

## North Norfolk District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Consultation

---

Mrs Beverly Hart, Programme Officer  
North Norfolk District Council, Holt Road, Cromer, Norfolk, NR27 9EN  
Tel: (01263) 516355 Email: [ldfprogrammeofficer@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:ldfprogrammeofficer@north-norfolk.gov.uk)

23rd October 2007

Dear Representor or Agent

### **Notes of the Preliminary Meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2007**

Further to my recent letter confirming your Regulation 32 representation as being duly made I am now writing to forward you copies of the recent documentation relating to the Core Strategy Examination.

Although you did not make a representation in relation to the Core Strategy Submission Document your Reg. 32 representation will be dealt with by the Inspector as part of the Examination into the Core Strategy.

Please find attached the following documents:

- Notes of the Preliminary Meeting held in the Council's offices on the 9<sup>th</sup> October 2007.
- Appendix 1 Attendance List for this meeting
- Appendix 2 Guidelines for Participants
- Copy of the Final Issues and Matters Statement relating to the Core Strategy (includes Programme details)

Representors who consider the Core Strategy unsound have a right to appear at the appropriate Examination session to expand on their representation (in the light of the questions raised in the Matters and Issues statement) and this right to appear also applies to you as a Reg. 32 Representor.

Please note that representors who support the Core Strategy do not have a right to appear as the Inspector works on the bases that the Core Strategy is sound until proven otherwise.

I would also reassure you that if you choose not to attend and to rely on your written representation that this written representations carries the same weight as those made orally to the Inspector.

If you would like to attend at the Examination please could you let me know by the 30<sup>th</sup> of October. If you have any queries, please contact me on 10263 516355 or via my email [ldfprogrammeofficer@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:ldfprogrammeofficer@north-norfolk.gov.uk)

Yours sincerely

*Beverly Hart*

**North Norfolk District Council Local Development Framework  
Public Examination of the Core Strategy & Development Control Policies  
Notes of the Pre-Examination Meeting held at  
North Norfolk District Council Offices on Tuesday 9 October 2007**

### **Introduction**

The Inspector, Mr Philip Goodman, confirmed that he had been appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to hold an independent Examination into the soundness of the North Norfolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD).

### **Purpose of the Examination**

The Inspector explained that the Meeting was part of the Examination. The Hearings commence on **Tuesday 4 December 2007** at the Council Offices.

The Inspector outlined that the purpose of the Pre-Examination Meeting was to:

- Explain and discuss procedural and administrative matters relating to the management of the Examination, including:
- Programme for the hearings
- Matters to be examined and related questions
- Running order and participants at the hearings
- How representations will be dealt with
- Timetable for submitting statements and any further material
- Any other relevant matters

**This was not the time to discuss the content or merits of the Core Strategy and the representations made.** Notes of this meeting, along with the final Programme for the Hearing Sessions and the Matters & Issues to be Examined, will be circulated as soon as possible to all who have made representations on the Core Strategy.

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

### **Programme Officer**

The Inspector introduced **Mrs Beverly Hart**, the Programme Officer for the Examination. He explained that she was acting as an independent officer, working under his direction in an impartial way and is responsible for:

- Acting as a communication channel between him and others
- organising the hearing sessions of the Examination;
- maintaining the Examination library;
- recording and circulating all written material received;
- assisting him with procedural and administrative matters.

Any programming or procedural queries or any other matter which the Authority or anyone wishes to raise with me should be addressed through her.

## **North Norfolk District Council**

Mrs Jill Fisher, Planning Policy Manager at North Norfolk District Council introduced the Council's team for the forthcoming hearings sessions: Steve Blatch, Strategic Director - Community, Mark Ashwell - Senior Planner, Polly Wake - Senior Planner, Nicola Turner - Development Officer - Strategic Housing, Helen Dixon - Environmental Policy Officer, Peter Frew - Head of Coastal Strategy and Rob Young - Coastal Planner.

Mrs Fisher said that the Council may also involve Roger Howe, its Planning Legal and Enforcement Manager, Emma Duncan, Legal Services Manager for specific issues, and consultants used in preparing the Core Strategy, such as Richard Fordham in respect the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

## **Representors**

The Inspector explained that lists of representors who had signalled their intention to appear at the Examination were available from the Programme Officer and on the Council's LDF website.

## **Scope of Examination and Inspector's Role**

The Inspector explained that his role was to consider: -

- whether the Core Strategy met the requirements of Sections 19-20 of the 2004 Act and associated regulations, and
- whether it is sound in terms of the tests of soundness set out in paragraphs 4.23-4.24 of Planning Policy Guidance Note PPS12.

The Examination will focus on the nine soundness tests grouped in 3 areas:

Procedural: whether the Core Strategy has been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme & Statement of Community Involvement, and has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal;

Conformity: whether it is a spatial plan consistent with national planning policy and in conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy, having regard to relevant plans and strategies of adjoining areas and the local Community Strategy;

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness: whether the strategies & policies are coherent and consistent and represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, having considered relevant alternatives, and whether the plan is founded on a robust and credible evidence base, with clear mechanisms for implementation & monitoring and is reasonably flexible to deal with changing circumstances.

## **Examination process**

The Inspector explained how the process of examining Development Plan Documents produced under the new system differs from the previous process of considering objections to a local plan. He outlined that: -

1. Examination process is to be undertaken quickly – with the aim of submitting the binding report and adoption no later than 12 months from the date of submission (which was 18<sup>th</sup> June 2007).
2. That there was a presumption that the plan is fundamentally sound, *unless it is shown to be unsound by evidence* presented during the Examination.
3. That unlike the old system, he is not required to consider each and every point made in all objections, or to report on them, but to use the representations as a starting point in considering whether the plan is sound.

He also explained that in examining soundness he will consider representations made to the submitted document insofar as they relate to the nine tests in PPS12 and that he is to exercise his duties under S39 of the 2004 Act with the aim of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.

## **Nature of Examination**

The Inspector outlined that Examination hearing sessions are intended to be inquisitorial under his direction and that after the Examination has closed he will submit a report to the Council with his conclusions and recommendations on the actions or changes needed in relation to the soundness of the Core Strategy. This report is binding and unless he concludes that the Core Strategy is “unsound” the Council has to amend the Core Strategy in accordance with his detailed recommendations and move swiftly to formal adoption, as anticipated in the Local Development Scheme.

## **Published guidance**

The Inspector outlined the published documents, which provide the context for the Examination, and where copies of these could be found.

## **Number & Scope of Representations Made**

The Inspector asked Mrs Fisher to outline the number and scope of representations made.

