

<b>Settlement Name:</b>	<b>Great and Little Plumstead</b>
<b>Settlement Hierarchy:</b>	<p>Great and Little Plumstead form a village cluster in the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan. The Towards a Strategy document identifies that around 2,000 dwellings in total should be provided between all the village clusters. Services and facilities in Great and Little Plumstead include a primary school, village hall and public transport.</p> <p>The current capacity of Little Plumstead Primary School is rated 'green'. Even with the remaining development commitment at the former hospital to build out, the school has capacity. Consequently, it is considered that Great and Little Plumstead could potentially accommodate development of up to 50- 60 more dwellings subject to the quality of the sites put forward.</p> <p>Great and Little Plumstead has a made neighbourhood plan which covers the same area as that of the parish boundary. The Plan was made in July 2015 and covers the period to 2034. It contains a series of policies that look to shape development within the neighbourhood area. There are policies within the plan that will be of relevance to development and any applications that are submitted for development within the parish should have due regard to those policies.</p> <p>At the base date of the plan there are no carried forward allocations and 129 dwellings with planning permission on a number of sites. Existing allocations relate to the redevelopment of the former Little Plumstead Hospital. In addition, 11 dwellings were given permission along Church Road (ref: 20161151).</p>

**PART 1 – ASESMENTS OF SITES INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN REGULATION 18C CONSULTATION (JANUARY – MARCH 2020)**

**STAGE 1 – COMPLETE LIST OF SITES PROMOTED IN THE SETTLEMENT**

**LIST OF SITES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RESIDENTIAL/MIXED USE ALLOCATION (0.5 HECTARES OR LARGER)**

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead</b>			
Land east of Salhouse Road	GNLP0328	5.18	Approx. 110-165 dwellings
Land west of Salhouse Road	GNLP0330	4.90	108-162 dwellings
Land at Hare Road	GNLP0420R	0.57	10-15 dwellings
Land at Middle Road	GNLP0441R	1.97	30 dwellings
Land east of Salhouse Road	GNLP0483	11.12	86 dwellings with 5.83 ha of green infrastructure and new play equipment.
South of Broad Lane	GNLP2040	7.60	Residential (unspecified number)
East of Salhouse Road, South of Belt Road	GNLP3007	2.05	8-10 dwellings
Home Farm, Water Lane	GNLP3014	14.26	300 dwellings
<b>Total area of land</b>		<b>47.65</b>	

**LIST OF SITES TO BE CONSIDERED AS SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY EXTENSIONS (SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY PROPOSALS AND SITES LESS THAN 0.5 HECTARES)**

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead</b>			
Witton Lane Gospel Hall	GNLP0357	0.26	5 detached dwellings or 3 detached dwellings if retaining the existing Gospel Hall
Plumstead Road, Thorpe End	GNLPSL3006	0.10	Single dwelling

(Sites of less than 0.5ha are not considered suitable for allocation and therefore have not been assessed in this booklet. These sites will be considered as part of a reappraisal of settlement boundaries to be published with the Regulation 19 Submission version of the Plan).

#### LIST OF SITES SUBMITTED FOR OTHER USES

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal
<b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead</b>			
Octagon Business Park	GNLP2107	1.62	office, agricultural storage, car park
East of Brook Farm, Thorpe End	GNLP3034	36.84	Employment B1, B2, B8

(Sites submitted for other uses are considered in separate 'Non-Residential' Site Assessment booklets and therefore have not been assessed in this booklet).

## STAGE 2 – HELAA COMPARISON TABLE

### RESIDENTIAL/MIXED

	Categories													
	Site access	Access to services	Utilities Capacity	Utilities Infrastructure	Contamination/ ground stability	Flood Risk	Market attractiveness	Significant landscapes	Sensitive townscapes	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Historic environment	Open Space and GI	Transport & Roads	Compatibility with neighbouring uses
Site Reference														
Great & Little Plumstead														
GNLP0328	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0330	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0420R	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0441R	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0483	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP2040	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber
GNLP3007	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP3014	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green

**STAGE 3 – SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION COMMENTS FROM THE  
REGULATION 18 STAGE A & B CONSULTATIONS**

Site Reference	Comments
<b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead</b>	
GNLP0328	<p><b>General comments</b> Objections raised concerns regarding loss of ‘good’ grade agricultural land and the site is outside the development boundary.</p> <p>There is no longer a post office, no services except the school which is full. The bus service does not run early or late enough for work. No shops so you have to travel for essentials and high schools and GPs are full.</p> <p><b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead comments</b> The Parish Council objects to this site allocation. The Village does not have the infrastructure to support such a large application, which also is contrary to our service village designation.</p>
GNLP0330	<p><b>General comments</b> Objections raised regarding the site being outside of the development boundary and is productive agricultural land which cannot be replaced.</p> <p><b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead comments</b> The Parish Council objects to this site allocation. The Village cannot support such a large development with next to no infrastructure in place. There is currently no shop or doctors and the school is already at capacity with no plans for a new one to build.</p>
GNLP0420R	<p><b>General comments</b> Objections raised concerning arable land, lack of services and infrastructure.</p> <p>One site submitted in support of site. ‘Suitable, available, achievable and viable therefore deliverables and developable, in line with NPPF’.</p> <p><b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead Parish council comments</b> The parish council objects due to the service village designation, the land is Grade 1 Agricultural land, has poor infrastructure and public transport, surface water flooding, capacity, flood risk, outside settlement boundary.</p>
GNLP0441R	<p><b>General comments</b> Objections raised concerning arable land, lack of services and infrastructure</p>

	<p>One site submitted in support of site. 'Suitable, available, achievable and viable therefore deliverables and developable, in line with NPPF'.</p> <p><b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead Parish council comments</b> The parish council objects due to the service village designation, the land is Grade 1 Agricultural land, has poor infrastructure and public transport, surface water flooding, capacity, flood risk, outside settlement boundary.</p>
GNLP0483	<p><b>General comments</b> Objections raised concerns regarding facilities, it has been suggested they need shops, post offices and an expansion of the school with better bus services if such development can happen. The site is also outside the development boundary.</p> <p>One comment in support of site 0483. 'Allocation of the site would bring forward a significant public benefit with the delivery of a roundabout at the Brick Kiln junction. This highway improvement is identified within the Neighbourhood Plan. The site has now been subject to a number of technical assessments which informed the planning application and demonstrates that there are no fundamental constraints to the development of the site for residential and it is therefore considered suitable for development'.</p> <p><b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead comments</b> The Parish Council objects to this site. Any exit for cars are onto two busy roads, accidents would become frequent. The community was against this site.</p>
GNLP2040	<p><b>General comments</b> Objections raised concerning many sites already allocated with GNDP and growth triangle. Lack of service provision and infrastructure.</p> <p>One site submitted in support of site. 'Suitable, available, achievable and viable therefore deliverables and developable, in line with NPPF'.</p> <p><b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead Parish council comments</b> The parish council objects due to the service village designation, the land is Grade 1 Agricultural land, has poor infrastructure and public transport, surface water flooding, capacity, flood risk, outside settlement boundary.</p> <p><b>Salhouse Parish council comments</b> Development of these sites would conflict with Policy 2 of the JCS and Broadland Policy EN 2 as it would fail to maintain the strategic gap between the communities of Sprowston and Rackheath and Salhouse and Rackheath respectively, and would damage the landscape setting. It also conflicts with Policy GT 2 Green</p>

