

BROADLAND VILLAGE CLUSTERS – SITE SUMMARIES

BLOFIELD HEATH & HEMBLINGTON CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	BLOFIELD HEATH & HEMBLINGTON OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	11
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 2 Object, 8 Comment

The Blofield Heath and Hemblington cluster has 1 c/f allocation (BLO5), 1 preferred site (1048), 0 reasonable alternatives and 5 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Preferred Site GNLP1048 – site promoter question whether a larger number of homes on the site could be appropriate. Blofield Parish Council suggest looking at the Renenergy scheme and implications for the size of the site.
- Unreasonable site GNLP2080 now has planning permission

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0099
- GNLP0288
- GNLP0300

- GNLP2172

Blofield Heath and Hemblington Cluster – General Comments

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Blofield Heath – Title (General Comments)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Blofield Parish Council	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site on Blofield Corner Road shouldn't be approved as drainage strategy is into a blind ditch, it would be useful to link that evidence to this response. Due to drainage, not much has been done on site. • The site beside Heathlands on Woodbastwick Road also proposes to link up to this drainage path, there's the issue of whether that also renders this site unworkable because of drainage. • The drainage strategy passed for Dawsons Lane is non-compliant and site specific for 12 properties and a small section of adoptable road, rest to be porous brick within the development itself. However this is now back with a new planning application to increase flow rate from 1.5l/sec to 18.8l/sec i.e. much changed drainage rate. For the GNLP it may be worth noting the site will not hold the 43 for either drainage or access reasons, as the road type 6 will only cover a max of 25 + possible 1 and the 12 plus 4 Dawsons Lane dwellings and the access of number 80 now onto this road and not Blofield Corner, there is not the capacity to go for more than a further 9 on the rest of the field, unless another access is made, and the drainage strategy would then need to be pumped uphill if it is to keep to the currently dug system 	

Blofield Heath and Hemblington Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP1048 Land east of Woodbastwick Road, Blofield Heath (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the Public	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No connectivity between Blofield Heath & Hemblington, and Blofield – should be dealt with separately • Infrequent bus service • Woodbastwick Road is dangerous, in poor condition and floods regularly • Pavements are narrow and dark. • Children can't safely walk/cycle to school. • School building is poor, part is temporary construction and detached from main building. • Mill Road unable to cope with school traffic • Residents require car to travel • No doctors surgery, park needs improving • No play space planned • Maximum number of housing should be defined • Permissive footpaths should be considered from back of this development to Hemblington 	

Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Hugh Crane Ltd via Savills	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support site identification for allocation • Strong support for draft policy GNLP 1048 for 15-20 dwellings but considered should plan for additional housing at site. • Submission supported by 'Highways Feasibility Assessment' by Create Consulting Engineers to address HELAA concerns about access • Landscape impact is amber on HELAA – Blofield Parish Neighbourhood Plan does not categorise area as important view or vista and a planning application would adequately mitigate any impact. • 33% affordable housing needs justification with up to date, robust evidence. • Site boundary needs amending to reflect recent employment development. 	Consider whether a larger number of homes on the site could be appropriate
Blofield Parish Council	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of site has been taken by the extension of Renenergy – is there sufficient space now to deliver minimum number of dwellings? • 25-33% of site appears to now be lost 	Look at the Renenergy scheme and implications for the size of the site

Blofield Heath and Hemblington Cluster – Carried Forward Allocation

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy BLO5 Land to the north of Blofield Corner, opposite 'Heathway', Blofield Heath (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 3 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the Public	Comment	Planning application 20162199 & 2019790 show a larger site?	
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Blofield Parish Council (posted on title)	Comment	Should not have been passed as drainage strategy was into a blind ditch, be useful to link evidence to this response	

Blofield Heath and Hemblington Cluster – Unreasonable Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2080 Dawsons Lane, Blofield Heath (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Comment	Access is now provided to the site and 12 units under construction Site is at risk of surface water flooding	Look at details of planning permission
Parish Council	Comment	Access and drainage agreed for existing permission is inadequate for the additional proposed scale of development.	Look at details of planning permission
Agent for landowner	Object	Site has permission on appeal and subsequent permission. All issues raised have been dealt with through these processes.	Look at details of planning permission. Check whether issues have been dealt with including safe route to school.

BUXTON WITH LAMAS AND BRAMPTON CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	BUXTON WITH LAMAS AND BRAMPTON OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	13
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	5 Support, 1 Object, 7 Comment

The Buxton with Lamas and Brampton cluster has 1 c/f allocation (BUX1), 1 preferred site (0297) and 5 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Preferred Site GNLP0297, further consideration of water capacity needed, in liaison with Environment Agency and Anglian Water
- Unreasonable Site GNLP0294, detailed representation submitted requesting site be relooked at for allocation. Cross boundary site so further discussion of proposal needed with North Norfolk District Council to clarify their position.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP3015

Buxton with Lamas and Brampton Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP 0297 Land east of Aylsham Road, Buxton with Lamas (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the Public	Support	<p>Least disruptive site for area. Access to affordable housing needed for young people in village. Policy should include the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extension of speed limit, • footpath access (including bike & pram access) and improvement to connect via bure valley car park to the school to minimise school traffic impact, • replace any trees and hedgerows that need to be removed to ensure buffer between developments and agricultural land, • include allotments, and • only allow vehicle access by Aylsham road ensuring pathways are in place for bikes/pedestrians to get to school, the bure valley path and to Bally park 	

Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Environment Agency (Eastern region)	Comment	<p>Not enough capacity in Aylsham WRC permit to accommodate development and no plans to upgrade in terms of flow in PR19, only plans to increase storage at intermittent CSOs.</p> <p>Development will require phasing in line with upgrades to WRC – need to see evidence of liaison with Anglian Water regarding this</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consideration of water capacity, in liaison with Environment Agency and Anglian Water

Buxton with Lamas and Brampton Cluster – Carried Forward Allocation

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy BUX 1 Land East of Lion Road, Buxton (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 2 comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the Public	Comment	<p>Policy should take into account the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access from existing point on Aylsham & Lion Roads (currently farm access only) - not through Mead close (due to flood risk in lower parts of village). • Green Infrastructure buffers between existing and new sites (via allotments/hedges/green play areas) to ensure sufficient water management and drainage. Current drainage insufficient to cope with any increase in volume/speed of surface water flow. • Footpath/cycle access/improvements to Crown Road and Bally park to avoid increasing traffic in village and minimising road safety impacts. 	
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed

Buxton with Lamas and Brampton Cluster – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0294 Land off Scottow Row (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the Public	Support	<p>Comments in support of the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outside development area and too large. • Would increase traffic • alter rural nature of the villages. • Insufficient infrastructure in place. • Increased surface run off would potentially increase flooding. • Land should remain agricultural. 	
Glavenhill Ltd Agent: Lanpro	Object/ Comment	<p>Since its early promotion the emerging development proposals have been refined, viability tested and worked up into a deliverable residential-led mixed use scheme. The scheme is an extension to the village of Badersfield and Scottow Enterprise Park within the former RAF Coltishall airbase.</p> <p>The total site is cross boundary with part being located within North Norfolk. The land promoted within the Broadland District is immediately available for use and will deliver:</p>	Further discussion of proposal with North Norfolk District Council to clarify their position.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approx. 300 dwellings, including affordable housing and first homes • Allotment growing spaces for each new dwelling • 1 ha of land and sufficient pupils for a new 210 pupil, one form entry primary school • New commercial employment and retail units • Large areas of new semi-natural publicly access open space • 100,000 new trees (also across North Norfolk area) to capture 200,000 tonnes of CO2 each year • Funding to deliver and sustain a new peak hours bus service • Water positive drainage infrastructure to capture waste-water for use on site and surrounding farmland and • A new HGV route from the B1150 to Scottow Enterprise Park <p>The site is being promoted as an alternative to nil housing growth in Wroxham and the 20-25 dwellings proposed for the Coltishall Cluster. (Also planned as an alternative to growth in Hoveton and North Walsham in North Norfolk). Delivery of the complete vision will require cross boundary working between authorities.</p> <p>Concern regarding the overreliance on the wider village clustering approach as there could be a clear disconnect between the main employment and services centres such as Scottow Enterprise Park and the more rural village clusters. This scheme will reduce motor car use and further the Local Plans stated climate change ambitions.</p> <p>Employment growth target should be more ambitious and increased to 45,000 jobs over the plan period. This new number should be specified in Policy 1 that does not currently identify any target figure.</p> <p>Objection to merging allocation BAW2 (Bawburgh and Colney Lakes). It is not effective as it is privately owned, currently let to a third party, no public access is achievable and it is not available to offset the impacts of housing growth. Allocation is unsound and should be removed from the emerging Plan</p> <p>To conclude:</p>	
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme will deliver a net environmental gain and act as a UK benchmark for sustainable planned housing and employment growth; • The provision of a large new publicly accessible semi-natural open space will act as a local recreation and leisure destination to reduce the pressure of the network of Natura 2000 sites in Broadland District including The Broads National Park; • It will deliver transport and community infrastructure improvements to sustain and grow jobs; • The site has no over-riding constraints that would prevent its development; • The site benefits from a willing landowner and a committed land promoter that will bring the site forward for development within the emerging Local Plan period; • The scheme delivers sustainable water infrastructure improvements to reduce flooding and ground water abstraction in Norfolk; • The public open spaces, water storage reservoir and allotments proposed will be valuable recreational spaces to improve health and well-being locally; • The new native woodland proposed will enhance natural landscape beauty locally and deliver recreational, landscape and carbon capture benefits to the City of Norwich; • The site is attractive to small and medium-sized housebuilders who currently find it difficult to compete for and deliver larger strategic sites and will provide additional choice to the local housing market; • Siting the new Primary School next to the woodland and semi-natural spaces (and encouraging the School to make the most of this green space) could allow children greater access to nature in and outside of School; • It has received good interest from local house builders, who offer their support to these representations; and • The scheme facilitates the delivery of a new Primary School. 	
--	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0387 Land at Back Lane, Buxton with Lamas (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2

SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment
--	--------------------------------

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Members of the public - various	Support	<p>Comments in support of the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land slopes to a narrow beck and flooding would increase. • Back Lane is a very narrow road with no space for widening, unsafe for pedestrians. • The site is outside of the village and building would be detrimental to the overall character of the village • Site is important habitat as a hay meadow. • Residents identified that area should be protected in neighbourhood plan consultation exercise 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0601 Land West of Coltishall Road, Buxton With Lamas (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Members of the public - various	Support/ Comment	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No safe pedestrian access to village facilities – Coltishall Road has blind turn between two houses • Site outside village edge • Numerous landmark trees • Detrimental to character of village • Already been extensions to developments behind birdcage farm, so if only for 1 or 2 houses and a foot/cycle path made to link to back lane that could be publicly used then development may be ok • Back Lane a narrow road with no space for widening, unsafe for pedestrians 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3016 Feofee Cottages, North of Crown Road, Buxton with Lamas (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Comment	Would like to have seen site endorsed as existing allocation or reasonable alternative. With current unreasonable classification it looks like it is not considered reasonable which is not the case. Would be positive development for village.	

CANTLEY CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	CANTLEY OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	0
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	-

The Cantley cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 0 preferred sites, 0 reasonable alternatives and 1 site which is judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- None

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0281

CAWSTON, BRANDISTON AND SWANNINGTON CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	CAWSTON, BRANDISTON AND SWANNINGTON OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	9
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 7 Object, 2 Comment

The Cawston, Brandiston and Swannington cluster has 2 c/f allocations (CAW1 & CAW2), 1 preferred site (0293), 0 reasonable alternatives and 2 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Promoter argues that unreasonable site GNLP0126 A&B is a better alternative than the preferred site and carried forward allocation CAW2

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP2134

Cawston, Brandiston and Swannington Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0293 Land east of Gayford Road, Cawston (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Promoters of Site 0126 A&B	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the preferred site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prospect of massive number of houses being built on area • The smaller allocation of site has not been delivered in last 3 years • Better alternative off Fred Tuddenham Drive; it's deliverable and in better location 	

Cawston, Brandiston and Swannington Cluster – Carried Forward Allocations

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy CAW 1 Land to the west of the existing cemetery, Cawston (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy CAW 2 Land east of Gayford Road, Cawston (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 1 comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Promoters of Site 0126 A&B	Object	Comments objecting to the carried forward allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor location • Danger of significant extension to existing proposal • Originally allocated in 2016 and not been deliver, should not be rolled forward • Better site off Fred Tuddenham Way 	
Anglian Water	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed

Cawston, Brandiston and Swannington Cluster – Unreasonable Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0126 A&B Land off Fred Tuddenham Drive, Cawston (Unreasonable Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 3 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Site Promoters	Object	Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well situated to existing settlement • Immediately deliverable • No access issues + footpath route • No threat of further development • Sustainable and well located for employment • Land devoid of environmental merit 	
CAM Architects (Norwich) Ltd	Object	Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing will service need for employment in village and nearby Reepham • Will provide much needed affordable homes in area • Sustainable location with no landscape impact issues 	

COLTISHALL, HORSTEAD AND STANNINGHALL AND BELAUGH CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	COLTISHALL, HORSTEAD AND STANNINGHALL OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	65
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 56 Object, 8 Comment

The Coltishall, Horstead and Stanninghall Cluster has 2 c/f allocations (COL1 and COL2), 1 preferred site (2019), 0 reasonable alternatives and 4 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Preferred Site GNLP2019 – highway and school capacity issues raised. Query informal agreement and acceptability of the scheme with Highways. Further discussion needed with Children’s Services regarding school capacity.
- Soundness issue – no climate change assessment for Village Clusters. To be dealt with through Part 1 of the Plan
- Unreasonable Site GNLP0388 – request to reconsider for allocation instead, or as well as, GNLP2019. Further discussions needed with Highways.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- Site GNLP0265
- Site GNLP2072

Coltishall, Horstead with Stanninghall and Belaugh Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2019 Land at Rectory Road and south of the Bure Valley Railway, Coltishall (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	50
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 44 Object, 5 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Magnus Magnusson on behalf of Crocus Homes	Support	<p>Support identification of the site as a preferred option and confirm the suitability, availability and achievability of the site for development.</p> <p>Site would be masterplanned with adjacent COL1 (which has outline permission).</p> <p>Additional RAG assessment undertaken showing all criteria as 'green'.</p> <p>Crocus Homes have an option on the land and are in the process of buying it from two willing landowners.</p> <p>Informal agreement in place with highways for 50 dwelling development.</p>	

			Further investigation of informal agreement with highways
CPRE Norfolk	Object	<p>Allocation of this site would lead to unacceptable encroachment into the countryside beyond the current settlement limit.</p> <p>Access to site would be congested and lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic on Rectory Road, with associated safety concerns.</p> <p>If allocated this site should be kept on a reserve list to ensure that more suitable allocated sites in the JCS are developed before the less suitable new GNLP sites.</p>	Confirm highways acceptability with NCC highways
Coltishall Parish Council	Object	<p>Question accuracy and validity of documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public transport links are not good • School and health practice are at capacity with no plans for further funding • Significant traffic issues on Rectory Road, improvements would damage streetscape in designated conservation area • Questions regarding Crocus Homes prior knowledge of GNLP plans • No climate change assessment made for village clusters • Concern the Chair of GNLP has a conflict of interest as a developer. 	<p>Confirm highways acceptability with NCC highways</p> <p>Strategic issues such as climate change assessments to be dealt with through Part 1 of the Plan</p>
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	<p>Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.</p> <p>Also see comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.</p>	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.