Mrs Fisher, referring to the Summary of Key Issues (Regulation 31 document, A17), stated that the Council received 807 individual representations from 258 individuals/organisations 770 on the Core

Strategy and 37 on the Proposal Maps. Representations covered:-  
Sustainable development and settlement hierarchy  
Scale and distribution of new housing and its mix;  
Scale and distribution of new employment development and  
leisure/tourism facilities  
Built and natural environment  
Community Needs

### **Proposed changes to the Core Strategy?**

The Inspector asked the Council to confirm whether

- it has formally considered the representations on the Core Strategy;
- if it has prepared any responses to them including any proposed minor changes, and if so where these may be found.

Mrs Fisher replied that The Council has prepared a 'Schedule of Minor Modifications to the Core Strategy (Doc I3) which addressed a number of objections and which are acceptable to the Council, should the Inspector decide to recommend them. These changes are limited to factual corrections and minor word changes and do not represent any alteration to the substance of a policy. This schedule was published on the website on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2007, with minor additions included on 1<sup>st</sup> October.

### **Examination Programme**

The Inspector went through the draft Programme which had been sent out to representors. The hearings will be held during two weeks before Christmas and a further two weeks in January 08. Hearing sessions are scheduled to commence at 10.00am on **Tuesday 4 December 2007** at the Council's Offices.

The Inspector referred representors to the Draft Programme for sitting days and topics. He explained that these may yet change in detail but the broad spread of topics will not and that the "Final" version of programme will be sent out with notes of PEM within the next ten days. He advised participants to keep in touch with Programme Officer to check programme & progress & ensure they were present at appropriate time.

### **Methods of considering representations:**

The Inspector explained that representors need to decide whether their views could be dealt with in writing or whether they needed to present them orally at the hearing. He explained that both methods carried the same weight and that attendance and participation at hearing sessions would be helpful only if representors would like to clarify views already made (new evidence should not

be introduced). Those who wish to proceed by written representations can rely on what they have already submitted in writing and need take no further action. He explained that only those parties seeking specific changes to the Core Strategy are entitled to attend the Examination hearing sessions and there was no need for those supporting or making comments on the plan to attend the Examination though in certain circumstances they may be invited to attend to clarify particular points. However, anyone can attend a session as an observer.

### **Procedure at Hearing Sessions**

The Inspector stated that separate hearing sessions would be held for each of the Main Matters identified in the programme; taking the form of a round table or hearing session, where the Council and those who wishing to be heard discuss the key points and issues in a discussion led by the Inspector in accordance with an agenda circulated beforehand. All participants can ask questions and join in the discussion. At the end of each session, participants will be asked if they wish to sum-up the main points of their arguments.

Those attending may bring professional representatives with them, but there is no need for legal representation. Mrs Fisher confirmed that, unless it becomes necessary at a later stage, the Council are not being legally represented.

The Inspector advised that the Hearings are conducted on the basis that everyone has read the relevant documents, although participants will be able to refer to, and elaborate on relevant points.

### **Reference Core Documents**

The Inspector said that a list of Examination Documents had been prepared. The list is available online (with links to most documents) and from the Programme Officer. An Examination Library is available for representors' use and those wishing to consult it should contact the Programme Officer to schedule a time.

### **Topic Papers**

The Inspector noted that the Core Document List includes a number of Topic Papers addressing specific main topics. He asked if the Council proposed to publish any more and if so when? Mrs Fisher stated that the Council had no plans at present to publish any others.

### **Other documents**

The Inspector asked the Council if there were any documents, reports or studies not currently available. Mrs Fisher stated that all documents were available with

the exception of the Regulation 32 representations, which, had yet to be published but should be available by the end of the week.

### **Further statements from Representors & the Council**

The Inspector requested from the Council a response statement on each session topic, answering the questions set out in his Matters and Issues schedule, limited to 3000 words per session.

He stated that there was no need for Representors to add to the comments they have already made in formal Representations, but that they could also submit a 3,000 word paper for the session they were attending which related to their representation outlining:

- which part of the Strategy was unsound,
- which test of soundness it failed & how, and
- how the Strategy could be made sound setting out the precise change/wording they were seeking.

### **Further statements – Submission guidelines**

The Inspector went through the guidelines for the submission of statements:-

1. Participants are invited (but not obliged) to respond to the questions raised in brief statements (4 copies no more than 3,000 words per session & clearly identified on top right hand corner with the Representor's Name, representor number and Session title and date), **to be received by the Programme Officer no later than the following deadlines:**

**Weeks 1 & 2 – Statement deadline: - Fri 9 Nov 2007.**

**Weeks 3 & 4 – Statement deadline: - Fri 14 Dec 2007.**

2. Representors may refer to information in previous representations and statements and the Council to information in the Self-Assessment of Soundness, Core Documents and any Topic Papers, to avoid unnecessary repetition. It is important that the representations and responses include all evidence and supporting material, and for the Authority, specific reference to the "core" evidence base - further information **will not be accepted** once the hearing sessions start.
3. All material which participants wish to refer to at the hearings must be submitted by the deadlines indicated. Late information or evidence can disrupt the hearing sessions and would disadvantage other participants. **If participants wish to rely only on their original representation, no further statement is needed.**

4. Following receipt of responses to the Matters and Issues schedule, detailed agendas for the hearing sessions will be issued shortly before they commence along with any papers submitted by the Council and others.
5. The lists of those attending the hearing sessions are based on the latest information in the database and the expressed preferences. **Participants wishing to attend a particular session, should let the Programme Officer know by Friday 19<sup>th</sup> October.**
6. The Inspector stated that if they decided they no longer wished to attend they should let the Programme Officer know.
7. Participants are reminded that the Examination focuses on the tests of soundness set out in PPS12 (4.23-4), with the presumption that the Core Strategy is sound unless it is shown to be otherwise by evidence considered at the Examination. Representors need to explain why the plan is unsound in terms of a specific soundness test and specify how the plan should be altered, with clear evidence to support this course of action, where necessary.

### **Site visits**

The Inspector confirmed that he will carry out a tour of the plan area and will visit most, if not all, of the places referred to in representations, either before, during or after the hearing sessions, by himself, or with the Programme Officer.

If there are particular reasons for an Accompanied Site Visit, participants should discuss this with the Programme Officer.

### **Close of Examination**

The Inspector stated that the Examination will stay open until his report is submitted to the Council. Further representations or evidence will not be accepted after the hearing sessions have finished unless he specifically requests it. The Programme Officer will return any late or unsolicited material.

