

North Norfolk Local Plan Examination: Matter 2 Agenda

Tuesday 23 January at 2 pm
Continuing if necessary Wednesday 24 January at 9.30 am

Matter 2: Spatial Strategy (SS policies)

Issue: Whether the spatial strategy of the plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy as a suitable basis for planning the development of the district.

Questions:

- 2.1 Is the proposed settlement hierarchy with five categories - Large Growth Towns, Small Growth Towns, Large Growth Villages, Small Growth Villages and Countryside - justified by the evidence?
- 2.2 How does the settlement hierarchy compare to that in the 2008 Core Strategy? How are the proposed changes justified or explained?
- 2.3 Does the evidence justify the inclusion of the particular settlements in each of the top three tiers – Large Growth Towns, Small Growth Towns and Large Growth Villages? Is the distinction between Large Growth Villages and Small Growth Villages distinct or have any been misclassified?
- 2.4 How has the proportion of new development in Large Growth Towns (about 50% of the total) been derived? Is this a 'top down' policy decision or the consequence of assessing site opportunities? How have the lower proportions of development in Small Growth Towns and Large Growth Villages been derived, and do these proportions suitably reflect the relative sustainability of the settlements?
- 2.5 What criteria have been used to define settlement boundaries, and have these been consistently applied? (Any site-specific issues will be dealt with settlement by settlement).

Small Growth Villages

- 2.6 Does the evidence justify the inclusion of the villages in the Small Growth Village category? How does the list compare with the designated service villages in the 2008 Core Strategy, and how are any changes justified or explained?
- 2.7 Should any further villages be included in the Small Growth Villages list due to their size, their suitability for minor development, to support existing services or for consistency? e.g. Langham, Edgefield, Beeston Regis
- 2.8 For effectiveness, should sites for development be allocated on the edge of Small Growth Villages, or settlement boundaries expanded, rather than inviting individual applications without further policy guidance?
- 2.9 In the Small Growth Villages, what is the justification for an 'allowance' of 6% growth in dwellings as opposed to a different figure? Is it justified for this figure to be cap on development, to include infill development, and to operate a 'first come first served'

approach as set out in Appendix 4? Given the possible uncertainty, how reliable are the 452 dwellings planned to come forward under this policy?

- 2.10 Are the criteria for development outside defined settlement boundaries in section 3 of Policy SS1 justified and would they be effective? Is the requirement for proposals to incorporate substantial community benefits justified and for sites in excess of 0.25 ha to be offered to registered social landlords first?
- 2.11 Are there any village specific issues, eg scale or location of growth or detailed definition of settlement boundaries:
- a) Aldborough
 - b) Badersfield (Scottow)
 - c) Bacton
 - d) Binham
 - e) Catfield
 - f) Corpusty & Saxthorpe
 - g) East & West Runton
 - h) Happisburgh
 - i) High Kelling
 - j) Horning
 - k) Little Snoring
 - l) Little Walsingham (Walsingham)
 - m) Overstrand
 - n) Potter Heigham
 - o) Roughton
 - p) Sculthorpe
 - q) Sea Palling
 - u) Southrepps
 - v) Sutton
 - w) Trunch
 - x) Walcott
 - y) Weybourne

Policies SS2 & SS3

- 2.12 Are Policies SS2 and SS3 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
- 2.13 Would limited infilling/rounding off, to be defined, be justified in villages or hamlets not defined as Small Growth Villages and without settlement boundaries?