered reasonable. The Council consider that the search for sites was extensive, but no further reasonable sites could be identified.

### **Mattishall**

1.65. The Local Plan sets a requirement for 141 dwellings in Mattishall over the plan period. The Pre-submission Publication document (LP/S/1) states that of these 141 dwellings there are currently 55 commitments and 21 completions, with a further 23 dwellings with resolution to grant subject to s106. As a result, 42 dwellings are required to come forward through the plan period. The Local Plan does not seek to allocate sites in Mattishall meaning that the 42 dwelling target is proposed to be met through policy HOU 03.

1.66. A total of 26 sites have been submitted in Mattishall during the plan making process. Pages 461 and 465 of the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3) and Appendix 5 of the Site Selection Topic Paper (LP/H/4) provide an assessment of all of these sites submitted and sets out the justification for not allocating these sites through the Local Plan.

1.67. At the time of publishing the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries document (LP/S/12) it was proposed to allocate sites LP[061]019 and LP[061]015, totally 75 dwellings. As this was still short of the housing requirement, the question was posed 'Are you aware of any further sites within Mattishall to ensure delivery of the housing target?'

1.68. Representations made during the consultation and further, subsequent, evidence provided in the Historic Characterisation study (LP/E/4) and the Sequential Test (LP/E/7) meant that sites LP[061]015 and LP[067]019 could no longer be considered reasonable. A subsequent planning application was refused<sup>12</sup> on site LP[067]019 due to the impact of the proposed development into the open

---

<sup>12</sup> Planning application 3PL/2015/0498/O [online]  
<http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningConditions?reference=3PL/2015/0498/O>  
[Accessed 16/02/2018]

countryside and the harm caused to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, and the surrounding landscape. The Council consider that the search for sites was extensive, but no further reasonable sites could be identified.

### **Necton**

1.69. The Local Plan sets a requirement for 301 dwellings in Necton over the plan period. The Pre-submission Publication document (LP/S/1) states that of these 301 dwellings there are currently 155 commitments and 74 completions, meaning 72 dwellings are required to come forward through the plan period. The Local Plan seeks to allocate 55 dwellings through the sites LP[067]010 and LP[067]011, meaning that the remaining 17 dwellings are proposed to be met through policy HOU 03.

1.70. A total of 11 sites have been submitted in Necton during the plan making process. Pages 461 and 465 of the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3) and Appendix 5 of the Site Selection Topic Paper (LP/H/4) provide an assessment of all of these sites submitted and sets out the justification for not allocating these sites through the Local Plan.

1.71. At the time of publishing the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries document (LP/S/12) it was proposed to allocate three sites, LP[067]007, LP[067]010 and LP[067]011, meeting the housing need in full. As such, a targeted call for sites was not conducted and no question was asked in the consultation document. Representations made during the consultation and further, subsequent, evidence provided in the Sequential Test (LP/E/7) meant that site LP[067]007 could no longer be considered reasonable. The Council consider that the search for sites was extensive, but no further reasonable sites could be identified.

### **North Elmham**

1.72. The Local Plan sets a requirement for 91 dwellings in North Elmham over the plan period. The Pre-submission Publication document (LP/S/1) states that of these 91 dwellings there are currently 50 commitments and completions, meaning 41 dwellings are required to come forward through the plan period. The Local Plan seeks to allocate 27 dwellings through the sites LP[070]001 and LP[070]007, meaning that the remaining 14 dwellings are proposed to be met through policy HOU 03.

1.73. A total of 14 sites have been submitted in North Elmham during the plan making process. Pages 461 and 465 of the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3) and Appendix 5 of the Site Selection Topic Paper (LP/H/4) provide an assessment of all of these sites submitted (with the exception of sites LP[070]004 and LP[070]005, which were below the size threshold) and sets out the justification for not allocating these sites through the Local Plan.

1.74. At the time of publishing the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries document (LP/S/12) it was proposed to allocate two sites, LP[070]001 and LP[070]008, meeting the housing need in full. As such, a targeted call for sites was not conducted and no question was asked in the consultation document. Representations made during the consultation and further, subsequent, highways comments meant that site LP[070]008 could no longer be considered reasonable. Although, the reasonable alternative, LP[070]007, was then included as a proposed allocation, the target has still not been fully met. The Council consider that the search for sites was extensive, but no further reasonable sites could be identified.

### **Old Buckenham**

1.75. The Local Plan sets a requirement for 69 dwellings in Old Buckenham over the plan period. The Pre-submission Publication document (LP/S/1) states that of these 69 dwellings there are currently 16 commitments and 16 completions, meaning 37 dwellings are required to come forward through the plan period. The Local Plan seeks to allocate 20 dwellings through the site LP[074]014, meaning that the remaining 17 dwellings are proposed to be met through policy HOU 03.

1.76. A total of 16 sites have been submitted in Old Buckenham during the plan making process. Pages 461 and 465 of the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3) and Appendix 5 of the Site Selection Topic Paper (LP/H/4) provide an assessment of all of these sites submitted and sets out the justification for not allocating these sites through the Local Plan.

1.77. At the time of publishing the Preferred Sites and Settlement Boundaries document (LP/S/12) it was proposed to allocate two sites, LP[074]006 and LP[074]014, for a total of 30 dwellings, still 20 short of the target. The consultation document asked the question "Are you aware of any further suitable sites within Old Buckenham to ensure delivery of the housing target?" As a result of this call for sites

a further two sites were submitted, however following detailed assessment of the sites, these sites were also considered to be unreasonable. Representations made during the consultation and further, subsequent, evidence provided in the Historic Characterisation study (LP/E/4) meant that site LP[074]006 could no longer be considered reasonable. The Council consider that the search for sites was extensive, but no further reasonable sites could be identified.