	Infrastructure of the Broadland North East Growth Triangle AAP which seeks to protect an area either side of the NDR from inappropriate development.
GNLP3007	No comments as site submitted through Stage B Consultation
GNLP3014	No comments as site submitted through Stage B Consultation

## **STAGE 4 – DISCUSSION OF SUBMITTED SITES**

**In this section sites are assessed in order to establish whether they are suitable for allocation. For the purposes of Sustainability Appraisal, suitable sites are those which are considered to be Reasonable Alternatives. Sites not considered suitable for allocation are not realistic options and therefore are not considered to be reasonable alternatives. The discussion below outlines the reasons why a site has been deemed suitable or unsuitable for allocation. By association this is also the outline of the reasons why a site was deemed to be a reasonable or unreasonable alternative.**

**A range of factors have been taken into account to establish whether a site should, or should not, be considered suitable for allocation. These factors include: impact on heritage and landscape; impact on the form and character of the settlement; relationship to services and facilities; environmental concerns, including flood risk; and, in particular, a safe walking route to a primary school. Sites which do not have a safe walking route to school, or where a safe walking route cannot be created will not be considered suitable for allocation.**

**Conclusions in regard to a sites performance against the relevant factors have also been informed by the outcomes of the HELAA, as set out under stage 2, consultation responses received, as summarised in stage 3, and other relevant evidence**

8 residential sites are promoted across the Great and Little Plumstead cluster of 0.5ha or larger.

For sites in Great Plumstead **GNLP0420R** measures 10.9 ha and **GNLP0441R** measures 4 ha. Both these sites are within walking distance of the primary school and are considered suitable to shortlist as reasonable alternatives for further consideration. Even nearer to the school is **GNLP3014** and this site too benefits from a safe walk to the school along Water Lane. However, given the requirement of 50-60 homes, only the frontage part of **GNLP3014** would likely to be required for development but nonetheless the site is shortlisted as a reasonable alternative for further consideration. Of themselves, sites around Great Plumstead total 30 ha and could meet the requirement for 50-60 dwellings.

To the north of the parish, around Little Plumstead four sites are promoted. All four are preferred as reasonable alternatives for further assessment. **GNLP0330** and

**GNLP0328** benefit from being slightly closer to the school but the land is Grade 1 agricultural standard. Conversely, **GNLP0483** and **GNLP3007** are slightly more remote from the school but the land is classified grade 2 agricultural. The four sites around Little Plumstead (not including near the former hospital site) total 23 ha and could easily fulfil the requirement for 50-60 dwellings.

Site **GNLP2040** is better related to Rackheath. This site is not considered to be a reasonable alternative for allocation at the current time as there is no safe pedestrian route to Little Plumstead Primary School over 3km away, which is the catchment school. There is a school closer in Rackheath but this site would be better delivered after site GT19 has been developed which is likely to provide improved footway links. The frontage of the site is affected by surface water flood risk.

### **STAGE 5 – SHORTLIST OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES FOR FURTHER ASSESSMENT**

**Based on the assessment undertaken at stage 4 above the following sites are considered to be reasonable alternatives.**

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>Great &amp; Little Plumstead</b>			
Land east of Salhouse Road	GNLP0328	5.18	Approx. 110-165 dwellings
Land west of Salhouse Road	GNLP0330	4.90	108-162 dwellings
Land at Hare Road	GNLP0420R	0.57	10-15 dwellings
Land at Middle Road	GNLP0441R	1.97	30 dwellings
Land east of Salhouse Road	GNLP0483	11.12	86 dwellings with 5.83 ha of green infrastructure and new play equipment.
East of Salhouse Road, South of Belt Road	GNLP3007	2.05	8-10 dwellings
Home Farm, Water Lane	GNLP3014	14.26	300 dwellings
<b>Total area of land</b>		<b>40.05</b>	



**STAGE 6 – DETAILED SITE ASSESSMENTS OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0328
<b>Address:</b>	Land East of Salhouse Road
<b>Proposal:</b>	Approx. 110-165 dwellings

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agricultural	Greenfield

**CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA**

**Amber Constraints in HELAA**

Access, Accessibility to Services, Significant Landscapes, Transport and Roads

**HELAA Conclusion**

This is a greenfield site bounded by Salhouse Road and Blofield Corner, It is not particularly well related to services, though it is adjacent to Little Plumstead village. Initial highway evidence has indicated that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be overcome through development. Also, subject to suitable footpath provision, any potential impact on the functioning of local roads could be reasonably mitigated. Other constraints include some sections within low to medium risk of surface water flooding, potential loss of high quality agricultural land grade 1& 2, and location within airport safeguarding zone . No concerns over impact on heritage assets or ecology. There are number of constraints but as these may be possible to mitigate the site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.

**FURTHER COMMENTS**

**Highways**

Yes. Frontage development only.

**Development Management**

Main issue is landscape on approach from south and loss of highway avenue of trees. Will improvements to Brick Kilns junction be required?

**Minerals & Waste**

No safeguarded mineral resources.

**Lead Local Flood Authority**

Few or no Constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. A flow path, as identified on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps, flows through the northern section of the site. Watercourse not apparent (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible).

<b>PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
--------------------------

None
------

<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION</b>
--

No additional documents submitted to support this proposal.
---

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0330
<b>Address:</b>	Land North of Salhouse Road
<b>Proposal:</b>	108 – 162 dwellings

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agricultural	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Significant Landscapes, Transport and Roads
<b>HELAA Conclusion</b> The site is adjacent to Salhouse Road. It is not particularly well related to services, though it is adjacent to Little Plumstead village. Initial highway evidence has indicated that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be overcome through development. Also, subject to suitable footpath provision, any potential impact on the functioning of local roads could be reasonably mitigated. Other impacts include, proximity to designated species point, potential loss of high quality agricultural land grade 1& 2, and location within airport safeguarding zone. No concerns over impact on heritage assets. There are number of constraints but as these may be possible to mitigate the site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<b>Highways</b> Yes. Frontage development only.
<b>Development Management</b> Similar landscape issues to 0328 but located adjacent to PROW and footpath to west of Salhouse Road therefore slightly better connected than 0328. Upgrades to Brick Kilns junction required?
<b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b> No safeguarded mineral resources.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b> Few or no Constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. RoFSW mapping indicates that the site is not at risk of surface water flooding. The site is not near a mapped watercourse. The location adjacent to an existing urban area suggests that sewerage connections may be available. IF not surface water disposal will be reliant on the results of infiltration testing.

