

Greater Norwich Local Plan Examination in Public (Part 2)

Matter 11

Statement on behalf of Halsbury Homes Ltd



Greater Norwich Local Plan Examination

On behalf of Halsbury Homes
Our ref 64264/01/MS/BHy
Date 11 February 2022

Subject Matter 11 – Housing and mixed use allocations - sites currently allocated in an adopted development plan, without planning permission

For Matters 9, 10, 11, & 12 we set out our review of the sites raised in the Part 2 MIQs. There are additional sites (such as those in the Growth Triangle and the LNGS1AAP Allocation) for which questions have not been asked. Our suggested amends to these are detailed in Matter 15 (for the Growth Triangle sites) and in our Matter 2 (Issue 2) Statement.

For all the sites, we have reviewed them considering the following:

- The definition of ‘deliverable’ in the NPPF noting the requirement to publish ‘clear evidence’ for sites without a detailed planning permission. Furthermore, we have considered the types of evidence that can form ‘clear evidence’ as set out in the PPG (ID: 68-007).
- The definition of ‘developable’ in the NPPF and its test relating to whether or not there is a ‘realistic prospect’ of the site being available at the point envisaged, as well as being viability tested at that point;
- The requirement to undertake an overall risk assessment in the PPG with regards to a housing trajectory (ID: 3-024); the types of considerations to assess where sites are ‘likely’ to be developed (ID: 3-017); and from this factors associated with availability, achievability, and presentation of the rate of development (ID: 3-018 to 3-022).
- Lichfields ‘Start to Finish’ (2nd Edition) report which details average lead-in times for development sites based on development size. It also provides some evidence on how higher delivery rates on sites can be achieved which is useful for considering whether there is evidence to justify higher rates where they have been assumed;
- Evidence of local delivery rates as per our Matter 2 (Issue 2) Statement; and
- The evidence produced by the Partnership including the various iterations of the HELAA, Topic Papers, and SoCGs.

1.0 Norwich

b. Mile Cross Depot, Norwich (Ref R36)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

1.1 No. The site was originally anticipated to start delivering in 2020/21.

Q2. If the allocation hasn’t come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

1.2 This is considered a question for the Partnership.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

- 1.3 No.
- 1.4 There is now some evidence that the site is available for development as it has now been cleared. However, it was originally suggested that this site would start delivering in 2020/21 and to date no planning application has been submitted. Given known lead-in times and local delivery rates, when looking at the evidence in the SoCG (D2.48) we do not consider there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate this site can deliver as quickly as anticipated in the 'deliverable' period. This is with reference to the definition of deliverable (Annex 2, NPPF) requiring the publication of 'clear evidence' and the types of evidence to demonstrate deliverability in the PPG (ID: 69-007).
- 1.5 We have therefore suggested an amendment to the trajectory; noting that whilst this does not reduce the Partnership's overall supply it will impact on the delivery of homes in the early part of the plan period.

Table 1 Amended Delivery - Mile Cross Depot, Norwich (Ref R36)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership				70	100															170
Lichfields				0	0							70	100							170 (-0)

c. Norwich Mail Centre, 13-17 Thorpe Road (Ref CC15)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

- 1.6 No. The site was originally anticipated to start delivering this monitoring year (2021/22).

Q2. If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

- 1.7 This is considered a question for the Partnership.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

- 1.8 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our responses below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

- 1.9 The SoCG (D2.30) states that the site is in use by the Royal Mail, and it will not come forward until an alternative site is found. However, no timescales for that site finding process is given. Moreover, it is stated that Royal Mail needs to undertake further assessments to confirm that relocation is operationally and financially viable. On this basis, we do not consider there is a realistic prospect of the site coming forward at the point envisaged (despite being late in the plan-period).

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.10 No. Given our response to Question 3, we do not consider the evidence supports the delivery trajectory. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory (as set out in our Matter 15 statement).

Table 2 Amended Delivery - Norwich Mail Centre, 13-17 Thorpe Road

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership																	75	75		150
Lichfields																	0	0		0 (-150)

d. Land at Garden Street and Rouen Road, Norwich (Ref CC10)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

1.11 No. The site was allocated in 2014 and originally anticipated to start delivering this monitoring year (2021/22).

Q2. If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

1.12 This is considered a question for the Partnership.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

1.13 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our response below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

1.14 No.

1.15 The site is in active use for car park and business uses and the SoCG (ref. D2.27) states that it is owned by the County Council who are at the early stages of "exploring options". We therefore do not consider there is evidence to demonstrate there is a realistic prospect that the site will be available at the point envisaged.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.16 No.