**5.10: Is Policy HOU 03 justified and consistent with national policy?**

1.78. The Council's Strategic Vision, set out in the Local Plan, is to allow for Breckland District to develop in a sustainable manner appropriate for its rural nature. Where the Local Plan does not identify sufficient sites to achieve the housing target for the Local Service Centres, Policy HOU 03 seeks to allow for small scale development to come forward in a sustainable manner to meet the housing need over the plan period. Policy HOU 03 seeks to build on Policies GEN 03, HOU 01 and HOU 02, which seek to create a balanced approach to development within the district. This is in line with the Strategic Vision and has been developed through consultation responses, as detailed in the response to issue 5.1.

1.79. The Local Service Centre Topic Paper (LP/H/03) identifies the services and facilities within all of the villages within the district, determining the most sustainable villages. In order to sustain these services and facilities the Local Plan has been positively prepared to ensure that each local service centre would develop by 10% throughout the plan period. This approach is in line with paragraph 55 of the NPPF, which states that in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. This is also proportionate to the level of development proposed for the Market Towns and Key Settlements.

1.80. Through the local plan site selection process, suitable sites were not identified to fully meet the housing need in the local service centre villages of Kenninghall, Litcham, Mattishall, Necton, North Elmham and Old Buckenham. However, it is still considered that 10% growth in these locations would enhance and maintain the vitality of these rural communities. This is also supported by HOU 02 and Appendix 2 of this Hearing Statement, which indicates that windfall development has come forward in each of these locations since 2011. As such, Policy HOU 03 seeks to provide a flexible approach to development outside the settlement boundary in these

villages, subject to being supported by other policies within the Local Plan and a set of criteria.

1.81. Criterion 1 sets out that development should be immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. This is in line with paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF ) and the core principles of paragraph 17, in particular that *“planning should: Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable; and take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving communities within it”*. Criterion 2 seeks to ensure that Policy HOU 03 accords with the development hierarchy as set out in Policies GEN 05 and HOU 02 (the response to issue 5.4 above considers and explains Policy GEN 05, and the response to issue 5.5 above and various responses within the Matter 4 Hearing Statement consider and explain Policy HOU 02. Both GEN 05 and HOU 02 are justified and consistent with national policy. Criterion 3 is consistent with Chapter 12 of the NPPF, which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment, and the NPPF as a whole in relation to connectivity. Criterion 4 is consistent with Chapter 11 of the NPPF, particularly paragraph 109, which seeks to protect and enhance valued landscapes.

1.82. It should be noted that Policy HOU 03 accounts for only 139 of the 16,675 dwellings to come forward over the plan period (as shown in Appendix 2), less than 1% of the overall housing delivery. This illustrates that although sites have not been proposed to meet the housing need in full in some of the Local Service Centres, there is not an over-reliance on windfall development.

1.83. Policy HOU 03 seeks to help deliver Policy HOU 02, which has been assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3) as being the most sustainable approach to development within the district and scores positively compared to alternative options. Policy HOU 03 has been assessed separately through the Sustainability Appraisal and scores positively when compared to the alternative option, which is not to have a policy (see paragraph 1.26 and Table 12.32). The proposed policy scores positively regarding criteria around Population and Human Health and Inclusive Communities.

1.84. The policy seeks to ensure that where suitable sites have not been identified development can still come forward to ensure that services and facilities within these villages are maintained or enhanced. The Local Plan has been positively prepared and Policy HOU 03 makes up less than 1% of the overall housing proposed through the plan. The Council considers the policy to be justified; it is in line with the Strategic Vision of the Local Plan and supported by national policy.

**5.11: Is Policy HOU 04 justified and consistent with national policy? (Please can the Council have particular regard to criteria 1, 2 and 3)**

1.85. The focus of housing delivery through the Local Plan is directed towards the most sustainable locations: The Key Settlements, Market Towns and Local Service Centres. This accounts for 93% of housing delivery through the plan period. 20% of the population live outside of the top three tiers of the settlement hierarchy. To reflect this, the Council's vision for the Local Plan is partly to ensure that "*the wider rural area will have development in a sustainable manner appropriate for the rural nature of the District*". In order to ensure that vision is met, it is considered that a proportion of development should come forward in the next tier of the settlement hierarchy, 'villages with boundaries'. Policy HOU 04 seeks to allow for small scale development in these locations.

1.86. This policy approach is in line with Policy HOU 02 and Policy GEN 03, which, through public consultation, were developed to seek a balanced approach across the district. The responses to issues 5.4 and 5.5 above set out this approach. Policy HOU 04 therefore seeks to capture the need to direct growth to the most sustainable locations, support local services, balance residential needs and employment opportunities and seeks to enhance the rural economy, thereby helping to maintain the vitality of rural communities, as intended by the NPPF. In line with the locally distinctive approach to sustainable development, rather than seeking to restrict all development outside the sustainable settlement hierarchy and inside of the settlement boundaries of the existing rural settlements where there are limited opportunities, this policy seeks to present a sensitive approach to rural housing that is responsive to local circumstances through a criteria based approach.

1.87. Criterion 1 seeks to allow for small scale development of up to 5 dwellings. It is considered that small scale development is appropriate for villages of this size. Given the rural nature of the district and the character of these rural villages,



development on a larger scale could have detrimental impacts upon the character and appearance of the settlements and the wider landscape. This approach is consistent with Paragraph 10 of the NPPF, which states that *“Plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas”*.

1.88. Appendix 2 illustrates that between 2011 and December 31 2017, 503 dwellings have come forward in ‘Villages with Boundaries’. Appendix 3 illustrates that of the 194 applications that make up these 503 dwellings, only 12 of these applications have been for over 5 dwellings. This equates to approximately 94% of applications being submitted in these areas totalling 5 or less dwellings. It is the intention that this criterion, along with the other criteria in Policy HOU 04 and all relevant policies set out in the Local Plan, will enable development that has been coming forward through planning applications to be able to do so in a more sustainable way.