<b>PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
--------------------------

N/A
-----

<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION</b>
--

No additional documents submitted to support this proposal.
---

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0420R
<b>Address:</b>	Land at Hare Road
<b>Proposal:</b>	10-15 dwellings

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agricultural	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<p><b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Transport and Roads</p>
<p><b>HELAA Conclusion</b> The site has been significantly reduced in size and scale. A linear (ribbon) development fronting onto Hare Road would broadly repeat the existing pattern of development on the opposite side of the road. Conservation colleagues have raised concerns about landscape impacts. Submission does not propose extending development along the road beyond the limits of the existing built form opposite. Extending meaningfully beyond edge of built form would have larger impacts. Landscape impacts are likely to be localised and do not impact significantly on Landscape Character sensitivities. Landscape and townscape impacts have been revised to Green. Highway Authority has objections because of access and network concerns. At this stage it is has not been deemed these are unresolvable, although Hare Road is narrow at only 5.5m wide. Availability of utilities remains unclear but no reason to consider these insurmountable. Although the site has some constraints it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment. However as the site has already been assessed for the purposes of the original HELAA it will not contribute any additional capacity to the HELAA addendum, without double counting, and has therefore been marked as unsuitable.</p>

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<p><b>Highways</b> No. No footway, poor visibility from Hare Road at Church Road</p> <p><b>Development Management</b> Site too small to deliver scale of development envisaged. Likely landscape harm and access issues.</p> <p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b> No safeguarded mineral resources.</p> <p><b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b> Few or no Constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. RoFSW mapping indicates that the site is not at risk of surface water flooding. The site is</p>

within 50m of a mapped watercourse but there is no mapped connection to it. The location adjacent to an existing residential area suggests that sewerage connections may also be available.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

None

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

- Access Appraisal

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0441R
<b>Address:</b>	Land at Middle Road
<b>Proposal:</b>	30 dwellings

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agricultural	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<p><b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Significant Landscapes, Transport and Roads</p>
<p><b>HELAA Conclusion</b> Site has been reduced by half. Nonetheless, a modest estate scale block of residential development to the west of Gt Plumstead will impact on the existing agricultural landscape setting to the Gt Plumstead, and create a potentially harsher urban edge. This could be mitigated to some extent through good quality landscaping. Whilst not consistent with the built form of Gt Plumstead on its western side, the site is not adjacent townscape that is considered to be of particular sensitivity. Highway Authority has raised objections because of access and network concerns. At this stage it is has not been deemed these are unresolvable. Availability of utilities remains unclear but no reason to consider these insurmountable. Although the site has some constraints it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment. However as the site has already been assessed for the purposes of the original HELAA it will not contribute any additional capacity to the HELAA addendum, without double counting, and has therefore been marked as unsuitable.</p>

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<p><b>Highways</b> No. No footway.</p> <p><b>Development Management</b> Similar issues to 0420R</p> <p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b> No safeguarded mineral resources.</p> <p><b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b> Few or no Constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. RoFSW mapping indicates that the site is not at risk of surface water flooding. The site is within 50m of a mapped watercourse but there is no mapped connection to it. The location on the edge of an existing residential area suggests that sewerage</p>

connections may not be available. If not surface water drainage will be reliant on the results of infiltration testing.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

None

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

- Access Appraisal



<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0483
<b>Address:</b>	Land East of Salhouse Road
<b>Proposal:</b>	86 dwellings plus 5.83 ha of Green Infrastructure and new play equipment

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agriculture	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<p><b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b>  Access, Accessibility to Services, Contamination and Ground Stability, Significant Landscapes, Townscapes, Transport and Roads</p>
<p><b>HELAA Conclusion</b>  This is a greenfield site bounded by Norwich Road, Salhouse Road, Crowes Loke and Sandhole Lane. It is not particularly well related to services. Initial highway evidence has indicated that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be overcome through development. Also, subject to suitable footpath provision, any potential impact on the functioning of local roads could be reasonably mitigated. Other impacts include potential loss of high quality agricultural land (Grade 2), mature trees on site, ecology, and location within airport safeguarding zone. There are number of constraints but as these may be possible to mitigate the site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<p><b>Highways</b>  Yes. Subject to provision of roundabout junction safety scheme at Norwich Rd / Salhouse Rd 'Brick kilns' junction. Access from Salhouse Road.</p> <p><b>Development Management</b>  Similar issues to 0328 and 0330. Improvements to Brick Kilns junction likely to be required?</p> <p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b>  The site is underlain by a defined Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. Any future development on this site will need to address the requirements of Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 - 'safeguarding' (or any successor policy) in relation to mineral resources, to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority.</p>

**Lead Local Flood Authority**

Few or no Constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. Our records indicate that we have been consulted on a planning application for 84 dwellings at this location. We currently have an outstanding objection based on a lack of information. RoSWF mapping shows that the site is at low risk of surface water flooding. Mapping shows a minor isolated area of ponding occurring in the 3.33% event, which extends northwards and deepens in areas to 0.6m in the 1% event. Mapping indicates that in the 0.1% this ponding will further extend northwards and southwards.

**PLANNING HISTORY:****20172209**

For 84 dwellings dismissed at appeal due to scale of development relative to access to services and impact on character and appearance.

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

- Proposals Plan
- Preliminary Ecological Overview
- GI Strategy
- Site Access

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP3007
<b>Address:</b>	East of Salhouse Road, South of Belt Road
<b>Proposal:</b>	8-10 dwellings

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Unused meadow land	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Transport and Roads
<b>HELAA Conclusion</b> This is a 2 ha greenfield site between Salhouse Road and Belt Road. The Village has a primary school, but it is within the newer development at the former Hospital, and is a distance of 2.2 kilometres away. GNLP3007 is though near to the northern built edge of Little Plumstead and is accessible to the village hall. Initial highway evidence has indicated that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be addressed. Possibly by constructing a roundabout at the junction by the Brick Kilns pub or by diverting Belt Road through the site to form a safer highway arrangement. Another consideration is the potential loss of high quality Grade 2 agricultural land. In summary, constraints facing the site appear possible to mitigate and it is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<b>Highways</b> Yes, subject to roundabout at Brick Kiln pub and footpath to school or divert road through site and create a new access. Access from Salhouse Road.
<b>Development Management</b> Similar issues to 0483
<b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b> No safeguarded mineral resources.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b> No comments

<b>PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
None

<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION</b>
--

No additional documents submitted to support this proposal.
---

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP3014
<b>Address:</b>	Home Farm, Water Lane
<b>Proposal:</b>	300 dwellings

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Cattle farming with farm buildings	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Flood Risk, Transport and Roads
<b>HELAA Conclusion</b> This is an extensive 14 ha greenfield site, east of Water Lane, that comprises the existing buildings of Home Farm, and land south of the former Little Plumstead Hospital site. The proposed use is for up to 300 homes. The site is accessible to the Little Plumstead Primary School, at a distance of 1.1 km, and there is a footpath. However, initial Highways comments raises concern due to the access onto Water Lane. Other constraints exist over the use of Grade 2 agricultural land for development and flood risk from the Witton Run that passes through the site. No ecological designations apply to the site and nor would the landscape setting of the Broads be affected. Subject to addressing constraints, the site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<b>Highways</b> Yes. Subject to pedestrian access to development to north.
<b>Development Management</b> Site likely to have significant townscape/landscape issues, flood zone issues, Witton Run.
<b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b> No safeguarded mineral resources.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b> Few or no Constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.

<b>PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
None

<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION</b>
--

No additional documents submitted to support this proposal.
---

**STAGE 7 – SETTLEMENT BASED APPRAISAL OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES AND IDENTIFICATION OF PREFERRED SITE/S (WHERE APPROPRIATE) FOR REGULATION 18C DRAFT PLAN CONSULTATION.**

Seven reasonable alternative sites have been identified in the Great and Little Plumstead cluster at stage five. These sites were considered to be worthy of further investigation to look at their potential for allocation as the initial assessment did not flag up any major constraints that would preclude allocation. These sites have been subject to further discussion with Development Management, Highways, Flood Authority and Children’s Services in order to identify preferred sites for allocation and their comments are recorded under section six above. As part of this discussion it was decided that none of the reasonable alternative sites were suitable for allocation primarily due to the highway improvements that would be needed at the ‘Brick Kilns’ junction in the form of junction realignment or a roundabout and also the lack of a safe pedestrian route to school in some cases.

