

KEY SERVICE CENTRES – SITE SUMMARIES

ACLE

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | ACLE OVERVIEW |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 30 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 9 Support, 11 Object, 10 Comment |

Acle has 3 carried forward allocations; 2 preferred sites (0378 and 2139); 0 reasonable alternatives; 7 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Look into highway design re roundabout and other traffic issues (parking?)
- Ensure school expansion is not fettered
- Parish Council object to allocations due to lack of infrastructure. "GNLP0378 is within route of possible escape of water from reservoir" (PC)
(update allocation policies with planning permission)

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Carried Forward Allocation

- Policy ACL3

Acle – Preferred Sites

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0378 Land west of Acle and north of Norwich Road, Acle (Preferred Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 8 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 1 Support, 3 Object, 4 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| NPS property Consultants | Support | Reaffirming the site's deliverability, alongside 2139 to the north | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport note at appendix 2 of report • Concept plan shows altered site boundary and 300+ dwellings possible on combined site | The increased site size and concept plan is considered appropriate to accommodate the link road, open space and landscaping. | Amend site boundary and increase dwellings to 150 on this site, 340 total. |
| Acle Parish Council | Object | Lack of infrastructure in village including sewerage, GP and traffic | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure capacity | As a key service centre, Acle's infrastructure has been considered to be appropriate for this level of growth. | None |
| Members of the public | Object | Total 465 extra houses – pressure on traffic and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway design • Pedestrian safety | The allocation aims to improve local | None |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|---|---|--|------|
| | | parking, A47 access and services at capacity. | | highway issues by linking South Walsham Road with Norwich Road. Acle's infrastructure has been considered to be appropriate for this level of growth. | |
| Acle Parish Council | Comment | Concerns over surface water drainage and link road to S Walsham Rd is essential | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway design | The allocation aims to improve local highway issues by linking South Walsham Road with Norwich Road. The site policy addresses surface water drainage. | None |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water efficiency policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Access to eastbound A47 from west of village to reduce through traffic and footpath along New Reedham Rd/Leffins Lane | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway design Pedestrian safety | The site policy requires early assessment of the A47 junction and capacity. The allocation aims to improve local highway issues by linking South | None |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | Walsham Road with Norwich Road. Leffins Lane is some distance from the site. | |
| Highways England | Comment | Early assessment of junction with A47 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy content to include requirement for early assessment of junction with A47 | Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment | Add to policy: <i>“Early assessment of the junction and the A47 at this location is required.”</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2139 South of South Walsham Road, Acle (Preferred Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 7 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 1 Support, 3 Object, 3 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| NPS Property Consultants | Support | Reaffirming the site's deliverability, (alongside 0378 to the south which is owned by NPS) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport note at appendix 2 of report • Concept plan shows altered site boundary and 300+ dwellings possible on combined site | The increased site size and concept plan is considered appropriate to accommodate the link road, open space and landscaping. | Amend site boundary and increase dwellings to 190 on this site, 340 total. |
| Acle Parish Council | Object | Lack of infrastructure in village including sewerage, GP and traffic | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure capacity | As a key service centre, Acle's infrastructure has been considered to be appropriate for this level of growth. | None |
| Members of the public | Object | Total 465 extra houses – pressure on traffic and parking, A47 access and services at capacity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway design • Pedestrian safety | The allocation aims to improve local highway issues by linking South | None |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | Walsham Road with Norwich Road. Acle's infrastructure has been considered to be appropriate for this level of growth. | |
| Acle Parish Council | Comment | Ensure expansion of Acle Academy is not prevented. Link road S Walsham Rd to Norwich Rd is essential. Old river bed runs through site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway design • School expansion plans | The allocation aims to improve local highway issues by linking South Walsham Road with Norwich Road. The site policy will address the potential for expansion of Acle Academy. | Amend policy to include "Development will not prevent the potential future expansion of Acle Academy" |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water efficiency policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Highways England | Comment | Early assessment of junction with A47 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy content to include requirement for early assessment of junction with A47 | Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment | Add to policy: " <i>Early assessment of the junction and the A47 at this location is required.</i> " |

Acle – Carried Forward Allocations

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy ACL1 Land to the North of Norwich Road, Acle (Carried Forward Allocation) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 3 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Acle Parish Council | Comment | Planning permission for 137 homes on this site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update policy to reflect permission | Noted | The supporting text has been updated to reflect permission 20191215 |
| Members of the public | Comment | Scale of development will swamp village. Concerns re traffic, parking, service capacity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway design | The wider allocation of sites in the vicinity aims to improve local highway issues by linking South Walsham Road with Norwich Road. Acle's infrastructure has | None |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---------|--|--|---|------|
| | | | | been considered to be appropriate for this level of growth. | |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy ACL2 Land to the South of Acle Station between Reedham Road and New Reedham Road, Acle (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| Members of the public | Comment | Scale of development will swamp village. Concerns re traffic, parking, service capacity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway design | The wider allocation of sites in the vicinity aims to improve local highway issues by linking South Walsham Road with Norwich Road. Acle's infrastructure has been considered to be appropriate for this level of growth. | None |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | include it in the allocation policy. | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|

Acle – Unreasonable Sites

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0007 Borderland Farm, Damgate Lane, Acle (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Parker Planning (site promoter) | Object | In support of the site's allocation, including a revised boundary | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised boundary | The site has been revised to address constraints, but is now promoted for only 5 dwellings. The GNLP aims to allocate sites of 12-15 dwellings as a minimum, to contribute to affordable housing targets. Additionally, the constraints on the site would not result in a suitable | None |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------|--|--|--|------|
| | | | | housing scheme, and the revised site is considered unreasonable. | |
| Acle Parish Council | Support | Most of site is in flood zone, road is narrow. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0384 Land at Acle, South Walsham Road, Acle (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Savills (site promoter) | Object | In support of the site's allocation alongside GNLP1049 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attachment outlines proposal to allocate two sites together, providing 10+ha site with road and footpath access achieved. Promoter of GNLP1049 did not submit similar proposal. | The combined sites (0384 and 1049) would result in a site of over 10ha. This level of growth, in addition to the preferred sites, would be a significant increase for the village's services to accommodate. | None |
| Acle Parish Council | Support | Pedestrian access would be unsafe. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0417 Land at Beighton Road/Norwich Road, Acle (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Acle Parish Council | Support | Site is remote | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0421R Land at Jolly's Lane, Acle (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Acle Parish Council | Support | Agree site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |
| Crocus Homes (site promoter) | Object | Challenging the HELAA assessment findings: access to services; reduction to 30 dwgs; site access; footway. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised site boundary • Nearby site has planning permission with similar constraints | The revised site is located to the south of the A47 and the rail tracks and is therefore not well related to services. The nearby site with permission had less impact on landscape and the form and character of the town. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0427 Land at Norwich Road, Acle (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Acle Parish Council | Support | Agree site is unreasonable, too close to A47 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP1022 Land north of Hillcrest, Acle (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Acle Parish Council | Support | Agree site is unreasonable, too close to A47 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP1049 Land North of Charles Close, Acle (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Acle Parish Council | Support | Out of scale, unsafe pedestrian access to village | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |

BLOFIELD

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | BLOFIELD OVERVIEW |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 14 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 5 Support, 4 Object, 5 Comment |

Blofield has 1 carried forward allocation; 1 preferred site (2161); 0 reasonable alternatives; 5 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Factual error/evidence submitted to require amendments to policy wording/assessment
- Blofield Parish Council pleased with perceived low level of allocation.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Blofield – Preferred Site

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2161 Land adj to Norwich Camping and Leisure, off Yarmouth Road, Blofield (Preferred 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Members of the public | Object | Scale, deliverability and viability. Alternative site would be better. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GNLP0252 comparison | There is a high level of commitments in Blofield, which has limited additional housing allocation. This site is considered to be sustainable and provide an appropriate level of additional growth. An additional site is not needed at this time. | None |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|--|---|---|--|
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water efficiency policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Highways England | Comment | The proposed site may have a significant impact on the A47 and it is suggested early assessment on the junction and the A47 at this location is required to ensure that these sites are deliverable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NO REP ON JDI BUT MAIN RESPONSE INCLUDES BLOFIELD PREFERRED SITES | The site policy will be amended | Add to policy: <i>“Early assessment of the junction and the A47 at this location is required.”</i> |