### **Examination Report**

The Inspector anticipated that the date of submitting his report to the Authority will be well within the 12-month period from submission of the Core Strategy anticipated by PPS12 and that he will give an estimated date at the end of the final hearing session.

### **Procedural questions for the Council**

The Inspector asked the Council the following procedural questions. Responses, on behalf of the Council, were given by Mrs Fisher

Q: Can the Council confirm that the Core Strategy has been prepared in accordance with:

- the statutory procedures under Section 20 (5) (a) of the 2004 Act and the associated Regulations;

*A: Yes, the Core Strategy has been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures contained in the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and the associated Regulations.*

Q: The Inspector asked how the Core Strategy fitted into other elements of the LDS, in particular the SSP which is to follow.

A: Mrs Fisher explained that initially the Council was hoping to prepare the Core Strategy and Site Specific Policies in parallel. As the new system developed PINS asked for the SSP to follow on after the Core Strategy which has delayed the SSP process. The Council now intended to do the Preferred Options stage a second time. The Inspector commented that the Core Strategy dealt with the broad principles e.g. quantum and balance of development and that the specifics of sites was a second generation issue.

- the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS);

*Yes, the Core Strategy is identified in the adopted Local Development Scheme (G18). The LDS outlines the general purpose of the strategy to set the vision, objectives and strategy for the spatial development of North Norfolk up to 2021 and states that a range of strategic policies and generic development control policies will be included, along with a monitoring and implementation framework, key diagram and inset maps. The Council believes that the submitted Core Strategy reflects the stated intentions of the LDS.*

*See Core Strategy self assessment tests of soundness (A5) pages 10 & 17*

- the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI);

*Yes, the Core Strategy has been prepared in compliance with the SCI (A9) which was adopted, following independent examination, in April 2006. Early stages of preparation of the Core Strategy (prior to April 2006) were carried out in accordance with draft versions of the SCI*

*See Core Strategy self assessment tests of soundness (A5) pages 10 & 17 and the Consultation Statement (A3), including Appendix A.*

- that it is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA);

*Yes, the Core Strategy has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal throughout its production. This included a SA scoping report (draft for consultation published*

*November 2005, revised scoping report published 2006, (G16), a draft SA of the Core Strategy published alongside the preferred options report (September 2006, G13 & G14) and the final SA report published alongside the submitted Core Strategy (June 2007, A2)*

- that it's been subject to the Council's own Self-Assessment against the tests of soundness in PPS12;

*Yes, the Council carried out a self-assessment of how the Core Strategy met the tests of soundness. See Core Strategy self assessment tests of soundness (A5)*

- whether the Authority is aware of any fundamental procedural shortcomings relating to CS preparation ?

*No. The Council believes that the submitted Core Strategy is sound.*

Q: Can the Council:

- confirm the opinion from the Regional Planning Body on the general conformity of the Core Strategy with the Regional Spatial Strategy and any issues arising from this opinion;

*A: Yes, EERA have confirmed that the Core Strategy is consistent with the RSS and issued a certificate of conformity. (A22)*

- update the current state of play on the Regional Spatial Strategy in general terms (ie how far has the review progressed and what happens next);

*Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the East of England (RPG14) was first published in February 2004. This was subsequently held in abeyance and a Draft revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England (D4) was published in December 2004 and subject to consultation until 16 March 2005. The Examination in Public took place in late 2005 / early 2006 and the Panel's Report was published in June 2006.*

*Following receipt of the Panel's Report, the Secretary of State's proposed changes to the draft revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy were published in December 2006 (D12) and subject to consultation until 9 March 2007. Following consideration of the representations received the final version of the RSS was originally due to be published in mid 2007 however this has been delayed I understand further consultation may be required so that publication is not now expected before the end of the year.*

- Indicate if the Core Strategy is consistent with the latest version of the RSS?

*Yes, the certificate of conformity was issued for the latest version of the emerging RSS.*

Q: Can the Council:

- Indicate if the adopted Local Plan policies have been saved beyond 27 September 2007 as an interim measure pending adoption of the Core Strategy and any subsequent DPDs;

*A: Yes, the Government Office have confirmed that 84 of the 153 Local Plan policies have been saved beyond 27 September 2007 as an interim measure pending adoption of the Core Strategy. (F20).*

- Indicate if any local plan policies are likely to be saved beyond that date?

*No, it is the intention that all saved policies will be replaced by the Core Strategy when adopted.*

The Inspector noted for those representors attending that saved policies provide the Council with a legal Development Plan in the interim period.

- Outline the programme for preparing other LDF documents, (as in LDS).

*The adopted LDS (G18) contains details and timetables for the production of the following other LDF documents:*

*Proposals Map: to be published alongside adoption of the Core Strategy (August 2008)*

*Site Specific Proposals DPD: following the previous preferred options consultation (25 September to 6 November 2006) the current LDS programmes a further round of preferred options consultation for January / February 2008. However, due to the workload involved in preparing for the Core Strategy Examination and the need to undertake regulation 25 consultations for sites in the coastal villages this timetable has slipped. The AMR will provide the mechanism for submitting a revised LDS. It is likely that a revised timetable will involve another round of preferred options consultation in September 2008, submission in May 2009 with adoption anticipated in Summer 2010.*

*North Norfolk Design Guide SPD: it is expected that there will be a slight delay to the LDS timetable and that the 6 week public consultation will take place in March / April 2008 with adoption in September 2008.*

*Planning Obligations SPD: Production of this SPD has been delayed due to resources, but, it is programmed for production in 2008.*

*Master Plans for major allocations SPDs: to be prepared throughout 2009/2010 in conjunction with preparation of the SSP and will be adopted following adoption of the SSP.*

*Annual Monitoring Report: published annually in December. (G1, G8)*

*See the adopted LDS (G18)*

Q: Can the Authority state if the Core Strategy has taken account of other relevant plans, for example:

- The Adopted Local Plan;
- The Council's Community Strategy;
- The plans of adjoining authorities;
- The Local Transport Plan;
- Minerals and Waste local plans

*A: Yes, the issues identification stage involved assessing a broad range of evidence and local strategies, studies and plans. An understanding of these plans informed the key issues, visions and aims that then informed the development of options and selection of preferred options.*

*See sections 1.1 and 1.2 of the Consultation statement (A3) and section 2 of the Core Strategy preferred options document (G10)*

---

## **QUESTIONS:**

**1. Garth Hanlon of Savills 1579** (on behalf of J P Rossi) questioned the content of the Core Strategy in relation to the generality of growth and allocations in the Proposals Maps which he felt was more of an SSP issue than a Core Strategy issue.