1.89. Criterion 2 seeks to allow for a 5% growth in the overall development of Villages with Boundaries. This approach is consistent with the settlement hierarchy. It is proposed that all Local Service Centres should increase by 10% over the plan period based on the level of services and facilities that these settlements provide. It is therefore justified that Villages with Settlement Boundaries, having fewer services and facilities than Local Service Centres, should receive a lower proportion of development. This approach is again consistent with paragraph 10 of the NPPF, taking local circumstances into consideration.

1.90. In order to provide further clarity around how the Council propose to calculate this 5% growth figure with individual dwelling numbers for each settlement. A modification is proposed to the reasoned justification, after paragraph 3.20, to add the following text:

As per Criterion 2, growth in each settlement will not lead to an increase of more than 5% from the date of adoption of the plan. Appendix 5 sets out the detailed methodology regarding the calculation of this 5% increase and provides a table, which sets out the number of new dwellings for each settlement.

- 1.91. Appendix 5 of this topic paper details the methodology proposed to be included in Appendix 5 of the Local Plan. This should provide certainty for each settlement around the levels of development they can expect over the plan period. It is considered that this Appendix embellishes and adds further clarity to Policy HOU 04.
- 1.92. Criterion 3 seeks to ensure that development provides a significant community benefit. Applicants should justify that there is clear evidence that development will provide a community benefit by meeting an identified need, delivering community aspirations or by virtue of local support for the scheme. The justification for the policy sets out that this can be achieved through demonstrating local support (parish council comments or a survey), demonstration of conformity with a neighbourhood plan or delivering a community aspiration within a neighbourhood plan, demonstration of local or social need i.e. a local housing needs assessment or an employment needs assessment. This is consistent with Paragraph 55 of the NPPF, which states that in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It is considered that this criterion is in line with NPPF and seeks to ensure that housing delivery enhances or maintains the vitality of these rural communities.
- 1.93. The individual criteria, as well as Policy HOU 04 overall, is in conformity with Chapter 3 of the NPPF, 'supporting a prosperous rural economy', which states that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. The policy approach is also considered to be consistent with Paragraph 10 of the NPPF, taking into account local considerations. The policy approach is considered to be justified when compared to the alternative of not having a policy, as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3). This highlights that the policy would score positively regarding the provision of new housing development and through the enhancement of services and facilities.
- 1.94. The Council considers that the policy is justified having been assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal against reasonable alternatives. The policy is also consistent with national policy, seeking to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

**5.12: Is Policy HOU 05 justified and consistent with national policy? (Please can the Council have particular regard to criteria 2, 3 and 5)**

- 1.95. Breckland is a large, rural district which contains a high number of small villages and hamlets with little or no service provision. For those areas with 2 or fewer of the services / facilities, settlement boundaries have been removed on the basis that this limits development in locations where it is unsustainable for additional growth. However, having regard to local distinctiveness, it must be recognised that in areas outside of the settlement hierarchy, i.e. the areas regarded as open countryside, there are living and working communities whose social and economic viability must be addressed.
- 1.96. The focus of housing delivery through the local plan is directed towards the most sustainable locations: The Key Settlements, Market Towns and Local Service Centres, with small scale development allowed through Policy HOU 04. The Council's vision for the local plan is partly to ensure that "the wider rural area will have development in a sustainable manner appropriate for the rural nature of the District".
- 1.97. In order to ensure that the vision of the local plan is met, and to ensure that a flexible approach is taken regarding housing delivery, it is considered that a small amount of development could come forward within the next tier of the hierarchy, 'villages without boundaries'. Policy HOU 05 seeks to address the development needs of these communities whilst minimising the impact on the countryside by allowing clearly identified and evidenced appropriate small scale development to meet local needs through criteria based policy. Development will be carefully managed in line with this policy in a manner which is more restrictive than for those named settlements with boundaries.
- 1.98. Criterion 2, allowing minor development of an appropriate scale and design to the settlement of up to 3 units, strikes a balance between minimising the impact upon the countryside while allowing development to meet a local need. This approach also reflects what has been coming forward in these locations throughout the plan making process. Appendix 2 shows that 574 dwellings make up the completions and commitments that have come forward in 'villages without boundaries' through the period 2011-December 31<sup>st</sup> 2017. Appendix 4 shows that of the 288 applications that make up the completions and commitments, only 34 have been for more than 3 dwellings; 88% of development coming forward in these areas

has been through applications of 3 or less. It is the intention that this criterion, along with the other criteria in the policy and all relevant policies set out in the local plan, will enable development that has been coming forward through planning applications to be able to do so in a more sustainable way.

1.99. As these are areas where, ordinarily, the Local Plan would not rely on development coming forward -as per the settlement hierarchy- criterion 3 seeks to ensure that where development does come forward it reflects a need and is required to support the vitality of the few services within these locations. The idea of sustainable communities runs throughout the NPPF; the very definition of the social role of sustainable development states *“by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being”*.

1.100. Criterion 5 seeks to ensure that where development does come forward it does not harm or undermine a visually important gap that contributes to the character and distinctiveness of the rural scene. This is in conformity with Chapter 11 of the NPPF, which seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment. Paragraph 109 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

1.101. The individual criteria, as well as the policy overall is in conformity with Chapter 3 of the NPPF, ‘supporting a prosperous rural economy’, which states that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. The policy is also consistent with Paragraph 10 of the NPPF, taking into account local circumstances. The policy approach is considered to be justified when compared to the alternative of restricting new private development outside of settlement boundaries, as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/3). This highlights that the policy would score positively regarding the provision of new housing development and through the enhancement of services and facilities.

1.102. The Council considers that the policy is justified having been assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal against reasonable alternatives. The policy is also considered to be in line with national policy, seeking to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

**5.13: What are the exceptional circumstances referred to in Policy HOU 05?**

1.103. The exceptional circumstances referred to in Policy HOU 05 are criteria 1 to 5 of the policy, which must all be met:

- The development comprises of sensitive infilling and rounding off of a cluster of dwelling with access to an existing highway;
- It is minor development of an appropriate scale and design to the settlement of up to 3 units;
- It can be demonstrated that there is appropriate support by the Parish Council;
- The design contributes to enhancing the historic nature and connectivity of communities; and
- The proposal does not harm or undermine a visually important gap that contributes to the character and distinctiveness of the rural scene.