Horstead with Stanninghall Parish Council	Object	<p>Not in favour of GNLP2019, instead supporting development of GNLP1056 at Horstead.</p> <p>GNLP2019 is in wrong place connecting to the existing highway network at a narrow, one way, congested road with safety concerns.</p>	Confirm highways acceptability with NCC highways
Colin Dean on behalf of Governors of Coltishall Primary School	Object	<p>Support that the majority of sites have been assessed as unreasonable due to concerns about traffic and school capacity.</p> <p>Disappointed to see additional housing proposed at Rectory Road. School is oversubscribed and Governors are strongly opposed to any expansion as it would be detrimental to ethos and environment.</p> <p>Rectory Road is severely congested and hazardous for children.</p>	<p>Discuss school expansion with Children's Services</p> <p>Confirm highways acceptability with NCC highways</p>
Lanpro Services Ltd on behalf of Glavenhill	Object	Object to level of growth within the Coltishall with Horstead/Belaugh cluster as it is located on the edge of the Norfolk Broads National Park. New development would be better focussed around Scottow Enterprise Park away from the Broads.	
Joanna Copplestone. District Councillor for Coltishall Ward	Object	<p>Total amount of development proposed (80 homes) is disproportionate for the size of the cluster which lacks key services and facilities.</p> <p>Traffic constraints and safety concerns about Rectory Road. Developer should pay for a new roundabout on the B1150 to counteract effect of additional traffic.</p> <p>The Bure Valley Railway and Bure Valley Path adjacent to sites COL1 and GNLP2019 is important for tourism and GI and such green spaces should be protected.</p>	Confirm highways acceptability with NCC highways

Members of the public – various	Object/ Comment	<p>Various concerns raised including:</p> <p>Traffic/Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic congestion and safety concerns on Rectory Lane and nearby roads • Capacity of railway bridge to accommodate additional traffic • Status of informal agreement with highways • Ability of buses to navigate Rectory Lane • Impact of construction traffic • One-way system and speeding drivers • Traffic increase in village since opening of NDR and new housing developments in North Walsham, Hoveton/Wroxham • Possibility of providing disabled access to the Bure Valley Railway path from the site. • No road layout or transport plan available for public comment <p>Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools and doctors at capacity with no plans/scope for expansion • Public transport limited and expensive • Statement that Coltishall has a wide range of services is incorrect • Site too far from services in the centre of the village • Issues with water/gas leaks and power cable failure in vicinity of the site within the last 5 years. • Surrounding villages better suited for growth to maintain their schools and services. • Fears surface water flooding on Rectory and Westbourne Roads will increase. Storm drains are regularly overwhelmed and houses on Rectory Road have regular problems with drains and sewerage • Potential damage/contamination to local underground aquifer <p>Landscape and Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on wildlife and landscape • Impact on conservation area and character of village as important tourist destination in the Broads 	Confirm highways acceptability with NCC highways
---------------------------------	--------------------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Field currently in highest level tier of agri environment scheme• Nearby woods classified as priority for woodland improvement <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No development in addition to COL1 and COL2• Develop brownfield sites instead of greenfield (alternative brownfield site possibility on the B1150, just north of the village centre).• No need for additional houses in Coltishall and there is a 5 year land supply• Outside development boundary• No public consultation, plans going under the radar• Cancellation of consultation event by Crocus Homes means consultation deadline should have been extended• No indication of the type of houses to be built or site layout plans• No climate impact assessment carried out	
--	--	--	--

			Strategic issues such as climate change assessments to be dealt with through Part 1 of the Plan
--	--	--	---

Coltishall, Horstead with Stanninghall and Belaugh Cluster – Carried Forward Allocations

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy COL1 Land at Rectory Road, Coltishall (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	9
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 8 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design. Also see comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.
Members of the public - various	Object	Various concerns raised including: Traffic/Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essentially a single lane road not suitable for additional traffic • Traffic congestion at peak times, accident record ignored. • Not safe for children to walk to school • Traffic in the village has increased since the NDR opened • No plans for managing construction or residents traffic have been presented Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure not sufficient to support new development • School at capacity and doctors oversubscribed 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Few jobs in the villages so occupiers will have to commute• Mains services have restricted capacity with 5 failures in last 2 years <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cynical application to access the whole site• Greenfield site outside the settlement boundary approved against local opposition• Site is next to a tourist attraction that sells itself on the beautiful scenery• Broadland housing figures show no need for the development.	
--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy COL2 Land at Jordans Scrapyard, Coltishall (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 2 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Comment	Do not feel that any development on this side of the River Bure is appropriate but if there has to be any then a carefully designed scheme on this site is preferable to desecrating greenfield sites and leaving an ex-scrapyard in the centre of a lovely but increasingly traffic bruised village.	
Member of the public	Object	An already busy road, with limited parking, and close to a school will become even busier. The local school and Dr's surgery are already at capacity.	
Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design. Also see comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.
Historic England	Object	Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there is a grade II listed limekiln just to the north east of the site and the Coltishall and Horstead Conservation Area and its associated listed buildings lies to the south of the site. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the setting of these heritage assets. There is currently no mention of the Conservation Area and	

		<p>listed buildings within the policy or supporting text or of the requirement to conserve and enhance the significance of these heritage assets.</p> <p>Suggested Change: Amend the policy and supporting text to make reference to the Lime Kiln and Coltishall and Horstead Conservation Area and associated listed buildings and the need to conserve and enhance the significance of the heritage assets (including any contribution made to that significance by setting).</p>	
--	--	--	--

Coltishall, Horstead with Stanninghall and Belaugh Cluster – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0388 Land at St Johns Close, Coltishall (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Savills on behalf of the Diocese of Norwich and Mr P Playford	Object	<p>Concerns about draft allocation GNLP2019 (highway constraints, residential amenity and intrusion into the countryside) and carried forward allocation COL2 (questions over deliverability) and suggest that GNLP0388 represents a more realistic and attractive option whether it comes forward in full or in part. GNLP0388 is sustainable and deliverable.</p> <p>The GNLP identifies Coltishall as suitable for 50-60 new homes but only makes an allocation for 20-25 new homes. GNLP0388 could make up the other 25-30 homes.</p> <p>GNLP0388 considered to be unreasonable on highways grounds. A Highway Technical Note is being prepared to address the issues raised. Previous highway advice has indicated that a suitable access can be achieved from St Johns Close.</p> <p>Development of GNLP0388 could improve pedestrian accessibility to the school and surgery through a new footpath and cycleway through the allotments in</p>	<p>Look at deliverability of COL2 carried forward allocation.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of site GNLP0388 against the preferred site GNLP2019</p> <p>Consider further allocation to make up short fall in dwellings for the cluster.</p>

		conjunction with the Parish Council. The site could also facilitate additional parking at the school. The site is owned by two parties who are working together to bring the site forward.	Consider Highway Technical Note when available and discuss with highway colleagues
--	--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	GNLP1056 Land at Buxton Road, Horstead (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support/ 1 Object/ 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Horstead with Stanninghall Parish Council	Object	The Horstead with Stanninghall Neighbourhood Plan, which is shortly to be published, comments that "Whilst it is a fact that none of the major landowners in the parish have expressed any intention of making land available for development, there are some opportunities in and around the village of Horstead and across the parish as a whole. Small parcels of land immediately adjacent to the settlement limit of the village are available....." The Parish Council feels that GNLP1065 would meet these requirements.	

FOULSHAM AND THEMELTHORPE CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	FOULSHAM AND THEMELTHORPE OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	18
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 16 Object, 2 Comments

The Foulsham and Themelthorpe Cluster has 1 c/f allocation (FOU2), 1 preferred site (0605), 0 reasonable alternatives and 3 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- None

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- Site GNLP0275
- Site GNLP0607
- Site GNLP2001

Foulsham and Themelthorpe Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0605 Land west of Foundry Close, Foulsham (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	15
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 14 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Foulsham Parish Council	Object	Very poor access – Aubrey Rix Close has poor paving for pedestrians and development would bring them into close proximity with traffic.	
Members of the public - various	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the preferred site include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much traffic currently – local roads and junctions unable to cope • Many single roads nearby, dangerous to pedestrians/cyclists • Site wildlife haven – possible conservation area • Affect wildlife corridor backing Foundry Close • Pedestrian route to school is unsafe • Increase in noise, pollution and stress to local residents and infrastructure • No village bus service, have to walk a mile to use another village's with no footways or street lighting • Would affect privacy of nearby residents • Parking issues locally, would make worse • Alternate brownfield sites within village 	

Anglian Water	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Historic England	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of grade II listed buildings to south • Foulsham conservation area to south and east • Suggest amending policy and text to reference Foulsham Conservation Area and associate listed buildings and need to conserve and enhance significance of heritage assets. 	

Foulsham and Themelthorpe Cluster – Carried Forward Allocation

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy FOU2 Land at Old Railway Yard, Station Road, Foulsham (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the carried forward allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should build on brownfield sites first – to approve would go against policy • Stringers Lane/Aubrey Rix is single lane. • Stringers Lane/Foundry Close Junction has become dangerous already • Field is wildlife haven • Concern for trees & hedgerows • This is a conservation area 	
Anglian Water	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Historic England	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impact on Foulsham Conservation Area to north east of site • Text should be amended to reference this 	

FREETHORPE, HALVERGATE AND WICKHAMPTON CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	FREETHORPE, HALVERGATE AND WICKHAMPTON OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 3 Comments

The Freethorpe, Halvergate and Wickhampton Cluster has 1 c/f allocation (FRE1), 1 preferred site (2034), 0 reasonable alternatives and 1 site which is judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Water capacity issues to be resolved for preferred site GNLP2034
- Amend policy for carried forward allocation FRE1 to include reference to listed buildings and the need for landscaping to mitigate impact

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- Site GNLP2033

Freethorpe, Halvergate and Wickhampton Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2034 South of Bowlers Close, Freethorpe (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Anglian Water	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2 	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Environment Agency (Eastern Region)	Comment	Freethorpe WRC is currently flow non-compliant. However, we have received an application to increase the dry Weather Flow of the sewage works, which should bring it compliant with the permit. There should be no development until the capacity has been upgraded.	Water capacity issues to be resolved

Freethorpe, Halvergate and Wickhampton Cluster – Carried Forward Allocation

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy FRE1 Land north of Palmer’s Lane, Freethorpe (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Support

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Anglian Water	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Historic England	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade II listed Walpole Almshouses lie to north west of site. Landscaping along northern edge would mitigate impact. Recommend amending policy to reference buildings, mention landscaping and need to conserve and enhance these assets 	

FRETtenham CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	FRETtenham CLUSTER OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	9
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	4 Support, 3 Object, 2 Comment

The Frettenham Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 0 preferred sites, 0 reasonable alternatives and 3 sites which are judged to be unreasonable (2 residential, 1 non-residential).

Main issues:

- Unreasonable site GNLP0492 – request to re-evaluate the brownfield part of the site, although some public opposition to development.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Frettenham Cluster – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0492 Land South of Harbord Road, Frettenham (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	5
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	4 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Members of the public - various	Support	<p>Comments in support of the site being unreasonable include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously rejected at highest appeals procedure, nothing has since changed • Harbord Road/Post Office Road junction unsuitable for increased traffic • No need given housing in Sprowston and Rackheath • Contested by villagers and Parish Council • Adjacent to country wildlife site • Outside settlement area of village • Part of woodland corridor within Broadland • Many trees on site 	
Lanpro Services Ltd	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council considers village could accommodate 50-60 additional homes. Reliance on windfall to fulfil this growth not appropriate, needs to be properly planned • Only the former gas storage works site (which is previously developed land) is for development. • CWS does not affect this area and the CWS is not currently accessible to public, nor is it managed. Possibility of public access to be explored. 	Re-evaluate the potential on the brownfield part of the site.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development can be achieved without impact on TPOs• Quantum of development on site is flexible• Within easy and safe walking distance of school• Adjacent to existing residential development• Junction improvements could be made to improve visibility if deemed necessary• Possible to surface alternate access if needed.	
--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2076 Adjacent 10 Buxton Road, Frettenham (Unreasonable Site – Non Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Frettenham Parish Council	Comment	In favour if footpath along Pound Hill is included	
Matthew Hewitt via Nicole Wright (Agent)	Object	There are currently 10 tenants occupying the units on the site. A number of new enquiries received over the past 24 months demonstrate a reasonably high demand for additional spaces for start-ups. A planning application for a mixed-use low carbon scheme at the site is currently being prepared for submission in 2020. These include proposals for new footpath links to the village.	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2078 Adjacent 10 Buxton Road, Frettenham (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Frettenham PC	Comment	In favour if footpath along Pound Hill is included	
Matthew Hewitt via Nicole Wright (Agent)	Object	Plans are underway to provide a new footpath to link the site to the rest of the village. It is also adjacent to existing employment opportunities where proposals are in place to introduce new starter units for small businesses and community facilities. A planning application for a low carbon mixed use development is currently being prepared to be submitted in 2020. The proposals demonstrate how the amenity of new and existing residents would be protected and enhanced. Ecology and other technical surveys show that there are no insurmountable constraints to delivering a viable proposal	

GREAT AND LITTLE PLUMSTEAD CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	GREAT AND LITTLE PLUSTEAD OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	23
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	16 Support, 4 Object, 3 Comments

The Great and Little Plumstead Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 0 preferred sites, 0 reasonable alternatives and 10 sites which are judged to be unreasonable (8 Residential, 2 Non-Residential).

Main issues:

- Comments regarding non-allocation of any sites in the cluster
- Site GNLP0420R – further consideration of highway statement regarding vehicular access and footpath provision
- Site GNLP0483 – re-evaluate site on revised boundary
- Site GNLP3014 – re-evaluate site on revised boundary

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Great and Little Plumstead Cluster – General Comments

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	General Comments, Great and Little Plumstead
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Glavenhill limited via Lanpro Sevices Ltd	Object	<p>Comments on village clusters Policy 7.4 (with particular reference to GNLP0483)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy considered to be neither positively prepared, justified or effective in delivering houses needed within village over plan period and is therefore unsound. • Cluster considered appropriate for 50-60 new homes, but area has been deemed unnecessary to carry forward any previous allocations or set new ones, instead relying on windfall strategy. • Para70 of NPPF is clear that windfall strategy should be based on compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. • No such evidence provided in this instance. • More effective and deliverable strategy would be to allocate series of small sites (12-25 homes) that have been confirmed as being deliverable. 	

Great and Little Plumstead Cluster – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0328 Land east of Salhouse Road, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside settlement boundary, defined as Service Village in JCS • Goes against policy 1&2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD. • Salhouse Road which borders is 60mph and not wide enough for large volumes of traffic. • Witton Lane equally unsuitable. • Brick Kiln junction known for accidents and unsuitable for further traffic 	
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not suitable due to required improvements that would be required to Brick Kiln junction. • Not well related to services and facilities. • Impact upon landscape • Flood risk • Loss of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0330 Land west of Salhouse Road, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside settlement boundary • Against policy 1&2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD • Salhouse Road 60mph and not wide enough. • Witton Lane unsuitable as exit for development • Brick Kiln junction known for accidents and not suitable for further traffic 	
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on landscape • Flood risk • Loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land • Not well related to existing developments and services/facilities • Requires significant highway improvements for Brick Kiln junction 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0420R Land at Hare Road, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hare Road not fit for further traffic as narrow and permanent flooding reducing road to single lane. • Outside settlement boundary • No social, environmental or economic reason for development • Drainage and absorption concern in area • Only serviced by hourly bus • No shops or schools in village 	
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitability Assessment concluded original, larger site was well related to services and character of village and that access constraints could be overcome through development. • Revised smaller site assessed in HELAA states; development fronting Hare Road would broadly repeat existing pattern of development with no significant impact on landscape and whilst some constraints it is considered suitable • However as site already assessed it will not contribute additional capacity to HELAA addendum without double counting and is therefore unsuitable. This does not mean sites itself is unsuitable, merely it should not be double counted for HELAA purposes. 	Further consideration of highway statement regarding vehicular access and footpath provision

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways statement has been undertaken to demonstrate satisfactory access can be achieved – two options for improvements are outlined, these will improve current issues. • Outline planning application currently under consideration ref: 20191938 for 10 dwellings (7 open market, 3 affordable) incl. access. • Site is currently available and no fiscal/environmental reasons why cannot be delivered within next 5 years (expected to commence 2020/2021). • Site is deliverable and developable. • Footpath proposed along site frontage to connect to existing footpath providing safe continuous footpath between site and facilities, incl. school. • Bus stop close by with regular bus service. • Existing hedgerow to be removed (with exception of Oak Tree) for footpath (stated to be low overall value and in poor form). Detailed landscaping scheme will form part of any application to replace and improve lost vegetation. • Site in Flood Zone 1, where possible SUDs will be used – this will be explored and provided as part of detailed application. • Highway surface water drains along entire length of site have been replaced by client as part of other ongoing developments which has resolved highway flooding issues. • Part of proposal is new drain being installed along proposed footpath. These will resolve Hare Road flooding. • No known utilities connection issues. • Site is more favourable location than others in village and comments have been made on each of the other sites. 	
Landowner via Bidwells	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is suitable, achievable, viable, deliverable and available • Great and Little Plumstead identified in Appendix 5 of GNLP draft as having higher potential to accommodate 50-60 dwellings due to there being a primary school, village shop, village hall, playing field, playground, church, allotments and bowling green. A community shop/café with post office is also being constructed. • Hourly bus service to Norwich within walking distance of site. 	Further consideration of highway statement regarding vehicular access and footpath provision

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No sites in area have been identified for growth due to significant existing commitments in village cluster – no commentary on these on whether these are deliverable or if they are included in the 995 dwelling across Broadland Village Clusters considered deliverable in Policy 1 of GNLP draft strategy. • Allocation in Broadland Village clusters identified in Appendix 5 as being 358-517 dwellings meaning no guarantee of required 480 being met. • Site is central within village, adjacent existing dwellings representing a logical extension to existing settlement. • Site will also provide delivery of footpath links which resolves an issue identified in the neighbourhood plan. • Traffic calming measures will be delivered. • Site will contribute to small sites target. • Site can allow for expansion of Hare Road, also for footpath to be provided. • Tree belt to frontage of Church Road is being removed due to current development which will improve visibility to west. • Highways statement has been prepared by Pritchard Civil Infrastructure Design presenting two viable options to deliver improvements to create sufficient visibility splays to east. • The statement also concludes no highways safety concerns precluding development at site and that local road network can accommodate this amount of growth. • The Environment Agency don't recognise site as being located within area of surface water flooding, HELAA confirms. • Highway surface water drains have been replaced to eradicate surface flooding on corner of Church Road and Water Lane, similar enhancements can be achieved at Hare Road. 	
--	--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0441R, Land at Middle Road, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No footpaths on Middle Road and not possible to create in certain parts due to pre-existing houses. • Road is narrow and cars can only just pass each other, not suitable for further traffic. • Outside settlement boundary. • Against policies 1 & 2 of ICE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0483 Land East of Salhouse Road, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Glavenhill Limited via Lanpro Services Ltd	Comment	<p>Site was previously awaiting outcome of outline application for 84 dwellings. This was refused and dismissed at appeal as provides excess of the 10-20 dwellings. Also concern over lack of foot and cycleways and infrequency of buses.</p> <p>An updated masterplan was sent to GNGB in 2019 with reduced dwellings (35), new care housing provision, community allotments, community uses, land being given to Parish as open space and provision of footpath and road calming measures. Despite this the site was still being considered for its original proposal - 86 dwellings, 5.83ha of GI and new play equipment.</p> <p>Parish considered appropriate for 50-60 houses but no sites carried forward or allocated making Policy 7.4 unsound, unjustified and ineffective. A series of small sites (12-25 homes) should be allocated.</p> <p>Site is now being submitted for between 20-25 dwellings which means it will have limited impact on Brick Kiln junction, will provide affordable housing, logical extension to settlement limit and allows easy and safe pedestrian access to local primary school.</p>	Re-evaluate site on revised boundary

Great & Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside of settlement boundary • Goes against policies 1&2 of SE and policies GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD • Salhouse road which borders is 60mph and not wide enough to have large volume of traffic. • Witton Lane equally unsuitable as exit for development. • Brick Kiln junction known for accidents and not suitable for further traffic. 	
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require significant highway improvements to Brick Kiln Junction. • Impact to surrounding landscape • Loss of high quality agricultural land • Impact on trees and ecology 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2040 South of Broad Lane, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside settlement boundary • against policies 1&2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD • Due to closure of Broad Lane all residents would use facilities in Rackheath rather than the Plumsteads. Rackheath has a large amount of development and this application provides no services or amenities for residents. 	
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remote from main development of the Plumsteads. • Lacks safe pedestrian access to existing services and facilities. • Flood risk • Landscape impact 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2107 North of Octagon Business Park, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Non-residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: Road network struggling to cope with current traffic on Highbrow Lane and Hospital Road/Water Lane	
Joe Wiley via Nicole Wright (Agent)	Comment	Zero carbon starter units for small businesses	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3007 East of Salhouse Road, South of Belt Road, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Great and Little Plumstead PC	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside settlement boundary • Against Policy 1&2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD • Salhouse road which borders is 60mph and is not wide enough for large volumes of traffic. • Witton Lane equally unsuitable as exit for site. • Brick Kiln junction is known for accidents and not suitable for further traffic. 	
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires significant highway improvements to Brick Kiln junction. • Impact on Landscape 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3014 Home Farm, Water Lane, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Land owner via Gary Collier (Agent)	Object	Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On rare occasions only small amount of water lays on grid ref 5332 and 6524 which is low lying. • Land for future development includes front field (7.08 acres) and 2nd field (8.55 acres), each acre allowing for 10 dwellings. • Smaller amount of land on Home Farm could be considered. • Starter, family or retirement homes could be considered, or local shop/supermarket. • Remaining 15 acres could be used for open space or recreation. 	Re-evaluate site on revised boundary
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	Comments supporting the site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside settlement boundary • Against policies 1&2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD. • Water Lane is narrow and is (not?) suitable for amount of traffic large development would cause. 	
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	Comments supporting the site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to cause significant landscape and character impact. • Unclear if satisfactory access could be achieved onto Water Lane • Flood Risk • Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land. 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3034 East of Brook Farm, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Non-residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Great and Little Plumstead PC	Support	Comments supporting the site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads surrounding site unsuitable for extra traffic. • Toad Lane extremely narrow country lane. • No exit onto A1270 as 70mph. • Broad Lane/Norwich Road junction has very poor visibility 	

GREAT WITCHINGHAM, LENWADE, WESTON LONGVILLE, ALDERFORD, ATTLEBRIDGE, LITTLE WITCHINGHAM AND MORTON ON THE HILL CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	GREAT WITCHINGHAM, LENWADE, WESTON LONGVILLE, ALDERFORD, ATTLEBRIDGE, LITTLE WITCHINGHAM AND MORTON ON THE HILL OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	8
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 6 Comments

The Great Witchingham, Lenwade, Weston Longville, Alderford, Attlebridge, Little Witchingham and Morton on the Hill Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 1 preferred site (0608), 0 reasonable alternatives and 7 sites which are judged to be unreasonable (6 residential and 1 non-residential).

