



GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Examination Hearing Statement for Matter 11

**Response on behalf of Pigeon Investment Management Ltd and their
Landowners**

February 2022

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared by Pigeon Investment Management limited ("Pigeon") and their Landowners, in respect of a number of land interests within both Broadland and South Norfolk Districts.

1.2 Pigeon has previously submitted representations in response to the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA), including the Pre-Submission Regulation 19 Publication Stage, where we submitted representations in support of the following sites:

- Land north of Brecklands Road, Brundall (GNLP0352)
- Land at Nelson Road, Diss (GNLP1045)
- Land at Walcot Green Lane, Diss (GNLP1044R)
- Land at Hethersett (GNLP4054, GNLP1023BR, GNLP4052, GNLP4052)
- Land at Dereham Road, Reepham (GNLP0353R)
- Land at Rightup Lane, Wymondham (GNLP0355)

2. MATTER 11 – HOUSING AND MIXED USE ALLOCATIONS - SITES CURRENTLY ALLOCATED IN AN ADOPTED DEVELOPMENT PLAN, WITHOUT PLANNING PERMISSION

Is the proposed site allocation soundly based? In particular:

Key Service Centres

Site aa. Land off Broomhill Lane, Reepham (Ref REP1).

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

2. 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?

2.1 In relation to Policy REP1: Land off Broomhill Lane, Reepham, the Part 2 Sites Plan notes:

"This site was allocated in 2016 as part of the Broadland Local Plan but has not yet been developed. ... it is expected that development will take place within the new local plan time-period up to 2038. ..."

2.2 As we noted in our representations to the Regulation 19 consultation (which have not been addressed by the Partnership (see D3.11 p.15), a planning application for 141 homes was submitted in April 2020 (refs. 20200847 and 20200469). The application remains undetermined principally due to outstanding objections from the Local Highway Authority and Sport England.

2.3 Section D2 - Site Allocation Statements of Common Ground/Delivery Statements, of the Local Plan Examination includes a SoCG dated October 2021 (ref. D2.112). This asserts that the applicant is: *"... confident of securing planning permission by the end of 2021 and being on site early in 2022."*

2.4 Clearly this has not happened.

2.5 With regard to highways, the latest consultation comment dated 18th January 2022 includes:

"To be frank I am not comfortable with the stance that the applicant is taking. ..."

and:

"... the TA does not demonstrate the local network is able to accommodate that traffic ..."

and:

"You will also be aware that the Highway Authority is insistent that the visibility splay from Broomhill Lane to Whitwell Road must be provided ... [and] It has not yet been confirmed that the required land can be secured."

- 2.6 The SoCG simply asserts (prior to the above comment) that the applicant is: "... working with Norfolk County Council and Reepham Academy to ensure that land is available to provide sufficient visibility splays ...".
- 2.7 Clearly, significant highway issues still remain unresolved.
- 2.8 Also as we noted in our representations to the Regulation 19 consultation, Sport England has objected to the application on the basis that it will result in the loss of 2.1 hectares of playing fields and has advised that should the LPA be minded to grant planning permission, contrary to Sport England's objection, then the application should be referred to the Secretary of State in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009.
- 2.9 In summary, the delivery of the site has not come forward as expected (see also Q4 below) and it is considered that, based on evidence, there is now a reasonable prospect that the site WILL NOT be developed during the plan period (see also Q3, 4 and 5 below).

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

- 2.10 The site was not re-assessed in the HELAA, it was simply assumed that it was available, viable and deliverable / developable.
- 2.11 The Local Highway Authority's objection in relation to the required visibility splays suggests that the land required is not all available.
- 2.12 The latest submitted application plans dating from 25th November 2021 appear to show 141 homes, with 27% being affordable (i.e. less than required), and no sports hall. The justification provided for a reduced level of affordable housing provision is viability, which suggests that the allocation as proposed is not viable.

2.13 Furthermore, the objections from the Local Highway Authority and Sport England, amongst others, suggest that the allocation as proposed is not deliverable.