Blofield – Carried Forward Allocation

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy BLO1 Land to the South of A47 and North of Yarmouth Road, Blofield (Carried Forward Allocation) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 4 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 1 Object, 3 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| Historic England | Object | Listed building to the south, setting is likely to be affected. No mention in policy wording. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording | It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this. | Add to policy: "Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of Manor Farm Barn to the south of the site, including any contribution made to that significance by setting." |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------|---|---|--|--|
| Blofield Parish Council | Comment | Pleased that recent growth has been taken into account | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Error in Blofield chapter, Notes section of BLO1: wrong planning permission reference, quantum and status | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate 20161066 and 20160488 | There is indeed an error in quoting 20161066 in the notes section. The correct reference is 20160488 with 'up to 175 dwellings' and 'permitted' being the correct information. | Amend error in permission, status and quantum in Notes section of BLO1 |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |

Blofield – Unreasonable Sites

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0082 Land to the South of Lingwood Road (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| CAM Architects | Object | In support of site, including sub-division of site and include extra care housing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for extra care housing • Scale of development | Little additional growth is proposed in Blofield due to substantial existing commitment and concerns about capacity of the A47 roundabout. Local road capacity is also limited. The need for housing with care has been addressed through strategic policy 5 and through allocations and | None |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------|---|---|--|------|
| | | | | commitments for housing with care in a number of locations. | |
| Blofield Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Part of site regularly floods | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate flood map | This matter has been considered during further site assessment. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0252 Land at Yarmouth Road, Blofield (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Blofield Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted | None |
| Site promoter | Object | Site is accessible, adjacent to recent development, no highway constraints | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reassess site on revised boundary | Little additional growth is proposed in Blofield due to substantial existing commitment and concerns about capacity of the A47 roundabout. It is not considered appropriate to allocate this site in addition to the allocated site. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2024 Land north of Yarmouth Road, Blofield (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| CAM Architects | Object | In support of site and sub- dividing site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reassess site on revised boundaries | Residential development would fetter the range of uses on existing Broadland Local Plan allocation BLO1 – which have been approved through planning applications. This may reduce the potential future level and range of services in the village. Furthermore, little additional growth is proposed in | None |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------|---|--|--|------|
| | | | | Blofield due to substantial existing commitment and concerns about capacity of the A47 roundabout. | |
| Blofield Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2085 Between Yarmouth Road and A47, Blofield (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Blofield Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2149 North of Yarmouth Road, Blofield (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 1 |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Blofield Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |
| John Long Planning | Object | Evidence to show access is possible (letter from NCC 'up to 4 dwellings' 20181043) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider highway access as a constraint | The evidence provided indicated that the site can be accessed (the application this relates to was for up to 4 dwellings). Notwithstanding the site's access, little additional growth is proposed in Blofield due to substantial existing commitment and concerns about | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | capacity of the A47 roundabout. | |
|--|--|--|--|------------------------------------|--|

BRUNDALL INCLUDING POSTWICK WITH WITTON

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | BRUNDALL OVERVIEW |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 23 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 17 Support, 2 Object, 4 Comment |

Brundall has 2 carried forward allocations; 0 preferred site; 0 reasonable alternatives; 14 sites which are judged to be unreasonable (4 of which are non-residential).

Main issues:

- Concerns about appeal site, loss of recreation land and traffic levels
- Opportunity to address highway constraints through new roundabout and link road
- Brundall PC supports the lack of additional allocations and the carried forward allocation for recreational open space.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0325
- GNLP0369
- GNLP0370
- GNLP3009

Unreasonable Non-Residential Sites

- GNLP0371
- GNLP3029
- GNLP3049

Brundall, including Postwick with Witton – Carried Forward Allocations

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy BRU2 Land North of Berryfields, Brundall (Carried Forward Allocation) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 2 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 1 Object, 3 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Cornerstone Planning/Norfolk Homes | Comment | RM 20190604 for 155 dwellings is pending and relocate recreation 20161483 are referred to but ignored | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider changing policy from recreation to housing with adjacent recreation, possibly re-draw red line | Unless the permission is implemented prior to Reg19, the previous allocation for open space will remain in place to emphasise the | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------|--|
| | | | | importance of open space. | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy BRU3 Land East of the Memorial Hall, Brundall (Carried Forward Allocation) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Member of the public | Support | Brundall needs recreational land | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. | None |
| Brundall Parish Council | Support | Supports allocation as open space in line with NP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy wording? | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |

Brundall, including Postwick with Witton – Unreasonable Sites

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0254 Land at Yarmouth Road, Brundall (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Brundall Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0295 Land West of Maurecourt Drive, Brundall (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Brundall Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0352 Land North of Brecklands Road, Brundall (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Brundall Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Members of the public | Support | Support decision that site is unreasonable due to flooding, site access and impact on infrastructure in village | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0375 Land North of Postwick Lane/West of Holmesdale Road, Brundall (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Brundall Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0436 Land North of Links Avenue, Brundall (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 7 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 6 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| Brundall Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Members of the public | Support | Supports use as open space Concerns about local road and service capacity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Barton Willmore/Quantum Land | Object | Site is subject to ongoing appeal. No highway objections, heritage or landscape concerns on application. Committee refused against officer recommendations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision on appeal against 20171386 due June 2020 delayed due to Covid-19. Appeal ref APP/K2610/W/19/3239986 Consider highway issues in context of application evidence | The appeal on this site has been allowed, which includes off-site highway works. | None, to protect the provision of open space, should the permission lapse |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0571 Land North of the A47, North and East of Witton Hall and West of Dawlings Wood, Postwick (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Gt & Lt Plumstead Parish Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable, Lt Plumstead does not have amenities to support or road capacity to link to site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Lanpro/Site promoter | Object | Site could provide new road junction and relieve pressure on A47. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway proposals including map at App A showing potential new road | The Highway Authority does not consider the scheme to be appropriate (adding a new access to the A47). Additionally, the site is considered remote from the built-up areas of both Plumstead | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | and Brundall and not suitable for housing. | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2069 East of Brundall Memorial Hall, Brundall (Unreasonable Non-Residential 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Members of the public | Support | Concerned that appeal application could be permitted, pressure on local services and spoil residential amenity, loss of recreation land. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | The appeal decision is outside the local plan process. | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Concern for increase in traffic. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

HETHERSETT

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | HETHERSETT OVERVIEW |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 28 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 11 Support, 7 Object, 10 Comment |

Hethersett has 3 carried forward allocations (one is on part of GNLP1077A); 0 preferred sites; 1 reasonable alternative; 6 residential sites and 4 non-residential sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

1 rep about lack of preferred sites, from member of the public, promoting a site in Little Melton.

Main issues:

- Erosion of strategic gap if RA site taken forward and safety zone for high voltage cables if HET1 expanded
- Thickthorn capacity re HET1
- Policy for HET1 inconsistent with permission
- HET2 link road location
- Several new sites proposed
- Hethersett PC supports the lack of additional allocations.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Hethersett – Carried Forward Allocations

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy HET1 (part of site GNLP0177A) Land North Hethersett (Carried Forward Allocation & Uplift) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 5 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 1 Support, 0 Object, 4 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Pegasus/Pigeon | Support | Supporting former elements of original site's allocation (and adding sites) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery statement contains new sites | The original site 0177A incorporates the carried forward allocation HET1. As this land has already been allocated in the last local plan, this representation has been treated as a submission of four additional sites. | None |
| John Long Planning (site promoter) | Comment | Site policy should only refer to uplift, not the rest of the site which is subject to planning conditions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are conditions? • Have they been addressed already? | It is accepted that the conditions and obligations attached to outline | Draft policy to apply only to uplift of 200 dwellings. |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | permission 2011/1804 and subsequent reserved matters permissions on this site under-write the allocation policy for this site. Policy wording will apply only to the uplift in dwelling numbers, subject to further permissions on the site. | |
| National Grid | Comment | Site is crossed/adjacent to NG assets, development must be 15m away. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check site complies with further guidance | The allocation will not infringe on the 15m easement. | None |
| Highways England | Comment | Transport assessment will be needed to ensure Thickthorn improvements can accommodate uplift of 360 dwellings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport assessment needed | These matters have been considered when sites were subject to further assessment | Add to policy: "A transport assessment must consider the capacity of the improved A47 Thickthorn Interchange" |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy wording? | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy HET2 Land North of Grove Road, Hethersett (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording? | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy HET3 Land West of Poppyfields, Hethersett (Carried Forward Allocation) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 2 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording? | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Hethersett Parish Council | Comment | Link road should be close to eastern boundary and minimum size allowable to protect archaeological site. Request input into design of any formal open space. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road layout Plans for open space | Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment. Hethersett PC needs to work with the developers regarding the form of open space. | Amend policy to emphasise need to minimise impact of road on archaeological site. |