In conclusion whilst it is considered the cluster could accommodate development of 50-60 additional homes, there are currently no new allocations proposed and no allocations to be carried forward in this cluster. There are however 129 dwellings with planning permission on a number of sites.

**Preferred Sites:**

Address	Site Reference	Area (Ha)	Proposal	Reason for allocating
<b>Great and Little Plumstead</b>				
NO PREFERRED SITES				

**Reasonable Alternative Sites:**

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Comments
<b>Great and Little Plumstead</b>				
NO REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES				

**Unreasonable Sites:**

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
<b>Great and Little Plumstead</b>				
Land east of Salhouse Road	GNLP0328	5.18	Approx. 110-165 dwellings	This site is not considered to be reasonable for allocation due to the level of highway improvements that would be needed at

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
				the 'Brick Kilns' junction in the form of junction realignment or a roundabout.
Land west of Salhouse Road	GNLP0330	4.90	108-162 dwellings	This site is not considered to be reasonable for allocation due to the level of highway improvements that would be needed at the 'Brick Kilns' junction in the form of junction realignment or a roundabout.
Land at Hare Road	GNLP0420R	10.93	10-15 dwellings	This site is not considered to be reasonable for allocation as there is not a continuous safe walking route to Little Plumstead Primary School. Although planning application 20161151 will provide part of the footway connection, visibility at the Church Road/Hare Road junction is poor.
Land at Middle Road	GNLP0441R	4.23	30 dwellings	This site is not considered to be reasonable for allocation as there is not a continuous safe walking route to Little Plumstead Primary School. Although planning application 20161151 will provide part of the footway connection, visibility at the Church Road/Hare Road junction is poor.
Land east of Salhouse Road	GNLP0483	11.12	86 dwellings with 5.83 ha of green infrastructure and new play equipment	This site is not considered to be reasonable for allocation due to the level of highway improvements that would be needed at the 'Brick Kilns' junction in the form of junction realignment or a roundabout.



Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
South of Broad Lane	GNLP2040	7.60	Residential (unspecified number)	This site is not considered to be reasonable for allocation as there is no safe pedestrian route to Little Plumstead Primary School over 3km away, which is the catchment school. There is a school closer in Rackheath but this site would be better delivered after site GT19 has been developed which is likely to provide improved footway links. The frontage of the site is affected by surface water flood risk.
East of Salhouse Road, South of Belt Road	GNLP3007	2.05	8-10 dwellings	This site is not considered to be reasonable for allocation due to the level of highway improvements that would be needed at the 'Brick Kilns' junction in the form of junction realignment or a roundabout.
Home Farm, Water Lane	GNLP3014	14.26	300 dwellings	This site is not considered to be reasonable for allocation. The site as submitted is too large so frontage development is likely to be more acceptable, however there is an area of surface water flood risk on the likely access point into the site.

## PART 2 – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM THE REGULATION 18C DRAFT PLAN CONSULTATION

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

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside settlement boundary, defined as Service Village in JCS</li> <li>• Goes against policy 1&amp;2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD.</li> <li>• Salhouse Road which borders is 60mph and not wide enough for large volumes of traffic.</li> <li>• Witton Lane equally unsuitable.</li> <li>• Brick Kiln junction known for accidents and unsuitable for further traffic</li> </ul>		No evidence submitted through Regulation 18C consultation to justify changing the classification of the site so it remains unreasonable for allocation.	None
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable:		No evidence submitted through	None

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not suitable due to required improvements that would be required to Brick Kiln junction.</li><li>• Not well related to services and facilities.</li><li>• Impact upon landscape</li><li>• Flood risk</li><li>• Loss of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land</li></ul>		Regulation 18C consultation to justify changing the classification of the site so it remains unreasonable for allocation.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0330 Land west of Salhouse Road, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	2
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside settlement boundary</li> <li>• Against policy 1&amp;2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD</li> <li>• Salhouse Road 60mph and not wide enough.</li> <li>• Witton Lane unsuitable as exit for development</li> <li>• Brick Kiln junction known for accidents and not suitable for further traffic</li> </ul>		No evidence submitted through Regulation 18C consultation to justify changing the classification of the site so it remains unreasonable for allocation	None
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on landscape</li> <li>• Flood risk</li> </ul>		No evidence submitted through Regulation 18C consultation to	None

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land</li><li>• Not well related to existing developments and services/facilities</li><li>• Requires significant highway improvements for Brick Kiln junction</li></ul>		justify changing the classification of the site so it remains unreasonable for allocation	
--	--	---	--	---	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0420R Land at Hare Road, Great and Little Plumstead (Unreasonable Site – Residential)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hare Road not fit for further traffic as narrow and permanent flooding reducing road to single lane.</li> <li>• Outside settlement boundary</li> <li>• No social, environmental or economic reason for development</li> <li>• Drainage and absorption concern in area</li> <li>• Only serviced by hourly bus</li> <li>• No shops or schools in village</li> </ul>		Comments noted	None
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Object	Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability Assessment concluded original, larger site was well related to services and character of village and that</li> </ul>	Further consideration of highway statement regarding vehicular access and footpath provision	A revision to the site was submitted through the Reg 18C consultation. Further discussion	None

		<p>access constraints could be overcome through development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Highways statement has been undertaken to demonstrate satisfactory access can be achieved – two options for improvements are outlined, these will improve current issues.</li> <li>• Outline planning application currently under consideration ref: 20191938 for 10 dwellings (7 open market, 3 affordable) incl. access.</li> <li>• Site is currently available and no fiscal/environmental reasons why cannot be delivered within next 5 years (expected to commence 2020/2021).</li> <li>• Site is deliverable and developable.</li> <li>• Footpath proposed along site frontage to connect to existing footpath providing</li> </ul>		<p>has taken place regarding this site and the Highway Authority are of the view that the revised proposals do not appear to satisfactorily address the previously expressed highway safety concerns. Current planning application 20191938 looks likely to be refused and at 10 dwellings the site is too small for allocation. In addition, further linear development in that location is not considered to be appropriate. For these reasons the site continues to be considered unreasonable for allocation.</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

		<p>safe continuous footpath between site and facilities, incl. school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus stop close by with regular bus service.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Site in Flood Zone 1, where possible SUDs will be used – this will be explored and provided as part of detailed application.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Part of proposal is new drain being installed along proposed footpath. These will resolve Hare Road flooding.</li> <li>• No known utilities connection issues.</li> <li>• Site is more favourable location than others in village and comments have been made on each of the other sites.</li> </ul>			
Landowner via Bidwells	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is suitable, achievable, viable, deliverable and available</li> <li>• Great and Little Plumstead identified in Appendix 5 of GNLP draft as having</li> </ul>	Further consideration of highway statement regarding vehicular access and footpath provision	A revision to the site was submitted through the Reg 18C consultation. Further discussion has taken place	None