*The Inspector replied that there was always the potential for debate regarding where the Core Strategy ends and the Site Specifics begin and that there was merit in trying to think strategically first and specifically later.*

*Mrs Fisher agreed that it was difficult to get a balance. There were no allocations in the submission proposal map but there was a de-allocation which arose from the employment strategy for North Walsham where land was no longer required or deliverable. However, the issue may need to be debated at the Examination.*

*The Inspector confirmed that he will expect to hear discussion on this matter (i.e. the quantum of required employment land) and on the de-allocation which followed on from it.*

*Mr Hanlon responded that he wanted to ensure that he appeared at the hearings at the correct time and in the correct context. The Inspector replied that if he was going to refer to a specific site, e.g. Bacton, then now was not the correct time but if it related to a de-allocation then this (the hearings) were the correct time even though it was not a perfect fit. Mrs Fisher confirmed that the Council would accept this as a fair approach and an appropriate opportunity to have a debate regarding employment land.*

- 2. Janet Long 1606** on behalf of Tattersett Park referred to policy EC4 on Sculthorpe Airbase stating Sculthorpe Airbase was very site specific and felt that it could only be dealt with as such, though she noted it was to be considered as part of the EC4 debate.

*The Inspector responded that whilst it was difficult to know if the balance of timings were right for that day. The aim was to focus on areas of disagreement. He encouraged Representatives to discuss matters with the Council with a view to an agreed factual background paper prior to the hearing.*

- 3. Nigel Morgan 4325** raised a concern regarding the relevance of the Bittern Line railway to in relation to the Environment, Housing and Economy area but it appeared solely to be appraised in the monitoring section on day 8. He felt that the sustainable use of the Railway, was a cross cutting issue and should be considered in a wider context as it affected other areas of policy.

*The Inspector requested a note on this matter and stated that he would consider it in relation to the proposed hearing programme. He asked if Mr Morgan wanted this issue brought in earlier in the proceedings and/or cross referenced on day 8. Mr Morgan replied 'both' but would prefer earlier in particular. Mrs Fisher suggested that it would be appropriate to discuss this on day 2 or 3 in relation to how consideration of the rail line informs the hierarchy. The Inspector noted it may mean attendance at both sessions for Mr Morgan but he would consider adding a related question into the Issues and Matters for day 2 or 3 as long as it did not dominate the debate.*

- 4. Stephen Faulkner, 614 Norfolk County Council**, made the following points:
  - a. That there were a number of saved policies from the Structure Plan (28<sup>th</sup> September with confirmation from the Government on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2007) which he could send to the Programme Officer if needed. *The Inspector*

*asked for Mr Faulkner to do this. Mrs Fisher confirmed that this had been added to the Examination Library (Doc E3(i)).*

- b. The County had submitted written representations and asked if attendance was expected. *The Inspector said it was not.*
- c. Mr Faulkner asked if he was invited to a session would he need to produce further evidence. *The Inspector said it was possible that NCC would be invited to appear as they were a custodian of the Development Plan and he may ask them to appear to explain the relationship between the Core Strategy and the Structure Plan policies but that he understood that NCC did have other calls on its time. The Inspector expected he would not need a representative rather than a paper but noted that a short briefing note may be helpful to him.*

5. **Mrs Rosalind Wilson from Blakeney Parish Council** asked if there was some flexibility in the Core Strategy and whether there were future opportunities for further discussion on allocations and affordable housing with relation to specific villages.

*The Inspector replied that the hearings would deal with the Core Strategy only, which included general principles regarding where (i.e. in which towns/villages) allocations would be made and what type. Specifics regarding where in town or villages those allocations would be a site specific issues and discussion on this matter would follow at a later stage (i.e. the Site Specific Allocations DPD) once the Core Strategy Examination been examined and found sound. He advised the Parish Council to raise any general concerns they had over affordable housing now.*

Mrs Wilson asked if the policy was set in stone now. *The Inspector replied that it was not, until he formally confirmed the Core Strategy was sound. He added that he would be considering if the Council's policies and aims in the Core Strategy were correct. He advised Mrs Wilson to speak to Mrs Fisher for any further clarification of this issue.*

6. **Mr Glyn Davies, 1149 Bidwells on behalf of Blue Sky Leisure**, asked about deadlines for statements and whether he would have the opportunity to see the Council's responses before submitting his own.

*The Inspector advised that the deadlines applied to everyone and were not staggered so statements would be submitted in isolation. However, all statements would be sent out in advance of the actual session so other participants would have the chance to read through them. He advised Mr Davies to focus on answering the questions from his client's point of view.*

**Tony Ross-Benham from Stalham Town Council** asked for clarification on the Site Specific Policies as the Core Strategy appeared to have a site specific

proposal for Stalham High Street and he was unclear about the differences between designations and their effect on allocations. He indicated he wanted to be clear about what was being dealt with when.

*The Inspector replied that the issue related to a policy designation not a site specific issue so would be dealt with now (the hearings). Mrs Fisher confirmed that the SSP (Site Specific Proposals DPD) was about allocations of land. This designation related to development control policy e.g. to define the town centre area now, site detail would be explored in the Site Specific Proposals.*

*The Inspector advised Mr Ross-Benham that it was a reflection of Core Strategy and development control policies being submitted at the same time and the maps illustrated the changes which would occur to policy lines which already existed in the Local Plan.*

Mr Morgan commented that there needed to be clarification regarding the difference between an allocation and a designation as they can have the same effect on a site. *The Inspector confirmed that this very difficult on the ground as site specific issues impact on strategy so on occasion you had to consider site specific matters. He confirmed that this was likely to be part of future discussions.*

### **Closing remarks**

The Inspector thanked everyone for attending the PEM. He advised that notes of meeting would be circulated to everyone in about ten days, along with a final programme for the hearing sessions.

He requested that everyone stick to the deadlines for submitting further material and keep in contact with the Programme Officer as necessary.