Hethersett – Reasonable Alternative Site

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0480 Land West of New Road, Hethersett (Reasonable Alternative Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 2 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Lanpro/Glavenhill | Comment | Support allocation of site and expand possible uses to include care | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider allocating site for care | The level of development proposed in Hethersett is considered appropriate for the level of services and considering the high level of outstanding commitment in the village. There is a carried forward allocation for care in Hethersett. Therefore there is | None |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|---|--|--|------|
| | | | | no need to erode the strategic gap and this site is not needed as an allocation. | |
| Hethersett Parish Council | Comment | Strongly oppose development due to erosion of strategic gap | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider whether to allocate site in context of strategic gap erosion. | The level of development proposed in Hethersett is considered appropriate for the level of services and considering the high level of outstanding commitment in the village. There is a carried forward allocation for care in Hethersett. Therefore there is no need to erode the strategic gap and this site is not needed as an allocation. | None |

Hethersett – Unreasonable Sites

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0135 Wood Hall, Norwich Road, Hethersett (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Bidwells/UEA estates | Object | Support allocation of site and consider the site would support deliverability of the GNLP. | Deliverability of sites elsewhere to be considered against the townscape and heritage impacts of developing this site. | The outstanding commitment in Hethersett is under construction or subject of reserved matters applications. The GNLP contains a variety of site sizes in a spread of locations. This constrained site would not add certainty of deliverability in the context of the | None |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|--------------------|--|---|------|
| | | | | entire plan. Furthermore, development of the site would have a significant impact on the setting of Wood Hall and risk TPO trees. | |
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0177BR Land to South East of Hethersett (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development based on Thickthorn capacity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted | None |
| Pigeon/Pegasus (site promoter) | Object | Support allocation of site (although most of the submission relates to other sites) and submit new sites around Hethersett | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery statement contains new sites | The original site 0177B is not the main focus of the representation, which has been treated as a submission of four additional sites. | None |
| La Ronde Wright (site promoter) | Object | Supports allocation of site, reduces scale of development, provides social infrastructure, addresses constraints | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apparent change use to commercial, care and footpath uses for site. Landscape impact assessment provided | To justify a local plan allocation in this location more evidence is needed of likely end-user businesses to bring forward Sites A and B, and likewise evidence about the | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>deliverability of the care village on Site C. The suitability of GNL0177BR for development should also become clearer once funding and scheme layout decisions are made about the Highways England Thickthorn junction scheme (for which submission of the development consent order to the Planning Inspectorate is expected early 2021). Due to the uncertainties described, GNL0177BR is not considered to be a reasonable alternative at the current time.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0394 Land at New Road, Hethersett (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development based on built form | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted | None |
| Savills (site promoter) | Object | Supports allocation of site alongside adjacent sites in 3 rd party ownership, to increase delivery of housing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attachments suggest access from B1172 or New Road | The impact on the strategic gap is considered to outweigh the benefits of developing the site. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0462 Land off Jaguar Road, Hethersett (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0481 Land West of New Road, Hethersett (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP3030 West of Hethersett (partly in Great Melton Parish) (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0177BR/0358R Land around Thickthorn Roundabout, either side of A11, Hethersett (Unreasonable Non-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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development – see comments under 0177BR | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |
| Pigeon/Pegasus (site promoter) | Object | Supports site, promotes new land | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery statement proposes new sites | Please see response under GNLP0177BR and GNLP0358R | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0486 Land North of Norwich Road, Hethersett (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development as more employment will drive demand for housing and erode strategic gap between Hethersett and Cringleford | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP1023A Little Melton Business Park – Site A. (Land to west) (Unreasonable Non-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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development as Burnthouse Lane recently approved as school walking route. There should be no increase in HGV for safety reasons. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |
| Pegasus/Pigeon (site promoter) | Object | Supports site, promotes new land | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery statement contains new sites. | Evidence suggests current land commitments are more than sufficient to meet the employment growth needs of Greater Norwich. On this basis GNLP1023A is not considered a reasonable alternative for | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|--|
| | | | | employment-related development. | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP1023B Little Melton Business Park – Site B (Land to the east) (Unreasonable Non-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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Hethersett Parish Council | Support | Oppose development as Burnthouse Lane recently approved as school walking route. There should be no increase in HGV for safety reasons. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted | None |
| Pegasus/Pigeon (site promoter) | Object | Supports site, promotes new land | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery statement proposes new sites. | Evidence suggests current land commitments are more than sufficient to meet the employment growth needs of Greater Norwich. On this basis GNLP1023BR is not considered a reasonable | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | alternative for employment- related development | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

HINGHAM

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | HINGHAM OVERVIEW |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 55 (was 66, but all Hingham PC reps duplicated, 2 site promoter duplicated) |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 13 Support (was 16), 25 Object (was 32), 17 Comment (was 18) |

Hingham has 1 carried forward allocation; 2 preferred sites (0503, 0520); 0 reasonable alternatives; 8 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

NB Hingham TC objected to lack of reasonable alternative sites.

Main issues:

- Traffic levels and pedestrian safety.
- Surface water flooding, worsened in lower lying areas after development on B1108
- Gateway nature of GNLP0520
- Future issues related to industrial site opposite.
- Missed opportunity for provision of community facilities through rejection of site/s to the west.
- Hingham Town Council object to GNLP0503 due to road safety concerns and GNLP0520 due to surface water flooding, road safety, proximity to industrial estate and landscape impacts. Consider that there are reasonable alternative sites.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Hingham – Preferred Sites

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0503 Land north of Springfield Way and west of Dereham Road, Hingham (Preferred Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 4 (5 but duplicate from PC) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Members of the public | Object | Pedestrian safety/footpath/ crossing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian safety | The Highway Authority considers the footpath issues associated with this site are capable of mitigation. | None |
| Hingham Town Council Duplicated email and web reps | Object | Existing allocations should be built out before new allocations made Challenge feasibility of footpath and road widening Safety of pedestrian crossings Traffic and parking issues Concern for habitat (SSSI) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian safety | The local plan covers a 15 year period, but has to be renewed in a shorter time frame. The Highway Authority considers the traffic and footpath issues associated with this | None |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|---|---|------|
| | | Support scale of development | | site are capable of mitigation. The site is not in a risk zone for impact on a SSSI. | |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water efficiency policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Pedestrian safety/footpath/crossing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian safety | The Highway Authority considers the footpath issues associated with this site are capable of mitigation. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0520 Land south of Norwich Road, Hingham (Preferred Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 16 (was 17, but PC rep duplicated) |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 1 Support, 9 Object, 6 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Bidwells/Abel Homes | Support | Reaffirming the site's deliverability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachments and proposed changes to site policy | The Highways Authority have determined the footpath policy. The number of dwellings may be varied subject to acceptable design and layout, and addressing any infrastructure issues. | None |
| Members of the public | Object | Pedestrian safety/footpath/ crossing Surface water flooding Site is too large Services at capacity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian safety | The Highway Authority considers the footpath issues associated with this site are | Add policy to address surface water drainage |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|---|---|---|
| | | Increase in traffic and parking Village centre is Fairland/ Marketplace, not Co-op | | capable of mitigation. | |
| Hingham Town Council Duplicated email and web reps | Object | Existing allocations should be built out before new allocations made Strong local feeling against site Surface water flooding Road and pedestrian safety Impact on gateway to Hingham Pressure on services Incompatible neighbouring uses Floodgate principle for adjacent site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian safety • Surface water flooding • Gateway to town • Neighbouring uses (chemical/incineration) | The local plan covers a 15 year period, but has to be renewed in a shorter time frame. The quantum of development is considered appropriate for the level of services in Hingham. The Highway Authority considers the traffic and footpath issues associated with this site are capable of mitigation. The site policy will address surface water drainage. | Add policy to address surface water drainage and site's role as eastern gateway to Hingham |
| Historic England | Object | No mention of adjacent listed buildings, or need to conserve or enhance significance/setting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy wording | It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this. | Add to policy: "Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of Lilac Farmhouse and Blenheim |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | Cottage to the south of the site, including any contribution made to that significance by setting. This includes but is not limited to landscaping along the southern edge of the site.” |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water efficiency policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Pedestrian safety/footpath/crossing Surface water drainage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian safety Surface water drainage | The Highway Authority considers the footpath issues associated with this site are capable of mitigation. The site policy will be amended regarding surface water drainage. | Add policy to address surface water drainage |
| Hingham Road Safety Campaign | Comment | Pedestrian safety/footpath/crossing Traffic speeds | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian safety | The Highway Authority considers the footpath issues | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | associated with this site are capable of mitigation. | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

