

## **Brennan, Charlotte**

---

**From:** Programme Officer  
**Sent:** 19 September 2018 08:56  
**To:** March, Jemma  
**Cc:** Planning Policy Team  
**Subject:** FW: Breckland Local Plan - Hockering  
**Attachments:** Rationale for housing allocations 18Sep18.docx

Dear Jemma

Would the Council like to comment any further on this matter?

Regards

*Charlotte*

Charlotte Brennan  
Programme Officer

DDI: 01362 656296

Email: [programme.officer@breckland.gov.uk](mailto:programme.officer@breckland.gov.uk)

Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE

Please note from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2018 – My working days will be Tuesday-Friday only

Advance Notice of Leave 25/9 – 28/9/18

---

**From:** [richardhawker](#)]

**Sent:** 19 September 2018 07:31

**To:** Mann, James; Programme Officer

**Cc:** Susan Warren; HockeringParishClerk; Derrick Johnson; Bambridge, Gordon; Mick Mason (Parish Council); julia virgoe

**Subject:** Breckland Local Plan - Hockering

19 September 2018

Dear Mr Mann and Ms Brennan,

Following our discussions after the morning session of the Local Plan hearing 18 Sept, I have summarised my understanding of the rationale used by Breckland officers for housing number allocation to service centres, in the attached document. I also include estimated figures relevant to Hockering.

- 1) Please can you confirm that this accurately reflects the situation.
- 2) If you agree with its content, please can you pass the document to the Inspector, to confirm that this is also his understanding.

3) I do not see why a straightforward explanation such as this was not drafted for the Local Plan document. The reference to 68, then 88, houses which have been given planning permission in Hockering, in conjunction with the 10%, was very confusing, and I asked for an explanation many times, but none clearly stated the process. It now emerges that the number 88 is totally irrelevant, since the rationale takes no account of the number of houses given planning permission since 2016. This lack of clarity could be taken to be obfuscation over the process, as it is surely clear that Hockering would be aggrieved by it.

4) This confusion has meant that I could not properly challenge Breckland's rationale during the hearings. In answer to the Inspector's question 'Is the methodology justified?', now that I understand that methodology, I find it unacceptable. The Inspector may consider it 'robust' in that it certainly means that 10% increase will be provided by Hockering after the plan's adoption; but the deleterious effect on Hockering of not taking into account recent building has not been considered. We have experienced a huge increase in housing over the past 2 – 3 years, giving us constant disruption due to building work, loss of green areas around the village and resultant change in the village's character. We have contributed massively to Breckland's perceived shortfall in housing allocations, yet we get no credit or appreciation of this, as we still have to accept further houses before the end of the plan, in a site allocation which has unaccountably increased since the 2016 document.

We believe housing completions and permissions after March 2016 should reduce the 10% figure.

Hockering Parish Council is very much aggrieved by this process. It has repeatedly stated its view that there are too many houses being built, at too fast a pace, in the village, with little consideration as to their location and amenities.

As we do not have a doctor's surgery, nor many employment opportunities (the figure 19 quoted in the Plan is clearly erroneous), Hockering's designation as a Service Centre is inappropriate anyway.

Please can you pass this e-mail to the Inspector, together with the attachment.

Thank you very much.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Hawker  
Hockering Parish Council

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.