

**MAIN TOWNS – SITE SUMMARIES**

## AYLSHAM (INCLUDING BLICKLING, BURGH & TUTTINGTON AND OULTON)

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	AYLSHAM OVERVIEW
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	50
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	14 Support, 19 Object, 17 Comment

Aylsham has 2 carried forward allocations, 1 preferred site (0311, 0595 and 2060 combined), 2 reasonable alternatives (0336 and 0596) and 2 sites which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

### Preferred Site GNLP0311/0595/2060

- Confirm size of primary school required and whether creation of new sixth form may be possible
- Investigate feasibility of proposed highway scheme
- Further evidence from Anglian Water possibly required
- Investigate GNLP0596 as a preferential site and if a car park to offset pressure on the town centre is achievable
- Ad policy requirements relating to transport, drainage and archaeology

#### Carried Forward Allocations AYL3/AYL4

- Remove or rephrase the text “Upgrades to the wastewater treatment works may be required”.
- Consider requirement for Non-housing development to meet the BREEAM "Very Good" water efficiency standard, or any equivalent successor.

#### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP0336

- Engagement with the Environment Agency about the country park, ecological mitigations and achieving overall biodiversity net gain
- Written confirmation required, and to be agree, of Water Recycling Centre capacity. Both current capacity and if/when upgrades are made
- Issues relating to transport, drainage, community facilities, historic environment, landscape impact, informal open space and biodiversity net gain.

#### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP0596

- Written confirmation required, and to be agree, of Water Recycling Centre capacity. Both current capacity and if/when upgrades are made
- Issues relating to access at Norwich Road for two vehicle accesses and non-vehicular access at Buxton Road, a school site, noise, air quality associated to the A140 and landscape setting considerations

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP0287

- Issues relating to access across the Marriott's Way, non-vehicular access points, provision of sports and community facilities, landscaping, and biodiversity net gain through the expansion of the adjacent Marriott's Way County Wildlife Site.

Unreasonable Site GNLP2059

- None

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

**Aylsham (including Blickling, Burgh and Tuttington and Oulton) – Preferred Site**

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0311, 0595 and 2060 Land south of Burgh Road and west of the A140, Aylsham (Preferred Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	22
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	3 Support, 11 Object, 8 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public - various	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape impact</li> <li>• traffic problems where Burgh Road meets Oakfield Road and again where Burgh Road meets Norwich Road/Red Lion Street.</li> <li>• no reference to the size of the primary school - minimum 210 pupils required.</li> <li>• Burgh Rd is too narrow for increased traffic.</li> <li>• A new 'downhill' (towards the A140) one-way section is proposed along Burgh Road from Oakfield Road to Foster Way.</li> <li>• Road widening on Burgh Road will exacerbate the difficulties of traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm two form of entry school required.</li> <li>• Investigate feasibility of highway scheme proposed by member of the public</li> </ul>	The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing needs to be provided through the GNLP and this site is considered to be suitable for residential development. Where feasible and reasonable new development includes provision for community	Allocate with alterations to policy wording.

		<p>congestion at the junction with the market place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Along Burgh Road is a line of mature dense tree line of oak, ash , lime and sycamore that would need removal for a new two-metre wide footpath. Ownership of this land has been the subject of discussion with Broadland District Council for several years and cannot legally be used by highways for new footpath provision.</li> </ul>		<p>facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>The documents provided for GNL0311, 0595 and 2060 give assurance for the deliverability of development. Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment. Including adjustments on requirements for highways, footways, education obligation, landscaping, and green infrastructure adjacent to the Bure Valley Walk.</p> <p>Importantly, too, the strategic requirement for new homes in Aylsham is being</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

				<p>kept to 550, based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy. This is change from the January 2020 consultation. A change that is prompted by a decision that a further 5,000 homes are needed across the Greater Norwich area.</p> <p>The concept for a 'transport hub' for Aylsham is noted, along with the fact that the idea features in the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives.</p>	
Members of public - various	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of new green space and plays areas proposed with new development. Traffic problems that will get worse. A 20 mph speed limit should be applied between Buckenham Road and Oakfield Road. Buses and cars cannot pass easily along sections of Burgh Road.</li> </ul>		<p>The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing needs to be provided through the GNLP and this site is considered to be suitable for</p>	None