Hingham – Carried Forward Allocation

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy HIN2 (employment) Land adjacent to Hingham Industrial Estate at Ironside Way, Hingham (Carried Forward Allocation) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 3 (was 4 but Hingham PC was duplicated) |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Historic England | Object | Listed buildings adjacent are not mentioned in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording | It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this. | Add to policy: “Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of Alexander’s Farmhouse to the east and White Lodge to the north of the site, including any contribution made to that significance by setting. This |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | includes but is not limited to landscaping along the site boundary.” |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy wording? | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Hingham Town Council (web and email) | Comment | HIN2 makes 0520 unsuitable due to proximity of access off B1108 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess conflict with employment site | The Highway Authority considers the highway access issues associated with this site and 0520 are capable of mitigation. | None |

Hingham – Unreasonable Sites

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0273 Land west of Attleborough Road, Hingham (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 1 (was 2 but Hingham PC duplicated) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Hingham Town Council (email and web) | Support | No more sites should be allocated in Hingham until existing allocations in core strategies have been developed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Undeveloped former allocations are reviewed and taken into account when determining the level of new allocations. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0298 Land opposite Hingham Sports Centre, Watton Road, Hingham (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 6 (was 8 but Hingham PC and site promoter duplicated) |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 4 Object, 2 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Hingham Town Council (email and web) | Object | No more sites should be allocated in Hingham until existing allocations in core strategies have been developed. However, this site is supported, can provide footpath and woodland. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpath is possible? • Consider landscape impacts | Undeveloped former allocations are reviewed and taken into account when determining the level of new allocations. The Highway Authority maintain that it does not appear to be feasible to provide an acceptable footway between the site and local facilities. Allocating this site in addition to the preferred site | None |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------|--|--|--|------|
| | | | | would result in growth which may swamp the town's services. | |
| Site promoter (2 reps) | Object | Site scores more favourably in HELAA than preferred site. Site is linked to adjacent site (0335) and proposal for 4.2ha community woodland (4007). Services are walkable, footpath achievable, woodland offered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider constraints and new evidence: masterplan, phased layout, planning statement, highways statement, ecological assessment, new woodland proposal | Significant new evidence has been submitted. However, the Highway Authority maintain that it does not appear to be feasible to provide an acceptable footway between the site and local facilities. Despite the proposal to deliver community woodland, allocating this site in addition to the preferred site would result in growth which may swamp the town's services. | None |
| Members of the public | Object | Can't see why site is unreasonable. Community woodland and footpath are achievable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footpath is possible? | The Highway Authority maintain that it does not appear to be feasible to provide an acceptable footway between | None |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|---|---|--|------|
| | | | | the site and local facilities. Despite the proposal to deliver community woodland, allocating this site in addition to the preferred site would result in growth which may swamp the town's services. | |
| Members of the public | Comment | Can't see why site is unreasonable. Better than preferred site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpath is possible? | The Highway Authority maintain that it does not appear to be feasible to provide an acceptable footway between the site and local facilities. Despite the proposal to deliver community woodland, allocating this site in addition to the preferred site would result in growth which may swamp the town's services. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0310 Land south of Norwich Road, North of Seamere Road, Hingham (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 3 (was 4 but Hingham PC duplicated) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Hingham Town Council (email and web) | Support | No more sites should be allocated in Hingham until existing allocations in core strategies have been developed. We support the unreasonable status of this site. However, we do not support the suggestion to consider it with 0520. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. Undeveloped former allocations are reviewed and taken into account when determining the level of new allocations. | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Road is used for walkers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0335 Land south of Watton Road, Hingham (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 3 (was 5 but Hingham PC duplicated and site promoter sent 2) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Hingham Town Council (email and web) | Object | No more sites should be allocated in Hingham until existing allocations in core strategies have been developed. Support site and its community benefits a better pedestrian access to services. but would like fewer homes and concern for habitat loss. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Undeveloped former allocations are reviewed and taken into account when determining the level of new allocations. The Highway Authority maintains that it doesn't appear to be feasible to provide an acceptable footway between the site and local facilities. Despite the proposal to deliver community | None |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|--|--|--|------|
| | | | | woodland, allocating this site in addition to the preferred site is likely to swamp the town's services. | |
| Members of the public | Object | Site offers community benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | The Highway Authority maintains that it doesn't appear to be feasible to provide an acceptable footway between the site and local facilities. Despite the proposal to deliver community woodland, allocating this site in addition to the preferred site is likely to swamp the town's services. | None |
| Henry Isotta (site promoter) two reps | Object | In support of the site's allocation, alongside 0298. Site scores better on HELAA than preferred site. Site is linked to adjacent site (0298) and proposal for 4.2ha community woodland (4007). Attachments give detail of site and community benefits. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider constraints and new evidence: masterplan, phased layout, planning statement, highways statement, ecological assessment, new woodland proposal | Significant new evidence has been submitted. However, the Highway Authority maintains that it doesn't appear to be feasible to provide an acceptable footway between the site | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | and local facilities. Despite the proposal to deliver community woodland, allocating this site in addition to the preferred site may swamp the town's services. | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0395 Land west of Attleborough Road, Hingham (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 2 (was 3 but Hingham PC duplicated) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Hingham Town Council (email and web) | Support/ Comment | No more sites should be allocated in Hingham until existing allocations in core strategies have been developed. Would like to see site allocated for cemetery extension and car park. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is cemetery use promoted? | Undeveloped former allocations are reviewed and taken into account when determining the level of new allocations. Delivery of a cemetery extension is proposed with additional housing. The site is considered unsuitable for housing. | None |
| Savills (site promoter) two reps | Object | In support of the site's allocation for housing, in full or in part. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attachment addresses constraints and offers part of site for cemetery/car park. | Delivery of a cemetery extension is proposed with | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>additional housing, but the site is considered unsuitable for housing. Attleborough Rd is constrained with narrow footways and no scope for improvement, not suitable for intensification of use. Site 0298 is not considered acceptable so unable to facilitate access that way. The harmful impact on the setting of the church, the landscape impact and the impact on the approach to the town from the south are considered to outweigh the benefits of development.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0501 Land west of Springfield Way, Hingham (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 1 (was 2 but Hingham PC duplicated) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Hingham Town Council (email and web) | Object | No more sites should be allocated in Hingham until existing allocations in core strategies have been developed. Support site, with access over HTC land, provision of community facilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are community facilities promoted on the site? | Undeveloped former allocations are reviewed and taken into account when determining the level of new allocations. Community facilities have not been proposed by the site promoter. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0502 Land west of Springfield Way, Hingham (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 1 (was 2 but Hingham PC duplicated) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Hingham Town Council (email and web) | Object | No more sites should be allocated in Hingham until existing allocations in core strategies have been developed. Support site, with access over HTC land, provision of community facilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are community facilities promoted on the site? | Undeveloped former allocations are reviewed and taken into account when determining the level of new allocations. Community facilities have not been proposed by the site promoter. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0544R Swan Field, Hardingham Road, Hingham (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 12 (was 13 but Hingham PC duplicated) |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 9 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Hingham Town Council (email and web) | Support | No more sites should be allocated in Hingham until existing allocations in core strategies have been developed. Agree site is unreasonable due to road capacity/visibility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local road safety | Undeveloped former allocations are reviewed and taken into account when determining the level of new allocations. Site is not allocated. | None |
| Members of the public | Support | Site is unsuitable due to road capacity/safety, proposed density, gateway to village, surface water drainage, service capacity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local road safety | The site is not allocated. | None |
| Lanpro Services Ltd | Object | In support of allocation of site. Attachments address constraints including a transport note | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport note and vision documents contain visibility splay and footway information | Additional evidence provided, particularly for highways issues, has been considered. The | None |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|---|---|--|------|
| | | | | Highway Authority considers the highway constraints (including carriageway width, lack of footpath provision and very poor forward visibility for vehicles travelling around the adjacent bend) preclude the site's development. | |
| Members of the public | Comment | Site is unsuitable due to road capacity/safety, impact of pipeline developments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local road safety | The site is not allocated. | None |

LODDON AND CHEDGRAVE

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | LODDON AND CHEDGRAVE OVERVIEW |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 51 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 2 Support, 23 Object, 26 Comment |

Loddon and Chedgrave has 1 carried forward allocation; 2 preferred sites (0312 and 0463); 0 reasonable alternatives; 7 residential and 1 non-residential sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- Several reps commented on sites which have planning permission being judged unreasonable, and requested these are preferred and reduced from the settlement total.
- Some evidence to support a further unreasonable site.
- A lot of concern about traffic, drawing attention to recent AWA roadworks causing chaos, and also the Langley School transport.
- One of the preferred sites has been reduced by us, apparently with negative landscape impacts due to site levels.
- Loddon Parish Council propose amendments to policy for 0312, Chedgrave Parish Council did not comment.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Non-Residential Sites