**5.14: Taking into account all of the above, overall, is the spatial distribution of housing justified?**

1.104. The spatial distribution of housing seeks to deliver the most sustainable approach to development across the district, achieving a more balanced approach to housing development between rural and urban areas.

1.105. The approach set out in HOU 02 related to the distribution of growth is supported by robust evidence. 78% of the development proposed is to come forward in the most sustainable locations: The Key Settlements and the Market Towns. A further 15% is to come forward in the Local Service Centres, villages that are considered to be sustainable and provide wider socio-economic benefits for the surrounding rural areas. Only 7% is proposed to come forward in the smaller settlements in the district in order to support the services and facilities within these locations. This approach to development is considered to be the most sustainable approach to development in the district and is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal (LP/S/03).

1.106. The Local Plan seeks to deliver a total of no less than 15,298 homes over the plan period, however at present it is understood that 16,675 homes will be delivered. This figure is based on allocations and the current levels of commitments and

completions, providing a 9% buffer compared to the housing target, based on the Objectively Assessed Need. The plan has been positively prepared and proposes to allocate 5,069 dwellings through the plan period; allocations are proposed for the Market Towns and the Local Service Centres. Only 1.6% of development is to come forward through windfall development.

1.107. Taking into account all of the above the Council consider that the overall spatial distribution of housing is justified.

## Appendix 1

### **Mann, James**

---

**Subject:** FW: Availability of Services and Facilities in Local Service Centres and Rural Areas - Audit

---

**From:** Britton, Julie  
**Sent:** 22 June 2016 16:31  
**To:** Members Distribution List  
**Subject:** FW: Availability of Services and Facilities in Local Service Centres and Rural Areas - Audit  
**Importance:** High

Sent on behalf of the Senior Planning Policy officer

Julie Britton | Senior Democratic Services Officer |  
Breckland Council  
DDI: 01362 656343  
[www.breckland.gov.uk](http://www.breckland.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Robertson, Sarah  
**Sent:** 22 June 2016 16:23  
**To:** Britton, Julie; McAleer, Helen  
**Cc:** Phil Mileham; 'Ottewell, Stephen'  
**Subject:** Services and Facilities Audit

Hi,

Please could you send out the below email and attachment to members.

Thank you

Sarah

Dear Councillors,

#### **Services and Facilities Audit**

At a recent informal Local Plan Working Group, Members of the group requested that officers undertake further work to validate their records in relation to the availability of services and facilities in the Local Service Centres and Rural Areas (parishes below market towns). We are seeking to utilise the local knowledge of all Members to complete this exercise quickly, and thoroughly. The audit is of key importance to the preparation of the Local Plan, as our approach to the classification of settlements is dependent upon the availability of services. The categories used to define service provision, are the same 5 criteria as those used for Local Service Centre. These are:

1. **School**
2. **Public Transport** – An assessment of the level of public transport access within the village. This has included looking at the frequency of services and whether you can reach the destination for normal working hours.
3. **Community Facility** - This can include a number of different facilities such as a village hall, public house, restaurant or café.

4. **Employment** – The assessment has looked at the level of employment available within the village. This has included whether there is a business park and also the size of the businesses within the settlement.

5. **Shop/Post Office**

The assessment has had regard to the distance of services and facilities from the designated settlement boundary/village core – and should only be considered to be available where they are within a recognised acceptable walking distance. Based on these criteria, an assessment has been made as to the availability of services within each village. A copy of our record is attached as a PDF.

We would be grateful if you could confirm the accuracy of the information held by **Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> June**. This will allow any necessary changes to be made prior to a series of Local Plan Working Group sessions in Mid July where the next stage of the Local Plan will be discussed (interim consultation of site allocations and settlement boundaries).

Kind Regards

Sarah

Sarah Robertson MSc MRTPI  
Senior Planning Policy Officer

Breckland Council  
*working in partnership with*

**CAPITA**

Tel: 01362 656 870

DDI: 01362 656 857

Fax: 01362 696 771

Email: [sarah.robertson@capita.co.uk](mailto:sarah.robertson@capita.co.uk)

Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE

Submit Planning Applications online at <http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply>



*Think of the environment...please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.*



## Appendix 2: Completions and Commitments

Tier of Hierarchy	Settlement	Pre-submission publication			Current figures (December 31 <sup>st</sup> 2017)							Difference in totals between pre-submission and present
		Total (completions and commitments 2011-March 2017) including saved allocations and decision to grant	Housing allocation within the local plan	Total (completions and commitments 2011-March 2017 + Housing target)	Total completions 01/04/2011 to 31/03/2017	Total commitments 01/04/2011 to 31/12/2017	Saved allocations	Decisions awaiting s106	Proposed allocation	Part 2 of the Council's Brownfield Land Register	Total	
Key Settlements	Attleborough	1808	2650	4458	473	1193		8 (Warrens Lane 3PL/2016/0486/H)	2650	75 – 86 (80)	4404	-54
	Thetford	3668	0	3668	104	3567			0		3671	+3
Market Towns	Dereham	797	750	1547	332	225	220 (D2)	175 48 (Greenfields Road: 3PL/2016/0952/O) 127 (Malting part of D1 3PL/2016/1454/H)	750	53- 75 (64)* remainder of D1	1766	+219
	Swaffham	1007	600 (605 target)	1612	383	636		525 185 (Norwich Road 3PL/2015/0917/O) 165 (north of Norwich road 3PL/2015/0917/O) 175 (3PL/2016/0068/O)	75 (525 have decision to grant)		1619	+7
	Watton	1130	205	1335	505	924			205		1634	+299
Local Service Centres	Ashill	71	20	91	22	57			20		99	+8
	Banham	69	42	111	17	57			42		116	+5
	Bawdeswell	6	36	42	6	40			0 (36 included within completions and commitments)		46	+4
	Garboldisham	9	35	44	6	7			35		48	+4
	Great Ellingham	184	0	184	19	184			0		203	+19
	Harling	157	85	242	97	70			85		252	+10
	Hockering	63	25	88	6	67			25		98	+10
	Kenninghall*	33	35	68	25	8			35		68	0
	Litcham	5	22	27	2	7			22		31	+4