Main issues:

- Request that site GNLP0548 should be considered for allocation alongside site GNLP0608

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- Site GNLP0460
- Site GNLP0553
- Site GNLP0586
- Site GNLP2129

- Site GNLP2184

Unreasonable Non-Residential Sites

- Site GNLP2144

**Great Witchingham, Lenwade, Weston Longville, Alderford, Attlebridge, Little Witchingham and Morton on the Hill Cluster
– Preferred Site**

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0608 Land at Bridge Farm Field, St Faiths Close, Great Witchingham (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	6
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 5 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Site Owners via Parker Planning Services	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is 1.75ha and has the potential to accommodate 15-20 dwellings • Site is suitable, available, achievable, viable and deliverable • Landowner actively promoting the site • RAG assessment undertaken showing all HELAA criteria as green so site is considered to have no major constraints 	
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Comment	Adjacent to Lenwade Pits West CWS which will be resurveyed in summer. Further comments can be provided once this survey has been undertaken	
Environment Agency (Eastern Region)	Comment	Boundary has been drawn to exclude current and future flood zones to north so the sequential approach has been correctly applied	
Historic England	Comment	Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II listed Bridge Public House lies to the south east of the site. Any development of the	

		site has the potential to impact upon the setting of the listed building. We welcome bullet point 4 which refers to the listed building.	
SMG Architects Ltd	comment	Redline plan + masterplan attached	

**Great Witchingham, Lenwade, Weston Longville, Alderford, Attlebridge, Little Witchingham and Morton on the Hill Cluster
– Unreasonable Site**

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP 0548 Council Field, Great Witchingham/Lenwade (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Landowner via Parker Planning Services	Object	Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available, achievable, deliverable, suitable and viable. • Site would constitute sustainable development and should be allocated alongside GNLP0608 as this would mean there is less pressure to allocate less sustainable sites across the village clusters • Site could accommodate approx. 20 dwellings • RAG assessment undertaken which shows all criteria as green so site is considered to have no major constraints 	
SMG Architects Ltd	Comment	Red line plan + Masterplan attached	

HAINFORD AND STRATTON STRAWLESS CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	HAINFORD AND STRATTON STRAWLESS OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 3 Object, 1 Comment

The Hainford and Stratton Strawless Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 0 preferred sites, 0 reasonable alternatives and 9 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Unreasonable sites GNLP0393 and 2162 promoted as suitable to accommodate the 50-60 dwellings identified for the cluster. Proposal from the promoter of GNLP2162 to facilitate safe walking route to school.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- Site GNLP0065
- Site GNLP0069
- Site GNLP0181
- Site GNLP0190
- Site GNLP0512

- Site GNLP0582
- Site GNLP2035

Hainford and Stratton Strawless Cluster – General Comments

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Hainford General Comments
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Councillor Dan Roper	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorse there being no currently identified suitable sites. • Hainford has limited infrastructure, narrow roads and lack of safe walking path to the school. • Question why village is clustered with Stratton Strawless, little in common with each other. Would be better for village to standalone. 	
Member of the public	Object	Ref small site GNLP3046 - Support this site being considered unreasonable for future development as per the GNLP on the basis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints by flooding, drainage issues, no safe route to local school by foot 	

Hainford and Stratton Strawless Cluster – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0393 Land at Hainford, Hainford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Savills on behalf of Diocese of Norwich	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site can meet identified housing need (50-60 as identified in sites document) • Village Hall, primary school (which has spaces) and public transport within walking/cycling distance of site. • Site is immediately adjacent to school, and Diocese could facilitate school expansion if necessary and part of the site could accommodate a car park for use by the school • Area is well related to Norwich with A140 close by and bus stop 150m from site. • Well related to existing settlement and it's boundary. Allocating the site would connect the school to the village. • Access will be via Newton Road. Current access and carparking for the school would be incorporated into overall development plan for the site. • Client has already installed a TROD footpath to provide access to the school and this could be upgraded through development 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Could incorporate SUDs to address pressures on site drainage and run off. Not locate on a flood zone 2 or 3, not subject to any PROW.• Electric, water, sewerage and telecoms all available.	
--	--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2162 Harvest Close, Hainford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Westmore Homes, Agent: Armstrong Rigg Planning	Object	Land adjacent to site has been acquired so it is now possible to provide a safe continuous segregated footway from Harvest Close to the primary school via a new 1.5m wide footpath to Newton Road then a further footway along the highway verge. There are no other constraints and building here will provide up to 60 dwellings including a proportion of affordable housing in line with GNLP policy as well as public open space and a new children's local area of play.	Liaise with Highways colleagues regarding suitability of footpath proposals

HEVINGHAM CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	HEVINGHAM OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

The Hevingham Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 0 preferred sites, 0 reasonable alternatives and 2 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- None

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- Site GNLP0292

Hevingham Cluster – Unreasonable Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2002 6 The Turn, Hevingham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Site Owner	Object	<p>Comments objecting to site being unreasonable:</p> <p>The Turn is a dead-end road. There is access to the school via a right of way to Westgate Street. Children do not walk to school from the Heath due to the mud on the road and flooding. Mothers take their children by car.</p> <p>Facilities in the village apply to the Heath, both the school and the village hall have the capacity to expand. The road has two good access points from the Heath.</p> <p>This is an infill site with housing all around, if the site is not considered suitable for building perhaps the frontage could be looked at as a separate site.</p> <p>The proposed site entrance is not into The Turn as you have shown but is directly on to the main road through the Heath.</p>	

HORSFORD, FELTHORPE AND HAVERINGLAND CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	HORSFORD, FELTHORPE AND HAVERINGLAND OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	27
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	13 Support, 9 Object, 5 Comment

The Horsford, Felthorpe and Haveringland Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 1 preferred site (0264), 0 reasonable alternatives and 28 sites which are judged to be unreasonable (26 residential and 2 non-residential).

Main issues:

- General objection to the method of assessment for village clusters being based on unpublished Children’s Services information
- General comment that as the 9th largest settlement in the Plan area Horsford should have a higher level of growth and at least be identified as a Service Centre.
- Suggestion that unreasonable site GNLP0283 should be considered for allocation in place of preferred site GNLP0264
- Preferred Site GNLP0264 requires WFD compliance assessment
- The designation of sites GNLP0332R and 0334R as unreasonable negatively impacts on the brand new community hub for Horsford
- Suggestion that unreasonable site GNLP0422 should be allocated to make up for the shortfall in Horsford’s housing numbers
- Suggestion that the HELAA for unreasonable site GNLP2160 has not been appropriately reviewed and updated

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0222
- GNLP0251
- GNLP0302
- GNLP0333
- GNLP0359R
- GNLP0469
- GNLP1043
- GNLP3004
- GNLP3005

Unreasonable Non-Residential Sites

- GNLP2154

Horsford, Felthorpe and Haveringland Cluster – General Comments

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Horsford Title Comments (General Comments)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Savills on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes	Object	<p>The ‘Sites Assessment Booklet’ for Horsford states: “HORSFORD, FELTHORPE AND HAVERINGLAND The catchment of Horsford Primary School brings Horsford, Felthorpe and Haveringland into a village cluster. The school currently has limited capacity. It is considered that as well as existing commitments and windfall development, approximately 20-50 new homes are appropriate for the Horsford cluster. In addition to the primary school, services include a shop, doctor’s surgery, village hall, library and public house.”</p> <p>The introduction to the Site Assessment Methodology, states (para. 1.5): “The scale of growth proposed within each ‘village cluster’ reflects school capacity or ability or grow, plus the availability of other accessible services. Taking account of the timescales for delivery and other uncertainties, such as pupil preference, it has been assumed that a minimum scale of allocation (12- 20 dwellings) can be accommodated in all clusters if appropriate sites are available. To guide development all village clusters have been rated ‘red’ (12- 20 dwellings), ‘amber’ (20-50 dwellings) or ‘green’ (50-60 dwellings) based on information provided by Children’s Services, although this is a starting point and there is flexibility within</p>	Objection to method of assessment for village clusters being based on unpublished Children Services information.

	<p>these ratings, depending upon the quality of sites and the circumstances of individual schools.”</p> <p>As a methodology, this statement is distinctly insufficient and places undue and unjustified emphasis on unpublished advice from ‘Children’s Services’.</p> <p>With the Booklet stating that ‘it is considered that ... approximately 20-50 new homes are appropriate’ for Horsford, it is assumed that the village has been rated ‘amber’ “based on information provided by Children’s Services’.</p> <p>There is no other justification as to how the GNDP has arrived at the figure of ‘20-50’ for Horsford.</p>	
--	--	--

Horsford, Felthorpe and Haveringland Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0264 Dog Lane, Horsford (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
MDPC Town Planning on behalf of Carl Palmer & Wellington	Object	<p>This representation is submitted in support of unreasonable allocation site GNLP0283 and seeks to highlight how GNLP0283 should be considered as a preferable site to the currently proposed preferred allocation GNLP0264 – explored in the ‘Connectivity Assessment’. The representation does not object to the development of GNLP0264 as such, more that it should not be considered as favourably.</p> <p>Negatives of site GNLP0264 are the industrial use which will remain adjacent to the site, possibility of contamination from the current industrial use, flood risk, restrictions on acceptable vehicle access location and requirement for segregation of vehicles between the residential and industrial use and higher accident record in the local area compared to area of site GNLP0283.</p>	Issues raised in representation promoting consideration of GNLP0283 in place of this preferred allocation
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	<p>Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design</p> <p>Please also see comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.</p>	No reference to water efficient design

Environment Agency (Eastern Region)	Comment	Site intersects with water course, It should undertake a WFD compliance assessment for the watercourse receiving the runoff, maintain a buffer of 20 m between the watercourse and gardens and secure opportunities for riparian habitat restoration.	Requires WFD compliance assessment
-------------------------------------	---------	---	------------------------------------

Horsford, Felthorpe and Haveringland Cluster – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0059 Bramley Lakes, Dog Lane, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>Whilst Dog Lane is able to cope with the vehicular traffic it sees now, I do not believe there is scope for larger developments including commercial. This would be to the detriment of a small and winding lane. Bramley Lakes is situated at the far end of Dog lane, so all other properties would need to be passed in order to reach the destination. Moreover, the junction with the B1149 really should not be seeing any further traffic given the through traffic the B1149 currently carries and will carry in the future.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0151 Pronto Joinery, Dog Lane, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>Dog lane cannot support any further housing due to the constraints of the lane itself and the junction with the B1149. Dog Lane has to be carefully negotiated as it is. It is single track traffic only in some places. Give and take is a must on this lane. Whilst the traffic it carries now is within reason, any further developments along Dog Lane would certainly be to the detriment of the existing residents, not to mention add congestion at the small junction with the B1149. The B1149 has seen a vast increase in traffic already</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0153 Pronto Joinery, Dog Lane, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>Dog lane cannot support any further housing due to the constraints of the lane itself and the junction with the B1149. Dog Lane has to be carefully negotiated as it is. It is single track traffic only in some places. Give and take is a must on this lane. Whilst the traffic it carries now is within reason, any further developments along Dog Lane would certainly be to the detriment of the existing residents, not to mention add congestion at the small junction with the B1149. The B1149 has seen a vast increase in traffic already.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0192 Arable Land, Dog Lane, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>This land is also far from ideal for a residential development. My previous comments on Dog Lane stand on this proposal too. Dog Lane is not in a position to carry further traffic. It is a small lane and vehicles would have to pass a large number of the properties on Dog lane to reach this development. It just isn't feasible. There is also no safe walking route on Dog lane itself. It could pose a danger to pedestrians. The junction with the B1149 is not sufficient for this development.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0283 Land off Holt Road, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>Serious concerns on vehicular access to this proposed development. The roundabout at the B1149/Brewery Lane junction carries most of the through traffic to the NDR. Further development in this area will add to an already heavily used route. With the implementation of the NDR, the through traffic that the B1149 carries was grossly underestimated resulting in regular tail backs through Horsford. Where once there were 3 exits at the south end of the village, there is now only 1. Additional housing here will only exacerbate the problem.</p>	
MDPC Town Planning on behalf of Carl Palmer & Wellington	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being considered unreasonable</p> <p>This representation submits includes a comprehensive comparison with other sites in Horsford, to demonstrate how this site should be considered as a preferred allocation.</p> <p>GNLP0283 can offer wider community benefits, higher level of affordable home provision, better transport links, better and less restrictive access options and lower accident records in the vicinity of the site when compared to other sites in Horsford.</p>	<p>Representation recommends review of this site in comparison to other sites in Horsford based on supporting evidence submitted.</p> <p>Horsford is the 9th largest settlement in the plan area – as</p>

	<p>The representation cites a key advantage site GNL0283 has over the majority of the sites listed for comparison in the representation's 'Connectivity Assessment' is that the site has good connectivity for various modes of travel, with good vehicle links to the Northern Broadway, which would not involve vehicle travel through the village to connect to the strategic road network; whereas the other sites involve travel through the village before connecting with the strategic road network.</p> <p>The promotion of this site through the application process is well documented and the outcome through negotiation has arrived at a scheme which in overall terms complies with all policy requirements. However the site remains outside of the settlement boundary.</p> <p>It is considered that Horsford should be identified as a Key Service Centre (or at the very least a Service Village as at present) to secure a sensible level of growth reflecting the realistic status of the village and therefore a contributor towards an effective local plan capable of delivering housing and achieving relevant strategic objectives.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this consultation response and demonstrated through the planning application that has been submitted, the reasons for considering the site to be unreasonable are not justified and do not provide a sound basis for rejecting the site for allocation.</p>	<p>such should it be regarded as a Key Service Centre & facilitate a higher level of growth than currently proposed?</p>
--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0332R Reepham Road/ Cromer Road, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Norwich City Community Sports Foundation	Object	<p>Norwich City Sports Community Foundation and The Nest have developed a brand-new state-of-the-art community hub at Horsford (The NEST) directly adjacent to the proposed sites for development (GNLP0332R and GNLP0334R). We firmly believe in the need for local services, facilities and infrastructure projects to be built alongside housing developments to support communities. The Nest Community Hub has gained investment of over £6.2million to build new community facilities that includes residential bunk boxes, high quality grass football pitches, 3G artificial pitch, multi-use classrooms / fitness spaces, IT suite, café, changing rooms and a disability changing places. The Foundation also continues to investigate further opportunities to encourage the local community to participate in health and wellbeing activities for all age groups and abilities addressing local issues and need.</p> <p>The Foundation has been in discussions with the adjacent landowners with a view to working in partnership to expand and enhance the recreational community open space facilities on adjacent land. Development of these sites would enable the Nest to provide more activities, link with local schools and increase access to the Nest for the residents of Hellesdon and other areas. The Nest are keen to see improved footpaths and cycleway links provided to the Community Hub alongside working with local agencies to provide other essential services.</p>	The assessment of the site as 'unreasonable for allocation' is considered to negatively impact the brand new community hub at Horsford.