- GNLP0347

Loddon and Chedgrave – Preferred Sites

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0312 Land to the east of Beccles Road, Loddon (Preferred Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 12 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 1 Support, 7 Object, 4 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Lanpro/Hopkins Homes | Support | Propose amended policy wording to remove requirement for two site access points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can site access be reduced to one primary and one emergency vehicle? | The Highway Authority view is that a development of this scale requires two vehicular accesses. | None |
| Members of the public | Object | Impact on residential amenity including loss of view; construction noise; traffic; light pollution Better to use it as employment land Landscape impacts Distance from services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revisit assessment criteria | These issues have been reconsidered and the impact on views has been addressed in policy. The Highway Authority considers that the impact of development and | Reference to the Broads to be inserted regarding development's impact on views. |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | future resident traffic can be mitigated. The allocation policy requires surrounding trees and hedgerows to be enhanced and site topography to be considered. | |
| Larkfleet Homes | Object | Lack of professional assessment of site's impacts, alternative site performs better (HELAA), | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison with site 0372 | The process of assessing a site is more complex than counting the number of amber scores in the HELAA assessment. The site assessment booklet for Loddon and Chedgrave explains the process of assessing sites, why 0312 has been allocated, and why 0372 has not. | None |
| Historic England | Object | Impact on conservation area to north and west of site not mentioned in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy wording re built heritage, including setting | It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for | Add to policy: "Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of listed |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | measure to address this. | buildings within the Loddon and Chedgrave Conservation Area to the north-west of the site, including any contribution made to that significance by setting.” |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water efficiency policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Need studies on surface water run-off, traffic risks, services capacity Support mixed use on the site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Surface water • Service capacity | Loddon’s services are considered appropriate for this level of growth. The Highway Authority considers the traffic impacts can be mitigated and the policy addresses surface water drainage. Additional studies will be required at planning application stage. | None |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|---|--|------|
| Loddon Parish Council | Comment | Propose amendments to policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density • Open space/landscaping • Community infrastructure • Highway safety | The additional highway elements and s106 contributions will be addressed at planning application stage. Elements such as density and open space are incorporated within design and layout. Infrastructure issues may be on- or off-site. | None |
|-----------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|---|--|------|

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0463R Land off Langley Road, Chedgrave (Preferred Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 20 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 1 Support, 14 Object, 5 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Brown & Co/ESCO Developments | Support | Welcome preferred status, consider number of units should not be reduced from 70 to 20 but to 60. Poor choice of subdivided site due to ground levels. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size and location of site boundary • Rebalance numbers between two sites | The area indicated on the masterplan as open space addresses some amenity concerns raised by local residents. Although there will be landscape and heritage impacts, these can be mitigated if site boundary altered as proposed. | The site will now be allocated at 5.58ha for 60 dwellings |
| Members of the public | Object | Various concerns including: Impact on residential amenity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would proposed revised site boundary address any of these issues? | The Highway Authority considers the traffic impacts can be mitigated, to | Change of site boundary to retain open space to south; |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Surface water flooding Services at capacity Traffic congestion/road safety Financial compensation Landscape and ecology impacts Air quality Ground contamination (foot and mouth)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does revised site have surface flood areas? | <p>be determined by a transport survey. The level of services in Loddon and Chedgrave is considered appropriate for this scale of allocation. Financial compensation is not awarded for impact of housing development. The revised site boundary may reduce the impact on residential amenity.</p> | <p>add policy requirements to conduct ground contamination survey and mitigate surface water flooding</p> |
| Historic England | Object | <p>No mention of Langley Park and impact on its setting</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording to conserve and enhance heritage assets including setting | <p>It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this.</p> | <p>Add to policy: "Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of Langley Park to the west of the site, including its associated listed buildings and any contribution made to its</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| | | | | | significance by setting.” |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | <p>Various concerns including: Parking and traffic congestion Services at capacity</p> <p>Disruption during construction</p> <p>Suggest alternative sites</p> <p>Suggest single storey dwellings</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does revised site boundary address any of these issues? | <p>The level of services in Loddon and Chedgrave is considered appropriate for this scale of allocation. The Highway Authority considers that traffic impacts can be mitigated. The revised site’s masterplan addresses amenity issues.</p> | Revision to site boundary. |

Loddon and Chedgrave – Carried Forward Allocations

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Loddon and Chedgrave LOD3 |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |

Loddon and Chedgrave – Unreasonable Sites

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0008 Wood Farm, Bungay Road, Loddon (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Members of the public | Comment | Traffic issues | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0313 Land to east of High Street, Loddon (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 2 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------------|--|
| Members of the public | Comment | Various concerns including: Heritage/conservation Safe highway access Traffic/parking/footpath Relocate fire station | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As previous | Noted The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0314 Land off Low Bungay Road, Loddon (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Members of the public | Comment | Safe highway access Traffic Service congestion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As previous | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0372 Land to the east of High Bungay Road, Loddon (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Members of the public | Object | Reduced site should be explored, as planning application which addresses landscape and highway constraints | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced site size | Noted. However there are concerns regarding vehicular access onto High Bungay Road. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Supports site, subject to highway solution | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support site | Noted However there are concerns regarding vehicular access onto High Bungay Road. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP1014 Land on the west side of Norwich Road, Chedgrave (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 6 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 1 Object, 5 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Members of the public | Object | Planning permission renders unreasonable status invalid | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate permission | The site has been reconsidered in its reduced state, excluding the permitted land. The remaining site is considered unsuitable. | None |
| Site promoter | Comment | Various attachments in support of the site, including permission | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate permission | The site has been reconsidered in its reduced state, excluding the permitted land. The remaining site is considered unsuitable. | None |
| Members of the public | Comment | Permission for 5 dwellings on this site and some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate permission | The permission will be included in | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | adjacent, should be included in settlement's total | | calculations of commitment, which has been considered when distributing growth. | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2032 South of Beccles Road, Loddon (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 3 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 0 Object, 3 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Site promoter | Comment | Flood and access constraints have been shown to be overcome. Also tree survey completed. Please reassess the site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood constraint • Highway access • 2011/1174 permits access | 2013/1846 permits 7m access strip which has been implemented. Flood model report suggests no risk to proposed housing but some risk to access in climate change scenario. The minimum size for a housing allocation is 12 – 15 dwellings, and this is unlikely to be achievable on this site due to highway | None |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|---|---|--|------|
| | | | | and drainage constraints. | |
| Members of the public | Comment | Site is between two new developments, is suitable for development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider site | The minimum size for a housing allocation is 12 – 15 dwellings, and this is unlikely to be achievable on this site | None |
| Larkfleet Homes | Comment | Addresses constraints | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider site | The minimum size for a housing allocation is 12 – 15 dwellings, and this is unlikely to be achievable on this site | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2055 Big Back Lane, Chedgrave (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 3 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 0 Object, 3 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Members of the public | Comment | Permission for 5 dwellings on this site should be included in settlement's total Potential access to site indicated Traffic concerns | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate permission and access to site | This site is considered unsuitable as it does not relate well to Chedgrave's built form. | None |

PORINGLAND, FRAMINGHAM EARL AND FRAMINGHAM PIGOT, INCLUDING WELL RELATED PARTS OF BIXLEY, CAISTOR ST EDMUND AND STOKE HOLY CROSS

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | PORINGLAND OVERVIEW |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 85 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 63 support, 12 object, 10 comment |

Poringland has 1 carried forward allocation; 0 preferred sites; 0 reasonable alternative sites; 20 unreasonable residential sites (2 of which have A and B elements); 1 unreasonable non-residential site.

There are 6 reps under the headings for No New Allocations and Reasonable Alternatives which support the strategy.