Breckland District Council Hearing Statement: Matter 4

	Mattishall*	99	42	141	21	79			42		142	+1
	Narborough	107	40	147	35	73			40		148	+1
	Necton*	229	79	301	79	151			79	4-8 (6)	315	+14
	North Elmham*	50	41	91	5	64			14 (27 included in completions and commitments)		83	-8
	Old Buckenham*	32	37	69	16	20			37		73	+4
	Shipdham	205	80	285	69	161			80		310	+25
	Sporle	32	35	67	16	21			35		72	+5
	Swanton Morley	95	85	180	80	19			85		184	+4
	Weeting	100	0	100	12	54			0		66	-34
<b>Villages with Boundaries</b>	Beeston, Beetley, Carbrooke, Caston, Gressenhall, Griston, Hockham, Lyng, Mundford, North Lopham, Rocklands, Saham Toney, Thompson, Weasenham, Shropham, Eccles Road (Quidenham), Yaxham (including Clint Green).				192	311	0	0	150			
<b>Villages without boundaries</b>	Beachamwell, Besthorpe, Billingford, Bintree, Blo Norton, Bradenham, Bridgham, Brettenham, Brisley, Bylaugh, Cockley Cley, Colkirk, Cranwich, Cranworth, Croxton, Didlington, East Tuddenham, Elsing, Foulden, Foxley, Fransham, Garvestone, Gateley, Gooderstone, Great Cressingham, Great Dunham, Guist, Hardingham, Hilborough, Hoe, Holme Hale, Horningtoft, Ickburgh, Kempstone, Kilverstone, Lexham, Lt Cressingham, Lt Dunham, Lt Ellingham, Longham, Lynford, Merton, Mileham, Narford, New Buckenham, Newton, North Pickenham, North Tuddenham, Ovington, oxborough, Riddlesworth, Roudham, Rougham, Scarning, Scoulton, Snetterton, South Acre, South Lopham, South Pickenham, Sparham, Stanfield, Stanford, Stow Bedon, Sturston, Thompson, Tittleshall, Tottington, Twyford, , Wellingham, Wendling, Whinburgh, Whissonsett, Wretham	902	150	1052	299	275	0	0	0		1227	+175
<b>Total</b>		<b>10,858</b>	<b>5069</b>	<b>15950 (4.3% buffer)</b>	<b>2821</b>	<b>8270</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>4,506</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>16,675 (9% buffer)</b>	<b>+725</b>

\*Delivery of housing target will in part be met through Policy HOU03

Appendix 3: Completions and Commitments in Villages with Boundaries

Beeston completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2003/0246/F
3	3PL/2012/0937/F
2	3PL/2013/0725/D
1	3PL/2014/0123/F
<b>7</b>	

Beeston Commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/0467/F
1	3PL/2015/1290/F
11	3PL/2016/0269/O
3	3PL/2016/0836/F
1	3PL/2016/1293/F
4	3PL/2017/0078/F
1	3PL/2017/0158/F
2	3PL/2017/0702/O
2	3PL/2017/0985/F
2	3PN/2017/0046/UC
<b>28</b>	

Beetley completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
5	3PL/2006/0429/D
1	3PL/2011/0564/F
1	3PL/2011/0623/F
1	3PL/2012/0272/F
1	3PL/2013/0563/F
1	3PL/2014/0120/F
1	3PL/2014/0320/F
<b>11</b>	

Beetley Commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
4	3PL/2015/0826/O
1	3PL/2017/0223/F
1	3PL/2017/1247/D
<b>6</b>	

Carbrooke Completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2008/1607/F
2	3PL/2012/1080/F
2	3PL/2014/1101/F
<b>5</b>	

Carbrooke Commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2015/1200/O
1	3PL/2016/1092/F
2	3PL/2017/1248/F
<b>5</b>	

Caston completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
3	3PL/2007/1709/F
1	3PL/2008/0469/F
2	3PL/2010/0108/F
1	3PL/2012/0722/F
2	3PL/2012/0769/CU
3	3PL/2013/0255/F
1	3PL/2013/1049/F
1	3PL/2014/0608/F
8	3PL/2014/1002/F
<b>22</b>	

Caston Commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
4	3PL/2015/0147/F
3	3PL/2015/0613/F
4	3PL/2017/0438/F
<b>11</b>	

Gressenhall completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2010/0960/F
1	3PL/2015/0191/F
1	3PN/2015/0040/UC
<b>3</b>	

Gressenhall commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2015/0386/O
5	3PL/2015/1316/F
1	3PL/2016/0326/D
2	3PL/2016/1226/F
<b>10</b>	

Griston completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2009/0917/F
1	3PL/2011/1404/F
1	3PL/2012/0631/F
1	3PL/2012/1179/D
1	3PL/2016/0050/F
<b>5</b>	

Griston commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
37	3PL/2012/1045/O
4	3PL/2014/0746/O
3	3PL/2014/1004/F
2	3PL/2015/1021/O
2	3PL/2016/0050/F
5	3PL/2016/0297/O
1	3PL/2016/1040/F
1	3PL/2016/1358/F
2	3PL/2016/1403/D
2	3PL/2017/0065/F
4	3PL/2017/1122/D
<b>63</b>	

Hockham Completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
3	3PL/2005/1014/F
3	3PL/2008/0524/F
1	3PL/2008/0525/F
1	3PL/2009/0471/F
1	3PL/2009/0933/F
1	3PL/2011/0428/F
1	3PL/2012/0668/F
1	3PL/2015/0316/F
<b>12</b>	