		We are therefore disappointed to note that the draft local plan Regulation 18 Stage C has identified the sites as 'unreasonable'. In our view, the Local Plan should be modified to include sites GNLP0332R and GNLP0334R as preferred allocations for development.	
CODE Development Planners Ltd	Object	<p>The representation sets out the landowner's response to what they consider to be an inadequate assessment of the suitability of the sites for development and the conclusion that the sites are 'unreasonable' for development.</p> <p>"We do not believe that the sites have been robustly assessed or indeed assessed on the same basis as other sites. The conclusions of the draft plan to allocate certain sites and not the proposed sites 0332R and 0334R have not been justified as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>As a consequence, we believe there is a significant danger that the Plan will be considered to be not sound. In addition, in the case of some of the Reasonable Alternative sites identified in the draft plan there is less than convincing evidence to confirm that these sites are justified or deliverable within the plan period. As such the Partnership's strategy is likely to be not effective, placing further doubt on the plan as a whole being sound. (Detailed explanation is provided within rep to support this position)</p> <p>The landowner invites further discussion of the issues raised in their representation and review of the proposals (including removal/reduction in employment area if necessary).</p> <p>Support Policy 1's general strategy which seeks to distribute housing growth in line with a settlement hierarchy placing the Norwich urban area including urban extensions in the Norwich fringe parishes at the highest level.</p> <p>Object to the allocation of at least 1400 homes on site GNLP0337 (Taverham), identification of sites GNLP0581 and GNLP2043 at Costessey as reasonable alternatives to be brought forward should this prove to be required due to low delivery of allocated sites and identification of sites GNLP332R and GNLP334R as 'unreasonable'. In our view these conclusions have not been justified as required</p>	<p>Site assessment process is not in accordance with NPPF & PPG, is not based in appropriate evidence, is inconsistent and is therefore unsound.</p> <p>Comprehensive evidence submitted in support review of site assessment, consideration that this should be regarded as a preferred allocation.</p> <p>It is recommended that without evidence to support the allocation of 11.08 hectares of land for recreational open space on land at Reepham Road without additional residential development, the proposal to simply carry forward the</p>

	<p>by paragraph 35 of the NNPF. Sites GNLP0581 and GNLP2043 cannot be categorised as being reasonably deliverable. Given the scale of proposed allocations involved, being a large proportion of the new allocations to meet housing requirements in the plan area, the issues raised are fundamental to the plan's function and objective. As such the approach and conclusions fail to demonstrate that the plan as a whole is justified and effective.</p> <p>Note the importance of identifying sufficient contingency sites given the specific issues related to the delivery of particularly complex sites in the East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area. Policy7 confirms the concentration of a further large proportion of the plan's new allocations (1,220) on three complex sites in the East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area in addition to an existing as yet undelivered commitment (780).</p> <p>Object to the allocation of 11.08 hectares of land at Reepham Road for recreational open space. The allocation has not been justified by evidence.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS TO POLICY It is recommended that a robust and consistent assessment with appropriately proportionate evidence is undertaken to assess the suitability of sites GNLP0332R and GNLP0334R. Given the assessments already prepared by the landowner's team and appended to these representations the evidence to allocate both sites is compelling.</p> <p>The submitted illustrative development framework plan suggests a possible form of development involving c600-700 dwellings on GNLP0332R and c250-300 dwellings on GNLP0334R both together with substantial additional recreational open space and green infrastructure. Further liaison with the Partnership would develop more detail associated with site expectations to be included in a policy which allocates the sites.</p> <p>It is recommended that without evidence to support the allocation of 11.08 hectares of land for recreational open space on land at Reepham Road without</p>	<p>allocation of HEL4 is deleted.</p>
--	---	---------------------------------------

		additional residential development, the proposal to simply carry forward the allocation of HEL4 is deleted.	
--	--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0334R Reepham Road/ Cromer Road, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Norwich City Community Sports Foundation	Object	<p>Norwich City Sports Community Foundation and The Nest have developed a brand-new state-of-the-art community hub at Horsford (The NEST) directly adjacent to the proposed sites for development (GNLP0332R and GNLP0334R). We firmly believe in the need for local services, facilities and infrastructure projects to be built alongside housing developments to support communities. The Nest Community Hub has gained investment of over £6.2million to build new community facilities that includes residential bunk boxes, high quality grass football pitches, 3G artificial pitch, multi-use classrooms / fitness spaces, IT suite, café, changing rooms and a disability changing places. The Foundation also continues to investigate further opportunities to encourage the local community to participate in health and wellbeing activities for all age groups and abilities addressing local issues and need.</p> <p>The Foundation has been in discussions with the adjacent landowners with a view to working in partnership to expand and enhance the recreational community open space facilities on adjacent land. Development of these sites would enable the Nest to provide more activities, link with local schools and increase access to the Nest for the residents of Hellesdon and other areas. The Nest are keen to see improved footpaths and cycleway links provided to the Community Hub alongside working with local agencies to provide other essential services.</p>	The assessment of the site as 'unreasonable for allocation' is considered to negatively impact the brand new community hub at Horsford.

		We are therefore disappointed to note that the draft local plan Regulation 18 Stage C has identified the sites as 'unreasonable'. In our view, the Local Plan should be modified to include sites GNLP0332R and GNLP0334R as preferred allocations for development.	
CODE Development Planners Ltd	Object	<p>The representation sets out the landowner's response to what they consider to be an inadequate assessment of the suitability of the sites for development and the conclusion that the sites are 'unreasonable' for development.</p> <p>"We do not believe that the sites have been robustly assessed or indeed assessed on the same basis as other sites. The conclusions of the draft plan to allocate certain sites and not the proposed sites 0332R and 0334R have not been justified as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>As a consequence, we believe there is a significant danger that the Plan will be considered to be not sound. In addition, in the case of some of the Reasonable Alternative sites identified in the draft plan there is less than convincing evidence to confirm that these sites are justified or deliverable within the plan period. As such the Partnership's strategy is likely to be not effective, placing further doubt on the plan as a whole being sound. (Detailed explanation is provided within rep to support this position)</p> <p>The landowner invites further discussion of the issues raised in their representation and review of the proposals (including removal/reduction in employment area if necessary).</p> <p>Support Policy 1's general strategy which seeks to distribute housing growth in line with a settlement hierarchy placing the Norwich urban area including urban extensions in the Norwich fringe parishes at the highest level.</p> <p>Object to the allocation of at least 1400 homes on site GNLP0337 (Taverham), identification of sites GNLP0581 and GNLP2043 at Costessey as reasonable alternatives to be brought forward should this prove to be required due to low delivery of allocated sites and identification of sites GNLP332R and GNLP334R as 'unreasonable'. In our view these conclusions have not been justified as required</p>	<p>Site assessment process is not in accordance with NPPF & PPG, is not based in appropriate evidence, is inconsistent and is therefore unsound.</p> <p>Comprehensive evidence submitted in support review of site assessment, consideration that this should be regarded as a preferred allocation.</p> <p>It is recommended that without evidence to support the allocation of 11.08 hectares of land for recreational open space on land at Reepham Road without additional residential development, the proposal to simply carry forward the</p>

	<p>by paragraph 35 of the NNPF. Sites GNLP0581 and GNLP2043 cannot be categorised as being reasonably deliverable. Given the scale of proposed allocations involved, being a large proportion of the new allocations to meet housing requirements in the plan area, the issues raised are fundamental to the plan's function and objective. As such the approach and conclusions fail to demonstrate that the plan as a whole is justified and effective.</p> <p>Note the importance of identifying sufficient contingency sites given the specific issues related to the delivery of particularly complex sites in the East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area. Policy7 confirms the concentration of a further large proportion of the plan's new allocations (1,220) on three complex sites in the East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area in addition to an existing as yet undelivered commitment (780).</p> <p>Object to the allocation of 11.08 hectares of land at Reepham Road for recreational open space. The allocation has not been justified by evidence.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS TO POLICY It is recommended that a robust and consistent assessment with appropriately proportionate evidence is undertaken to assess the suitability of sites GNLP0332R and GNLP0334R. Given the assessments already prepared by the landowner's team and appended to these representations the evidence to allocate both sites is compelling.</p> <p>The submitted illustrative development framework plan suggests a possible form of development involving c600-700 dwellings on GNLP0332R and c250-300 dwellings on GNLP0334R both together with substantial additional recreational open space and green infrastructure. Further liaison with the Partnership would develop more detail associated with site expectations to be included in a policy which allocates the sites.</p> <p>It is recommended that without evidence to support the allocation of 11.08 hectares of land for recreational open space on land at Reepham Road without</p>	<p>allocation of HEL4 is deleted.</p>
--	---	---------------------------------------

		additional residential development, the proposal to simply carry forward the allocation of HEL4 is deleted.	
--	--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0419 Land at Holly Lane/ Reephams Road, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>This site is completely unreasonable for a development of this scale. It would have a huge impact on the countryside and landscape. This is not acceptable in my eyes. Countryside is vanishing at a vast rate to the detriment of wildlife. It is not either part of Helledon or Horsford and is therefore a stand alone proposal with no safe walking passage to anywhere. An implementation of a development of this size is completely ludicrous. I further believe NDR traffic needs slowing down as it is a dangerous carriageway. This site runs parallel with it.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0422 Land at Lodge Farm, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>This land is behind the Church Rooms/new bungalow development. The only access near to this is opposite the Co-op food store. There is no other access along that stretch of the B1149. This location is completely unsuitable for development. The B1149 is pushed to its maximum now. Should there be an alternative proposed access, this too would be completely unsuitable. I note that the former garage is now vacant? Would this be a proposed entrance? Either way, this proposal is unsuitable for Horsford.</p>	Access issues related to the site – existing access is insufficient, new access would be inappropriate.
Bidwells for Mrs Rachel Foley	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable:</p> <p>Given the suitability of the village cluster, it is surprising that only one site for 30-40 dwellings has been identified, despite the commentary confirming that approximately 20-50 new homes are appropriate for the cluster. Therefore, allocating GNLP0422 will help achieve the GNLP's target of 9% of total housing growth being within village clusters (480 dwellings in Broadland).</p> <p>it is sought to amend the red line boundary, alongside reducing the site area and quantum of development proposed on the site. More specifically, the village cluster assessment booklet confirms that only one preferred allocation has been</p>	<p>Proposed revision of quantum of homes to address shortfall in Horsford's allocation potential. (reduction in proposed site allocation area)</p> <p>Evidence supporting how access issues can be overcome.</p>

	<p>identified in the village for 30 - 40 dwellings, despite development of 20 – 50 dwellings being appropriate for the cluster. Accordingly, this leaves a surplus of between 10 – 20 dwellings capacity for allocation in the village cluster.</p> <p>On this basis, it is sought to reduce the quantum of development proposed on the site to 10 – 20 dwellings, in order to accommodate this surplus. In reducing the quantum of development proposed to 10 – 20 dwellings, it is sought to both amend the red line boundary and reduce the site area to 0.86 ha.</p> <p>One of the reasons for the site being identified as being unreasonable was due to the convoluted access route into the site. As a result, the red line of the site has been amended, to include land to the north and west of the access route. In parallel, this helps to create a logical extension to Horsford whilst addressing concerns over convoluted access route. (See site plan submitted with rep). An Indicative Access Road General Arrangement Plan has been submitted to support overcoming highways access issues.</p> <p>A deliverability programme estimates that the site could deliver 20 homes by 2024 – within the first 5 years of the plan.</p>	<p>Evidence supporting deliverability within the first 5 years of the plan.</p>
--	---	---

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0423 Land at Mill Lane, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Comment	I am slightly confused at the current/proposed allocation. Already committed to 8 dwellings, which is too much for a lane as small as this given the development it has already seen. Not to mention the school that is located at Mill Lane. I would have thought that any further proposed dwellings (I don't know if its 10 on top of the 8 already allocated, or make it up to 10 by adding 2 more?) Regardless, this lane is not designed to carry any further traffic than it already does. Historically there have been major issues with school traffic.	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0479 Land east of Holt Road, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>There is already substantial development at this location, and, you have quite rightly deemed this site as unreasonable for more. My fear is that this will be overridden at some point for this extra housing which will all feed onto Crown Hill, thus causing further congestion to the B1149. The neighbourhood plan in Horsford has not exactly been adhered to so far with "extra" housing allowance.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0519 Land to the east of Holt Road, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Savills	Comment	<p>In summary, in your assessment of sites, the site that you refer to as GNLP0519, is stated as being ‘promoted for’ 266 dws. Planning permission ref. 20161770 – the permission referenced in your assessment, that has now been implemented, permitted 259 dws. However, the site is now subject to a subsequent resolution to grant planning permission ref. 20191999 for 304 dws (subject to completion of the S106 Agreement).</p> <p>Your assessment states that the site is “not considered suitable for allocation as despite being a reasonable location for development it already had planning permission at the base date of the plan in 2018 and is currently under construction”.</p> <p>Your reply advises that you have stated 266 dwellings as that is the number we included in our original site submission to the GNLP “back in 2016”, and that you haven’t updated the number of dwellings as we haven’t requested any change.</p> <p>To avoid any further confusion, on behalf of our client – , I should be grateful if you would amend the figure of 266 dwellings to 304 dwellings to align with the most-recent resolution to grant permission.</p>	Requested revision to numbers proposed on site from 266 to 304

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0578 Hilltop Farm, Church Street, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>This land is situated on Church Street, which, as a small country lane is not designed for access onto a residential housing site. The A140 would be the obvious choice for access, however, the traffic carried on this road has increased dramatically, moreover the junction with it at Church Street is unsafe as it stands now. Both the B1149 and the A140 are already heavily congested at peak times resulting in unacceptable tail backs. B1149 traffic tails back through Horsford which is frustrating at best for village residents. Not to mention idle engine pollution.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP1008 Home Farm, Holt Road, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>This land sits between the A140 Cromer road and the B1149 Holt Road. Developing an "unknown" number of houses at this site would result in the loss of more precious countryside and potentially add to an already heavily congested A140. Similarly, the B1149 would see an increase in traffic should access to this site lead from it. The through traffic that the B1149 carries was, I believe grossly underestimated when implementing the NDR. The feeder roads onto the NDR (from all directions) are not able to cope effectively as it stands now.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2009 Swanington Lane, Felthorpe (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Support	<p>I support the draft plan's conclusion, however reasons extend beyond lack of access to Horsford Primary School.</p> <p>Felthorpe has poor access to services with shops, schools and doctors over two miles away. It has limited employment, poor connectivity, poor infrastructure (no gas, street lights, narrow pavements and sewage capacity problems) so the village is unsuitable for development.</p> <p>The site itself is likely unviable, suffering from poor site access and links to the main village. It may also impact on nearby SSSI, local archaeology and suffer from surface water flooding.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2012 Brand's Lane, Felthorpe (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Support	<p>I support the draft plan's conclusion, however reasons extend beyond lack of access to Horsford Primary School.</p> <p>Felthorpe has poor access to services with shops, schools and doctors over two miles away. It has limited employment, poor connectivity, poor infrastructure (no gas, street lights, narrow pavements and sewage capacity problems) so the village is unsuitable for development.</p> <p>The site itself is likely unviable, suffering from poor site access and links to the main village.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2133 Glebe Farm North, Horsford (Unreasonable Non-residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Support	<p>Comment in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <p>This piece of land is far too big to support any employment led development given the current roads surrounding it. The feeder roads onto the NDR struggle now. This would increase that tenfold.</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2160 Green Lane, Horsford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Savills for Barratt David Wilson Homes	Object	<p>Representations submitted to previous consultations have addressed areas which require mitigation as flagged up in the HELAA (additional evidence supporting this has been submitted with the rep).</p> <p>The HELAA states that it will need to be reviewed periodically, however – no review has been undertaken.</p> <p>The assessment regarding access has been inaccurately produced & requires review in accordance with evidence submitted in rep.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided by GNLP to provide clarification of the alternative site sizes that have been considered as part of the assessment exercise (despite developer's previously stating that they would be willing to meet to discuss the site).</p> <p>Barratt David Wilson has a good track record of delivery, this site could commence within the first five years of the plan and deliver into the second five years of the plan at an estimated rate of 100 homes per year.</p>	<p>HELAA has not been appropriately reviewed and updated.</p> <p>Previous submissions have addressed items that require mitigation in the HELAA</p> <p>Access issues can be addressed.</p> <p>GNLP review of alternative site areas is not sufficiently evidenced & is contrary to the findings of Savills.</p>

			Site can be commenced in first five years of plan, and is deliverable in second 5 years of plan.
Savills for Barratt David Wilson Homes	Comment	Please note that we have previously promoted the site as having the capacity to accommodate 500 new homes, not the 600 that has been recorded and is referenced in the Sites Assessment Booklet. However, following further technical work, the site is now being promoted for c. 350 new homes, together with additional recreation facilities, as outlined in the Vision Document that accompanies these representations.	Update required to the proposed quantum of housing on site. This should be revised to 350 homes.

