

GNLP Hethersett/ Regulation 19 'Soundness and Legality'

1. **The GNLP describes Hethersett as having, 'a good range of facilities....convenience shops, post office, pharmacy, doctor and dentist, library and business centre..'**

- These facilities existed prior to the 2011 Hethersett North Development and have not been extended, enlarged, or improved.
- The Post Office is under threat of closure.
- The dentist does not accept patients who are: entitled to free dental care/adults over 18 years and / children up to 18 years. In short then it is not accepting non private patients.
- The surgery is oversubscribed and includes practices in Cringleford and Mulbarton.
- The library is on reduced opening hours.
- The business centre is now a Private Health Centre (Rowan House).

Therefore, the information is misleading and not sound.

2. **We are promised there are no new allocations of housing: -**

As there is '*permitted development of 1369-including an uplift of 200*' on the Hethersett North site (HET 1).

'..it has become apparent from the reserved matters planning applications that an uplift of approximately 200 dwellings is a realistic prospect..'

- This needs explanation considering Sustainability and the comments above re facilities.
- What specifics within a legal and sound model, allow for an '**apparent**' uplift?
 - Our concerns must be over the protection of open space and the environment
 - The implied possibility of increased density of housing and the ramifications for residents on the new estate who purchased homes on the previous model.
 - the effect of further increases in traffic flow.
- Why is the housing number described as '**approximate**'? In order not to be adjusted it must be one thing or else the 'soundness' of the plan alters.

We believe that the language used to describe development, housing, land and all factors involved must be specific and exact in order for the plan to be both sound and legal.

3. We appreciate the recognition toward improvement of the access strategy for '**all modes of transport**'. These must be articulated with due regard to the local community. For example, '**safeguards against increasing traffic through Little Melton**' should address the convergence of Burnthouse Lane with Harness Makers Way where a dual road narrows to a single and where pedestrians, cyclists and lorries pass.

This should be made specific if the plan is deemed sound and legal.

4. HET 2

This land is earmarked for development with a '40 place, extra care housing scheme'. A revision in the GNLP describes that, 'opportunity exists for revision' or for 'further market and affordable housing'.

We again ask for clarification here. Either the site is developed for a care facility with due regard to open green space according to the Planning Permission 2011, or it is not. There should not be room to jeopardise the construction of a care facility or to overbuild on a site which allows for open space. **The language is too vague and opportunistic.**

5. HET 3

This site is described as Open Space/ Burial Ground on the plans. The GNLP states that with ***'proposed increase in numbers of HET 1 and HET 2.....additional supporting infrastructure including green infrastructure may be necessary'***.

The site holds ***'significant archaeological remains'*** and while permission exists for a through road archaeological digs are required for its fulfilment.

We are glad to see that the archaeological site will receive due care and consideration of an official dig and again ask for this to be made specific within the plan. There will also need to be reference to the need for Burial Ground which should not be lost under the ***'additional supporting infrastructure'*** heading.

SUMMARY HET 1/2/3 - GNLP General Comments

Predominant concern is that since the GNLP Regulation (19) is being tested on its soundness and legality, **all language used should be precise and specific.** For instance, the following: -

- 'Opportunity does exist for revision' –{why does it exist ? What evidence?}
- 'Proposed increase in house numbers'- {is this happening, or is it not? Who proposes and why? when and how will we know and are we involved in this discussion}
- '...become apparent {how?}..that an uplift of approximately 200 is a realistic prospect' { realistic? How does this qualify against the original plan and what is the criteria of 'realistic'-who is assessing it and for whom?}
- The discrepancy between the descriptors of Hethersett and the reality. For example, Rowan House is not a Business Centre.

Hethersett has fulfilled its housing quota and a rationale for the uplift is not explained. There are currently 22 additional dwellings with planning permission on small sites in the village (GNLP) and 40 more for the 'extra care housing' allocation as above. On other sites in the village 48 were delivered 2018-20 (GNLP). This totals to 110.

Is this in addition to the 'uplift' and how is the uplift to be decided on if it is 'proposed'?

We understand that unused planning permissions are included both in Hethersett (Norwich City and Greater Norwich) to meet planning quotas.

If the document is to meet the 'sound and legal' requirement then the ongoing emergency of **GLOBAL WARMING** needs distinct mention in the plan. Planning needs to measure development objectives against the Governments directives on Carbon Emissions and Global Warming. Building without addressing these urgent issues is negligent and neither sound nor wise.

(with reference to Air, Water, Soil and Noise pollution- where houses are built, how they are constructed and how we use them)