1.17 Given our response to Question 3, we do not consider the evidence supports the delivery trajectory. There is insufficient evidence to suggest the site is developable, with a realistic prospect of it being available at the point envisaged: it may be that the County Council conclude it does not want to develop the site. In reality, the County Council have been exploring options since before

2014 when it was allocated, and no substantial progress has been made. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory (as set out in our Matter 15 statement).

Table 3 Amended Delivery - Land at Garden Street and Rouen Road, Norwich (Ref CC10)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership									50	50										100
Lichfields									0	0										0
																				(-100)

f. Land at Ketts Hill and east of Bishop Bridge Road (Ref R14/R15)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

1.18 No. This site was allocated in 2004 and was assumed to start in this monitoring year (2021/22).

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.19 No. The SoCG (D2.39) provides some evidence that National Grid are bringing the site forward to enable development. However, it is a site that has been allocated since 2004 and in the 18 years since its allocation has failed to come forward. There is not sufficient evidence to suggest the site is deliverable as the Partnership suggest. Given known lead-in times and local delivery rates, when looking at the evidence in the SoCG (D2.39) we do not consider there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate this site can deliver as quickly as anticipated in the 'deliverable' period. This is with reference to the definition of deliverable (Annex 2, NPPF) requiring the publication of 'clear evidence' and the types of evidence to demonstrate deliverability in the PPG (ID: 69-007).

1.20 We have therefore suggested an amendment to the trajectory; noting that whilst this does not reduce the Partnership's overall supply it will impact on the delivery of homes in the early part of the plan period.

Table 4 Amended Delivery - Land at Ketts Hill and east of Bishop Bridge Road (Ref R14/R15)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership						26	25	25	4											80
Lichfields						0	0	0	0			26	25	25	4					80 (-0)

g. Heigham Water Treatment Works, Waterworks Road, Norwich (Ref R31)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

1.21 No. The site was expected to start delivering in 2023/24 but based on known lead-in times and the site’s availability, this will not be achieved.

Q2. If the allocation hasn’t come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

1.22 This is considered a question for the Partnership.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

1.23 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our response below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

1.24 No.

1.25 The site is in active use as a water treatment centre and the SoCG (ref. D2.46) confirms that its development relies on Anglian Water changing its operational processes. It is of note that Anglian Water has recently made a major £36 million investment in the plant¹. We consider there is no evidence before the examination to suggest the site has a realistic prospect of being available for development at the point envisaged.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.26 No.

1.27 Given our response to Question 3, we do not consider the evidence supports the delivery trajectory. There is no evidence to suggest the site is developable, with a realistic prospect of it being available at the point envisaged. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory (as set out in our Matter 15 statement).

¹ [https://waterprojectsonline.com/custom_case_study/heigham-wtw-2021/#:~:text=Heigham%20Water%20Treatment%20Works%20\(WTW,population%20in%20excess%20of%20200%2C000.](https://waterprojectsonline.com/custom_case_study/heigham-wtw-2021/#:~:text=Heigham%20Water%20Treatment%20Works%20(WTW,population%20in%20excess%20of%20200%2C000.)

Table 5 Amended Delivery - Heigham Water Treatment Works, Waterworks Road, Norwich (Ref R31)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership												30	30							60
Lichfields												0	0							0 (-60)

h. Land at Rose Lane/Mountergate (Mountergate West) (Ref CC4a)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

1.28 No. Phase 1 of the development was due to start in 2016/17 with Phase 2 in 2022/23.

Q2. If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

1.29 This is considered a question for the Partnership.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

1.30 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our response below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

1.31 No.

1.32 The SoCGs (ref. D2.23 & 24) – which are limited in terms of detail – state that the site is part owned by the City Council but has multiple landowners making land assembly difficult. It states:

“The site is available and suitable, however there are some issues with the CC4b policy text relating to land ownership of existing green space which could make it undeliverable.”

1.33 It also suggests the City Council will bring in temporary retail/leisure uses rather than pursue early delivery of new homes. Furthermore, the SoCG notes that one landowner (Whitbread) is bringing forward an application for non-housing uses on part of the site. There is no assessment regarding the potential consequential impact on the development capacity of the site.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.34 No.