HORSHAM AND NEWTON ST FAITH CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	HORSHAM AND NEWTON ST FAITH OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	82
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	45 Support, 22 Object, 15 Comment

The Horsham and Newton St Faith Cluster has 3 c/f allocations (HNF1, HNF2/0466R, HNF3), 1 preferred site (0125), 0 reasonable alternatives and 10 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Preferred Site GNLP0125. Historic England suggest the need for a detailed heritage impact assessment and the consideration of the Conservation Area in the policy wording
- Carried Forward Allocation HNF1. Historic England suggest further investigation of heritage impacts and rewording of policy to take nearby listed buildings into account
- Carried Forward Allocation HNF3. Revised boundary to be considered, Norfolk Wildlife Trust suggest rewording policy to take account of nearby County Wildlife Site. Historic England suggest reviewing the site in terms of historic environment, particularly proximity to St Faith Priory.
- Unreasonable Site GNLP0482 – revisit HELAA, consider Utilities Statement and Landscape Assessment which have been submitted.
- Unreasonable Site GNLP1054 – revisit HELAA, consider reduced number of dwellings
- Unreasonable Sites GNLP2021, 3027 and 3028 – additional land to be considered

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0085
- GNLP0246
- GNLP0471

Horsham and Newton St Faith Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0125 Land west of West Lane, Horsham St Faith (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	19
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 15 Object, 3 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of the design unlike other allocation policies. See comments on Policy 2	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Historic England	Object	Concerns over any development as has potential impact on surrounding heritage assets (Grade I listed Church of Blessed Virgin and St Andrew and scheduled monument St Faith Priory). We suggest that a more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment be undertaken to assess the impact of the proposed development upon the significance of these heritage assets, to establish the suitability or otherwise of the site and to establish appropriate mitigation and enhancement should the site be found suitable. If the site is found suitable, the findings of the HIA should then inform the policy wording. The policy wording should also reference the conservation area.	Consider need for more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment Consider the conservation area in policy wording

Members of the public - various	Object	<p>Issues Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local amenities/infrastructure already stretched • Traffic already challenging • Joining up with the HNF2 area – losing semi-rural feel of area • Unsuitable access – dangerous for existing junction, visibility issues with existing tree belt • The culvert in West land needs to be kept open for flood risk • School Capacity • Sewage and drainage concerns • Grade II listed building opposite the church, near site. Church is also a listed building • Site would remove rural buffer between village, an A road and employment development to the south. • Landscape Issues • Lack of biodiversity benefits • Detailed assessment of site should be made upon a reduced area 	Further investigation of heritage, landscape and conservation impacts
Member of the Public	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding conservation area – very close to site entrance, suggests using land as a children’s play area 	Further investigation of conservation impacts
Bidwells (Site Promoter)	Support	<p>Sustainable location for growth, benefitting from a range of services and amenities, including a primary school, village hall, local shop and public transport provision.</p> <p>The site is suitable, available, achievable and viable, and is deliverable within the first five years of the plan period. There are no constraints which would affect the suitability of the site for residential development. We have demonstrated the suitability of the site to accommodate all of the growth allocated to the cluster of Horsham and Newton St Faith (i.e. 50 dwellings), if required, and is capable of meeting the requirements of Policy GNLP0125 . This is particularly relevant given that no alternative sites are identified in Horsham and Newton St Faith as being suitable for development. Accordingly, the foregoing text demonstrates that this specific site is a suitable location for further development, and Abel Homes</p>	Consider revised policy wording

		<p>supports the GNLP's proposals to allocate the site under Policy GNLP0125 for residential development.</p> <p>Assessment of Deliverability included and suggested revised policy wording.</p>	
Bright Future Developments St Faiths Ltd	Object	<p>The basis of identifying this site for allocation appears flawed when the site is considered against the HELAA, as there are clearly significant constraints associated with the development of the site. There are also questions as to whether the small scale of development will be viable and besides affordable housing there will be no benefits arising from the site. The site is also a considerable distance from the Primary School and the community buildings when compared with other sites within both Newton and Horsham St Faiths. No works are sought to improve pedestrian access to this facility.</p> <p>The identification of this site as a preferred option should be rejected. If not a detailed assessment of the site should be made based upon the reduced area. This assessment should also demonstrate how the impact of the development is to be properly mitigated in relation to the wider landscape setting. At the same time other sites should be reassessed to confirm whether a smaller site area would render them suitable for development. This aspect of the plan is considered to be unsound and the evidence available does not justify the identification of this site as the preferred option.</p>	Relook at HELAA assessment
Horsham and Newton St Faiths Parish Council	Object	<p>The Council feel that further development in the parish should be confined to "infill" within the current local plan boundary. They have no doubt that if the proposal to allocate GNLP0125 for residential development went ahead the planning authority would come under extreme pressure to increase this further in to that landholding putting even more stress on local facilities and infrastructure. The land west of West Lane provides a green buffer zone to the various areas adjacent to the A140, Church Street and the NDR which are allocated for commercial activity.</p>	

Horsham and Newton St Faith Cluster – Carried Forward Allocations

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy HNF1 Land east of Manor Road, Newton St Faith (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 3 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Historic England	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II listed Middle Farmhouse and Granary lie to the east of the site. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the setting of these listed buildings. There is currently no mention of the listed building in the policy or supporting text. Landscaping along the eastern edge of the site would help to mitigate the impact on the heritage asset.</p> <p>Suggested Change: Amend the policy and supporting text to make reference to the grade II listed Middle Farmhouse and Granary and the need to conserve and enhance the significance of the heritage assets (including any contribution made to that significance by setting). Mention landscaping along the eastern site boundary.</p>	<p>Further investigation of heritage impacts</p> <p>Revisit policy to take in consideration listed building</p>

Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design. See comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Member of the Public – 2 People	Object	<p>Issues Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Impact • Capacity of local amenities • Loss of country roads • Noise pollution from NDR • Loss of countryside views 	Further investigation of landscape and environmental impacts

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy HNF2/Site GNLP0466R Land east of the A140 and north of Norwich International Airport, Horsham St Faith (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	5
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 3 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the Public	Object	Issues raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impacts at NDR junction and traffic congestion. • Vehicles use HSF as a bypass to NDR • Loss of Semi-Rural feel 	Consider traffic impacts on surrounding area
Member of the Public – 2 people	Comment	Issues raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing tree belt along boundary has been cut, diminishing the landscape • Any development should enhance landscape with a tree belt to act as wildlife corridor, sound and pollution barrier • Loss of village surroundings • Concerns regarding access improvements 	Consider landscape and conservation impacts
GP Planning Ltd (site promoter)	Support	Supports retention of HNF2 and the change of wording in policy to reflect benefits of proximity to airport. Strongly suggest amendments to the policy wording to reflect the primacy of the CAA guidance to assist in minimising aviation hazards posed by wildlife.	Consider policy wording to reflect Civil Aviation Authority Guidance Consider boundary change to reflect full extent anticipated

		Notes accompanying the policy refer to the site being promoted with a larger boundary. This was done to reflect extant policy Guidelines for Development that accepts a slightly larger area for development incorporating land that was safeguarded for Broadland Northway. To avoid future confusion, the landowners and promoters would strongly suggest that the allocation boundary is extended to reflect the full extent of anticipated development.	
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of the design unlike other allocation policies. See comments on Policy 2	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy HNF3 Land at Abbey Farm Commercial, Horsham St Faith (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	6
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 5 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Comment	Would like to see full impact assessment on traffic, archaeology, and confirmation that existing property at Abbey Farm is fully occupied and active, before extension into new development	
Lawson Planning Partnership (Site Promoter) and	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocation contains significant planning merits when considered against NPPF Would provide further expansion opportunities for existing businesses 	Consideration of revised boundary

Horsham Properties Ltd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request: existing central bund is included within the employment allocation HNF3 • Revised Plan included • It is considered that the allocation of further land (approx. 0.9 hectares) to the north of the Commercial Park for employment use would also be compliant with the NPPF and the spatial approach for employment land set out in the GNLP. It is envisaged that the site's allocation would provide one additional building to the north of the Commercial Park, together with structural landscaping and forms a logical final extension to the Commercial Park. This additional allocation of land would provide for a small but important extension to the Commercial Park, which could be achieved within the limits of the site's future infrastructure capacity during the Plan period to 2040. • Sustainability Assessment Carried Out 	Consideration of additional studies undertaken
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of the design unlike other allocation policies. See comments on Policy 2	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Comment	In addition to the protection provided in Policy 2, we recommend that specific wording is included in the allocation policies to ensure they are properly addressed at the planning application stage. Any applications in proximity to known wildlife sites (as set out in Table 4), as well as irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland, and priority habitats (as set out in the NERC Act 2016) should be accompanied by an ecological appraisal, with provision of biodiversity net gain and sufficient buffering and safeguarding space secured between the development and the wildlife site in perpetuity (potentially also delivering contributions to green infrastructure). HNF3 - this site is adjacent to Horsham Meadows CWS, a pingo site. Impacts on the local hydrology and changes in drainage may have a significant effect on the adjacent CWS and so would need to be addressed by any application.	<p>Consider policy wording to address proximity of wildlife sites</p> <p>Consider impacts on local hydrology and drainage effecting adjacent CWS</p>
Historic England	Comment	Site is separated from Horsham St Faith and its conservation area and listed building by existing industrial estate however the site is of	Consider proximity to scheduled St Faith Priory

		<p>archaeological sensitivity given the proximity to the scheduled St Faith Priory.</p> <p>Concerns regarding insufficient evidence in relation to the historic environment in terms of site allocations. Site Allocation should be reviewed in terms of Historic Environment. Referred to: HE Good Practice Advice in Planning 1 and He Advice Note 3 – site allocations in local plans.</p> <p>Suggestion: Use numbers rather than bullet point in the policies to make referencing easier.</p>	<p>Consider Site Review in terms of Historic Environment</p> <p>Consider use of number rather than bullet points in site policies</p>
--	--	---	---

Horsham and Newton St Faith Cluster – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0482 Land east of Old Norwich Road, Horsham and Newton St Faith (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	22
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	21 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the Public – Various	Support	<p>Supports Unreasonable site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrusion on rural landscape • Narrow, unsafe roads and junctions • HGV restrictions • Amenity land already exists • Bullock Hill – newly built cycle path links to nearby villages already in place • Highly productive agricultural land • Local historic site (Old Drovers' Road), ancient hedgerows and Norfolk Wildlife logged endangered species • Noise Pollution • Access to NDR through narrow roads and sharp bend • Sewer System already failing • Not enough infrastructure • Loss of Wildlife 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land is of Historical Interest • Added to important history area- largest cattle and horse fair in Norfolk was held from 12th Century • Lack of paths 	
ESCO Developments Ltd (Site Promoter)	Object	<p>No significant infrastructure constraints have been identified that would impede or delay the development.</p> <p>Has accessibility to existing local businesses and services.</p> <p>Only 2 scheduled monuments within 2km of the site.</p> <p>Mitigation planting is proposed by new boundary trees and hedgerows to all boundaries. Informal group planting trees to public open spaces and native planting of meadow grass and wildflowers.</p> <p>Corner of Spixworth road and Old Norwich Road to remain as open space with grass and trees.</p> <p>No Visible water courses or ditches, site is in flood zone 1 and no risk of surface water flooding recorded.</p> <p>Site areas assessed was much larger than proposed in the December 2018. This makes assessment invalid and contradicts 2017 and 2018 HELAAs.</p>	<p>Revisit HELAA assessment</p> <p>Consider full utilities statement and landscape assessment</p>

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP1054 Land off Manor Road, Horsham and Newton St Faith (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	5
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	4 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public – various	Support	Support unreasonable site because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size of development • Lack of amenities and infrastructure • Increase in traffic • Dangerous junctions • Broadland has substantial land supply 	
Bright Futures Developments St Faiths Ltd (Site Promoter)	Object	Site reflect infill whereas preferred site represents an intrusion into the open countryside. Full Review of Horsham and Newton St Faiths requested. Questions Soundness of Plan. Should be considered against existing built form and character of village. HNF1 is subject to extant planning application (20182043 Full application) for the demolition of a dwelling and the erection of 69 Dwellings and Associated Infrastructure and landscaping at Land off Manor Road, Newton St Faiths, NR10 3LG. The Lovells scheme is also committed to providing a footpath to the south to St Faith's Primary School and the landowners of site GNLP1054 have stated in a recent planning appeal and via a current application that they are committed to extending the pedestrian link on Manor Road.	Consider implications on existing planning permission on HNF1 Revisit HELAA Assessment Consider reduced number of dwellings

		<p>Suggest flood risk comments are incorrect.</p> <p>Access has been confirmed as acceptable by Highways.</p> <p>It is accepted that the eastern part of the site is less suitable for development and the most easterly fields should be removed from any assessment. As a result the capacity of the site is circa 25-30 dwellings. The reduced density and site area will still allow surface water drainage to be attenuated on site.</p> <p>In reviewing all of the documents relating to the allocation of development sites in Horsham and Newton St Faiths it is apparent that there are inconsistencies in the commentary relating to the rejection of this site when compared with the HELAA comparison table. This table confirms that the site is not at risk of flooding and whilst the Historic Environment is detailed as amber, if the most easterly field is deleted then the score should be green.</p>	
--	--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2021 Oak Tree Farm, Horsham and Newton St Faith (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the Public	Support	There is now sufficient development at Newton St Faith there is no need ruin the village with more and more estates.	
Brown & Co	Support	<p>Whilst the overall strategy for village clusters contained in Policy 7.4 is supported, we believe that GNLP2021 and the additional land identified should be included as part of the delivery of growth in this part of Greater Norwich. The sites would offer an opportunity to deliver additional housing growth in a highly sustainable area. In particular the land between Meadow Farm Lane and Coltishall Lane is well related to the built form of the village and would form a logical extension to the built form.</p> <p>The contention in the general comments of the Horsham St Faith Assessment Booklet that 'prime agricultural land would be sacrificed' is incorrect as the latest Agricultural Land Classification map of Eastern England places these sites within Grade 3- Good to Moderate agricultural land. Additional Land Submitted</p>	<p>Consider assessment of agricultural land</p> <p>Consider additional land</p>

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2030 The Warren, Horsham and Newton St Faith (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Support	The Warren had recently had a small development a lot of the area surrounding the Warren is waterlogged and marshy. The infrastructure will have difficulty maintaining further development.	Consider waterlogged and marsh comments in assessment
Member of the public	Object	Concerns raised over flooding. Circle housing developed part of this site in 2012 installing additional drainage and have left provision for access for the rest of this site for additional housing in the future. They had the pick of the original site and we asked that they build near the school. We cannot understand why the additional land is unsuitable for development given the contours of the site are exactly the same. Mature trees to be retained.	Consider drainage comments and potential access

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2141 Manor Rd/A140 Cromer Road, Horsham and Newton St Faith (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	3 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Members of the public - various	Support	Support unreasonable site on the basis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ruin landscape of village • Lack of facilities to support development • Lack of employment opportunities in village • Increase in air pollution • Highway issues and increased traffic • Loss of conservation wildlife site 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3027 East of Manor Road, Horsham and Newton St Faith (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	6
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	4 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public - Various	Support	Support unreasonable site on the basis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land waterlogged • Lack of infrastructure • Flood Risk • Traffic concerns, dangerous junctions and increased traffic • Access is opposite school 	
Trustee of M.A Medler	Comment	Additional Land submitted	Consider additional Land
Horsham and Newton St Faiths Parish Council	Support	Concurs with your assessment that these two sites are totally unsuitable for development.	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3028 North of Meadow Farm Lane, Horsham and Newton St Faith (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	8
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	7 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Trustee of M.A Medler	Comment	Additional Land submitted	Consider additional Land
Member of the Public - various	Support	Support unreasonable site on the grounds of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow/Poor access • Narrow roads • Lack of a pedestrian access to School • Flood Risk • Poor drainage • Insufficient infrastructure 	
Horsham and Newton St Faiths Parish Council	Support	Concurs with your assessment that these two sites are totally unsuitable for development.	

LINGWOOD AND BURLINGHAM, STRUMPSHAW AND BEIGHTON CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	LINGWOOD AND BURLINGHAM, STRUMPSHAW AND BEIGHTON OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	276
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	140 Support, 100 Object, 36 comment

The Lingwood and Burlingham, Strumpshaw and Beighton Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 1 preferred site (0379), 2 reasonable alternatives (0296 and 0380) and 7 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Should Old School site be included in the figures for Lingwood
- High level of local opposition to preferred site GNLP0379
- Mixture of support and opposition to reasonable alternative sites
- Historic England suggest a more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment should be undertaken for preferred site GNLP0379
- New site (GNLP4051) to be assessed

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Lingwood and Burlingham, Beighton and Strumpshaw Cluster – General Comments

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Lingwood No Carried Forward Sites (General Comments)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Comment	No objection to plan. However, the access roads to Lingwood are poor especially the road to Blofield and the roads to the A47. These roads need to be widened and improved in the interests of safety given that this development will increase the number of vehicles using the access roads considerably.	
Member of the public - various	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All local roads need improving • Church Road to be closed in A47 dualling plans, this means more traffic on Blofield Road which is already dangerous • Flooding is an issue in the locality • We need a doctors surgery not more houses • Existing houses will be impacted by new housing. Newcomers rarely mix with locals • Danger for children using the local park • Destruction to local wildlife 	

Lingwood and Burlingham, Beighton and Strumpshaw Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0379 Land north of Post Office Road, Lingwood (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	87
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 77 Object, 8 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
NPS Property Consultants Ltd	Support	<p>Norfolk County Council own the land and are committed to bringing it forward for a high quality, well designed development to deliver housing growth in Lingwood identified in the GNLP. Land currently farmed by a County Farms tenant and is let under a Business Farm Tenancy. The land would be available for NCC to take back once planning permission is granted. Site would likely be developed in a 2-3 year period after grant of detailed permission. NCC's development company, Repton Property Developments Ltd., will develop the site.</p> <p>Site is relatively flat and topography would not offer any constraints to development. The site has clearly defined boundaries on 3 sides. Current use is agricultural. No evidence of any unstable ground or contamination. Site is within flood zone 1 with no identified risk or evidence of surface water flooding.</p> <p>Adjacent uses to the site are mainly residential and there would be no conflict between the proposed housing and existing properties subject to normal design and layout considerations.</p>	Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted

		<p>Access to the site would not prejudice access to the agricultural land to the north of the allocation. In order to achieve adequate visibility it would seem appropriate to position the access in the central portion of the Post Office Road frontage. Widening Post Office Road to 5.5 metres with a new footway on the north side would require removal of existing hedge and trees. Maybe scope for a new footpath link through to Church Road to the north.</p> <p>Infrastructure and services exist on Post Office Road and will be extended into the site. Site would accommodate about 60 dwellings with a policy compliant level of affordable housing. Substantial new planting would be needed on the northern boundary to protect the setting of the church. Initial layout plan submitted.</p>	
Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council	Object	<p>This is not the preferred site. Views of the medieval church will be compromised if the whole width of the site is used. This is grade 1 agricultural land so it would be preferable to use a smaller area to the right for building as per the original plan and parkland to the left of the site. The widening of Post Office Road would take away the current natural traffic calming. Traffic calming measures not possible as we are a dark village. Drains and sewers in the area are already an issue. The 50-60 figure could be reduced by using the brownfield site at the Old School Site on Chapel Road which is not currently included in the GNLP figures. We would expect no new building in the village until after the Chapel Road site is developed.</p> <p>The Parish Council preferred site is GNLP0380.</p> <p>Following from NPS representations if GNLP0379 is developed it is essential the view of the church is kept open to the village for all time. The Church is already divorced from the village spiritually and allow building to obstruct the view from Millennium Green would further isolate the community from its spiritual heart. The development should allow for an avenue of trees from the Millennium Green on Post Office Road to the Church and an area of parkland to protect the church not just a block of land at the front or back.</p>	<p>Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted</p> <p>Should the site at the Old School be included in the figures for Lingwood?</p>

Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	<p>Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.</p> <p>Also see comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.</p>	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.
Historic England	Object	<p>No designated heritage assets within the site boundary but grade listed Church lies to the north as well as some other listed buildings in the vicinity. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the setting of these listed buildings.</p> <p>Note that the policy and supporting text refer to the church and a possible linear parkland but no mention is made of other heritage assets. This is a sensitive site in terms of potential impact on multiple heritage assets and therefore there are concerns about the allocation.</p> <p>Suggest a more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment is undertaken to assess the impact of development on these heritage assets, to establish the suitability or otherwise of the site and to establish appropriate mitigation and enhancement should the site be found suitable. If the site is found suitable the findings of the HIA should inform the policy wording.</p> <p>It might also be helpful to illustrate the proposed mitigation in the form of a concept diagram showing where open space and landscaping would be located.</p>	Further consideration of heritage comments needed. Consider undertaking Heritage Impact Assessment and the use of a concept diagram as suggested
Amber Slater, Brown & Co on behalf of client	Object	<p>Agree with the overall strategy for village clusters but object to site GNLP0379 suggesting instead that the site at Buckenham Road offer a good opportunity with minimal constraints and impact on the character of the village. Site GNLP0379 is in a sensitive area with rural character and development would be at odds with this. Concerns raised regarding traffic, excess provision of open space and surface water flood risk.</p>	Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted
Member of the public	Support in part	<p>Object but to meet housing targets could support a partial development of the site. Enlarged proposal is incorrect. Would suggest a development to the</p>	

		eastern end of the site, larger than the previous submission but smaller than the current one but subject to Post Office road not being widened, retaining mature trees and western end of site left open to preserve view to the church from Post Office Road.	
Members of the public – various	Object	<p>Roads/Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road network in and around Lingwood not suitable for increased level of traffic. Many accidents and recent fatality • Concern about road closure following dualling of A47 leading to increased traffic levels in the village • Post Office Road is narrow which currently has natural effect of reducing traffic speeds • Widening road would increase traffic speeds and safety concerns. • Loss of mature trees and hedgerows • Concern about proximity of site to Millennium Green children’s play park. • What about current footpath on site? • Traffic calming measure not possible as village has no street lights • How and where will 2 metre footway be constructed? <p>Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about ability of infrastructure to cope with additional development • Lack of doctors surgery and surgeries in neighbouring settlements overwhelmed • Oversubscribed school, concerns that capacity of the school has been incorrectly evaluated and should be reviewed • Lack of parental choice for secondary education • Small village shop • No dentist and nearby practises not taking new patients • Public transport needs improving • Surface drainage will need considerable modifications and may not be able to cope. • Electricity and drinking water supply will need uprating and this will bring disruption. 	<p>Detailed consideration and understanding of ‘grounds for objection’ and ‘schematic diagram’ and other documents submitted through the consultation needed as part of ongoing site assessment</p> <p>Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted</p>

	<p>Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about current flooding issues at Post Office Road – field has a gradient which encourages surface water runoff • Post Office Road is lower than land proposed for development. It would be more logical to build on high, well drained ground to the north of the site allowing the area to the south to act as natural drainage. • Concern that removal of ditch on southern boundary would exacerbate flooding issue • Concern about drainage and sewerage systems ability to cope with new development <p>Landscape/Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about loss of view of Grade I Listed medieval church and impact on setting – recognised in Broadland Landscape Character Assessment. Would amount to significant heritage harm • Concern about loss of strategic gap • Concern about loss of highest quality Grade 1 agricultural land • Loss of habitat for wildlife and biodiversity <p>Submitted Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans for development are ambiguous. No detail of access points, size or location of houses, traffic mitigation measures etc • NPS plan does not show promised avenue of open space protecting view of church, the existing footpath from Post Office Road to Church Road has vanished, no detail of pedestrian improvement at the Post Office Road/Close junction. The proposed landscaping strip will hide views of the church • Late submission of design layout by NPS is unacceptable and indicates a lack of transparency in process. It should have been on GNLP website throughout the consultation period and available at roadshows • There is a conflict of interests as NPS represents NCC in the promotion of land owned by NCC. NCC are also a partner in the GNLP 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is New Evidence not a comment, and as such requires full consultation with Residents and Parish Council members alike. If extra time is not to be given to allow comments, then it should be withdrawn. <p>Better sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GNLP0380 would be a better site, easier access to A47, closer to facilities, less traffic through village. Lower agricultural grade • GNLP0296 would be a better option • Development should be on brownfield sites • Why hasn't the Old School Site been included in the plan? • Reasonable alternatives should be re considered as preferred sites <p>Other Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why does the majority of development have to be on one site? • Area and number of houses have increased since original submission • The Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment evidence base is flawed • Outside existing settlement boundary • Impact on privacy of nearby properties • Developments should not be considered in isolation, need to take account of what is happening in nearby settlements • Fears of subsidence if building work was to take place or there were changes in drainage • Failures in process and application of policy including inconsistencies, no change control and incorrect/out of date data. Nonadherence to procedures stated within the methodology for site assessment • Discordant with National and Local Planning guidelines • No overall assessment of Lingwoods ability to sustain 60+ houses. The policy of increasing school capacity is arbitrary and does not consider local constraints • During construction there will be noise, dust, air pollution and additional traffic hazards to be considered 	
--	---	--

Lingwood and Burlingham, Beighton and Strumpshaw Cluster – Reasonable Alternative Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0296 Land east of Buckenham Lane and west of Buckenham Road, Lingwood (Reasonable Alternative Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	11
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 8 Object, 3 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council	Object	<p>Site is too large, 110 homes would be too much for the village, infrastructure is not sufficient. The land is to the south of village so traffic would have to go through the village to get to it. The site is off two very narrow lanes with little chance of widening from the junctions off Norwich Road.</p> <p>The figure of 50-60 for Lingwood can be reduced if the brownfield site at the Old School on Chapel Road is used. Not currently included in the GNLP figures. The Parish Council were given the nursery building in original application to try and encourage a doctors surgery which has now been taken away.</p>	<p>Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted</p> <p>Further discussion with NCC Highways regarding access.</p> <p>Should the site at the Old School be included in the figures for Lingwood?</p>

Amber Slater Brown & Co on behalf of client	Object	<p>Agree with overall strategy for village clusters in Policy 7.4 but object to site GNLP0379 as the preferred site in Lingwood. This site is not the best option to deliver the amount of housing. Site GNLP0296 at Buckenham Road should be preferred as it has minimal constraints and impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>Site GNLP0296 could provide a linear park and walks to the south of the village rather than focusing all open space to the north of the village as development of site GNLP0379 would. It also have a lower risk of surface water flooding.</p>	<p>Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted</p> <p>Investigate the potential for site GNLP0296 to provide linear park</p>
Members of the public – various	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being a reasonable alternative include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is wrong side of the village. Traffic accessing the A47 would have to pass through the village. Additional traffic would be a hazard especially for children walking to school • Buckenham Road and Buckenham Lane are single track and cannot accommodate extra volume of cars, widening would be difficult. Already difficult to get out onto Norwich Road • Lingwood has limited facilities. No GP or library, only a small shop and strained sewerage system • Site close to Buckenham woods, potential wildlife impact • Development would spoil rural nature of the village and impact on residential amenity of surrounding properties due to disruption, noise, loss of privacy and visual amenity. • Land is grade 1 agricultural land and is also a flood risk area. 	<p>Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted</p> <p>Further discussion with NCC Highways regarding access.</p>
Members of the public - various	Comment	<p>If Lingwood has to provide additional housing, a development on this site would have less impact on the village as a whole. It has more access routes - via Brundall/Strumpshaw; from A47 at the White House turnoff; from A47 via Blofield Rd (at present), which would spread the traffic flow through the village rather than channeling it all along Post Office Rd. There is an existing footpath to the school and the site is no further from the school than the Post Office Rd proposed site.</p> <p>Whilst we do not want further development in Lingwood, site GNLP0296 being the largest of the proposed sites in Lingwood, has the greatest potential to meet future</p>	<p>Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted</p>

		<p>housing targets for many years to come as long as it is developed in phases as opposed to being developed in one go.</p> <p>Figures for Lingwood should be revised to take account of the Old School site.</p>	<p>Should the site at the Old School be included in the figures for Lingwood?</p>
--	--	---	---

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0380 Land west of Blofield Road (Reasonable Alternative Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	20
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	8 Support, 12 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council	Support	GNLP0380 is the preferred site of Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council. The site would meet the allocation of 50-60 dwellings in combination with the brownfield site on Chapel Road which is not currently included in the GNLP figures Traffic impact will be less than other sites. Any development in Lingwood would require the widening of Blofield Road. An additional 50-60 houses on top of the current 44 committed will be too much for the school to take.	Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted
Members of the public – various	Support	Comments supporting the site being a reasonable alternative include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More suitable site access onto the main highway leading to the A47 thus reducing traffic travelling through the village. • Less impact on the visual rural setting of the church • Lesser environmental impact, lesser impact on infrastructure and lesser landscape impact. Not in close proximity to any Grade 1 Listed Buildings and has negligible impact on Grade 2 Listed Buildings • Site could be expanded at a later if needed • Less safety issues as not near children's play area 	Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the light of consultation comments submitted
Members of the public – various	Object	Comments objecting to the site being a reasonable alternative include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently Buckenham Road has no pavements and at points is single lane only • Road is already very busy and more housing would bring more traffic, people do not abide by the 30mph limit 	Further work needed to look at preferred and reasonable alternative sites in the

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site entrance is on a bad bend where a fatality recently occurred • Children walk to school down this road. • Traffic in the village will increase following the dualling of the A47 • Building here would take away the charm of the village and views of open countryside • Further housing is not needed and will put a strain on resources. The village does not have enough facilities to cope with more people e.g. one shop, no doctors/dentist/inadequate bus service • Light and noise pollution from more properties in a dark village. Poorer air quality and bigger carbon footprint in rural area • The area floods already and this would increase flood risk. Water pump is not adequate, problems with raw sewerage flooding gardens • Impact on wildlife e.g. bats • Loss of mature oak trees • Grade 1 agricultural land • Devalue properties and spoil enjoyment of living in the village. • Should not be supported just because it does not obstruct views of the church, what about the view from Church Road? • Other sites have greater capacity to meet the housing targets placed upon the cluster 	<p>light of consultation comments submitted</p>
--	--	---

Lingwood and Burlingham, Beighton and Strumpshaw Cluster – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	GNLP0067 Land at Lodge Road, Lingwood (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council	Support	Support categorisation of the site as unreasonable. The original application was not approved by Lingwood & Burlingham Parish Council or residents but was given on appeal to the Secretary of State. To extend the area with more Live Work Units would not be acceptable.	
MDPC Town Planning on behalf of client	Object	Object to categorisation of the site as unreasonable. Northern 3rd of overall field has the benefit of planning permission for Live/Work and B1 development through an allowed appeal. This development has commenced. Seeking allocation of undeveloped part of site for Live/work units. Settlement boundary extension would be welcome	New site to be assessed

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0090 23 Norwich Road, Strumpshaw (Lingwood) (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	36
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	31 Support, 0 Object, 5 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Upton with Fishley Parish Council	Support	Strumpshaw Parish Council support the description of the site as being 'unreasonable'. Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan aims to resist the development of housing outside the settlement limit. The village has no shop, no school and limited public transport.	
Members of the public – various	Support/ comment	<p>Comments in support of the site being unreasonable include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads are narrow and inappropriate for increased construction and residential traffic that would be created. • Roads will become busier following proposed A47 changes • Access has limited visibility • There are few services or amenities. Inconsistent with plans to reduce reliance on the private car and become carbon neutral by 2050. • Public transport is poor • Lower levels of this land are prone to flooding and issues with sewerage capacity • Site contributes to landscape character and openness of area • No continuous footpath to local facilities • No street lighting • No common areas for children to play 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In close proximity to a landfill site, risk of contamination• Harm to biodiversity• Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan which should be respected. Site is identified as a key green feature• Would create a ribbon of development between Lingwood and Strumpshaw• Not in keeping with small village rural character, already compromised by the Oaklands and Mill Meadow. Village has reached its capacity for new development• The site would impact an area that is rural and open, with excellent countryside views.• The negative impact on amenity for properties and community through noise, disturbance, nuisance, loss of privacy and overlooking.• Why do small villages have to be developed when there is better quality land in larger places with plenty of roads, services and amenities.• No reason to develop outside settlement boundary as Council has a 5 year land supply	
--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0215 Land North of Long Lane, Strumpshaw (Lingwood) (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	39
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	33 Support, 0 Object, 6 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Upton with Fishley Parish Council	Support	Strumpshaw Parish Council support the description of the site as being 'unreasonable'. Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan aims to resist the development of housing outside the settlement limit. The village has no shop, no school and limited public transport.	
Members of the public – various	Support/ Comment	<p>Comments in support of the site being unreasonable include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood Plan should be respected and not overruled • Lack of local services and facilities, would increase reliance on the private car inconsistent with aim to be carbon neutral by 2050 • Localised surface water in the area close to the Huntsman pub. • Issue with sewerage capacity and flooding • In close proximity to a landfill with risk of contamination • Narrow unsuitable roads that would not cope with construction and residential traffic generated • Lack of pavements for safe walking • No street lighting • Poor public transport • Removal of hedgerows and trees for access. Ancient hedgerow would be lost if road were widened 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accessing A47 is already busy and slow, will be made busier by proposed A47 changes• Site provides a contribution to the rural landscape character and openness of the area.• Includes existing footpath frequently used by walkers• Valuable agricultural land• Close to conservation and wildlife area e.g. Strumpshaw nature reserve• Would create ribbon development between Brundall and Strumpshaw, not conducive to keeping the two settlements separate• Part of this site was considered by the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan for 10 dwellings and a community hall and was rejected due to concerns about access on the Long Lane bend• Rural character already compromised by the Oaklands and mill meadow developments, no need for further housing as Council already has 5 year land supply• Why develop in small villages when there is better quality land in larger places with plenty of roads, services and amenities• Negative impact on amenity for properties and community through noise, disturbance, nuisance, loss of privacy and overlooking	
--	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0449 Land at Southwood Road/ Hantons Loke, Beighton (Lingwood) (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	5
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	4 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council object to this site as it is too far outside the Parish boundary	
Members of the public – various	Support/ Comment	<p>Comments supporting the site being unreasonable include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of local amenities to support development leading to an increase in car journeys. Conflict with ambition to be carbon neutral by 2050. • Building would not be in keeping with rural character of the village • Key western arrival to the village • Roads are narrow, prone to surface water and a lack of pavements. Would not be able to cope with the increase in construction and residential traffic that would be created. • No street lights • Main sewer is undersized and overflows from manholes in heavy rain • Takes a long time to safely access the A47 with current traffic volumes • Contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan 	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0499 Land north of Lodge Lane, Lingwood (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Comment	A safe walking route to the school could be creating along the existing verges. This site is no further from the school than other sites. Once the A47 is dualled, Lodge Road will be the main route in/out of Lingwood and development here will reduce traffic impact on the rest of the village. Development could improve access into the village by straightening out the dangerous S bends.	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0521 Mill Lane (South of Norwich Road, North of Buckenham Road), Strumpshaw (Lingwood) (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	34
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	28 Support, 0 Object, 6 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Upton with Fishley Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council support the site being unreasonable. The site is outside the settlement limit and the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan aims to resist development outside present areas of housing. The village has no shop, no school and limited public transport.	
Members of the public – various	Support/ Comment	Comments supporting the site being unreasonable include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site provides a high contribution towards the landscape character and openness of the area • Roads surrounding the site are narrow and inappropriate. Creation of access and road widening would destroy ancient hedgerows with loss of wildlife. • Access would have limited visibility and endanger highway safety • No continuous footpath to local amenities. Safety issue of children walking to school in winter months • Strumpshaw has no facilities like shops, schools, dentist, doctors, public transport etc so residents would be totally reliant on the private car, not consistent with law to become carbon neutral by 2050. • Issues with sewerage capacity and flooding • Close proximity to landfill site, risk of contamination • Loss of prime agricultural land 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The village has experienced recent growth so more preferable locations for development should be considered.• No need for growth, the Council has a 5-year land supply• Neighbourhood Plan should be respected. Part of this site was considered by the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan for 10 dwellings and a community hall but was rejected because the site is isolated from the remainder of the settlement.• No communal areas for residents to meet and play• Negative impact on amenity for properties and community through noise, disturbance, nuisance, loss of privacy and overlooking• Strumpshaw within the immediate catchment and buffer (1 mile) of the Broads National Park – environmental footprint inappropriate in terms of noise and light pollution	
--	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2017 Mill Road, Strumpshaw (Lingwood) (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	38
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	33 Support, 0 Object, 5 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Members of the public – various	Support/ Comment	<p>Comments supporting the site being unreasonable include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site provides high contribution towards landscape character and openness of area • Strumpshaw does not have services and facilities to deal with further increase in residential dwellings • Issue with sewerage capacity and flooding • Development would increase reliance on private car, inconsistent with plans to become carbon neutral by 2050. • Roads serving the site are narrow. Creation of adequate access and visibility splay would require removal of ancient hedgerow. Widening the road would significantly change rural character of area. • Speed limit continually abused • Access to A47 is busy and difficult • Impact on public footpaths and healthy lifestyles • The village has already experienced a lot of growth in recent years, there are more preferable locations for development to take place. Broadland Council already have a 5 year land supply 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norfolk Heritage Records show there are Ancient Monument and archaeology special considerations in relation to the site e.g. remains of a World War Two searchlight battery and site of a windmill • Site is in SSSI risk zone for Yare Broads and Marshes and Broadland Ramsar site • Site is within 100m of ex landfill site. Questions about contamination and safety. • Out of keeping with the Neighbourhood Plan • Unsafe for children to walk to school as there is no continuous footpath to Lingwood and no street lighting. • No communal areas for residents to meet and play • Negative impact on amenity for properties and community through noise, disturbance, nuisance, loss of privacy and overlooking • Land immediately to the north of this plot is only recently developed plans to extend this development undermine the trust and process of limiting this original development to 10 houses and new community hall • Strumpshaw is within the immediate buffer (1 mile) of the Broads National Park and is inappropriate for urban development. There will be an effect on environmental footprint in terms of noise and light pollution • Loss of prime agricultural land 	
--	--	--

MARSHAM CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	MARSHAM OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	14
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 10 Object, 3 Comments

The Marsham Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 1 preferred site (2143), 0 reasonable alternatives and 5 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- General point – ensure densities across all sites are in line with Policy 2
- Preferred Site 2143 :
 - Need highway view on access appraisal
 - Consideration of water capacity in liaison with Environment Agency and Anglian Water
 - Historic England suggest undertaking more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment with concept diagram to show mitigation
 - Investigate the importance and implications of World War 1 landing strip
- Re-evaluate Site GNLP3035 in light of consultation comments received

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0171
- GNLP0219

- GNLP0229
- GNLP0572

Marsham Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2143 Land South of Le Neve Road, Marsham (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	12
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 8 Object, 3 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Bidwells on behalf of client	Support	<p>Support preferred allocation of GNLP2143. Land is in single ownership and available immediately. Further land is available if required.</p> <p>Upper limit of density for 25-35 dwellings is lower than the min. 25dph suggested in Policy 2 so site could accommodate at least 35 dwellings.</p> <p>Masterplan shows how land immediately adjacent to the existing cemetery could be used as an extension to the cemetery designed to mitigate visual impact on nearby heritage assets. Development has been designed around existing public right of way and a landscape strategy would be submitted with any planning application.</p> <p>An access appraisal has been prepared and submitted with the representation showing safe access from Le Neve Road and safeguarding the public right of way from the south east corner of the site. A new junction with Croft Lane (private road) will be required.</p>	Ensure densities across all sites are in line with Policy 2

			Get highway view on access appraisal
Carter Jonas on behalf of Noble Foods Ltd	Object	<p>Questioning/comparing HELAA assessment of site suggesting that site GNLP3035 is more preferable for allocation. Question why GNLP2143 was considered to be unreasonable in HELAA yet preferred for allocation.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal identified site as having minor negative impact on landscape and major negative impact on heritage</p> <p>Further work needed to look at impact on heritage assets and landscape, particularly setting of Grade 1 Listed Church of All Saints and wider setting of the village.</p> <p>Why develop a greenfield site when there are brownfield sites available in the village?</p>	<p>Relook at site assessment for both sites GNLP2143 and GNLP3035 (including HELAA) in the context of this submission</p> <p>Further SA work will be undertaken</p> <p>Consider further investigation of landscape and heritage impacts</p>
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	<p>Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.</p> <p>Also see comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.</p>	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.
Sue Catchpole, District Councillor for Aylsham	Comment	Support Marsham Parish Council view that there is no need to build outside originally designated area, especially after fire on old Chicken Farm, this site should be developed first. Green space is important and should be included within any development.	Relook at Old Chicken Farm (Site GNLP3035) in the light of consultation comments received.