Meeting Closed at 12.58

**Appendix 1: PEM 9th October 2007 - Attendance List**

1	A Pugh	
2	AEJ Edwards	
3	Alex Barrett	Framptons
4	Asher Ross	Indigo Planning on behalf of Blackfish
5	Brian Metcalf	Aldborough Parish Council
6	Brian Wexler	North Walsham Town Council
7	Charlotte Read	Waveney District Council
8	Cllr A Green	North Norfolk District Council
9	Cllr Angie Tillett	North Norfolk District Council
10	Cllr Barbara McGoun	North Norfolk District Council
11	Cllr Clive Stockton	North Norfolk District Council
12	Cllr Hilary Nelson	North Norfolk District Council
13	Cllr L A McGinn	Sheringham Town Council
14	Cllr Nigel Dixon	North Norfolk District Council
15	Craig Neilson	Falcon on behalf of Tattersett Park
16	David Gosling	Griffon Area Partnership
17	Desi Reed	Waveney District Council
18	E G Vickers	Overstrand Parish Council
19	Edward Hanson	Barton Wilmore (Coltishall & Sutherland)
20	Garth Hanlon	Savills on behalf of JP Rossi and Partners
21	Geoffrey Lane	GLTP
22	Glyn Davies	Blue Sky Leisure
23	Helen Dixon	North Norfolk District Council
24	Jon Jennings	Pegasus Planning on behalf of Orchid Properties
25	Joanne Pears	Roger Tym & Coon behalf of Mr Barker
26	James Aflatt	(Ray Houghton) on behalf of Hopkins Homes and Cherryridge Poultry
27	Janet Long	Planit Consulting on behalf of Tattersett Park
28	John Flowerdew	Anstruthers Estates
29	John Vincent	
30	John Wharfe	
31	Jon Rowling	
32	Jonathon Green	NPS Property Consultants
33	Lee Muston	Fakenham Rugby Club
34	M Hyde	DLP Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey
35	Martyn Hutchins	
36	Mark Ashwell	North Norfolk District Council
37	Martin Bagshaw	John Martin Associates on behalf of Gresham School
38	Maxine Collis	North Norfolk District Council
39	Mike Terry	on behalf of Caroline Seed
40	Mr Collins	
41	Mr Jack Hedley	
42	Nick Saffell	Brown & Co on behalf of Crisp Maltings
43	Nicola Turner	North Norfolk District Council
44	Nigel Morgan	Edwin Watson Partnership
45	P Grove Jones	Stalham Town Council
46	Peter Frew	North Norfolk District Council
47	Polly Wake	North Norfolk District Council
48	R Possett	Martin Robeson Planning
49	Richard Davies	Coltishall Group & Sutherland House
50	RJ Read	
51	Robert Young	North Norfolk District Council
52	Rosamund Wootten	Chair of Blakeney Parish Council
53	Sara Nicholls	Waveney District Council
54	Sarah Tudhope	North Norfolk District Council
55	Stephen Faulkner	Norfolk County Council
56	Steve Blatch	North Norfolk District Council
57	T Lincoln	North Norfolk District Council
58	T Ross Benham	Stalham Town Council
59	TA Armitage	
60	TC Duffy	
61	Y R Nolan	
62	Mrs J Fisher	North Norfolk District Council
63	Mr Witham (?)	Open Spaces Society

## Appendix 2

### NORTH NORFOLK CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

#### GUIDANCE NOTES FOR PARTICIPANTS

1. The public Hearings part of the Examination will run for four weeks over two fortnights. The first fortnight starts on 4 December 2007 and the second on 8 January 2008. The detailed Programme is on the Council's LDF web site. It may be subject to detailed changes as the Examination progresses although these will be avoided as far as possible.
2. The Inspector's Matters & Issues Schedule (Annex 3 to the PEM invitation) lists the main topics and issues to be discussed. For each topic it asks a number of questions on which the Inspector invites responses from the attending participants. Participants are invited (but not obliged) to respond to the questions raised in brief statements (4 copies; no more than 3,000 words per hearing session; clearly identified on top RH corner with Representor's Name, No and Session title & date), to be received by the Programme Officer as follows:
  - For the December sessions **no later than Friday 9 November 2007**;
  - For the January sessions **no later than Friday 14 December 2007**.
3. Participants may refer to information in previous representations and statements and the Council to information in the Self-Assessment of Soundness, Core Documents and Topic Papers, to avoid unnecessary repetition. However, the Inspector only has copies of the representations made at formal submission stage. It is important that the representations and responses include all evidence and supporting material, and for the Council, reference to the "core" evidence base. The Inspector will not expect to receive further information once the hearing sessions start.
4. All material which participants wish to put to the inspector or refer to at the hearings or in writing should be submitted by the deadlines indicated. Late information or evidence can disrupt the hearing sessions and could disadvantage the participants. If participants wish to rely only on their original representation, no further statement is needed, but this should be confirmed with the Programme Officer.
5. Following the responses received to the Schedule of Matters & Issues for Examination, detailed agendas for the hearing sessions will be issued shortly before they commence. The Inspector will aim not to introduce new issues or questions that do not arise from the topics and issues identified. Not all matters and issues will be discussed fully at the hearing sessions; this will partly depend on those who wish to have an oral hearing; some matters may be dealt with solely by written representations. The lists of those attending the hearing sessions are based on the latest information in the database and the expressed preferences. If participants wish to attend (or no longer attend) a particular session, they should let the Programme Officer know as soon as possible.
6. Participants are reminded that the Examination focuses on the tests of soundness set out in PPS12 (¶ 4.24 see overleaf), with the presumption that the Core Strategy is sound unless it is shown to be otherwise by evidence considered at the Examination. Participants are expected to explain why the plan is unsound in terms of a specific soundness test and specify how the plan should be altered, with clear evidence to support this course of action, where necessary.

## **Tests of Soundness for DPD's**

*(Extract from PPS12 Local Development Frameworks, para 4.24)*

### **"Assessing whether the development plan document is sound**

4.24 The presumption will be that the development plan document is sound unless it is shown to be otherwise as a result of evidence considered at the examination. The criteria for assessing whether a development plan document is sound will apply individually and collectively to policies in the development plan document. A development plan document will be sound if it meets the following tests:

#### **Procedural**

- i. it has been prepared in accordance with the local development scheme;
- ii. it has been prepared in compliance with the statement of community involvement, or with the minimum requirements set out in the Regulations where no statement of community involvement exists;
- iii. the plan and its policies have been subjected to sustainability appraisal;

#### **Conformity**

- iv. it is a spatial plan which is consistent with national planning policy and in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy for the region or, in London, the spatial development strategy and it has properly had regard to any other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or to adjoining areas;
- v. it has had regard to the authority's community strategy;

#### **Coherence, consistency and effectiveness**

- vi. the strategies/policies/allocations in the plan are coherent and consistent within and between development plan documents prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross boundary issues are relevant;
- vii. the strategies/policies/allocations represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, having considered the relevant alternatives, and they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base;
- viii. there are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring;
- ix. the plan is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances. "

*For use at North Norfolk Core Strategy Public Examination, Dec 2007 – Jan 2008*

**North Norfolk Core Strategy incorporating development control policies**

**INSPECTOR'S SCHEDULE OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION (18<sup>th</sup> October 2007)**

**Day 1 – Tues 4 December 2007**

**AM CORE AIMS AND KEY ISSUES**

**Key issues:**

- i. How have document's Strategic Aims and Key Issues been identified?
- ii. How have community interests been engaged in their identification?
- iii. How were the priorities evolved?