		<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hourly bus service to Norwich within walking distance of site.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Allocation in Broadland Village clusters identified in Appendix 5 as being 358-517 dwellings meaning no guarantee of required 480 being met.</li> <li>• Site is central within village, adjacent existing dwellings representing a logical extension to existing settlement.</li> <li>• Site will also provide delivery of footpath links which resolves an issue identified in the neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>• Traffic calming measures will be delivered.</li> <li>• Site will contribute to small sites target.</li> <li>• Site can allow for expansion of Hare Road, also for footpath to be provided.</li> </ul>		<p>regarding this site and the Highway Authority are of the view that the revised proposals do not appear to satisfactorily address the previously expressed highway safety concerns. Current planning application 20191938 looks likely to be refused and at 10 dwellings the site is too small for allocation. In addition, further linear development in that location is not considered to be appropriate. For these reasons the site continues to be considered unreasonable for allocation.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tree belt to frontage of Church Road is being removed due to current development which will improve visibility to west.</li><li>• Highways statement has been prepared by Pritchard Civil Infrastructure Design presenting two viable options to deliver improvements to create sufficient visibility splays to east.</li><li>• The statement also concludes no highways safety concerns precluding development at site and that local road network can accommodate this amount of growth.</li><li>• The Environment Agency don't recognise site as being located within area of surface water flooding, HELAA confirms.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No footpaths on Middle Road and not possible to create in certain parts due to pre-existing houses.</li> <li>• Road is narrow and cars can only just pass each other, not suitable for further traffic.</li> <li>• Outside settlement boundary.</li> <li>• Against policies 1 &amp; 2 of ICE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD</li> </ul>		No evidence submitted through Regulation 18C consultation to justify changing the classification of the site so it remains unreasonable for allocation.	None

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

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
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>	Re-evaluate site on revised boundary	A revision to the site was submitted through the Reg 18C consultation. Further discussion has taken place regarding this site and although the Highway Authority are of the view that a maximum of 25 dwellings could potentially be provided subject to carriageway widening and footway provision,	None

		<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>		<p>Development Management colleagues point to the history of refusals in the area, both on this site and adjacent GNLP3007R. They consider that existing development around the Brick Kilns crossroads is of a separate character to the development to the south on Salhouse Road and separation should be maintained. For these reasons the site continues to be considered unreasonable for allocation.</p>	
Great & Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside of settlement boundary</li> <li>• Goes against policies 1&amp;2 of SE and policies GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD</li> </ul>		Comments noted	None

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salhouse road which borders is 60mph and not wide enough to have large volume of traffic.</li> <li>• Witton Lane equally unsuitable as exit for development.</li> <li>• Brick Kiln junction known for accidents and not suitable for further traffic.</li> </ul>			
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would require significant highway improvements to Brick Kiln Junction.</li> <li>• Impact to surrounding landscape</li> <li>• Loss of high quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Impact on trees and ecology</li> </ul>		Comments noted	None

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

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside settlement boundary</li> <li>• against policies 1&amp;2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		No evidence submitted through Regulation 18C consultation to justify changing the classification of the site so it remains unreasonable for allocation.	None
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	Comments in support of site being unreasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remote from main development of the Plumsteads.</li> <li>• Lacks safe pedestrian access to existing services and facilities.</li> <li>• Flood risk</li> </ul>		No evidence submitted through Regulation 18C consultation to justify changing the classification of the site so it	None

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Landscape impact</li></ul>		remains unreasonable for allocation	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------	--



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

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Great and Little Plumstead PC	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside settlement boundary</li> <li>• Against Policy 1&amp;2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD</li> <li>• Salhouse road which borders is 60mph and is not wide enough for large volumes of traffic.</li> <li>• Witton Lane equally unsuitable as exit for site.</li> <li>• Brick Kiln junction is known for accidents and not suitable for further traffic.</li> </ul>		<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>A revision to this site was submitted through the Reg 18C consultation reducing it to 0.47ha for 8-10 dwellings. It is now classified as a 'small site' and will be dealt with through work on reviewing settlement boundaries.</p>	None

Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	<p>Comments in support of site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires significant highway improvements to Brick Kiln junction.</li> <li>• Impact on Landscape</li> </ul>		<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>A revision to this site was submitted through the Reg 18C consultation reducing it to 0.47ha for 8-10 dwellings. It is now classified as a 'small site' and will be dealt with through work on reviewing settlement boundaries.</p>	None
-------------------------------	---------	---	--	---	------

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

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Land owner via Gary Collier (Agent)	Object	<p>Comments objecting to the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On rare occasions only small amount of water lays on grid ref 5332 and 6524 which is low lying.</li> <li>• Land for future development includes front field (7.08 acres) and 2nd field (8.55 acres), each acre allowing for 10 dwellings.</li> <li>• Smaller amount of land on Home Farm could be considered.</li> <li>• Starter, family or retirement homes could be considered, or local shop/supermarket.</li> <li>• Remaining 15 acres could be used for open space or recreation.</li> </ul>	Re-evaluate site on revised boundary	A revision to the site boundary was submitted through the Reg 18C consultation. Further discussion has taken place regarding this site and although the Highway Authority have said that small scale development could be acceptable subject to access and pedestrian/cycle connections it is	None

				unlikely that previous townscape and landscape concern can be overcome so the site is still concerned to be unreasonable for allocation.	
Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council	Support	<p>Comments supporting the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside settlement boundary</li> <li>• Against policies 1&amp;2 of SE and GC4 and EN4 of DMDPD.</li> <li>• Water Lane is narrow and is (not?) suitable for amount of traffic large development would cause.</li> </ul>		Comments noted	None
Ingram Homes via One Planning	Support	<p>Comments supporting the site being unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to cause significant landscape and character impact.</li> <li>• Unclear if satisfactory access could be achieved onto Water Lane</li> <li>• Flood Risk</li> <li>• Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> </ul>		Comments noted	None

**PART 3 – ASSESSMENT OF NEW & REVISED SITES SUBMITTED DURING THE REGULATION 18C CONSULTATION**

**STAGE 1 – LIST OF NEW &REVISED SITES PROMOTED IN THE SETTLEMENT**

**LIST OF SITES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RESIDENTIAL/MIXED USE ALLOCATION (0.5 HECTARES OR LARGER)**

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Status at Reg 18C</b>
<b>Great and Little Plumstead</b>				
Land at Hare Road	GNLP0420R	0.79	10-15 dwellings	Unreasonable
Land east of Salhouse Road, Little Plumstead	GNLP0483R	1.48	Housing	Unreasonable
Home Farm, Water Lane	GNLP3014R	7.01	Housing	Unreasonable
North of Low Road	GNLP4015	0.68	12 Homes	New site
Dairy Farm	GNLP4030	44.79	Up to 1200 dwellings	New site
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>54.75</b>		

## STAGE 2 – HELAA COMPARISON TABLE

Site reference	Site access	Access to services	Utilities capacity	Utilities infrastructure	Contamination / ground stability	Flood risk	Market attractiveness	Significant landscapes	Sensitive townscapes	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Historic environment	Open space & GI	Transport & roads	Compatibility with neighbouring
<b>Great and Little Plumstead</b>														
GNLP0420R	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0483R	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP3014R	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP4015	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP4030	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber

## **STAGE 3 – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM THE REGULATION 18 STAGE C CONSULTATION**

See Part 2 above

## **STAGE 4 – DISCUSSION OF NEW & REVISED SITES**

**In this section sites are assessed in order to establish whether they are suitable for allocation. For the purposes of Sustainability Appraisal, suitable sites are those which are considered to be Reasonable Alternatives. Sites not considered suitable for allocation are not realistic options and therefore are not considered to be reasonable alternatives. The discussion below outlines the reasons why a site has been deemed suitable or unsuitable for allocation. By association this is also the outline of the reasons why a site was deemed to be a reasonable or unreasonable alternative.**

