

AGENDA FOR HEARING SESSION 17:

Matter 14 - Housing Site Allocations (Swaffham, Ashill, Banham, Bawdeswell, Garboldisham & Great Ellingham)

Venue: Breckland Council, Dereham Time: 14.00 Wednesday 6 June

Participants:

Breckland Council

Jon Jennings (For Goymour Properties Ltd)

Stuart Thomas (For De Merke Estates)

Iain Hill or Sarah Hornbrook (For Breckland Bridge)

Lydia Voyias (For Abel Homes)

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?

Swaffham

3. Table 3.3 sets out that Swaffham Allocation 1 and 5 are counted as part of the completions and commitments. Why are these sites therefore allocated? Is there any double counting?
4. Are the allocations justified, consistent with national policy and deliverable, insofar, that the HRA cannot rule out likely significant effects on the Brecks SPA?
5. To be effective, should the criteria of Swaffham Allocation 3 refer to the need to have regard to the findings of the Historic

Characterisation Study, as set out in the supporting text (3.163)?

6. To be effective, should the criterion 4 of Swaffham Allocation 4 refer to the need to also have regard to non-designated heritage assets and require a Heritage Statement to inform any future proposal?
7. Swaffham Allocation 5 refers to the provision of 78 dwellings. However, Table 3.3 identifies the site as having capacity for 130 dwellings? To be effective, should this be corrected?
8. To be effective, should the criteria of Swaffham Allocation 5 refer to the need to have regard to the findings of the Historic Characterisation Study, as set out in the supporting text (3.172)?
9. Is criterion 3 of Swaffham Allocation 6 consistent with national policy and would it ensure that any potential effects on heritage assets (namely the Grade II* listed Manor House) are fully considered?

Ashill

10. Is there sufficient evidence to suggest that Ashill Housing Allocation 1 could come forward without causing harm to heritage assets?
11. Is Criterion 2. consistent with national policy?

Banham

12. Is the settlement boundary for Banham justified?
13. Are the requirements for open space, as part of the allocation justified?
14. Is there sufficient evidence to suggest that Banham Housing Allocation 1 could come forward without causing harm to heritage assets?

Bawdeswell

15. Is there sufficient evidence to suggest that Bawdeswell Housing Allocation 1 could come forward without causing harm to heritage assets?

Garboldisham

16. Are sites LP[031]004 & LP[031]005 the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
17. Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the development of the site allocation would not unacceptably affect flood risk and highway safety?
18. To be effective, should the criteria of Garboldisham Housing Allocation 1 refer to the need to have regard to heritage assets?

Great Ellingham

19. Is the Plan positively prepared and justified, insofar, that no allocations are proposed for Great Ellingham?
20. If no suitable sites can be identified in Great Ellingham, is relying on the delivery of dwellings through windfall development justified?
21. Is the settlement boundary set out in Map 3.7 up-to-date for Great Ellingham?
22. Any other matters?