Main issues:

- Support for lack of allocations/taking account of commitments
- Concern over local service/infrastructure capacity and surface water drainage
- Check commitment figure (536 in GNLP/358 in RLA maybe just P not FE etc)
- 0280 proposals now changed to care home/housing with care
- 0485 refers to late submitted evidence and offers infrastructure
- Some assumptions that strategy indicates no allocations in surrounding villages
- Poringland PC supports the recommendation of no new allocations. Framingham Earl PC and Framingham Pigot PC did not respond.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Poringland, Framingham Earl and Framingham Pigot, Incl well related parts of Bixley, Caistor St Edmund and Stoke Holy Cross – General Comments

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Poringland General Comments |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 4 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 3 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Public | Comment/ support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support rejection of 21 sites and no further developments needed in Poringland and Framingham Earl. Infrastructure, particularly roads, education and health, unable to cope with additional growth. Rural nature and surroundings need to be protected for visual and environmental reasons. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pleased allocations aren't restricted to Poringland alone but also include Framingham Earl & Pigot, well related parts of Bixley, Caistor St Edmund and Stoke Holy Cross as all have an impact on Poringland and boundaries are not easily distinguished. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. . The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. However, the | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support there being no new allocations due to high amounts of existing commitments and environmental/infrastructure constraints. | | policy refers to parts of the other parishes which form the settlement of Poringland/Framingham Earl. The villages referred to are covered by the South Norfolk Village Clusters Plan. | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Poringland Reasonable Alternative Comments |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Public | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree no reasonable alternatives • too much development currently without support for infrastructure • Schools, doctors and roads all full | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree no reasonable alternatives • high amounts of existing commitment • environmental and infrastructure constraints | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |

Poringland, Framingham Earl and Framingham Pigot, Incl well related parts of Bixley, Caistor St Edmund and Stoke Holy Cross – Carried Forward Allocation

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy POR 3 Ex MOD site, Pine Loke, Poringland (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 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 | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |

Poringland, Framingham Earl and Framingham Pigot, Incl well related parts of Bixley, Caistor St Edmund and Stoke Holy Cross – Unreasonable Sites