Environment Agency – Eastern Region	Comment	There is not enough capacity in current permit at Aylsham WRC to accommodate this development and there are no plans for capacity upgrades in terms of flow in PR19. There are only plans to increase storage at intermittent CSOs. Development at this site will require phasing in line with upgrades to WRC and we will expect to see evidence of liaison with Anglian Water Services regarding this.	Further consideration of water capacity, in liaison with Environment Agency and Anglian Water
Historic England	Object	<p>Sensitive site in terms of the potential impact upon multiple heritage assets, some of which are highly graded. We therefore have some concerns about the allocation of this site. Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are a number of listed buildings to the east of the site including the grade I listed Church of All Saints and the grade II listed Old Rectory, Colenso Cottage and Marsham War Memorial.</p> <p>Suggest a more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment be undertaken to assess the impact of the proposed development upon the significance of these heritage assets, to establish the suitability or otherwise of the site and to establish appropriate mitigation and enhancement should the site be found suitable. If the site is found suitable, the findings of the HIA should then inform the policy wording.</p> <p>It might also be helpful to illustrate proposed mitigation in the form of a concept diagram for the site e.g. showing where open space and landscaping would be located.</p>	Consider need for more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment with concept diagram showing proposed mitigation.
Members of the public – various	Object	<p>Various concerns raised including:</p> <p>Traffic/accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway access insufficient for contractors and residents. Current residents on Le Neve Road will experience a significant period of disruption. • The junction with The Street and the A140 is difficult and dangerous. • Le Neve Road and Wathen Way are narrow residential roads with parking on both sides and increased volume of traffic would be dangerous for pedestrians using these roads. <p>Heritage/landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site would represent a clear breakout into open countryside outside development boundary. Other smaller sites would integrate more successfully with existing form (such as GNLP0171). 	Promoters have submitted an access appraisal which will need to be considered by NCC highways

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact/harm to the setting of Grade I Parish Church. New landscaping will not mitigate this in the short or medium term. Church will be enshrouded by a modern housing estate • The site is a recognised historic Word War 1 landing strip which would be lost forever if the site is built on. • Site of archaeological interest • Important for wildlife. Hares, farmland birds, smooth snake and hedgerow bird species <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village has few facilities other than the school. Modest infill development may be appropriate but a large allocation would harm the character and setting of the village. • Allocation suggests 25-35 homes but accepts more could be accommodated. Fear that up to 60 dwellings could come forward. Site forms part of a much larger site and promoter could push for further growth. • Extension to cemetery being used as an incentive for the landowner to release the land. If extension is required this should be pursued as an allocation in isolation. • Use of Grade 1 agricultural land over brownfield sites within the village like Fengate Farm. Recommend compulsory purchase of brownfield sites • Creating less efficient agricultural use of land and increasing carbon footprint • Flood risk to existing properties, field run off seen regularly • Farming activities in close proximity to living space, nuisance to farmland animals. Dust clouds and insects in abundance from the field 	<p>Consider need for more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment with concept diagram showing proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Investigate historic importance and implications of Word War 1 landing strip</p>
--	--	--	---

Marsham Cluster – Unreasonable Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3035 Fengate Farm, Fengate, Marsham
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Carter Jonas LLP on behalf of Noble Foods Ltd	Object	<p>The findings of the site assessments for some of the preferred allocations and reasonable alternative are not robust or credible, including those in Marsham. We have reassessed the findings for sites in Marsham, attached to our representations.</p> <p>Site GNLP3035 contains vacant and unused buildings and areas of hardstanding associated with former poultry farm. Buildings recently damaged by fire and are due to be demolished. Site not likely to be reused for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Main access to development would be from Old Norwich Road and the access from Fengate would be used as a secondary/emergency access.</p> <p>Planning application for 36 dwellings submitted in 2013 was refused and dismissed at appeal. As number of dwellings exceed limit for service villages at the time. Some concern raised about proposed design and layout but no concerns about a vehicular access off Old Norwich Road. A contamination assessment would be needed because of previous uses on the site. Existing trees and hedgerows would</p>	<p>Relook at site assessment for both sites GNLP3035 and GNLP2143 (including HELAA) in the context of this submission</p> <p>Need further information from NCC</p>

		<p>be retained and a substantial landscape buffer provided. There would be a mix of housing including affordable.</p> <p>It is considered that the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal for landscape and heritage are incorrect and should be revised.</p> <p>Request that the site should be allocated for residential development of 35 dwellings in the GNLP.</p>	<p>Highways regarding suitability of site access. Look at highway comments made to refused planning application on this site</p> <p>Further SA work will be undertaken</p>
Member of the public	Object	<p>Object to the site being unreasonable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two points of access to the site from Fengate and the Old Norwich Road will naturally split traffic rather than forcing all traffic onto one road as would be the case with the preferred site. • Access from Old Norwich Road should be able to support construction traffic without using Fengate. • Site is brownfield and therefore will not destroy more greenfield sites as would be the case with the preferred site. • Owner of site has already applied for planning permission so reasonable to assume they would like it to be built on • Site should be big enough for 35 houses so would satisfy the requirement for housing without increasing the footprint of the village. 	

REEDHAM CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	REEDHAM OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	104
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 92 Object, 10 Comment

The Reedham Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 2 preferred site (1001 and 3003), 0 reasonable alternatives and 0 unreasonable sites.

Main issues:

- High levels of local opposition to both preferred sites as contrary to policy and site assessment principles

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Reedham Cluster – General Comments

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Reedham – No carried forward sites (General Comments)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 3 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Members of the public - various	Object	<p>Reedham cannot support any further housing because:</p> <p>Roads and transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village is at the end of a single, narrow 7-mile road which passes through several other villages • Roads are narrow and in an appalling state, without proper passing places • Poor, infrequent and expensive public transport increases reliance on private car • Parking changes at the station leading to increased on-road parking <p>Services and facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overloaded sewerage system, regularly trucked out. Frequent effluent flooding into properties • One small village shop • No free cash point, some distance to nearest banking facilities • Part time post office and GP surgery • No police presence 	<p>Further discussion with NCC highways to confirm local road network is suitable</p> <p>Further consideration of sewerage capacity</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telephone and internet stretched, minimal mobile phone signal • Electricity often fails • Nothing for young people to do. Money from developments should be used on projects to help young, elderly and families <p>Primary School capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasons why school has empty places should be explored. Parents elect to send their children to other schools • Building more houses will not necessarily fill school places as evidenced by recent developments <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in conflict with plans to cut carbon emissions • Affordable housing is still too expensive for local people to buy or rent. • Needs to be a law to stop people buying properties for holiday rentals • Give permission for smaller infill sites better suited to the village • Covering farmland with houses means being left with inaccessible, unusable pieces of land and the need to fly in produce from around the world. 	<p>issues in conjunction with Anglian Water</p> <p>Further discussion with NCC Children's Service re: school capacity</p> <p>Plan-wide consideration of location of allocations in relation to carbon reduction requirements</p>
--	---	--

Reedham Cluster – Preferred Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP1001 Land to the east of Station Road (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	41
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 36 Object, 4 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Savills on behalf of client	Support	<p>Support for the draft allocation of GNLP1001 in the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is located to the east of Broadland Local Plan allocation RED1 which has been built. No obvious constraints identified to prevent further development.</p> <p>The site has a single landowner and Badger Building who delivered the RED1 allocation have expressed an interest. It is envisaged the site will deliver policy compliant 33% affordable housing.</p> <p>Access to the site will be through Barn Owl Close. Any application will be supported by relevant technical documents, including a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Sewerage system capacity is not envisaged to be a constraint to development as Anglian Water have a responsibility to expand capacity to accommodate new development.</p>	

		<p>Together sites GNLP1001 and 3003 could provide up to 60 dwellings in the plan period to 2038. There are 550 dwellings in Reedham so this would represent growth of 0.5% per annum which is considered to be sustainable.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Reedham are progressing a Neighbourhood Plan which is still at early stages.</p>	<p>Further discussion with NCC highways to confirm adequate access can be provided.</p> <p>Further consideration of sewerage capacity issues in conjunction with Anglian Water</p>
Reedham Parish Council	Object	<p>Outside the development boundary for the village.</p> <p>Contrary to GNLP Policy 2 as the site cannot provide “safe, convenient and sustainable access to on-site and local services and facilities including schools, healthcare, shops, leisure/community/faith facilities and libraries” without the use of a car.</p> <p>Contrary to GNLP Policy 7.4 as there is no safe walking route to school. Discussion states “Sites which do not have a safe walking route to school, or where one cannot be created, will not be considered suitable for allocation”. Highways have confirmed it is not feasible to provide an off-carriageway pedestrian facility to enable safe journeys to school.</p> <p>The sewerage system for the village is at or nearing capacity. Waste is removed on a near daily basis, more in peak summer season. Without additional capacity further housing is unreasonable and a hazard to health and the environment</p> <p>Road infrastructure to and around Reedham is not suitable for additional traffic. Most roads in the village are less than 4 metres wide with no pavements</p> <p>Public transport is poor, this increases reliance on the private car. Further development in Reedham is contrary to the GNLP Climate Change Statement. There are no policies in place to fulfil the GNLP ambitions of working from home or greener transport.</p>	<p>Further consideration of preferred sites in the context of GNLP Policy 2 and Policy 7.4</p> <p>Further discussion with NCC Highways regarding safe walking route to Primary School</p> <p>Further consideration of sewerage capacity</p>

			<p>issues in conjunction with Anglian Water</p> <p>Further discussion with NCC highways to confirm local road network is suitable</p> <p>Plan-wide consideration of location of allocations in relation to carbon reduction requirements</p>
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	<p>Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design</p> <p>Please also see comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document</p>	<p>Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.</p>

Broads Authority	Comment	<p>The site is on higher ground close to Broads Authority boundary and potential visual receptors: Wherrymans Way, the river, Ferry Road and Reedham Drainage Mill. Site might also be visible from the opposite valley side against backdrop of existing settlement</p> <p>New housing could have adverse impacts on the setting of the Broads if not sensitively handled.</p> <p>Landscape effects could be mitigated by low ridge heights, reduced scale/massing and screen planting.</p>	Talk to the Broads Authority about any changes needed to the policy wording to mitigate the effects of development
Members of the public – various	Object/ Comment	<p>Comments objecting to the site being preferred include:</p> <p>Roads and transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single lane, narrow roads in a poor state without proper passing places. • Contrary to GNLP Policy 2 as cannot provide safe access to facilities without the use of a car. Often more than one car is needed due to remote nature of Reedham • Contrary to plans to become carbon neutral • Conflict with HGV's and farm machinery • Poor, infrequent public transport both bus and train • Increased traffic more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists • On-road parking issues outside the school and at the station (since parking fees were introduced) • Contrary to GNLP Policy 7.4 as there is no safe walking route to school • A report from NCC Highways assessing the suitability of the preferred sites is needed <p>Services and facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local infrastructure insufficient to accommodate further development. Village has experienced 30% growth in the last 10 years with no infrastructure improvements • New housing without infrastructure improvements would over whelm the village 	<p>Further discussion with NCC highways to confirm local road network is suitable and regarding safe walking route to Primary School</p> <p>Further consideration of preferred sites in the context of GNLP Policy 2 and Policy 7.4</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overloaded sewerage system, regularly trucked out. Frequent effluent flooding into properties. Smell in village. Reedham not on mains system, water pressure is low and supply is inadequate • Concern about surface water run-off from site • One small village shop • No free cash point, some distance to nearest banking facilities • Part time post office and GP surgery • No police presence • Telephone and internet stretched, minimal mobile phone signal • Electricity often fails • Nothing for young people to do. Money from developments should be used on projects to help young, elderly and families • Understanding that the field at the top of the Barn Owl Close development was to be used for recreation purposes. Land should remain as a green space buffer between Barn Owl Close and the agricultural land in the centre of the village • No employment opportunities available in the village <p>Primary School capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of up to 60 homes based entirely on the fact that the school has vacancies is poor decision making • How can Reedham be a 'cluster' of one village. The school currently has pupils from Freethorpe, Cantley and Brundall. • Reasons why school has empty places should be explored. Parents elect to send their children to other schools. Would like to clarify that figures are correct • Building more houses will not necessarily fill school places as evidenced by recent developments • The only way to make Reedham school better attended by resident children would be to extend/move it. • School currently thriving so if trend continues it will be up to capacity before additional houses are built 	<p>Further consideration of sewerage capacity issues in conjunction with Anglian Water</p>
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to available places at the school is not supported by evidence from school management, governing board or local authority <p>Landscape/wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the Broads National Park and should be kept as it is to preserve the natural beauty of the village • The views of the village from the Broads will be further degraded by the complete lack of architectural merit in new builds and the lack of planting and landscaping • Concerns about light pollution and loss of wildlife <p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village has already had substantial new developments in recent years, many new houses are still for sale. • Village should not be expected to over develop to compensate for other villages. • The GNLP does not contain sufficient evidence of current or future housing demand with respect to Reedham 60+ new homes is excessive and would result in over supply. • Figures do not take account of new housing at Sanderson Boatyard approved by the Broads Authority in December 2019 • Infill development or use of empty homes would provide a more organic growth solution • New housing should be closer to the NDR or on brownfield sites instead • Site outside development boundary • No housing should be allocated until the Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted • With projected sea level rises it is irresponsible to build more housing in Reedham. Large parts of the village could be under water by 2050 • Affordable housing is still too expensive for local people to buy or rent. No proper evidence on affordable housing the site assessment booklet • Needs to be a law to stop people buying properties for holiday rentals • GNLP is deeply flawed. Appears to pursue a political agenda and flouts national policy on climate change mitigation 	<p>Further discussion with NCC Children's Service re: school capacity</p>
--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern at change in focus regarding rural development between the JCS and GNLP. The JCS protected rural areas by keeping housebuilding near to Norwich. • GNLP should use 2016 National Household projections rather than 2014. • GNLP priority should be getting young people off the streets of Norwich and rehousing people who are living in poor rented conditions 	<p>Talk to the Broads Authority about any changes needed to the policy wording to mitigate the effects of development</p> <p>Revisit housing figures in Reedham. Look at planning permission at</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Sanderson Boatyard and whether this should be counted towards current commitment, recognising that it is in the Broads Authority area</p> <p>Strategic issues such as affordable housing and climate change to be dealt with through Part 1 of the Plan</p>
--	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3003 Mill Road, Reedham (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	60
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 53 Object, 6 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Magnus Magnusson, Parker Planning on behalf of client	Support	Support the identification of the site as a preferred option. The site is under the control of a single landowner who is actively promoting it for development. The wider site area is available for development if required. There are considered to be no overriding constraints that would prevent development and promoter has undertaken their own RAG assessment to support their representation.	
Reedham Parish Council	Object	<p>Outside the development boundary. Loss of valuable agricultural land.</p> <p>Contrary to GNLP Policy 7.4 as there is no safe walking route to the school. Highways have confirmed there is no scope to provide a footway within the highway. Highways also confirm it is not feasible to provide safe access to the site. No evidence to support the statement that Mill Road is 'relatively lightly trafficked'.</p> <p>The sewerage system for the village is at or nearing capacity. Waste is removed on a near daily basis, more in peak summer season. Without additional capacity further housing is unreasonable and a hazard to health and the environment</p> <p>The road infrastructure to and around Reedham is not suited to additional traffic. Roads are narrow with no pavements. Public transport (both train and bus) are infrequent and unreliable. Reliance on private car contrary to GNLP Climate Change Statement.</p>	Further discussion with NCC Highways regarding safe walking route to Primary School and to confirm adequate access can be provided