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

***[Soundness Tests 1; 2A/B; 3;]***

**Key issues:**

- iv. Has the Strategy been prepared in accordance with the current Local Development Scheme and have the relevant details in the LDS been met?
- v. Has the Strategy been prepared in compliance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement, including explaining how community involvement has been undertaken and how views have been taken into account?
- vi. Has the Strategy been subject to Sustainability Appraisal, which has properly identified the process carried out, the baseline information used and the outcomes of the process?
- vii. Has the Strategy preparation included an Appropriate Assessment on the impact on European sites having regard to the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 2006? Is any clarification or update needed?
- viii. Is there a complete Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which has informed the preparation of the Core Strategy and related DC policy?

**PM PROPOSALS MAP AND KEY DIAGRAM**

**Key issues:**

- i. Does the Proposals Map link with the Core Strategy and its Key Diagram?
- ii. How does it relate to the Site Specific Proposals DPD?
- iii. What is the position in relation to extant Mineral and Waste designations and allocations?
- iv. What policies are saved from the SP and LP and have they been shown on the Proposals Map where they have a specific spatial dimension?
- v. What is the status of the Cromer, Sheringham, Holt "Cluster" on the Key Diagram, and is it reflected in any policies shown on the Proposals Map?
- vi. Detailed Proposals Map queries raised by representors?

---

**Day 2 – Wed 5 December 2007**

**SPATIAL VISION & STRATEGY**

***[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C; 5, 6: 7 & 9]***

**Key issues:**

- i. How has the Council approached the Vision, Objectives and generation of the Strategy?
- ii. Is the Spatial Strategy soundly based and appropriate for this area, consistent with RSS & national policy, reflecting community views, and providing a sound basis for the strategic spatial policies, including local justification for variance with higher policy?
- iii. Are areas for development and restraint clearly identified and related to the Key Diagram?
- iv. Does the spatial strategy properly reflect the objectives and policies of the emerging RSS, and does it provide sufficient flexibility to deal with changing circumstances?
- v. Has the Council considered all reasonable options in terms of the development strategy?
- vi. Does the Strategy clearly relate to other relevant plans and strategies which influence the delivery of its proposals?
- vii. Does the Strategy integrate effectively with plans prepared by other local planning authorities in the area (eg the County Council and adjoining local planning authorities)?
- viii. Are cross-boundary issues properly and sufficiently addressed?
- ix. How was the settlement hierarchy identified, including the categorising of Towns and the selection of Service Villages and is there a need to define it more clearly?
- x. Has the need for encouraging sustainable transport informed the process with regard to improved public transport services and the role of the Bittern railway line?
- xi. Is the role, function and choice of Principal Settlements based in sound evidence?
- xii.

---

**Day 3 – Thurs 6 December 2007**

**AM**     **SPATIAL VISION & STRATEGY (cont'd)**     *[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C; 5, 6: 7 & 9]*

- i. Is the role and function of Secondary settlements clear? Have the right settlements been chosen?
- ii. Has the role of transport links (road and rail) in connecting the area been sufficiently considered?
- iii. Is the approach to development in the countryside and non-selected settlements sound and are the tensions between development needs and conservation fairly balanced?
- iv. Should the smaller rural settlements be allowed some development to assist their longer term sustainability?

**PM**

- v. Is the role and function of Service Villages clear? Have the right settlements been chosen?
  - vi. Is the role and function of Coastal Service Villages clear? Have the right settlements been chosen?
  - vii. Other settlement specific queries
- 

**Day 4 – Fri 7 December 2007**

**AM**     **Town Strategies**     *[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C; 5, 6: 7 & 9]*  
**Key issues:**

- i. Are the individual Town Strategies consistent with the CS's overall approach?
  - ii. Do the proposed town strategy policies adequately reflect the issue and needs of each place and the opportunities and constraints affecting development in:
    - a. Cromer (SS7); Sheringham (SS12); Holt (SS9); (clarify "cluster policy")
    - b. Wells-next-the-Sea (SS14);
- PM**
- c. Fakenham; (SS8);
  - d. North Walsham (SS10);
  - e. Hoveton (SS11) & Stalham (SS13);
  - iii. Are the Town Strategies consistent with the rest of the CS policies?
  - iv. Are adequate monitoring mechanisms in place to adapt to changing circumstances?
  - v. Any other relevant points raised by representors?
- 

**Day 5 – Tues 11 December 2007**

**AM**     **HOUSING\_(Strategic)**     *[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C; 5, 6: 7 & 9]*

**Key issues:**

- i. What housing numbers does extant and emerging RSS expect the area to deliver?
- ii. Are there outstanding queries re this?
- iii. How does the strategy aim to ensure sufficient dwellings are provided?
- iv. Will there be sufficient land to provide a 5, 10 (and 15) year supply?
- v. Is the distribution of new dwellings consistent with the Spatial Strategy and sustainable travel options?

**PM**

- vi. Have the risks of overshoot and undershoot of housing delivery been considered and how will this be managed?
  - vii. Is the intended delivery of housing over-reliant on windfall sites and what assumptions underlie this approach? Would it harm the ability to deliver affordable housing?\*
  - viii. How has the distribution of the housing yet to be delivered (ie uncommitted) been done?
  - ix. How were distributional options considered in arriving at the final proposals?
  - x. How was the housing mix between different sectors/user groups (eg Affordable housing\*, elderly) arrived at and is it too prescriptive?
  - xi. Is there sufficient focus on the housing needs of the elderly?
  - xii. What does the Affordable Housing strategy aim to achieve and does it fit with the overall strategy?
  - xiii. Is the proposed density figure of 40 dwelling per hectare for main settlements (HO7) too rigid and inflexible, and if so, what implications are there for the estimated land supply?
- 

**Day 6 – Wed 12 December 2007**

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING (Policies HO2 &3) [Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C; 5, 6: 7, 9]**