2.14 In summary, it is considered that the availability, viability and deliverability of the site has not been robustly assessed, and the evidence suggests that the site is neither deliverable, nor developable.

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

2.15 The trajectory in the Broadland Site Allocations DPD shows the sites as delivering homes as follows:

Year	Delivery
2014/15	
2015/16	
2016/17	25
2017/18	50
2018/19	45
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	
2022/23	
2023/24	
2024/25	
2025/26	
2026/27	
2027/28	
2028/09	
2029/30	
2030/31	

2.16 The latest trajectory (D3.2C) shows the sites as delivering homes as follows:

Year	Delivery
2014/1	
2015/1	
2016/1	
2017/1	
2018/1	
2019/2	
2020/2	
2021/2	
2022/2	
2023/2	
2024/2	
2025/2	
2026/2	26
2027/2	26
2028/0	31
2029/3	32
2030/3	26

2.17 Intervening trajectories have shown variations on the above. Over the past six years, delivery from the site appears to have slipped by at least ten years.

- 2.18 No evidence has been submitted to support the latest trajectory, nor is there any justification for the trajectory including 141 homes, as opposed to the allocated 100 homes, given the outstanding issues surrounding the undetermined planning application.
- 2.19 Indeed it is noted that the SoCG asserts that the applicant is: "... confident of securing planning permission by the end of 2021 and being on site early in 2022." and: "... anticipating a start on site in early 2022 with a build programme of approximately 5 years."
- 2.20 This conflicts with the latest trajectory.
- 2.21 In summary, there is no evidence to support the delivery of housing as per the expected trajectory.

5. Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

- 2.22 Policy REP1 allocates the site for: "residential development [‘approximately 100 homes’] & community facilities (including cemetery land, recreational open space and a sports hall)" and requires (inter alia):
1. Vehicular access to be from a realigned and improved Broomhill Lane,
 3. Provision of a sports hall for the high school to be located in proximity to the existing school facilities.
- 2.23 The latest submitted application plans dating from 25th November 2021 appear to show 141 homes, with 27% being affordable (i.e. less than required), and no sports hall.
- 2.24 In summary, it is clear from this and the objections to the submitted application from the Local Highway Authority and Sport England that the allocation itself, and the detailed policy requirements, are either not justified or are unlikely to be met, and in either case will not be effective.

Site bb. Land north of Grove Road (Ref HET2).

Is the proposed site allocation soundly based? In particular:

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

2. 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?

2.25 In relation to Policy HET 1 (part of GNLP0177A): Land north Hethersett, the Part 2 Sites Plan notes:

"This site was allocated in 2015 as part of the South Norfolk Local Plan but has not yet been developed. ... it is expected that development will take place within the new local plan time-period up to 2038. ..."

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

2.26 No evidence of the original assessment of availability, viability and deliverability of the site is available, and the site was not re-assessed in the HELAA, it was simply assumed that it was available, viable and deliverable / developable.

2.27 Section D2 - Site Allocation Statements of Common Ground/Delivery Statements, of the Local Plan Examination website states (ref. D2.102):

"A number of attempts have been made requesting an SoCG which have not been responded to."

2.28 In summary, it is considered that the availability, viability and deliverability of the site has not been robustly assessed, and there is thus no evidence that the site remains developable.

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

2.29 The latest trajectory (D3.2C) shows the sites as delivering homes as follows:

Delivery	Year
	2020/21
	2021/22
	2022/23
	2023/24
	2024/25
	2025/26
	2026/27
	2027/28
40	2028/29
	2029/30
	2030/31
	2030/31
	2031/32
	2032/33
	2033/34
	2034/35
	2035/36
	2036/37
	2037/38
	2038+

2.30 No evidence has been submitted to support the latest trajectory (see D2.102) and there is clearly a question mark over whether the site is available. The inclusion of 40 dwellings in the final year of the Plan assumes a worst case scenario. However, this does not obviate the need to demonstrate that the site is available.