

## AGENDA FOR HEARING SESSION 18:

Matter 14 - Housing Site Allocations (Harling, Hockering, Kenninghall, Litcham, Mattishall, Narborough & Necton)

Venue: Breckland Council, Dereham

Time: 09.30 Thursday 7 June

### **Participants:**

Breckland Council

Erica Whettingsteel (EJW Planning)

Iain Hill or Sarah Hornbrook (For Breckland Bridge)

Lydia Voyias (For Lexham Estate)

Mrs Susan Warren or Richard Hawker or Mrs Rosemary Neave (Hockering 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?

#### ***Harling***

3. To be effective, should the criteria of Harling Housing Allocation 1 refer to the need to have regard to highway safety and any potential mitigation measures that could be required?
4. To be effective, should the criteria of Harling Housing Allocation 1 refer to the need to have regard to heritage assets?
5. To be effective, should the criteria refer to the need to avoid the Anglian Water 15 metre protection zone from the pumping station?

#### ***Hockering***

6. The text of Hockering Residential Allocation 1 states that the site is approximately 1.2 ha. However, the support text at 3.243 refers to the site being 0.8 ha. Why is this?

***Kenninghall***

7. Is the Plan positively prepared and justified, insofar, that only 15 dwellings are allocated within Kenninghall?
8. Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the development of the site allocation would not unacceptably affect highway and pedestrian safety?
9. Is Criterion 1 consistent with national policy?
10. To be effective, should the criteria of Kenninghall Housing Allocation 1 refer to the need to have regard to heritage assets?

***Litcham***

11. Is the Plan positively prepared and justified, insofar, that no allocations are identified in Litcham?
12. Is the evidence, particularly with regard to highways, that has ruled out sites put forward for allocation in Litcham robust?
13. If no suitable sites can be identified in Litcham, is relying on the delivery of 22 dwellings through windfall development justified?

***Mattishall***

14. Is the Plan positively prepared and justified, insofar, that no allocations are identified in Mattishall?
15. Is the evidence that has ruled out sites put forward for allocation in Mattishall robust?
16. If no suitable sites can be identified in Mattishall, is relying on the delivery of 42 dwellings through windfall development justified?
17. What is the current position of the Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan?

***Narborough***

18. Is the allocation justified, consistent with national policy and deliverable, insofar, that the HRA cannot rule out likely significant effects on the Brecks SPA?

***Necton***

19. Is the Plan positively prepared and justified, insofar, that insufficient allocations are identified in Necton?
20. If insufficient sites can be identified in Necton, is relying on the delivery of 17 dwellings through windfall development justified?
21. Is the evidence, with particular regard to flood risk that has ruled out other sites put forward for allocation in Necton robust?
22. Is Criterion 3 of Necton Housing Allocation 2 consistent with national policy?
23. Is the site boundary of Necton Housing Allocation 3 justified?
24. To be effective, should the criteria of Necton Housing Allocation 3 refer to the need to have regard to non-designated heritage assets?
25. Any other matters?