**A range of factors have been taken into account to establish whether a site should, or should not, be considered suitable for allocation. These factors include: impact on heritage and landscape; impact on the form and character of the settlement; relationship to services and facilities; environmental concerns, including flood risk; and, in particular, a safe walking route to a primary school. Sites which do not have a safe walking route to school, or where a safe walking route cannot be created will not be considered suitable for allocation.**

**Conclusions in regard to a sites performance against the relevant factors have also been informed by the outcomes of the HELAA, consultation responses received and other relevant evidence**

### **Great and Little Plumstead**

#### **GNLP0420R, Land at Hare Road, 0.79ha, 10-15 dwellings**

This site was originally submitted in 2016 on a much larger scale (10.93ha). The site was revised as part of the Regulation 18 Stage A consultation to become a much smaller frontage development. The site has now been revised down in size again to reflect live planning application 20191938. The site was shortlisted at Stage 5 of the Great and Little Plumstead site assessment booklet but ultimately was not considered to be suitable for allocation as there is not a continuous safe walking route to Little Plumstead Primary School. It was recognised that although planning application on the adjacent site 20161151 will provide part of the footway connection, visibility at the Church Road/Hare Road junction is poor. The revised site submission suggests that further footpath links are proposed through application 20191938, as well as a range of traffic calming measures and the realignment of the Hare Road/Church Road junction to deliver compliant visibility splays. The site appears to have minimal other constraints so it is considered reasonable to shortlist at this stage so that the new highway proposals can be examined in great detail.

### **GNL0483R, Land east of Salhouse Road, 1.48ha, housing**

This site, on the northern edge of Little Plumstead, has been revised down from 11ha to 1.48ha which is a scale more in keeping with existing housing as a continuation of the settlement boundary. The original larger site was shortlisted for further consideration at Stage 5 of the Great and Little Plumstead site assessment booklet but was ultimately considered to be unreasonable on highway grounds. It is promoted for residential development with a proposed access from Salhouse Road. Initial highway evidence suggests additional development in this location would require a roundabout at the Norwich Road/Salhouse Road junction and footpath improvements. This would need further investigation in relation to the now significantly smaller site boundary to determine whether a site of this size would still require that degree of highway improvements. The village has a primary school, but the school is located within the newer development at the former hospital and is a distance of 2 km away, although there is a safe walking/cycling route. Another consideration is the potential loss of high quality Grade 2 agricultural land. Overall the site is shortlisted as reasonable for further consideration to allow the need for highway improvements to be considered.

### **GNL03014R, Home Farm, Water Lane, 7.01ha, housing**

This site, east of Water Lane and south of the former Little Plumstead Hospital has been reduced in size from 14ha to 7ha. The original larger site was shortlisted at Stage 5 in the Great and Little Plumstead booklet but was then ultimately considered to be unreasonable due to its size and surface water flood risk at the access point. Initial highway evidence indicates the need for improvements including pedestrian access linking to the former Little Plumstead Hospital development to the north. The site is close to the primary school and there does appear to be a footpath along Water Lane. Other constraints include the use of grade 2 agricultural land for development and flood risk from the Witton Run on the southern boundary of the site. The site is shortlisted as reasonable for further consideration subject to internal consultee comments as the boundary has been redrawn to make the site smaller and exclude the access point covered by surface water flood risk which were the main reasons it was considered to be unreasonable previously. The new access point appears to be in the vicinity of Home Farm and this would need further investigation as to its suitability

### **GNL04015, North of Low Road, 0.68ha, 12 houses**

This 0.68ha greenfield site lies to the north side of Low Road at the western edge of Great Plumstead. The land is promoted for 12 homes. Initial highway evidence raises concern about the suitability of Low Road and achieving a suitable vehicular access (even if existing hedgerows were removed). There are limited services and facilities in Great Plumstead but Little Plumstead Primary School is 1.5km away.



Footpath provision to the school exists, except for a short section near to the site along Low Road. Other considerations include some surface water flood risk along the adjacent highway and the fact that the site is on grade 1 agricultural land. Overall the site is shortlisted as reasonable for further consideration at this stage subject to further internal consultee comments.

### **GMLP4030, Dairy Farm, 44.79ha, up to 1200 dwellings**

This is a large greenfield site of 44 ha, promoted for approximately 1,200 dwellings, next to the north-eastern edge of Thorpe End, and either side of the Plumstead Road. The majority of the promoted land is within the A1270 Broadland Northway, with a further area extending to Broad Lane at the edge of Rackheath (part of which is already promoted as GMLP2040). Initial highways evidence queries how walking and cycling links would be provided. Although GMLP4030 is next to Thorpe End, and benefits from proximity to the Plumstead Road, the land is currently remote from existing services and facilities by walking or cycling, which are mainly in either Rackheath or Sprowston, however a development of this scale is likely to provide its own services and facilities as well as wider highway and pedestrian improvements. Due partly to the site's size, there are landscape and townscape considerations, relating to the setting of Thorpe End, as the Garden Village Conservation Area abuts the south-western corner of GMLP4030. Other matters likely to require investigation, given the scale of GMLP4030, include: considerations of habitat and biodiversity net gain; the removal of existing agricultural buildings; and, noise from the Broadland Northway will be a factor for parts of the site as well. While the site is in flood zone 1 there are two main areas at surface water flood risk that would need consideration. A site of this size is out of scale for the requirements of the Great and Little Plumstead village cluster and is also within the green protection zone of the AAP but it is shortlisted as reasonable for further consideration at this stage if additional housing numbers are needed due to its edge of Norwich location close to and inside the NDR.

**STAGE 5 – SHORTLIST OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE NEW & REVISED SITES FOR FURTHER ASSESSMENT**

Based on the assessment undertaken at stage 4 above the following sites are considered to be reasonable alternatives.

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>Great and Little Plumstead</b>			
Land at Hare Road	GNLP0420R	0.79	10-15 dwellings
Land east of Salhouse Road, Little Plumstead	GNLP0483R	1.48	Housing
Home Farm, Water Lane	GNLP3014R	7.01	Housing
North of Low Road	GNLP4015	0.68	12 Homes
Dairy Farm	GNLP4030	44.79	Up to 1200 dwellings
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>54.75</b>	

**STAGE 6 – DETAILED SITE ASSESSMENTS OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE  
NEW & REVISED SITES**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0420R
<b>Address:</b>	Land at Hare Road, Great Plumstead
<b>Proposal:</b>	10-15 dwellings

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agriculture	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Transport and Roads
<b>HELAA Conclusion</b> This site has been revised down in scale for a second time to reflect planning application 20191938. The revised submission does not propose extending development along the road beyond the limits of the existing pattern of development on the opposite side of the road. Conservation colleagues had raised some concerns about the landscape impact of the original site proposal however this much smaller site revision is not likely to impact on landscape character sensitivities so landscape and townscape impacts have been revised to green. The Highway Authority raised objections to the previous site revision because of access and network concerns and these will need to be investigated further in relation to planning application 20191938. Although the site has some constraints it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment. However as the site has already been assessed for the purposes of the HELAA it will not contribute any additional capacity without double counting and has therefore been marked as unsuitable.

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<b>Highways</b> No – The proposals do not appear to satisfactorily address the previously expressed highway safety concerns.
<b>Development Management</b> Current planning application 20191938 is likely to be refused. Site too small for allocation (application for 10 dwellings) and would not want to continue linear development in that location.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b> GREEN – No surface water flooding on site, few or no constraints, standard information required at planning stage. No internal & external flooding on site or within 500m. No surface water sewer systems on site or within 100m. In Source Protection Zone 3. The site predominantly has superficial deposits of diamicton.