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0003 Land adjacent (west of) Bella Vista, Burgate Lane, Framingham Earl (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Member of the public | Support | Already too much development schools, doctors and roads all full water table issues cannot support more development on this section of village Would disrupt disguised edge that village has on this exposed approach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | Support site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | new residential sites are allocated. | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0131 Land east of French Church Farm, Caistor Lane, Caistor St Edmund (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 4 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 3 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Member of the public | Comment/ Support | General support of site being unreasonable Area has already had lots of developments without support for infrastructure Schools, doctors and roads all full Already enough development across KCS to meet GNLP targets. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support of site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0169 Land north and south of Shotesham Road, Poringland (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted | None |
| Jonathan Kidner via Landowners Group Ltd | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rejected as 536 dwellings have planning permission on small sites, this is incorrect as there are only 358 permission/ commitments in Poringland (from South Norfolk Council 2017/18 Residential Land Availability (2017/18 RLA) publication) Of these 349 are on large sites ranging from 78-145 dwellings and only 9 dwellings are from smaller sites. On this basis Poringland can accept a further 187 dwellings. 2012 South Norfolk Place Making Guide suggests not accentuating linear settlement pattern this was breached with granting of West of Octagon Farm, Bungay Road, Bixley permission which | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the source of GNLP figures for commitment? Are our figures correct? Otherwise, no new evidence provided. | The 2017/18 RLA has been superseded. Although the base date of the plan is 2018, commitment information is updated annually for the calculations in the GNLP. The large number of committed housing sites is the principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>hideously extended linear pattern of Poringland settlement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alleged groundwater conditions do not apply to this site. • Improvements to Shotesham/Bungay road junction may be needed but, with available alternate access points, the improvements can be carried out whilst retaining site viability. • Site adjoins Big Sky development and is in the currently adopted development boundary. | | <p>this settlement, in order to allow local services to accommodate the growth already planned.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0223 Land north of Heath Loke and west of The Street, Poringland (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Member of the public | Comment/ Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would lead to more cars, congestion, noise and pollution • Increase strain on schools, roads and medical centres • Site is home to variety of wildlife • Access to site would be difficult • Close to head waters of River Chet and could adversely affect drainage and ecology • Area already has enough development in progress • Ground is prone to waterlogging | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support of site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0280 Cherry Trees, south of Bungay Road, Poringland (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 3 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 2 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Member of the public | Support | Already enough development in area Infrastructure unable to cope (roads, doctors and schools full) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Cygnet Care Ltd via CODE Development Planners Ltd | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is now for care home and extra care bungalows and other Class C2 uses. This will meet need for new specialist housing over the planning period. Existing care home has been extended over the years but requires redeveloping | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change to proposed site use | The need for extra care housing has been considered across the plan area. There are several allocations in the GNLP for extra care housing | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>to allow for growth and to improve current facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not approved this would result in a loss of 25 beds in care home accommodation. • Impacts on Public Right of Way to south east would be minimised and, with appropriate landscape mitigation, will make positive contribution to built environment. • Community facilities (to be discussed with community) will be provided on a members basis. • Will likely create more local jobs • Biodiversity of site will be protected, diversified and improved • Will help make GNLP positively prepared and effective with regard to provision of specialist accommodation. | | <p>and care homes, and Policy 5 supports accessible and specialist housing on allocated sites with good access to local services. This site is separate from the built form of the village and has been judged to have harmful landscape and townscape impacts.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0316 Land north of Bungay Road, Poringland (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Member of the public | Comment | Local infrastructure cannot cope with more growth Local topography has documented water table issues in area would disrupt disguised edge village has on exposed approach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. This site is not allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. This site is not allocated. | None |
| ESCO Development Ltd via Brown & Co | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suitable access with required visibility can be provided off Bungay without demolition work required, would extend 30mph zone to ensure safety Entire site is not to be built upon as assumed, extensive open space will be provided with landscaping and SUDs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposing 54 dwellings with extensive open space/SUDs. Road access drawing submitted. What is impact on ecology and flood? | The additional information submitted does aim to address some of the constraints previously identified on this | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation will be enhanced and maintained on the western edge, with the introduction of trees to continue the tree line into the village. • Report from Hopkins Ecology confirms no negative impact on protected species or designated sites. • Several listed building nearby, can mitigate the impact development would have on these • Low risk of fluvial and surface water flooding, SUDS will be provided with a permanent pond feature for site. • Footway opposite side of Bungay Road to village centre, scope to provide footway along frontage to join this. • Access track to south could be improved by diverting to new access or formalising it in current position. • Frequent local bus services within 350m. • Do not believe there are any constraints to utilities infrastructure • Land is available, no further land required, and is deliverable • Saffron Housing have committed to developing site and it can be delivered within next 3 years. | | <p>site. However, the large number of committed housing sites is the principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in order to allow local services to accommodate the growth already planned.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0321 Land immediately adjacent to Octagon Farm and adjacent fields, Bungay Road, Framingham Earl (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 3 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 2 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Member of the public | Support | Already a lot of development in area Schools, doctors and roads full disrupt disguised edge of village on this approach which disguises high school. | •None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | •None | Noted. This site is not allocated. | None |
| Crown Point Estate via Pegasus Group | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (NOTE: Site specific comments on SA found in attachment) • assert that site represents rounding-off of built form given development on opposite side of road. • Sustainable location and accessible by non-car transport. | •Transport technical note provided as additional evidence | The content of the transport note is acknowledged. However, the large number of committed housing sites is the | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • footway already exists • school is close by with bus stops adjacent to site • small scale employment will contribute to sustainability of area • will aim to enhance setting of Octagon Barn, heritage statement will also provide evidence site can be developed without undue harm to the significant heritage asset. • Transport technical note included to show how accessibility can be organised. • Flood Risk Assessment will demonstrate proposed development would be fine for lifetime of development without increasing flood risk elsewhere – opportunity to incorporate on-site surface water attenuation which will help site and Barn itself. | | <p>principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in order to allow local services to accommodate the growth already planned.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site would have a detrimental impact on the form and character of the village.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNL0391 A & B Land at Framingham Earl, Burgate Lane (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 9 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 7 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNL0 RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Member of the public | Support/ Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area has high level of development commitments. • No growth or support for infrastructure. • Schools, doctors and roads full. • Fields frequently water logged • Within 65m of Grade 1 listed church (Site A) • Located off small single track country lane • Negative impact on wildlife and environment • Beyond settlement boundary | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Savills | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, available and achievable • All or part of site B could be considered • Site within walking/cycling distance of KSC. Three bus routes serving KSC. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional evidence provided, but statements to | Comments have been taken into account through further site | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site relates well to existing form. • Access roads could be upgraded through development. • Site A currently, due to largely enclosed nature, does not make significant contribution to wider landscape. • Site B is more open but in context of village's built edge it is not considered development would significantly impact the landscape character. • Current application pending for dwellings and work units to immediate south of site. | <p>address HELAA constraints.</p> | <p>assessment work. However, the large number of committed housing sites is the principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in order to allow local services to accommodate the growth already planned.</p> | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0485 Land North of Caistor Lane, Caistor St Edmund (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 7 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 5 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Member of the public | Support/ Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support recommendation as unreasonable • Already a lot of committed development in area • schools, drs and roads full • No new sites in Poringland so would be unreasonable to have sites in Caistor St Edmund • Known flood risks in area • Caistor Lane is a dangerous country road and unable to cope with additional traffic. • School on site would be too far removed from majority of housing in area and further increase traffic issues. • Would disrupt relatively disguised edge village has on this approach • would merge settlements too far. • no need to destroy natural habitats to develop country park | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|--|---|------|
| Caistor St Edmund Parish Council | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite community benefits being offered, development would worsen the overloaded local roads and services • LANPROs transport note does not address major issue of junction with Norwich Road, Poringland. • Limited car parking on plan which would not cope with additional school traffic. • 200 Homes at Brickle Wood Road who have access to homes via Caistor Lane would be affected by development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Glavenhill Limited via Lanpro Services Ltd | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is suitable, available and deliverable • Will provide GI via country park, primary school with parking/drop off point, community building public open spaces for play & sports, 180 dwellings • Will deliver improved connectivity through new foot and cycle links • South Norfolk Council have serious deficiency of publicly accessible natural and semi-natural public open spaces. • Glavenhill refined submission with a masterplan, access and viability information which was sent in to GNDB Dec 2019, site suitability are not based on full suite of information as this was not included. • 515 new homes within all Key service centres is considered unreasonable, disproportionate and unjustified. Particularly in Poringland/Framingham Earl KCS. • Rossi Long Consulting have conducted an access appraisal and 3 access points are proposed as a result, These potential points of access along with the proposed 3.0m wide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional site information, including wider access point at eastern end of site | The revised site access does not appear to provide a suitable standard and the carriageway is not wide enough. However, the large number of committed housing sites is the principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in order to allow local services to accommodate the growth | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|--|
| | | <p>foot/cycleway facilities on Caistor Lane will connect the site to existing foot and cycleway facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pro:works (Landscape Architects) have assessed potential impact to western most access point and conclude with an appropriate design the impact will be minimised. • Placement of development areas, open spaces and provision of substantial new planting along boundaries can assist in assimilating development. • Wheatman Planning Limited assessed primary care provision in area which concluded patient GP ratios are very favourable compared to other surgeries in other Greater Norwich KSC, the national average and South Norfolk CCG averages. • New school requirement has been identified in area by NCC and Poringland in the neighbourhood plan. • No new country parks within GNLP mean plan may be unsound • Initial screening assessment of sites flood risk and drainage potential undertaken by Rossi Long Consulting which demonstrated site is Flood zone 1 with low probability of fluvial flooding. Some low risk surface water flooding identified which can be managed with an appropriately designed SUDS. The utility infrastructure was also appraised and all services were found to be available without capacity limitations. | | <p>already planned.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0491 Land south of Caistor Lane, Caistor St Edmund (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Member of the public | Support | Caistor Lane is country road being dangerously used as cut through to southern bypass, can't cope with additional traffic. poor drainage on land, development will exacerbate flooding issues Significant planning permitted across the area already | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0494 Land south of Poringland Road, Stoke Holy Cross (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Glavenhill Limited via Lanpro services Ltd | 1 Object and 1 comment (1 web 1 email believed to be duplicate) | Site is now being proposed as smaller alternate proposition which will deliver 20 bungalows with open spaces and boundary landscaping. Only 515 new homes proposed for Key Service Centres compared to 1,680 in village clusters, this is inappropriate. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider smaller alternate proposition | The reduced site size has been considered. However, the large number of committed housing sites is the principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in order to allow local services to accommodate the growth already planned. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0589 A&B Land North and South of Pigot Lane, Framingham Earl & Framingham Pigot (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted The site is not allocated. | None |
| Hibbett & Key Ltd via John Long Planning | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land in Poringland/Framingham Earl should be allocated for development. • Site is available for development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Comments have been taken into account through further site assessment work. However, the large number of committed housing sites is the principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in order to allow local services to | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|--|---|------|
| | | | | accommodate the growth already planned. | |
| Hibbett & Key Ltd via John Long Planning | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site well related to village • not allocated due to other commitments in village and there being no new allocations. • If further sites allocated then this site appears to outperform other sites and should be considered preferable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Comments have been taken into account through further site assessment work. However, the large number of committed housing sites is the principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in order to allow local services to accommodate the growth already planned. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP1032 Land adjacent to and to north of Octagon Farm, Bixley (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 3 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 2 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Member of the public | Support | Area already had a lot of development schools, doctors and roads full disrupt disguised edge the village has on this exposed approach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. This site is not allocated. | None |
| Crown Point Estate via Pegasus Group | Object | <p>(NOTE: Site specific comments on SA found in attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoted with site 0321 Assert that site represents rounding-off of built form given development on opposite side of road. 300m from remains of Bixley Hall and associated garden water features – potential negative impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport technical note provided as additional evidence. No new evidence re flood risk, which was identified as a | Comments have been taken into account through further site assessment work. However, the large number of committed housing sites is the principal | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>however it is unlikely given intervening woodland to north of sites and this being accounted for in masterplan meaning impact will be neutral.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location and accessible by non-car transport. • Adjacent to The Beck – through planning process contamination will be prevented • School is close by with bus stops adjacent to site • Small scale employment will contribute to sustainability of area • Will aim to enhance setting of Octagon Barn, heritage statement will also provide evidence site can be developed without undue harm to the significant heritage asset. • Transport technical note included to show how accessibility can be organised. • Flood Risk Assessment will demonstrate proposed development would be fine for lifetime of development without increasing flood risk elsewhere – opportunity to incorporate on-site surface water attenuation which will help site and Barn itself. | <p>constraint for this site.</p> | <p>reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in order to allow local services to accommodate the growth already planned.</p> | |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP1047 Pine Lodge School of Classical Equitation, Pine Loke, Caistor St Edmund (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2093 South of Caistor Lane, Caistor St Edmund (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 4 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 4 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Member of the public | Support | Significant flood risk would exacerbate traffic problems with joining Norwich Road Caistor Lane is a country road which is already under great strain from recent developments nearby Already enough developments across this key service centre | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Comments have been taken into account through further site assessment work. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. This site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2094 North of Stoke Road, Caistor St Edmund (Unreasonable Residential 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. This site is not allocated. | None |
| Member of the public | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caistor Lane is a country lane with too much traffic already. Poringland has been overdeveloped. flood risk | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Durrants | Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is between POR1 & 3 forming a natural infill No potential impacts or constraints found within suitability analysis which would not be addressed. Possibly includes a package of off-site highway improvements which may include foot/cycle way enhancements, signage/signalling improvements and any widening that may be needed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statements about site's suitability but no new evidence provided. | The large number of committed housing sites is the principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in order to allow local | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only small part of southern boundary at risk of flood, improvements can be made to drainage and dwellings can be built apart from this area.• Available and achievable. | | services to accommodate the growth already planned. | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2111 South of Long Lane, Stoke Holy Cross (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Member of the public | Support | Will ruin countryside lead to more cars, noise and pollution increase strain on roads, GPs and schools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2124R Model Farm, Stoke Holy Cross (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Member of the public | Support | Will further ruin countryside Substantial developments in area already would result in more cars, noise and pollution, further pressure on roads, GPs and schools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2127 Orchard Farm, Framingham Earl (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Public | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already a lot of development in area • Schools, roads and doctors full • Local topography with documented water table issues cannot support development. • Would disrupt disguised edge on this exposed approach to village. • Would overload road which has frequent accidents. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |
| Poringland Parish Council | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2153 South of Burgate Lane, Poringland (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 10 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 8 Support, 1 Comment, 1 Object |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Member of the public | Support/ Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original application (2017/2652) unanimously rejected by SNDMC in 2018. • Outside settlement boundary and SN development boundary. • Would impact landscape and lead to loss of agricultural land • Access from narrow country lane • Would require removing important hedgerow that fulfils historical & ecological criteria for retention under hedgerow regulations act 1997. • Unique geology and drainage issues in area. • Percolation/attenuation ponds not suitable in this flood risk area – Poringland SUDS seek to prevent surface water being infiltrated into the ground since the perched water table means water will emerge as springs in other parts of village – this has not been demonstrated as understood by applicant. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | The large number of committed sites in Poringland/ Framingham Earl has been taken into account. No new residential sites are allocated. | None |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------|---|---|---|------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newts, pheasants, bats, partridges, owls, kites and deer all live in area. • Would disrupt disguised edge on this exposed entry to village. • Already enough smaller sites development for gnlp needs • Changes to Burgate Lane (which is narrow and unsuitable currently) would disrupt current traffic which would be greater than the benefit to the new residents • Increased pollution as residents would need to travel out of area for schools/work • Schooling, doctors and public transport/roads not robust enough to support new development. • Development won't conform with policy 32 of NPPF – safe and suitable access can't be achieved due to insufficient lines of access and increased impact on local traffic. | | | |
| Poringland PC | Support | General support for site being unreasonable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted | None |
| Gladman Developments | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poringland 5th largest settlement outside Norwich Urban area, has wide range of local services and regular bus services to Norwich – concerned that no growth here planned. • Site is available, deliverable, achievable/suitable. • No adverse effects which cannot be mitigated against. • Up to 36% affordable housing • 2.56ha of GI included in plan. • Childs play provision • Integrated walking trails to connect with public right of way system to south of site • Sustainable transport improvements. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision document submitted as evidence. Site promoted for 98 dwellings, 5 live-work units plus open space. | Landscape impacts identified by Reg18C and a landscape impact assessment are referred to in the vision document but not provided. The large number of committed housing sites is the principal reason that the GNLP does not allocate more housing in this settlement, in | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existing vegetation retained as much as possible and additional planting throughout site• Situated in flood zone 1• No designated heritage or landscape assets | | order to allow local services to accommodate the growth already planned. | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNL0323 Park Farm, Bungay Road, Bixley (Unreasonable Non-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 | DRAFT GNL0 RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Crown point Estate via Pegasus Group | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client has sufficient landholdings in area to ensure adequate highway access – highways and transport technical note included. • Enables employment uses closer to existing settlements to south of Norwich. • Site well-screened • Possible to mitigate any landscape impacts • Would result in net increase in employment floorspace • Brownfield site, building here could mean less building on greenfield sites elsewhere. • Provides opportunity for low-tech and smaller/start-up businesses, at a reasonable cost, not catered for within GNL0. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport technical note submitted. • Reconsider need for employment land for low-tech B1 and start-up development | Flood Risk Assessment and heritage statement referred to but not submitted. Evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient to meet the employment growth needs in the area. | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Listed building noted and setting will remain largely unchanged in terms of character and appearance.• Flood Zone 1 | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