Hockham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2016/0170/F
1	3PL/2016/0862/O
4	3PL/2017/0903/O
1	3PN/2017/0013/UC
<b>7</b>	

Lyng completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2010/0251/F
2	3PL/2011/0586/F
1	3PL/2011/0820/F
1	3PL/2013/0058/F
1	3PL/2014/0471/D
2	3PL/2015/1149/F
<b>8</b>	

Lyng commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
3	3PL/2014/1012/F
1	3PL/2015/0252/F
0	3PL/2015/1149/F
1	3PL/2017/0154/F
<b>5</b>	

Mundford Completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
15	3PL/2007/0356/F
1	3PL/2008/1056/F
2	3PL/2012/0607/F
2	3PL/2013/0970/D
<b>20</b>	

Mundford commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2014/0350/F
1	3PL/2015/1085/D
1	3PL/2016/0634/O
4	3PL/2017/0059/F
<b>8</b>	

North Lopham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2010/0802/F
1	3PL/2011/0769/F
1	3PL/2011/1425/F
1	3PL/2012/1013/D
1	3PL/2012/1077/F

North Lopham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/1212/F
2	3PL/2014/1213/F
1	3PL/2015/0797/F
2	3PL/2016/0784/F
1	3PL/2016/0826/F

	1 3PL/2012/1106/F
	1 3PL/2013/0093/F
	1 3PL/2013/0579/F
8	

	1 3PL/2017/0909/F
	2 3PL/2017/0943/F
	2 3PL/2017/0966/O
	3 3PL/2017/1327/F
15	

Rocklands completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
	1 3PL/2008/1228/F
	1 3PL/2008/1527/F
	1 3PL/2009/0509/F
	1 3PL/2011/0411/F
	1 3PL/2011/1123/F
	1 3PL/2012/1057/F
	1 3PL/2013/0261/F
	1 3PL/2013/0499/F
	1 3PL/2013/0853/F
	1 3PL/2014/0302/D
	1 3PL/2014/0332/F
	1 3PL/2014/1016/F
	2 3PL/2014/1225/F
	1 3PL/2015/1173/F
15	

Rocklands Commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
	1 3PL/2015/0640/F
	1 3PL/2015/0815/F
	0 3PL/2015/1173/F
	1 3PL/2016/0147/F
	1 3PL/2016/1119/O
4	

Saham Toney Completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
	1 3PL/2008/0749/F
	1 3PL/2009/0434/F
	2 3PL/2009/0729/F
	1 3PL/2011/0468/F
	1 3PL/2012/0310/F
	29 3PL/2013/0869/F
	1 3PL/2013/1001/F
	1 3PL/2013/1097/F
	1 3PL/2014/0149/F
	1 3PL/2015/0134/F
39	

Saham Toney Commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
	1 3PL/2015/0198/F
	5 3PL/2015/0242/F
	6 3PL/2015/0450/O
	1 3PL/2015/0817/F
	4 3PL/2015/0879/O
	1 3PL/2015/0944/F
	1 3PL/2015/1334/F
	1 3PL/2016/0012/O
	1 3PL/2016/0284/O
	10 3PL/2016/0766/F
	4 3PL/2017/0415/F
	2 3PN/2016/0003/UC
37	

Thompson Completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
	3 3PL/2008/1697/F
	1 3PL/2012/0048/F
	1 3PL/2012/0150/F
	1 3PL/2012/0547/F
	1 3PL/2013/1148/D
7	

Thompson commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
	3 3PN/2017/0049/UC
3	

Weasenham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
	1 3PL/2008/1561/F
	1 3PL/2009/0898/F
	1 3PL/2013/0396/F
3	

Weasenham Commitments

Shropham

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
	1 3PL/2011/0600/D
	1 3PL/2012/0997/F
	1 3PL/2012/1267/F
3	

Shropham

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
	3 3PL/2015/0228/F
	6 3PL/2017/0177/O
	2 3PL/2017/0402/D
	8 3PL/2017/0867/O
	6 3PL/2017/0960/D
	1 3PL/2017/1149/F
26	

Eccles Road

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
	1 3PL/2014/0474/F
1	

Eccles Road

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
	24 3PL/2013/1123/O
	2 3PL/2016/0075/D
	6 3PL/2017/0106/F
	1 3PL/2017/1298/F
33	

Yaxham

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
	2 3PL/2009/0669/F
	1 3PL/2009/0751/F
	3 3PL/2010/0261/F
	2 3PL/2010/0971/D
	1 3PL/2011/0404/F
	4 3PL/2011/0536/F
	1 3PL/2011/1379/F
	4 3PL/2012/0276/F
	1 3PL/2012/0533/F
	1 3PL/2012/0635/F
	1 3PL/2013/0592/F
	1 3PL/2014/1030/D
	1 3PL/2015/1371/F
23	

Yaxham

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
	1 3PL/2010/0291/F
	45 3PL/2014/0820/O
	1 3PL/2015/1416/O
	2 3PL/2016/0749/O
	1 3PL/2016/1083/F
50	

**Breckland District Council Hearing Statement: Matter 5**

**Appendix 4: Completions and Commitments in Villages without Boundaries**

Beachamwell commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/1049/F
1	

Beachamwell Completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2010/0789/F
1	

Billingford commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2012/1160/F
1	3PL/2017/0695/F
2	

Billingford completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2010/0030/F
1	3PL/2011/0107/F
3	

Bintree commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2012/1160/F
1	3PL/2017/0695/F
2	

Bintree completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/1060/F
1	3PL/2015/1317/F
2	

Bradenham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/0812/F
2	3PL/2016/1338/D
1	3PL/2017/0572/F
4	

Bradenham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
10	3PL/2010/1333/F
2	3PL/2013/0399/F
1	3PL/2013/0956/F
13	

Bridgam commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2012/0214/F
1	

Bridham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2012/0214/F
1	

Brisley commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2013/0006/F
1	3PL/2014/0037/F
1	3PL/2014/0790/F
3	

