

## AGENDA FOR HEARING SESSION 19:

### Matter 14 - Housing Site Allocations (North Elmham, Old Buckenham, Shipdham, Sporle, Swanton Morley & Settlement with Boundaries)

Venue: Breckland Council, Dereham

Time: 14.00 Thursday 7 June

#### **Participants:**

Breckland Council

Cllr Adrian Joel or Cllr Steve Milner (For Old Buckenham Parish Council)

James Millard or Graham Tuddenham (For Millard Tuddenham)

Erica Whettingsteel (EJW Planning)

Maggie Oechsle or Mr Ian Martin (For NP4 Yaxham)

Peter Lowings (for Yaxham Parish Council)

Cllr Pablo Dimoglou (Ward Member)

Chris Blow (For Saham Toney Parish Council)

Faye Le Bon or Roger Atterwill (For Swanton Morley Parish Council)

#### **Agenda**

Introduction by Inspector

#### ***General Questions Relevant to all Sites Allocations***

1. Are the allocated sites in each case the most appropriate options given the reasonable alternatives?
2. Is each site allocation and its criteria justified and appropriate in all aspects, having regard to the likely impacts of the development?

#### ***North Elmham***

3. Is the Plan positively prepared and justified, insofar, that insufficient allocations are identified in North Elmham?

4. If insufficient sites can be identified in North Elmham, is relying on the delivery of 14 dwellings through windfall development justified?
5. Is the evidence that has ruled out sites put forward for allocation in North Elmham robust?
6. To be effective, should the criteria of North Elmham Housing Allocation 1 refer to the need to have regard to archaeological remains?
7. Is Criterion 4 of North Elmham Housing Allocation 1 consistent with national policy?
8. Are Criteria 2 and 3 of North Elmham Housing Allocation 2 consistent with national policy?

### ***Old Buckenham***

9. Is the Plan positively prepared and justified, insofar, that insufficient allocations are identified in Old Buckenham?
10. If insufficient sites can be identified in Old Buckenham, is relying on the delivery of 17 dwellings through windfall development justified?
11. Is the evidence that has ruled out other sites put forward for allocation in Old Buckenham robust?
12. To be effective, should the criteria of Old Buckenham Residential Allocation 1 refer to the need to have regard to heritage assets?

### ***Shipdham***

13. Is there sufficient infrastructure to support new development in Shipdham?
14. To be effective, should the criteria of Shipdham Residential Allocation 1 refer to the need to have regard to the nearby Conservation Area?

15. To be effective, should the criteria of Shipdham Residential Allocation 2 refer to the need to have regard to the nearby Conservation Area?
16. In combination can the Shipdham Residential Allocation 1 & 2 be delivered without adverse impacts on the highway network?

***Sporle***

17. Is Criterion 5 of Sporle Residential Allocation 1 consistent with national policy?

***Swanton Morley***

18. To be effective, should the criteria of Swanton Morley Residential Allocation 1 refer to the need to have regard to heritage assets, namely the Grade I listed Parish Church of All Saints?

***Settlements with boundaries***

19. Is the Beetley settlement boundary, as shown on Map.2 justified?
20. Is the Hockham settlement boundary, as shown on Map.7 justified?
21. Is the Saham Toney settlement boundary, as shown on Map.13, accurate and justified?
22. Is the Yaxham settlement boundary, as shown on Map.17 justified?
23. Is the approach to settlement boundaries and whether schools are located within them justified and consistent across the District?
24. Any other matters?