REEPHAM INCLUDING BOOTON, GUESTICK, HEYDON, SALLE AND WOOD DALLING

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | REEPHAM OVERVIEW |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 16 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 9 Support, 1 Object, 6 Comment |

Reepham has 2 carried forward allocations; 0 preferred sites; 0 reasonable alternatives; 9 sites which are judged to be unreasonable (1 non-residential).

Main issues:

- The town council appear to have misunderstood the assessment of the proposal to expand the WTC on GNLP1007. Otherwise Reepham TC appear to support the GNLP assessment of sites.
- New mix of uses proposed on GNLP0353 to expand GP surgery and relocate an employer – investigate need for these.
- Proposed relocation of former allocation for school sports to increase number of dwellings on REP1.
- Policy text on REP2 re CWS impact and water efficiency.
- Reepham Town Council supports the lack of new allocations.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Reepham including Booton, Guestwick, Heydon, Salle and Wood Dalling – Carried Forward Allocations

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy REP1 Land off Broomhill Lane, Reepham (Carried Forward Allocation) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 4 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 1 Object, 3 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Member of the public | Object | Impact on wildlife and footpath, capacity of local services and road safety. Homes should use best eco technology and materials | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat • Footpath | NWT have also commented on the wildlife. We cannot require higher standards of build on individual sites, but Policy 2 covers this element. | None |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy wording? | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|--|---|---|
| Norfolk Wildlife Trust | Comment | Policy wording to address proximity to Broomhill Meadows CWS, need for ecological appraisal including evaluation of drainage impacts on CWS, provision of net gain biodiversity and buffering | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy wording? | Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment, and the policy wording has been changed. | Include requirement for ecological appraisal. |
| Bidwells/Lovell Partnerships | Comment | Relocate previously planned sports hall onto new site, increase number of dwellings on REP1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider additional dwellings • Assess sports hall site • See 20200847 (140 dwgs) and 20201183 (sports hall) | The playing field is undeliverable in its own right. It is suggested that this proposal is more appropriate as a planning application. The allocation is carried forward as previously allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Policy REP2 Land at Former Station Yard, Station Road, Reepham (Carried Forward Allocation) |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 2 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comment |

| RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS) | SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT | BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Member of the public | Comment | Impact on Marriotts Way and competition for local shops | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail element of proposal? • Marriotts Way impact? | There is no retail element to the allocation. Reepham already has a relationship with Marriotts Way based on its former use. | None |
| Anglian Water | Comment | No reference to water efficiency in policy wording | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend policy wording | This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy. | None |

Reepham including Booton, Guestwick, Heydon, Salle and Wood Dalling – Unreasonable Sites

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0096 Land off Wood Dalling Road, adjacent to Collers Way, Reepham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Reepham Town Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable for housing, but would support industrial use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. Site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0180 Land north of Whitwell Street, Reepham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Reepham Town Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable for housing, but would support if highway access achievable and school expansion provided | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. Site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0183 Land east of Whitwell Road, Reepham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Reepham Town Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable for housing, but would support if highway access achievable and school expansion provided | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. Site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0221 Land off Norwich Road, Reepham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Reepham Town Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable for housing due to pedestrian safety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. Site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0353 Land north and south of the B1145 and Dereham Road, Reepham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Reepham Town Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable for housing due to pedestrian safety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Noted. Site is not allocated. | None |
| Pegasus/Pigeon | Comment | Supporting allocation of site for relocation of local employer and extension of GP surgery, plus 50 dwellings. Attachments support different mix of uses to that previously assessed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which employer needs to relocate? • Does GP need to expand? • If so, could safe pedestrian access be achieved? • Access strategy plan submitted within delivery statement | No evidence has been submitted to support the proposal to relocate the local employer nor of the need to expand the GP surgery. It is suggested that an application would be the appropriate way to address these needs. | None |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | The Highways Authority have reviewed the access strategy but consider that the highway constraints are insurmountable. | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0543A&B Land adj Wood Dalling Road, Reepham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Reepham Town Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable due to pedestrian safety and built form | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2026 Orchard Lane, Reepham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Reepham Town Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable due to highway access/local road capacity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2075 Cawston Road, Reepham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Reepham Town Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable due to distance to services, lack of footpath, proposed cable route | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP1007 The Old Rectory Meadow, Reepham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Reepham Town Council | Support | Supports decision that site is unreasonable for housing due to competing proposal for extension to WTC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal was for WTC extension, not housing | The site was proposed to GNLP as an extension to the Water Treatment Centre and therefore was not assessed for housing. | None |

WROXHAM

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | WROXHAM OVERVIEW |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: | 7 |
| SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN: | 0 Support, 4 Object, 3 Comment |

Wroxham has no carried forward allocations, no preferred sites, no reasonable alternatives, only three sites which are all judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

- FC suggest GNLP contradicts Playing Pitch Strategy
- Wroxham Parish Council supports the lack of new allocations.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Wroxham – Unreasonable Sites

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP0041 Wroxham Football Club, Trafford Park, 35 Skinners Lane, Wroxham |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Wroxham Parish Council | Comment | Agree development of site would be inappropriate for current road access, while road improvements would spoil riverside location. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Wroxham FC | Object | Unreasonable status will affect football club's ability to serve growing village and team's progress. Playing pitch strategy recommends WFC relocated in the growth triangle. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check contents of, and cross refer to Playing Pitch Strategy | The Playing Pitch Strategy does identify relocation of WFC in the action pan. However, this site is not considered suitable for housing development. | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2131 East of Salhouse Road, Wroxham (Unreasonable Residential Site) |
| 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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Wroxham Parish Council | Comment | Agree that site is unreasonable, local residents agree, too large and proximity to conservation area and Broads. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. This site is not allocated. | None |
| Hopkins Homes | Object | Addressing technical points re landscape and traffic impacts (attachment) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconsider landscape and traffic impacts | Landscape impacts (appendix C) and traffic impacts (appendix B and D) have been reconsidered. However the landscape and townscape impacts and impact on the Broads from leisure users outweigh the | None |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|--|----------------------------------|------|
| | | | | benefits of developing the site. | |
| Hopkins Homes | Object | Reaffirms site's suitability and refers to same attachment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above | As above | None |

| | |
|---|--|
| STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE: | Site GNLP2135 South of Wherry Gardens, Wroxham (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 | DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE | PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Wroxham Parish Council | Comment | Agree that site is unreasonable. Site is too large and would put pressure on roads and services. Proximity to conservation area and Broads. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | Noted. The site is not allocated. | None |
| Hopkins Homes | Object | Reaffirms site's suitability and attachment addresses constraints | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconsider landscape and traffic impacts | Landscape impacts (appendix C) and traffic impacts (appendix B and D) have been reconsidered. However the landscape and townscape impacts and topography of the site outweigh the benefits of developing the site. | None |