1.35 Given our response to Question 3, we do not consider the evidence supports the delivery trajectory. There is insufficient evidence to suggest the site is developable, with a realistic prospect of it being available at the point envisaged. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory as set out in our Matter 15 statement.

Table 6 Amended Delivery - Land at Rose Lane/Mountergate (Mountergate West) (Ref CC4a)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership											30									30
Lichfields											0									0 (-30)

j. Westwick Street Car Park, Norwich (Ref CC30)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

1.36 No. The site was originally anticipated to start delivering in 2019/20.

Q2. If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

1.37 This is considered a question for the Partnership.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

1.38 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our response below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

1.39 The site is in use as a car park. There is no evidence in the SoCG to demonstrate that the site will be available at the point envisaged. Moreover, the response to whether any technical constraints are known is simply "N/A". It is not clear whether this means there are no technical constraints or whether they are not yet known.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.40 No. The SoCG for this site (D2.34) provides only limited information – especially for a 250-unit site – and concludes there has been 'no progress to date' with regarding to the site's progress and progress towards a planning application.

1.41 We therefore do not consider the evidence supports the delivery trajectory. There is insufficient evidence to suggest the site is developable, with a realistic prospect of it being available at the point envisaged. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory as set out in our Matter 15 statement.

Table 7 Amended Delivery - Westwick Street Car Park, Norwich

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership														50	50	50	50	50		250
Lichfields														0	0	0	0	0		0 (-250)

k. Two sites at Hurricane Way, Airport Industrial Estate, Norwich (Ref R29)

Q2. If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

1.42 This is considered a question for the Partnership / other Participants.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

1.43 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our response below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

1.44 No. The SoCG sets out that the site is being appraised as part of the whole airport industrial estate; so it is unclear that this site will be made available for housing at the point envisaged.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.45 No. The SoCG (ref. D2.44) shows that there has been no progress on this site at all since it was previously allocated. There is no evidence available to suggest the site is deliverable nor do we suggest it being developable. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory (as set out in our Matter 15 statement).

Table 8 Amended Delivery - Two sites at Hurricane Way, Airport Industrial Estate, Norwich (Ref R29)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership						30														30
Lichfields						0														0 (-30)

n. 147 – 153 Ber Street, Norwich (Ref CC2)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

1.46 No. This site was originally allocated in 2004 and was assumed to start delivering in 2018/19.

Q2. If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

1.47 This is considered a question for the Partnership / other Participants.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

1.48 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our response below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

1.49 No. The site is in active use as a car sales forecourt. There is nothing within the SoCG to demonstrate that the site – which has been allocated for development since 2004 – has a realistic prospect of being available in this plan period. Moreover, there are currently planning applications submitted for signage (ref. 21/01556/A) on the site.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.50 No.

1.51 The SoCG (ref. D2.21) shows that there has been no progress on this site at all since it was previously allocated. We therefore do not consider the evidence supports the delivery trajectory. There is insufficient evidence to suggest the site is developable, with a realistic prospect of it being available at the point envisaged. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory (as set out in our Matter 15 statement).

Table 9 Amended Delivery - 147 – 153 Ber Street, Norwich (Ref CC2)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership										20										20
Lichfields										0										0 (-20)

o. Land to rear of City Hall, Norwich (Ref CC24)

Q2. If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

1.52 This is considered a question for the Partnership.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

1.53 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our response below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

1.54 No. The site is in active use by the police. The SoCG (ref. D2.33) states “*Land to be assessed under strategic asset management framework and options considered. no programme for delivery at this time*”. This does not provide the evidence to demonstrate there is a realistic prospect of the site being available at the point envisaged.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.55 No.

1.56 There is insufficient evidence to suggest the site is developable, with a realistic prospect of it being available at the point envisaged. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory (as set out in our Matter 15 statement).

Table 10 Amended Delivery - Land to rear of City Hall, Norwich (Ref CC24)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership										20										20
Lichfields										0										0 (-20)

r. Site of former Gas Holder at Gas Hill, Norwich (Ref R13)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

1.57 No. The site was originally allocated in 2004 and was anticipated to start delivering in 2020/21.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

- 1.58 No.
- 1.59 This site has been allocated since 2004 and has not come forward in the 18 years since. There is not sufficient evidence to suggest the site is deliverable in the timescale that the Partnership suggest.
- 1.60 However, the SoCG (D2.38) provides some evidence that National Grid are bringing the site forward to enable development. We have therefore suggested an amendment to the trajectory; noting that whilst this does not reduce the Partnership’s overall supply it will impact on the delivery of homes in the early part of the plan period.