Comments on infiltration potential are dependent on a complete geotechnical investigation.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

**Original submission:**

- Access Appraisal
- (Site submission form and boundary plan)

**Revised site:**

- Off site Highway Improvement Works
- (Supporting info, location plan, photos)

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0483R
<b>Address:</b>	Land east of Salhouse Road, Little Plumstead
<b>Proposal:</b>	Housing

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agriculture	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Significant Landscapes, Sensitive Townscapes, Transport and Roads
<b>HELAA Conclusion</b> This site, on the northern edge of Little Plumstead, has been revised down from 11 ha to 1.48 ha. It is proposed for residential development with a proposed access from Salhouse Road. Initial highways evidence suggests development would be subject to a roundabout at the Norwich Road/Salhouse Road junction and footpath improvements. The village has a primary school, but the school is located within the newer development at the former hospital and is a distance of 2 km away. Another consideration is the potential loss of high quality Grade 2 agricultural land. There are no ecological designations affecting the site but some regard will be needed to factors like the presence of mature trees. In conclusion the land is considered suitable for inclusion in the land availability assessment. However as the site has already been assessed for the purposes of the HELAA it will not contribute any additional capacity without double counting and has therefore been marked as unsuitable.

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<b>Highways</b> Subject to 25 dwellings max, satisfactory access, possible carriageway widening to min 5.5m at site frontage and provision of footway for full extent of site frontage, extending southwards to existing facility at junction with Sandhole Lane.
<b>Development Management</b> History of refusals in the area both on this site and adjacent site 3007R. Development in this location would require improvements at the Brick Kiln junction, even for smaller scale development. There is no benefits to be gained from a smaller development and in many ways a larger scheme would be better. Development around the crossroads is of a separate character to the existing development to the south on Salhouse Road so would like to see separation maintained.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b>

GREEN – No surface water flood risk on site, few or no constraints, standard information required at a planning stage. No internal & external flooding on site but external flooding within 500m. No watercourses on site or within 100m. No surface water sewer system on site or within 100m. In Source Protection Zone 3. The site predominantly has superficial deposits of sand and gravel. Comments on infiltration potential as dependent on a complete geotechnical investigation.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

**Original Submission:**

- Transport Technical Note
- Utilities Statement
- Footpath/cycleway and landscape connections to Broadland Northway
- Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Site Access plans
- (Site submission form and boundary plan)

**Revised Site:**

- Landscape Assessment
- Utilities Statement (as original submission)
- (Revised boundary plan)

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP3014R
<b>Address:</b>	Home Farm, Water Lane, Little Plumstead
<b>Proposal:</b>	Housing

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agriculture	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Flood Risk, Transport and Road
<b>HELAA Conclusion</b> This site, east of Water Lane and on land south of the former Little Plumstead Hospital, has been revised from 14 ha to 7 ha. It is promoted for housing of an unspecified number. Initial highways evidence indicates need for improvements, including pedestrian access linking to the former Little Plumstead Hospital development to the north. Other constraints exist over the use of Grade 2 agricultural land for development and flood risk from the Witton Run that passes through the site. Whilst not within the site, nearby notable features are: the extensive Tree Preservation Order for woodland across the former hospital grounds and, the Grade II listed Old Lodge that is just to the north fronting Water Lane. No ecological designations apply to the site and nor would the landscape setting of the Broads be affected. Subject to addressing constraints, the site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment. However as the site has already been assessed for the purposes of the HELAA it will not contribute any additional capacity without double counting and has therefore been marked as unsuitable.

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<b>Highways</b> Subject to small scale development, acceptable access and pedestrian/cycle access to development north of proposed site.
<b>Development Management</b> No Development Management comments sought as issues with revised site seem to be mainly highway related. Development Management comments on the original site raised significant townscape and landscape concerns, flood issues and impact on Witton Run. These views are unlikely to be changed by the revision of this site.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b> GREEN – Surface water flood risk on site but not severe enough to prevent development, few or no constraints, standard information required at a planning stage. No internal & external flooding on site but external flooding with 500m. Watercourse – main rive on site and within 100m. No surface water sewer systems on site or within 100m. In Source Protection Zone 3 and Broads IDB.

The site predominantly has superficial deposits of diamicton. Comments on infiltration potential are dependent on a complete geotechnical investigation. There is what appears to be a minor flow path concentrated on/adjacent to the southern site boundary. This does not significantly affect the site and appears to be concentrated to the main river and watercourse in this area.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

- None (Site submission form and boundary plan)



<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP4015
<b>Address:</b>	North of Low Road, Great Plumstead
<b>Proposal:</b>	12 Homes

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agriculture	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Transport and Roads
<b>HELAA Conclusion</b> This is a 0.68 ha site on the north side of Low Road, at the western edge of Great Plumstead. The land is promoted for 12 homes. Initial highways evidence raises concern about the suitability of Low Road and achieving a suitable vehicular (even if existing hedgerow were removed). There are limited services and facilities in Great Plumstead but Little Plumstead Primary School is 1.5 km away. Footpath provision to the school exists, except for a short section near to the site along Low Road. The site is in flood zone 1, although it is noted that some surface water flood risk exists along the adjacent highway. There are no known constraints from utilities infrastructure, contamination or ground instability, or potential loss of open space. Neither are there notable heritage or ecological constraints, but the status of the land as Grade I agricultural value is a consideration. In conclusion, the site is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<b>Highways</b> No – substandard highway network without opportunity for improvement, no safe walking/cycling route to school.
<b>Development Management</b> Not supported. Development on Grade 1 agricultural land. Surface water drainage issues on the road.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b> GREEN – no surface water flood risk on site, few or no constraints, standard information required at a planning stage. No internal & external flooding on site or within 500m. No watercourses on site or within 100. No surface water sewer systems on site or within 100m. In Source Protection Zone 3. The site predominantly has superficial deposits of diamicton. Comments on infiltration potential are dependent on a complete geotechnical investigation.

<b>PLANNING HISTORY:</b>

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

- None (Site submission form and boundary plan)

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP4030
<b>Address:</b>	Dairy Farm, Thorpe End
<b>Proposal:</b>	Up to 1200 dwellings

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agriculture	Greenfield

### **CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA**

#### **Amber Constraints in HELAA**

Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Utilities Infrastructure, Flood Risk, Significant Landscapes, Sensitive Townscapes, Transport and Roads, Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses

#### **HELAA Conclusion**

This is a large site of 44 ha, promoted for approximately 1,200 dwellings, next to the north-eastern edge of Thorpe End, and either side of the Plumstead Road. The majority of the promoted land is within the A1270 Broadland Northway, with a further area extending to Broad Lane at the edge of Rackheath (part of which is already promoted as GNLP2040). Initial highways evidence queries how walking and cycling links would be provided. Although GNLP4030 is next to Thorpe End, and benefits from proximity to the Plumstead Road, the land is currently remote from existing services and facilities by walking or cycling, which are mainly in either Rackheath or Sprowston. Due partly to the site's size, there are landscape and townscape considerations, relating to the setting of Thorpe End, as the Garden Village Conservation Area abuts the south-western corner of GNLP4030. Other matters likely to require investigation, given the scale of GNLP4030, include: considerations of habitat and biodiversity net gain; the removal of existing agricultural buildings; and, noise from the Broadland Northway will be a factor for parts of the site as well. While the site is in flood zone 1 there are two main areas at surface water flood risk that would need consideration. There are though no particular constraints from utilities infrastructure, contamination or ground instability, potential loss of open space, or ecological designations. In conclusion, the site is considered as suitable for the land availability assessment.