Brisley completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2013/0006/F
1	3PL/2014/0037/F
1	3PL/2014/0790/F
3	

Cockley Cley commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/1503/F
1	

Cockley Cley Completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/1503/F
1	

Cranwich commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2012/0481/F
1	3PL/2013/1162/F
1	3PL/2014/1343/F
3	

Cranwich completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2012/0481/F
1	3PL/2013/1162/F
1	3PL/2014/1343/F
3	

Croxton commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference

Croxton completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference

Besthorpe Commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2009/0420/F
4	3PL/2015/0446/F
1	3PL/2015/1188/F
6	3PL/2015/1225/O
3	3PL/2016/0271/O
4	3PL/2016/1393/F
5	3PL/2016/1399/F
6	3PL/2017/0002/F
1	3PL/2017/0029/D
2	3PL/2017/0031/D
1	3PL/2017/0130/O
2	3PL/2017/0593/F
36	

Besthorpe Completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2007/1980/F
5	3PL/2011/1347/F
1	3PL/2012/0433/F
3	3PL/2012/0953/F
1	3PL/2013/0618/D
1	3PL/2014/1341/F
1	3PL/2015/1188/F
1	3PL/2015/1233/F
14	

Blo Norton commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2016/1146/F
1	3PL/2017/0070/O
1	3PL/2017/1079/D
2	3PN/2015/0043/UC
5	

Blo Norton Completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2009/0675/F
1	3PL/2010/0061/F
3	

Brettenham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/0247/F
1	

Brettenham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/0247/F
1	

Bridgham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2012/0214/F
1	

Bridgham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2012/0214/F
1	

Bylaugh commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PN/2016/0066/UC
1	

Bylaugh completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference

Colkirk commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2007/1687/F
2	3PL/2009/0500/D
2	3PL/2010/0467/D
1	3PL/2010/1003/F
1	3PL/2011/0747/F
2	3PL/2012/0671/F
1	3PL/2013/0139/F
2	3PL/2015/1491/F
8	

Colkirk completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2007/1687/F
1	3PL/2009/0500/D
4	3PL/2010/0467/D
1	3PL/2010/1003/F
1	3PL/2011/0747/F
2	3PL/2012/0671/F
1	3PL/2013/0139/F
1	3PL/2015/1491/F
12	

Cranworth commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference

Cranworth completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference

Didlington commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference

Didlington completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference



1	3PL/2016/1453/D
4	



Holme Hale commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2016/0440/F
2	3PL/2016/0955/F
2	3PL/2016/1158/O
1	3PL/2016/1164/F
7	

Holme Hale completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2008/1236/F
2	3PL/2010/0863/O
1	3PL/2014/0763/F
2	3PL/2016/0517/D
6	3PL/2016/0625/F
13	

Horningtoft commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2016/0873/F
1	

Horningtoft completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/0392/F
1	

Ickburgh commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
8	3PL/2015/0001/F
6	3PL/2015/0472/F
1	3PL/2016/0108/F
1	3PL/2016/0706/O
1	3PL/2016/1097/F
1	3PL/2017/0288/F
18	

Ickburgh completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2007/2051/D
1	3PL/2008/1426/D
1	3PL/2012/0350/D
2	3PL/2015/0981/F
5	

Kempstone commitments

Kempstone completions

Kilverstone commitments

Kilverstone completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2004/1406/F
1	

Lexham commitments

Lexham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2006/0311/F
2	

Little Cressingham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/0965/F
1	

Lt Cressingham completions

Lt Dunham

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
4	3PL/2013/0888/F
1	3PL/2014/0611/F
1	3PL/2014/0612/F
1	3PL/2014/1169/O
0	3PL/2015/1236/F
1	3PL/2016/0431/F
8	

Lt Dunham

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2004/1711/F
3	3PL/2015/0329/F
5	

Little Dunham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/1412/F
1	

Little Dunham completions

Longham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/0309/F
1	3PL/2016/0372/O
2	

Longham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2004/0030/F
1	

Lynford commitments

Lynford completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2016/0127/VAR
1	

Merton commitments

Merton completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
3	3PL/2015/0657/F
1	3PL/2015/1090/F
4	

Mileham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
10	3PL/2016/0534/O
3	3PL/2016/0959/F
13	

Mileham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
3	3PL/2011/0752/D
2	3PL/2012/0397/F
1	3PL/2012/0913/F
11	3PL/2015/0761/D
1	3PL/2015/1394/F
18	

Narford commitments

Narford completions

New Buckenham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/1201/F
2	3PL/2015/1441/O
1	3PL/2016/0228/F
2	3PL/2017/0189/D
6	

North Tuddenham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
5	3PL/2017/0928/F
1	3PL/2017/1020/F
6	

Oxborough commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2016/1129/F
1	

Roudham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/1123/F
1	

Scarning commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/1206/D
1	3PL/2016/0160/F
1	3PL/2017/0053/O
3	

Snetterton commitments

South lopham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/0338/F
2	3PL/2016/0500/F
3	3PL/2016/0530/F
1	3PL/2016/0613/F
1	3PL/2016/1242/F
1	3PL/2017/0073/VAR
9	

Sparham commitments

New Buckenham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2009/0194/F
1	

North Tuddenham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2007/1334/F
1	3PL/2008/1653/F
3	3PL/2009/0605/F
1	3PL/2011/0406/F
1	3PL/2011/1335/EU
1	3PL/2012/0799/F
1	3PL/2012/0854/F
1	3PL/2015/0542/F
1	3PL/2015/0763/F
11	

Oxborough completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2010/0050/D
1	

Roudham completions

Scarning completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2006/1177/F
1	3PL/2007/0554/F
14	3PL/2009/0310/F
1	3PL/2009/0798/F
8	3PL/2012/0426/D
1	3PL/2014/0475/F
1	3PL/2015/0005/D
1	3PL/2015/1336/F
28	