			<p>Further consideration of sewerage capacity issues in conjunction with Anglian Water</p> <p>Plan-wide consideration of location of allocations in relation to carbon reduction requirements</p>
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	<p>Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design</p> <p>Please also see comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.</p>	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.
Historic England	Comment	We welcome the reference to the non-designated heritage asset.	
Members of the public – various	Object/ Comment	<p>Comments objecting to the site being preferred include:</p> <p>Roads and transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reedham is not a ‘through’ village. Traffic goes in and out the same way and poor road infrastructure needs to be addressed.. • Contrary to GNLP Policy 2 as cannot provide safe access to facilities without the use of a car. • Poor, infrequent public transport both bus and train • On-road parking issues outside the school and at the station (since parking fees were introduced) • No pavements or street lights 	Further discussion with NCC highways to confirm local road

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrary to GNLP Policy 7.4 as there is no safe walking route to school. Highways have confirmed it is not feasible to provide a footway. • Vehicular access to the site is not adequate at either Mill Road or Holly Farm Road. Highways have confirmed there is no scope to widen to accommodate 2 way traffic. Need for 3rd party land. Refused permission in the past on access grounds • Main vehicular access would be over railway bridge on Mill Road, only wide enough for 1.5 car width and poor visibility on approach from both sides. Accident blackspot not able to cope with volume of traffic increase. • Mill Road used daily by heavy agricultural machinery, large delivery vans and lorries • Concern about proposed public footpath running from the site immediately next to existing properties causing loss of privacy, disturbance and safety issues. • A report from NCC Highways assessing the suitability of the preferred sites is needed <p>Services and facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Reedham is to be expanded then the infrastructure needs to be improved first • Developer fees of just over £23k have been provided to the parish council to improve facilities over the last 3 years. If development is to go ahead then contributions towards the village should be sought e.g. a larger amount of parking spaces and a green area for children • Sewerage treatment and disposal is at breaking point • Mains water pressure is already low in the village • Site has a potential flood amber from HELAA table • One small village shop • No free cash point, some distance to nearest banking facilities • Part time post office and GP surgery • No police presence • Telephone and internet stretched, minimal mobile phone signal • Electricity often fails • No employment opportunities available in the village • Site is close to the railway line which is likely to become busier due to proposed rail upgrades. Children and railways do not mix 	<p>network is suitable and clarification regarding vehicular access and safe walking route to Primary School</p> <p>Further consideration of preferred sites in the context of GNLP Policy 2 and Policy 7.4</p>
--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Site carries an HGV overhead cable running east to west which will need to be diverted should the site be developed. <p>Primary School capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scale organic development of infill and small developments with architectural merit and careful consideration of the local environment should be the drivers for planning not notional ‘spare’ school capacity • How can Reedham be a ‘cluster’ of one village. The school currently has pupils from Freethorpe, Cantley and Brundall. • Reasons why school has empty places should be explored. Many parents elect to send their children to other schools. • Building more houses will not necessarily fill school places as evidenced by recent developments • References to available places at the school is not supported by evidence from school management, governing board or local authority • Suggest a land swap with the school playing field. This would make the school playing field opposite the school with a safer walk for children • Utilise the central site beside this for a new purpose built Primary School to support all villagers including rooms for multi-purpose village hall. Build on current Village Hall site. <p>Landscape/wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the Broads National Park and should be kept as it is to preserve the natural beauty of the village • Site is within 3000m buffer zone of Halvergate Marshes, designated a conservation area by the Broads Authority, SSSI, SPA and RAMSAR site of international importance. • Dark skies, wildlife and farming will be impacted by this proposal • Environmental and nature impact survey needed <p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village has already had substantial new developments in recent years, many new houses are still for sale. 	<p>Further consideration of sewerage capacity issues in conjunction with Anglian Water</p>
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GNLP does not contain sufficient evidence of current or future housing demand with respect to Reedham 60+ new homes is excessive and would result in over supply. The number of houses recently built plus any further a-hoc housing going forward should be deducted from total. • Figures do not take account of new housing at Sanderson Boatyard approved by the Broads Authority in December 2019 • New housing should be closer to the NDR or on brownfield sites instead • Site outside development boundary • With projected sea level rises it is irresponsible to build more housing in Reedham. Large parts of the village could be under water by 2050 • The Reedham assessment booklet has not properly addressed affordable and social housing demand in the village • GNLP is deeply flawed. Appears to pursue a political agenda and flouts national policy on climate change mitigation. There is nothing in the plan regarding the proposed housing being carbon neutral • Concern at change in focus regarding rural development between the JCS and GNLP. The JCS protected rural areas by keeping housebuilding near to Norwich. • GNLP should use 2016 National Household projections rather than 2014. • GNLP priority should be getting young people off the streets of Norwich and rehousing people who are living in poor rented conditions • Have any unbiased views on the site been sought or is allocation based on information put forward by the site promoter? • Number of houses on site is far too optimistic. Five or less would be a better number • 30-50 homes would be a massive intrusion to privacy as the majority of houses along this site are bungalows and would be overlooked by the new development • The site is bounded by a railway line and cutting to the east. This potentially constrains development on the site by reason of noise and stability of the banks • The area is attractive for tourism which will be lost if we 'commercialise' the area with 100 unsightly new homes. 	<p>Further clarification of safety/stability issues of proximity to railway line.</p> <p>Further discussion with NCC Children's Service re: school capacity</p> <p>Further investigation of land swap idea with</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>NCC Children's Services.</p> <p>Talk to the Broads Authority about any changes needed to the policy wording to mitigate the effects of development</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Revisit housing figures in Reedham. Look at planning permission at Sanderson Boatyard and whether this should be counted towards current commitment, recognising that it is in the Broads Authority area</p> <p>Strategic issues such as affordable housing and climate change to be dealt with through Part 1 of the Plan</p>
--	--	--	---

			Further clarification of safety/stability issues of proximity to railway line.
--	--	--	--

SALHOUSE, WOODBASTWICK AND RANWORTH CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	SALHOUSE, WOODBASTWICK AND RANWORTH OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	9
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 5 Object, 2 Comment

The Salhouse, Woodbastwick and Ranworth Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 1 preferred site (0188), 1 reasonable alternative (0157 – Non-residential) and 10 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Unreasonable site GNLP0175 – further discussions needed with Highways and Development Management in light of consultation comments
- Unreasonable site GNLP0487 – reassess in the context of new type of development being proposed
- New site (GNLP4024) to be assessed.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- Site GNLP0110
- Site GNLP0160
- Site GNLP0161

- Site GNLP0163
- Site GNLP0164
- Site GNLP0493

Salhouse, Woodbastwick and Ranworth Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0188 Land adjoining Norwich Road, Salhouse (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
One Planning	Support	<p>Our client has an exclusive option agreement with the landowner and they are no physical or legal impediments. The site is deliverable and developable. A policy compliant level of affordable housing will be provided, including a mix of sizes, types and tenures.</p> <p>Pedestrian and vehicular access can be addressed via Norwich Road without requirement for third party land. The road at the frontage to the site is relatively straight and flat. Removal of specimen trees is unlikely to be required to provided visibility, although there would be a need for some existing hedgerow to be removed. Any lost hedgerow will be replaced with mixed native species.</p> <p>The site is single plot depth, the proposed scheme would provide frontage development which will fit in well and maintain a similar pattern to existing built form opposite and bordering the site to the west.</p> <p>As set out in the allocation, the scheme would provide a footway along Norwich Road between the existing development to the west and Honeycombe Road.</p>	

		<p>Further, it is proposed to provide roundabout improvements to facilitate a pedestrian crossing in its vicinity. These provisions would connect the site to the village and provide safe and easy pedestrian access site to the Primary School along its entire route.</p> <p>The site is visually contained and more distant views of the site are set against the backdrop of existing residential development. The land represents a logical site for development.</p>	
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed
Salhouse Parish Council	Support	<p>Support site but with concerns;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be low rise to protect skyline and views, higher dwellings should be downslope. • Access should be off Honeycombe Road as far from other roundabouts as possible, access from Norwich road, close to the roundabout, would be too dangerous. • The walk to school route will need to cross two busy roads regardless of where access is. • Footpaths/footways should extend along Honeycombe Road, preferably servicing other properties along this road as an added benefit to local residents. • 40mph speed limit should be extended along Honeycombe Road. 	

Salhouse, Woodbastwick and Ranworth Cluster – Reasonable Alternative (Non-residential) Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP 0157 Land to north of Salhouse Road, Salhouse (Reasonable Alternative, Non-Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Environment Agency (Eastern Region)	Comment	<p>It is not clear what is being proposed at Salhouse Broad (Tourism GNLP0157) near Woodbastwick, if there are to be any changes then a WFD compliance assessment must be undertaken to assess the impacts on ecological elements.</p> <p>The east of the site adjacent to the river is Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. Part of Flood Zone 3 is also shown to be Flood Zone 3b on our modelling. Ideally all new built development should be sequentially sited to be located within the large area of Flood Zone 1 on the site. However if the tourism uses were classed as 'water compatible' then this would be an acceptable land use within the flood zones, including Flood Zone 3b, providing that it is designed to: 'remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere'.</p>	

Salhouse, Woodbastwick and Ranworth Cluster – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0175 Site off Bell Lane, Salhouse (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
One Planning	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable:</p> <p>Site GNLP0175 is suitable for residential development and would bring forward additional housing to meet the identified need within the Salhouse cluster. With preferred site GNLP0188 there is a potential shortfall of at least 35 dwellings in the cluster. Client has exclusive option agreement with landowner and there are no physical or legal impediments. The site is deliverable and developable. A policy compliant level of affordable housing will be provided with a mix of sizes, types and tenures. In addition a substantial part of the site can be offered for public open space or any alternative community use.</p> <p>Access can be provided via an existing agricultural access from Bell Lane which would be designed to meet the requirements of Norfolk County Highways. Some existing landscaping may need to be removed to allow for visibility splays, although any lost hedgerow would be replaced to ensure landscape impacts are minimised. It is considered that improvements could be undertaken to provide an additional small</p>	<p>Consideration of footway proposals with NCC Highways.</p> <p>Further discussion of landscape and heritage concerns with Development Management Officers</p> <p>New site to be assessed</p>

	<p>section of footway to link up with service and facilities in the village centre including the primary school</p> <p>The proposal fits in with the built surroundings in term of scale and form, it is well related to the existing settlement pattern and represents a logical extension to the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Landscape and heritage concerns of Development Management Officers are noted and regard will be paid to these constraints through the design of development with suitable and effective mitigation put in place to significantly reduce any potential harm. The site is contained by established hedgerows along the western boundary and more distant views of the site are set against the backdrop of existing residential development</p> <p>An additional site has been submitted for consideration which lies immediately to the east of this site, currently used as an equestrian facility. The two sites could come forward as one larger development proposal with linkages across. The vehicular access for site GNLP0175 could be taken via the new site.</p>	
--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP 0189 Site off Lower Street, Salhouse (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
One Planning	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being considered unreasonable:</p> <p>Site GNLP0189 is a suitable site for residential development to bring forward additional housing to meet the identified need within the Salhouse cluster. With preferred site GNLP0188 there is a potential shortfall of at least 35 dwellings. Client has exclusive option agreement with the landowner and there are no physical or legal impediments to development. The site is deliverable and developable. A policy compliant level of affordable housing will be provided with a mix of sizes, types and tenures. The client is also keen to offer a substantial part of the site for public open space or any alternative community use.</p> <p>Access can be provided via Lower Street and would be designed to meet requirements of Norfolk County Highways. Access can be achieved without the need for third party land. Some existing landscaping would need to be removed to allow for access but any lost hedgerow would be replaced with mixed native species to ensure any potential landscape impacts are minimised.</p>	

	<p>The whole of the site is included within the Salhouse Conservation area, there is a listed building to the north and the site is near to the Broads Authority area and Broads Special Area of Conservation. These constraints and sensitivities of the site are recognised and mitigation would be provided to significantly reduce any harm resulting from the scheme. The landscape and heritage concerns of Development Management officers are also noted.</p> <p>Site GNLP0189 connects well to the existing village centre and therefore represents a sustainable location in respect of access to services and facilities. The site also relates well to the existing settlement boundary and the built form of the village thereby representing a logical extension to the existing boundary. The site is contained due to established hedgerows which reduces and mitigates its visual impact when viewed in the wider landscape context.</p> <p>It is considered that other constraints such as biodiversity/geodiversity and surface water flood risk can be dealt with through any future planning application.</p>	
--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP 0226 Manor Farm, Land to west of Wroxham Road (A1151), Salhouse (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
GP Planning Ltd	Object	<p>The landowner of this site OBJECTS to it being considered unreasonable given its potential for a long-term extension to the GT16 allocation. The site and land area offer the opportunity for the provision of approximately 1,000 residential units and certainty of delivery through the masterplan for GT16. There is no clear justification for its exclusion.</p> <p>Furthermore, the spine road into North Rackheath, as shown on the endorsed Masterplan, provides a roundabout that fronts the GNLP 0226 site, allow safe access and a reasonable extension</p>	

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNL0487 Land to the north of Norwich Road, Salhouse (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Grand Vision Developments Ltd via Jon Jennings (Cheffins Planning)	Object	<p>Comments objecting to site being considered unreasonable:</p> <p>This site is subject to a current application for residential development. The application has not been determined but conversations with Development Control show that there is potential conflict with the Salhouse Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan discourages unrestricted open market housing but has a specific policy relating to development meeting the needs of elderly residents. The committed and proposed developments in Rackheath and Salhouse do not cater for this.</p> <p>As a consequence the decision has been made to change the form of development proposed on this site with 1.2ha now proposed for a 60 bed care home with the remainder of the site providing circa 60 dwellings aimed at over 55's accommodation. A significant number of these will comprise bungalows. 33-50% of the units will be affordable i.e. shared equity and rented accommodation.</p> <p>The site will still provide 5.09ha of green infrastructure, which will help to reinforce the gap between Salhouse and the development at Rackheath. The proposal will also allow for the extension of the Salhouse Country park which will result in a significant community benefit</p>	Re-evaluate the site in the context of change in development proposed

		<p>Development in this location relates more closely to the existing and proposed facilities within Rackheath. As a consequence, Grand Vision Developments Ltd will work with Network Rail to upgrade the existing level crossing, to provide a safe means of pedestrian access to Rackheath. Similar pedestrian upgrades can also be made to Salhouse. Due to the nature of the proposed development the issue of a safe walking route to Salhouse Primary School is less relevant.</p> <p>In reviewing the documentation relating to this site it is interesting to note that Salhouse Parish Council are of the view that “The scheme is highly sustainable and will deliver net environmental gains”. The Parish Council have also commented on the high pressure gas main which crosses the site. It can be confirmed that the position of this pipeline and its easement has been taken into account in identifying the developable areas.</p> <p>The assumptions made in the HELAA comparison table are questioned as many issues have been mitigated or resolved through the current planning application. It is requested that the site be reassessed and allocated for a care home and over 55s housing development to meet the needs of Salhouse and the wider area and to accord with the Salhouse Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
GP Planning Ltd	Object	Landowner objects to site being unreasonable, the site is immediately adjacent to village and could be designed to provide safe access and footpath links	

SOUTH WALSHAM AND UPTON WITH FISHLEY CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	SOUTH WALSHAM AND UPTON WITH FISHLEY OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

The South Walsham and Upton with Fishley Cluster has 1 c/f allocation (SWA1), 1 preferred site (0382, 0 reasonable alternatives and no unreasonable sites.

Main issues:

- Preferred Site GNLP0382 - Consider slightly reduced site size and submitted masterplan layout

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

South Walsham and Upton with Fishley Cluster – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0382 Land north of Chamery Hall, South Walsham (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Norfolk County Council via NPS Property Consultants Ltd	Support	<p>Norfolk County Council own the land and work has been ongoing to confirm the site can deliver a sustainable, policy compliant housing scheme. Site is currently farmed by a County Farms tenant, let under a Business Farm Tenancy. The land would be available following grant of planning permission. Site would be developed in a two year period following completion of SWA1 allocation. Anticipated to commence within 5 years.</p> <p>Site slopes gently from north to south but the topography does not offer any significant constraint to development. The site is open to the west, limited boundary planting to east and south. Land to the north is allocated (SWA1).</p> <p>Site is within flood zone 1 with no history of flooding. Adjacent uses to the site are residential so there would be no conflict. Infrastructure and services are in place.</p> <p>Work has been undertaken to identify the most suitable means of access to the site and it is proposed that vehicular access will be via the SWA1 allocation. No</p>	Consider slightly reduced site size and submitted masterplan layout

		<p>vehicular access is proposed from Chamery Hall Lane. Footway improvements are required as part of the outline permission on SWA1.</p> <p>NOTE: The representation shows a slightly smaller red line boundary than the preferred allocation.</p>	
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed

South Walsham and Upton with Fishley Cluster – Carried Forward Allocation

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy SWA1 Land to rear of Burlingham Road/St Marys Close, South Walsham (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Member of the public	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School and pre-school are oversubscribed, people who move to the new houses will likely need to travel to other villages to school their children. • Increased traffic, noise and air pollution doesn't appear to have been factored in. • Impact on over stretched local services (e.g. GPs) can only worsen with this. • Vehicular access via Burlingham Road could be problematic due to speed on the road creating danger. • Detrimental to wildlife that thrives in area along field boundary 	
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed

SPIXWORTH AND CROSTWICK CLUSTER

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	SPIXWORTH AND CROSTWICK OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

The Spixworth and Crostwick Cluster has 0 c/f allocations, 0 preferred sites, 0 reasonable alternatives and 1 site which is judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Reassess revised proposal on unreasonable site GNLP0467

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Spixworth and Crostwick Cluster – Unreasonable Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0467 Land off North Walsham Road, Crostwick (Unreasonable Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION
Brown and Co representing landowner	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has been revised to bring benefits to local community by providing significant mature open space (27.69 acre Area of Spixworth Marsh) delivering substantial net biodiversity gain. • This land will be transferred to the Parish providing increase in open space and ability to offset carbon footprint. Provides ability to deliver forest school or similar to improve school capacity and education benefits. • Revision seeks to address disconnect issue identified previously by linking development around north and eastern side of settlement, access will still be necessary from B1150. • Site will now provide up to 100 dwellings with benefits deemed to outweigh drawbacks. 	Revised site proposal to be assessed