### **FURTHER COMMENTS**

#### **Highways**

There is no safe walking & cycling route to the catchment school at Little Plumstead. The site needs to be considered in combination with other proposed sites adjacent to give a scale of development that supports delivery of a new primary school.

#### **Development Management**

Currently no need for that scale of development in that location within the green protection zone of the AAP. However as a well located urban fringe site, with easy access onto the NDR, it may be more difficult to resist development there in the future if additional housing growth is needed.

**Lead Local Flood Authority**

AMBER – surface water flood risk on site but not severe enough to prevent development, mitigation required for heavy constraints and significant information required at a planning stage. No internal & external flooding on site both within 500m. No watercourses on site or within 100m. No surface water sewer systems on site or within 100m. In Source Protection Zone 3. The site predominantly has superficial deposits of diamicton. Comments on infiltration potential are dependent on a complete geotechnical investigation.

The site is affect by minor/moderate flow paths in the 1.0% and 0.1% AEP events. In addition the site is immediately adjacent to a large number of internal and external flood incidences. This must be considered in the site review. A large percentage of the site is not affected by flood risk and would still be developable. The site has an odd shape and is split into different sections. In turn, the LLFA review is quite broad for the site scope. Construction phase management appertaining to the surface water drainage would be crucial for the entire site. If the sites have poor infiltration, the connectivity of the on-site flow paths will have to be assessed. We would recommend more detailed analysis of the site through 'zoning'.

**PLANNING HISTORY:****BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

- None (Site submission form and boundary plan)

## STAGE 7 – INITIAL CONCLUSIONS ON THE SUITABILITY OF NEW AND REVISED SITES FOR ALLOCATION

The new and revised sites shortlisted at Stage 4 have been subject to further consideration with Development Management, the Local Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority and their comments are recorded under Stage 6 above. Based on their views the following initial conclusions regarding the suitability of the sites for allocation have been drawn.

### New and revised sites to be considered for allocation:

None

### New and revised sites considered to be unreasonable for allocation:

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
<b>Great and Little Plumstead</b>				
Land at Hare Road	GNLP0420R	0.57	10-15 dwellings	This site is not considered to be reasonable for allocation as there is not a continuous safe walking route to Little Plumstead Primary School. Although planning application 20161151 will provide part of the footway connection, visibility at the Church Road/Hare Road junction is poor. The site was revised during the Regulation 18C draft plan consultation, including the submission of further highway evidence which the local highway authority has said does not satisfactorily address previously expressed highway concerns. Development Management have advised that current planning application 20191938 is likely to be
	GNLP0420R*	0.79	10-15 dwellings	

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
				<p>refused, the site is too small for allocation and they would not want to continue linear development in that location.</p> <p>Site GNLP0420 was originally submitted in 2016 on a much larger scale (10.93ha) but this was revised down to 0.57ha prior to the site assessment process commencing so the original site was never formally assessed or subject to Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
Land east of Salhouse Road	GNLP0483	11.12	86 dwellings with 5.83 ha of green infrastructure and new play equipment	<p>This site was originally submitted and assessed as a much larger proposal with a significant element of open space only to be revised down to a much smaller 1.48ha site through the Regulation 18C consultation. The larger site was not considered to be suitable for allocation due to level of highway improvements which would be needed as the 'Brick Kilns' junction in the form of junction realignment or a roundabout. A smaller scale of development may still require some level of highway improvements. There has been a history of planning refusals in the area and it is considered that there are no benefits to be</p>
	GNLP0483R	1.48	Housing	

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
				gained from a smaller development. Development around the crossroads could be considered to be of a separate character to the existing development to the south on Salhouse Road so separation should be maintained.
Home Farm, Water Lane	GNLP3014	14.26	300 dwellings	This site as originally submitted was considered to be too large for the requirements of the cluster and would have swamped the village and its services and facilities. The site was revised down in size during the Regulation 18C consultation but is still too large for the cluster with likely significant townscape and landscape concerns and impact on the Witton Run
	GNLP3014R	7.01	Housing	
North of Low Road	GNLP4015	0.68	12 Homes	This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation due to the substandard highway network with no opportunity for improvement, no safe walking/cycling route to school and surface water drainage issues on the road.
Dairy Farm	GNLP4030	44.79	Up to 1200 dwellings	This site is not currently proposed for allocation as there is currently no need for that scale of development in that location within the green protection zone of the

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
				<p>AAP, there are other sites in the urban fringe which are considered to be better. However as a well located urban fringe site, with easy access onto the NDR, it may be more difficult to resist development there in the future if additional housing growth is needed.</p>



## **FINAL CONCLUSIONS FOR THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN**

### **Site assessment prior to the Regulation 18C consultation**

Up to the Regulation 18C consultation there were 8 sites promoted for residential/mixed use in the Great and Little Plumstead cluster totalling around 48 hectares of land. The outcome of initial site assessment work (which is detailed in part 1 of this booklet) was not to prefer any sites for allocation. This was primarily due to the highway improvements that would be needed at the 'Brick Kilns' junction in the form of junction realignment or a roundabout and also the lack of a safe pedestrian route to school in some cases.

### **Summary of comments from the Regulation 18C draft plan consultation**

Through the Regulation 18C consultation a number of comments were received regarding sites in the Great and Little Plumstead cluster. The main issues raised were in relation to the non allocation of any sites in the cluster (detailed in part 2 above). Further discussions have taken place regarding the sites promoted with highway and development management colleagues the conclusion being that no evidence has been submitted to change the approach of not selecting any sites for allocation in the cluster.

### **Assessment of new and revised sites submitted through the Regulation 18C consultation**

A total of 2 new sites and 3 revised sites were submitted through the Regulation 18C consultation totalling around 55 hectares of land. All the new and revised sites were subject to the same process of assessment as the earlier sites (detailed in part 3 of this booklet). In relation to the site revisions they were still not considered suitable for allocation due to the reasons given in part 3 above. In terms of the new sites GNL4015 has a substandard highway network and GNL4030, a very large site on the edge of Thorpe End for 1200 dwellings, is not needed presently for that scale of development within the green protection zone of the AAP. The conclusion of this work was there are still no sites considered to be suitable for allocation in the cluster. N.B – site GNL3007 was revised during the Regulation 18C consultation and has now become a small site.

### **Sustainability Appraisal**

The sustainability performance of each reasonable alternative site has been considered in the selection of sites. The Sustainability Appraisal includes a scoring and assessment narrative on the sustainability performance of each reasonable alternative and recommendation for mitigation measures which have been

incorporated into policy requirements as appropriate. The Sustainability Appraisal (insert link) highlighted a number of negative and positive impacts for the sites in the Great and Little Plumstead cluster but no clear site emerged as being favoured for allocation. A couple of the larger sites promoted scored well for housing delivery but the cluster would not support that level of housing.

### **Final conclusion on sites for allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan**

Based on all the information contained within this booklet the final conclusion of the site assessment process for Great and Little Plumstead is not to allocate any sites in the plan. Sites promoted have been rejected for allocation primarily because of highway concerns and the absence of a safe pedestrian route to school in some cases.

See tables of allocated and unallocated sites at appendices A and B for a full list of sites promoted with reasons for allocation or rejection.