Snetterton completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/0565/F
1	3PL/2014/1347/F
2	

South Lopham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PN/2015/0001/UC
1	

Sparham completions

Newton commitments

North Pickenham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2017/0293/F
1	3PL/2017/0699/F
2	

Ovington commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/1374/F
1	3PL/2017/0019/F
2	

Riddlesworth commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/1239/F
1	

Rougham commitments

Scoulton commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PN/2016/0064/UC
1	

South Acre commitments

South Pickenham commitments

Stanfield commitments

Newton completions

North Pickenham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
4	3PL/2012/0544/F
2	3PL/2012/1288/F
3	3PL/2016/0095/F
9	

Ovington completions

Riddlesworth completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2013/0256/F
1	

Rougham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
2	3PL/2004/1233/F
2	

Scoulton completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2011/0006/F
1	

South Acre completions

South Pickenham completions

Stanfield completions



SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2017/0184/F
1	

Stanford commitments

Sturston commitments

Thompson commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
3	3PN/2017/0049/UC
3	

Tottington commitments

Wellingham commitments

Whinburgh

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
8	3PL/2014/0979/O
4	3PL/2015/1264/F
12	

Wretham commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
27	3PL/2007/1569/F
1	3PL/2016/0248/VAR
3	3PL/2016/1133/F
1	3PL/2016/1318/F
2	3PL/2017/1031/F
34	

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2010/1233/F
5	3PL/2012/0050/F
1	3PL/2014/0664/F
1	3PL/2015/1075/F
8	

Stanford completions

Sturston completions

Thompson completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
3	3PL/2008/1697/F
1	3PL/2012/0048/F
1	3PL/2012/0150/F
1	3PL/2012/0547/F
1	3PL/2013/1148/D
7	

Tottington completions

Wellingham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/0425/D
1	

Whinburgh completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2014/1022/F
1	3PL/2015/1429/F
1	3PL/2016/0155/D
2	3PL/2016/0996/VAR
1	3PN/2015/0003/UC
1	3PN/2016/0076/UC
7	

Wretham completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2005/0965/F
1	3PL/2007/1606/F
3	3PL/2011/0402/F
1	3PL/2011/0849/F
1	3PL/2014/0577/D
8	3PL/2014/0686/F
1	3PL/2015/1253/F
16	

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/0293/O
1	3PL/2015/0880/O
2	

Stow Bedon commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/0461/F
1	3PL/2015/0950/O
1	3PL/2016/0371/F
1	3PL/2016/0787/F
1	3PL/2016/1418/F
1	3PL/2017/0754/D
1	3PN/2015/0045/UC
7	

Tittleshall commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
3	3PL/2012/1323/F
3	

Twyford Commitments

Wending commitments

Whissonsett commitments

SumOfNumber remaining	Planning Application Reference
4	3PL/1991/0796/F
1	3PL/2016/0891/O
1	3PL/2016/1520/F
3	3PL/2017/0352/O
1	3PL/2017/0433/O
1	3PL/2017/0937/O
1	3PL/2017/1108/O
12	

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2009/0856/F
1	3PL/2013/0036/F
2	

Stow Bedon completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2008/1377/F
1	3PL/2009/0801/F
1	3PL/2012/0459/F
1	3PL/2013/0764/F
1	3PL/2015/0081/F
5	

Tittleshall completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2012/0179/F
1	3PL/2012/1323/F
1	3PL/2015/1135/F
3	

Twyford completions

Wending completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2006/1326/F
1	

Whissonsett completions

SumOfDwellings	Planning Application Reference
1	3PL/2015/0401/F
2	3PL/2015/0930/F
3	

**Appendix 5: PD05A - HOU 04 Methodology**

Criteria 2 of Policy HOU 04 limits new residential development for rural settlements with boundaries to a 5% increase in dwellings from the date of adoption of the plan. This methodology sets out how the baseline level of dwellings have been calculated for each settlement with boundaries and the maximum number of dwellings which could be permitted within the plan period for each settlement. This methodology provides the most accurate, up to date information for each of the settlements regarding residential dwellings and planning permissions. This data, as set out in the table below, provides the basis for the 5% calculation, which sets a target for the number of dwellings to be built in each of the settlements.

To set the current baseline number of dwellings within in the settlement boundary, the Council have used the Address Points Layer, a layer contained on a Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping software. Address points provide a record of each property. This data is held by the Spatial Information team at Breckland Council and contains the address points for a range of uses within the District including residential properties and commercial units. This layer was originally derived from Ordnance Survey data; however, post-2004 the Spatial Information team have updated the layer based on planning applications, building control stages of completion and council tax records. This is considered to be the most accurate representation of address points within the District.

The Address Points within each settlement boundary were counted as a baseline for the current number of residential properties within each settlement. Only those address points which were registered as 'Residential', 'Dual Use' (A property with multiple uses, e.g. residential and office) and 'Land, Development, Development Sites' (sites with planning permission) were counted in developing the baseline. Those defined as 'Dual Use' were checked to see if they contained a residential use. Those entries defined as 'Land, Development, Development Sites' were then cross checked with the Housing Land Availability (HLA) layer. The HLA layer is used by the Planning Policy Team to monitor development within the district and is updated at each monitoring period, the data is accurate as of the 31/04/2017.

<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Number of Dwellings within the settlement boundary (Including residential planning permissions as of 31/03/2017)</b>	<b>5% growth – Number of dwellings to be built over the plan period to 2036</b>
Beeston	121	6
Beetley	406	20
Carbrooke	167	8
Caston	128	6
Gressenhall	403	20
Griston	301	15
Hockham	258	13
Lyng	325	16
Mundford	664	33
North Lopham	245	12
Rocklands	158	8
Saham Toney	638	32
Thompson	117	6
Weasenham	118	6

Shropham	109	5
Eccles Road (Quidenham)	120	6
Yaxham (including Clint Green)	363	18
<b>Total</b>		<b>230</b>