**Key issues:**

- i. What local factors led to the definition of Core Aim 1 and policies HO2 & 3?
  - ii. What is the thrust of national policy & advice in PPS3 and elsewhere and what does extant and emerging RSS say about this topic?
  - iii. What is the evidence base for Policy HO2 and how robust and up to date is it, including the analysis in Core Document H3? Should the up-to-date evidence have been part of the CS Sustainability Appraisal?
  - iv. Is Policy HO2's site size threshold and the 45% target for AH dwellings underpinned and fully justified by the evidence having regard to emerging RSS policy?
  - v. Will the allocated sites be large enough to enable provision of AH at this level; should site development viability be factored in, and if so, how?
  - vi. Is Policy HO2 sufficiently flexible to take account of changing circumstances?
  - vii. How realistic and deliverable is the application of the 50% target in Service Villages?
  - viii. Is the overall policy likely to be deliverable if market conditions change materially?
  - ix. Are resources likely to be available to RSLs to help meet the 80% social rented target?
  - x. Is there a local role for intermediate affordable housing and if so where does it fit into the policy framework?
  - xi. Is there a need for SPD on "in lieu" contributions and control mechanisms?
  - xii. Are the control mechanisms spelt out and fit for purpose?
  - xiii. Would HO3 permit AH in unsustainable locations poorly related to key services?
  - xiv. Should the need for AH override other planning considerations in smaller villages?
- 

**Day 7 – Thurs 13 December 2007**

**AM HOUSING – OTHER POLICIES**

**[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C; 5, 6: 7, 9]**

**Key issues:**

- i. Are the following policies consistent with national policy and RSS and where not is the case for departing from such policy based on sound and credible evidence?

Sites for Gypsies, Travellers & Showpeople HO4

Agricultural and key worker dwellings HO5

Removal of AWD occupancy conditions HO6

**PM**

House extensions & replacement dwellings HO8

Re-use of rural buildings as dwellings HO9

---

**Day 8 – Tues 8 January 2008**

**AM ACCESS & INFRASTRUCTURE  
TRANSPORT & COMMUNITY**

**[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C; 5, 6: 7 & 9]**

**Key issues:**

- i. Is there a potential shortage of infrastructure in the area likely to prevent delivery of the plan, and if so what options are available to address identifiable constraints?
- ii. Does the CS need to be more proactive in this regard?
- iii. How committed are infrastructure providers/stakeholders to the Strategy, and does more need to be done to influence their plans?
- iv. How are timing and phasing of development to be linked to infrastructure provision?
- v. Are the monitoring measures adequate?
- vi. Is the Strategy consistent with the Local Transport Plan?
- vii. Does strategy do enough to foster sustainable transport and choice of travel modes including maximising the use of existing rail routes/services and providing for necessary ancillary development?
- viii. Open space designations Policy CT1 – Does the policy comply with national guidance in PPG17? How were the areas chosen? Would it safeguard natural village greens and play areas in the countryside, parks in towns, and open space in new developments? Is Church House, Wells correctly included? Are open spaces in Cromer properly protected including North Lodge Park? Open land in Aldborough? Open Space Standards: – are they too onerous?
- ix. Provision & retention of local facilities & services Policy CT3 – Does plan properly reflect role of voluntary sector and the need to consult local organisations? Need for a Community Resource Centre for Fakenham? Should the plan include a criteria based policy to deal with a firm prison proposal should it arise during the plan period? Should there be an assessment of need in relation to a community facility before its loss is agreed?
- x. Developer Contributions Policy CT2 – Is the approach to developer contributions consistent with national advice in Circular 05/2005 and its practice guidance volume? (Core Documents?) and otherwise generally sound? How much can be delegated to the proposed SPD? Contributions for additional Police resources required as a result of new development? Subsequent protection of open space set aside as part of new development? Appropriate timing of development contributions in relation to scheme economics? Appropriate balance of funding between developer contributions and public purse? Maintenance and pump priming payments?

Would the policy harm deliverability of new development (especially housing) by reducing scheme viability? Need for more detail on education, open space and sports facilities contributions? Any other detailed sub-issues?

xi. Telecommunications Policy CT4 – Should policy preclude sites only accessible by footpath or bridleway? Should policy address need for improved broadband and digital TV signals in Cromer? Should there be a presumption against telecommunications masts close to housing unless there is no demonstrable alternative?

PM

xii. Transport impact of new development – Policy CT5 – Should the policy commit to preserving the Cromer to Happisburgh coast road linking the service villages? Can the A1151 accommodate traffic arising from new housing in Hoveton, Stalham, Ludham and Catfield without capacity improvements and if not should the housing allocations be reduced to avoid increased congestion in Hoveton and Wroxham villages?

xiii. Parking provision – Policy CT6 and Appendix C – Are the policy's parking provision standards consistent with the thrust of national guidance to reduce reliance on car usage and the need to balance other environmental objectives in new development? Should the parking standards be more flexible in relation to car parking provision in town centre and edge of centre sites? Does the policy adequately address the need for improved station parking to encourage modal shift onto the Bittern railway line at all stations along the line and at North Walsham in particular?  
Xiv Safeguarding land for sustainable transport uses – Policy CT7 – Is safeguarding of land at Great Ryburgh for potential rail freight use realistic? Should the former rail route from High Kelling to Fakenham be protected from development under the policy? Should the policy be more pro-active in promoting greater passenger and freight use of the Bittern railway line including usage monitoring targets? Is the Proposals Map clear in relation to CT7 proposals?

---

## Day 9 – Wed 9 January 2008

AM **ENVIRONMENT**

*[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C;5, 6: 7 & 9]*

**Key issues:**

- i. How were the Core Aims for the Environment generated and how were they related to nationally designated areas (e.g. AONB, The Broads)?
- ii. What evidence underpins the landscape and coastal protection policies, and is further work to be done, and if so how will that feed into the development plan LDF?
- iii. Are the policies to protect the historic environment sound and flexible?
- iv. Are the policies to safeguard biodiversity and geological interests sound and flexible?
- v. Design Policy EN4 – Is the policy consistent with national policy and how will local distinctiveness and other matters raised by representors be factored in?
- vi. Public Realm Policy EN5 – Can the policy be operated while also accommodating the needs of traditional enterprise such as fishing? Are car parking measures and improvement of the public realm policy mutually exclusive?

PM

- vii. How are climate change issues addressed and how is this linked to more detailed policy such as the spatial strategy, sustainable construction and renewable energy?
- viii. Sustainable construction & energy efficiency Policy EN6 – Where is government policy & RSS on this issue. Should EN6 encourage or require energy efficient buildings/renewable energy beyond Code for Sustainable Homes standards? Can the policy avoid overlap with Building Regulations and if so how?
- ix. Renewable Energy Policy EN7 – Is the policy consistent with the thrust of national guidance (PPS22)? What are the RSS targets in this regard and how will the policy deliver them locally? Are the delivery targets meaningful? How is the need for greater renewable energy to be reconciled with local environmental protection?