Table 11 Amended Delivery - Site of former Gas Holder at Gas Hill, Norwich (Ref R13)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership						15														15
Lichfields						0						15								15 (-0)

u. Site of former Earl of Leicester Public House, 238 Dereham Road, Norwich (Ref R33)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

- 1.61 No. The site was allocated in 2014 and was anticipated to start delivering in this monitoring year 2021/22.

Q2. If the allocation hasn’t come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

- 1.62 This is considered a question for the Partnership.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

- 1.63 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our response below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

- 1.64 No. The SoCG (D2.22) provides very limited information with regard to the site’s availability, viability, and deliverability.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

- 1.65 No.

1.66 At the time of writing, there is no SoCG for the site. The site had permission from an application submitted in 2006 (06/01039/F). This permission was extended in 2010 (10/00335/ET). No further progress is evident since the site was allocated in 2014 when it was originally anticipated to start delivering in 2021/22. There is insufficient evidence to suggest the site is developable with a realistic prospect of delivery at the point envisaged. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory (as set out in our Matter 15 statement).

Table 12 Amended Delivery - Site of former Earl of Leicester Public House, 238 Dereham Road, Norwich (Ref R33)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership																		12		12
Lichfields																		0		0
																				(-12)

v. 10 – 14 Ber Street, Norwich (Ref CC3)

Q1. Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

1.67 No. the site was allocated in 2014 and was anticipated to start delivering in 2015/16.

Q2. If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this?

1.68 This is considered a question for the Partnership.

Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

1.69 No, there is not a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan-period (see our response below).

Q3. Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

1.70 No. The SoCG (D2.22) provides very limited information with regard to the site's availability, viability, and deliverability.

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

1.71 No.

1.72 The SoCG simply states that an application will be submitted in 2021/22 but notes that the site is at an early stage of coming forward. To date no application has been submitted (as far as we are aware). We do not consider there is sufficient evidence to suggest the site is developable, with a realistic prospect of it being available at the point envisaged; especially given the site has not been progressed since its allocation in 2014. This should be a site that is not relied upon in the trajectory (as set out in our Matter 15 statement).

Table 13 Amended Delivery - 10 – 14 Ber Street, Norwich (Ref CC3)

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership				10																10
Lichfields				0																0 (-10)

w. Land at Lower Clarence Road (Ref CC13)

Q2. If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

- 1.73 No. As per the Matter 2 hearing sessions this site is now being removed from the Partnership's trajectory. It is unclear as to why the site was included given the SoCG noted that there was only "limited likelihood of progressing with housing". This example illustrates that the Partnership has not taken a prudent approach to assessing the developability of its sites.

2.0 Main towns

y. Land at Spirketts Lane, Harleston (Ref HAR 4)

Q4. Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)

- 2.1 No.
- 2.2 The site is assumed to be deliverable, but no planning application has been submitted to date. The SoCG (ref. D2.82) notes that the site is owned by a local farming family rather than a developer. Given known lead-in times and local delivery rates, when looking at the evidence in the SoCG we do not consider there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate this site can deliver as quickly as anticipated or at the rates expected. This is with reference to the definition of deliverable (Annex 2, NPPF) requiring the publication of 'clear evidence' and the types of evidence to demonstrate deliverability in the PPG (ID: 69-007).
- 2.3 We have therefore suggested an amendment to the trajectory; noting that whilst this does not reduce the Partnership's overall supply it will impact on the delivery of homes in the early part of the plan period.

Table 14 Amended Delivery - Land at Frontier Agriculture Ltd, Sandy Lane, Diss

Trajectory	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38	38+	Total (in PP)
Partnership						75	75													150
Lichfields						0	0	40	40	40	30									150 (-0)

Conclusion

- 2.4 Given the uncertainties over the delivery trajectory for the above sites and the consequential impact on the ability of the plan to deliver the homes needed in the Plan area to 2038, we consider it is appropriate for the Partnership to review and amend Table 6 of the GNLP.