---

## Day 10 – Thurs 10 January 2008

AM **ENVIRONMENT II**

*[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C;5, 6: 7 & 9]*

**Key issues:**

- i. What evidence underpins the approach to Flood Risk and is it consistent with the policy expectations in PPS25? Is the SFRA sufficient for its purpose?
- ii. Is the general approach to Flood Risk sound, and if not, what changes would make it so?
- iii. Flood Risk Policy EN10 – Is the policy consistent with PPS25; should other uses be permitted in flood risk zones; is the policy flexible enough? Is the SFRA complete and has it properly informed the policy? How does the SMP fit into the picture? Is Catfield rightly identified as a Service Village?

PM

- iv. Is the Coastal Erosion policy EN11 sound and able to adapt to changing circumstances? How consistent is it with other plan policies? How does the SMP fit into the picture?

- v. Is the replacement of affected development policy EN12 sound? Are there viable alternatives to it? Is the policy too restrictive? How would EN12's criteria work in practice? How will the policies be reviewed?
- vi. Any other Environmental policy issues not covered by above

**Day 11 – Tuesday 15 January 2008**

**AM** **ECONOMY I**  
Key issues:

*[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C; 5, 6: 7 & 9]*

- i. What are the Strategic Aims in Core Aims 5 and 6 and elsewhere, and are they consistent with the extant & emerging RSS?
- ii. What evidence underpins the Economy strategy and how have stakeholders been engaged and tensions resolved?
- iii. What is the likely demand for & supply of new employment land required to support the Core Aims?
- iv. Is it deliverable in line with the anticipated population growth and locations?
- v. Should existing employment areas outside settlements be protected?
- vi. Does the analysis support any proposed 'de-allocations' of land currently designated for employment purposes in the Local Plan?
- vii. How will the "bad neighbour land" be identified, delivered and controlled?
- viii. Are monitoring mechanisms appropriate and able to adapt to changed circumstances?
- ix. Would the employment land be in the right places to provide a Sustainable mix of job opportunities?

**PM**

- x. Farm Diversification Policy EC1 – Is the policy consistent with PPS7 and RSS? Is it over-restrictive given the need to encourage rural diversification? How would the various criteria, including the floor space limit on new build, work in practice?
- xi. Re-use of rural buildings Policy EC2 – Is the policy consistent with PPS7 and RSS? Is it over-restrictive given the need to encourage rural diversification? Should residential conversion of rural buildings be permitted?
- xii. Extensions to existing businesses in the countryside Policy EC3 - Is the policy consistent with PPS7 and RSS? How would the question of appropriate scale of expansion be addressed in a consistent way? Does this require clarification?  
Is the Bacton Gas Terminal (BGT) likely to need to expand beyond its present defined boundary? If BGT contracted in its geographical extent how should the surplus land be regarded?

**Day 12 – Wednesday 16 January 2008**

**AM** **ECONOMY II**  
Key issues:

*[Soundness Tests: 4A/B/C; 5, 6: 7 & 9]*

- i. Redundant Defence Establishments Policy EC4 – What does national policy and emerging RSS have to say on this topic? How does the policy fit within the plan's Core Aims? Is there a role for mixed use (including housing) development? Is it realistic to confine development to the designated 'technical areas'? Have the individual constraints and opportunities of each of the four ex airfields been properly addressed:
  - a) Coltishall
  - b) Neatishead (part)
  - c) Sculthorpe (part) (including need to preserve R Wensum SAC) NB Where is "X" on Proposals Map 53?
  - d) West Raynham

**PM**

Tourism Development

- ii. Location of new tourism development Policy EC8 – How robust is the evidence base for the policy? Does the policy comply with national guidance? Is the sequential order compatible with other local material considerations such as climate change and flood risk? Is it right to restrict new build unserviced accommodation in the countryside in all cases?
- iii. Retaining supply and mix of tourist accommodation Policy EC9 – Does the policy comply with national guidance? Does new serviced accommodation in suitable locations need more encouragement? Does the policy complement policy EC8?
- iv. EC10 & EC11 – Occupancy Conditions and Caravan and Camping sites\_- any key issues here? Too restrictive? Clarification of areas in EC11?

**Day 13 – Thursday 17 January 2008**

**AM RETAIL & TOWN CENTRES**

**[Soundness Tests 4A/B/C; 5; 6; 7; 9.]**

- i. Is the overall strategy (SS1, SS5) consistent with national policy in PPS6 and emerging RSS? Is the retail hierarchy based on sound evidence? What was the approach to the identification and definition of large and small town centres and how have retail and other commercial and service interests been taken into account in this process?
- ii. Are the catchment areas, floorspace thresholds and exception criteria based on robust evidence and reasonable in the local circumstances?
- iii. How were the Primary Shopping Areas and Frontages defined and are they appropriate in all cases? Is the 30% non A1 use criterion flexible enough in all cases? Is the Service Village space limit for shops of 250sq m evidence based and reasonable?

**PM**

- iv. Retail and commercial leisure development Policy EC5 – Are the control criteria appropriate in all cases?
- v. Public Car Parking provision EC6 – Should public use of private car parking areas at the weekends be encouraged?
- vi. Amusement Arcades Policy EC7 – Is the policy consistent with PPS6 and otherwise sound? Might it be over-restrictive and unworkable by concentrating rather than dispersing such uses? Is the text clear? How would Sheringham fare under the policy?

---

**Day 14 – Friday 18 January 2008**

**AM IMPLEMENTATION & MONITORING**

**[Soundness Tests: 8 & 9]**

**Key issues:**

- i. Does the Strategy give sufficient/appropriate guidance in respect of Implementation, Monitoring and Performance Indicators so that it can be properly focussed and flexible to changing circumstances?
- ii. Does the Strategy need to go further in respect of an implementation framework for policies including in relation to infrastructure constraints? I.e. should it be more pro-active in securing infrastructure earlier so as to deliver new development in line with the strategy and the housing trajectory?
- iii. Are implementation timing/phasing issues sufficiently clearly addressed?
- iv. Are appropriate Performance Indicators identified and are there any outstanding queries?
- v. If changes to the Implementation and Monitoring section are proposed do they need to be the subject of further public consultation and Sustainability Appraisal?
- vi. Any other relevant points of a general nature raised by representors?

**PM ANY OTHER MATTERS**

**A Washing Up session**