				residential development. Where feasible and reasonable new development includes provision for community facilities and infrastructure.	
Burgh and Tuttington Parish Council	Comment	Capacity of the Anglian Water sewage works, consequent environmental impacts, and compliance with Policy VIII of the Aylsham Neighbourhood Plan.		This is a known constraint and a matter for ongoing dialogue to ensure capacity exists to accommodate new development.	Allocate with alterations to supporting text to emphasise the importance of engagement with Anglian Water.
Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.	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
Aylsham Town Council	Object	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burgh Road is narrow and busy.</li> <li>• Junctions of Burgh Road Oakfield Road and Norwich Road will cause issues if more traffic utilises them.</li> </ul>		Comments noted. Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment.	Allocate site with adjustments.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence on if the new A140/Burgh Road roundabout could cope.</li> <li>• Within consultation zone for the water recycling centre.</li> <li>• Plans for a school (including one moved from an existing site) would exacerbate traffic issues.</li> <li>• The density of development is higher than for other sites proposed.</li> <li>• There is an 'amber' assessment for flood risk.</li> <li>• Aylsham had a proportionally higher level of development under the JCS so should have a reduced number under this new plan.</li> <li>• Clarity wanted on why two points of access is required.</li> <li>• Needs to address Norfolk Minerals Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16.</li> </ul>		<p>Including adjustments on requirements for highways, footways, education obligation, landscaping, and green infrastructure adjacent to the Bure Valley Walk.</p>	
Sue Catchpole, District Councillor for Aylsham	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burgh Road is not the preferred site for the town</li> <li>• Norwich Road is expected to be developed first</li> <li>• A bus terminus on site would reduce the need for buses to enter the town centre</li> <li>• Electric hook ups for Electric cars should be provided in a car park on the Norwich Road site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate GNL0596 as a preferential site; and, if a car park to offset pressure on the town centre is achievable.</li> <li>• Investigate creation of a new Sixth Form.</li> </ul>	<p>The documents provided for GNL0311, 0595 and 2060 give assurance for the deliverability of development. Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment. Including adjustments on</p>	<p>Allocate GNL0311, 0595 and 2060 with alterations to policy wording.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A school is required and should be planned in too.</li> <li>• A sixth form at Aylsham High school is required</li> <li>• Demonstration needed of coordination and investigation into capacity of the Water Recycling Centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further evidence from Anglian Water possibly required.</li> </ul>	<p>requirements for highways, footways, education obligation, landscaping, and green infrastructure adjacent to the Bure Valley Walk.</p> <p>The concept for a 'transport hub' for Aylsham is noted, along with the fact that the idea features in the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives.</p>	
Environment Agency	Comment	<p>Aylsham WRC currently only has room to accommodate around 160 dwellings before it reaches capacity. Paragraph 314 [of the Draft Strategy] states that Anglian Water Services has plans to increase capacity at Aylsham WRC. Given the number of dwellings proposed, the Plan should outline the importance of early consultation with Anglian Water about potential options for foul waste in this area.</p>	<p>Written confirmation required, and to be agreed, of Water Recycling Centre capacity. Both current capacity and if/when upgrades are made.</p>	<p>Comments noted and integrated into supporting text.</p>	<p>Add importance of early consultation with Anglian Water about potential options for foul waste in the area either to the policy or supporting text.</p>

Norfolk Land Ltd	Support	Support for continued growth in Aylsham, above that proposed by the GNLP of 300 extra homes, due to the quality of its services, facilities and employment, together with good transport links.		Comment noted, but the strategic requirement for new homes in Aylsham is being kept to 550, based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy. This is change from the January 2020 consultation. A change that is prompted by a decision that a further 5,000 homes are needed across the Greater Norwich area.	Allocate with alterations to policy wording.
Historic England	Object	A policy wording change is proposed. Development should conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of the grade II listed Bure Valley Farmhouse (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset) through appropriate landscaping, setback and open space and design.	Consider policy amendment.	It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this.	Allocate site with policy wording to protect the setting of Bure Valley Farmhouse.

<p>Bidwells/ Hopkins Homes (site promoters)</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carriageway widening is required to achieve a minimum width of 5.5m over the full frontage and a 2.0m footway should also be provided to connect with the existing facility to west.</li> <li>• Appropriate turning head facilities provided to allow vehicles such as refuse vehicles to turn and enter/egress the site in forward gear.</li> <li>• Avoid conflict with the Buckenham Road junction.</li> <li>• Site access junctions would take the form of Priority T-junctions with Burgh Road, with key site access roads developed to a 'Type 2' and 'Type 3' standard.</li> <li>• Two additional possible points of access may be possible for emergency vehicles / non-motorised users - Rippingall Road to the west of the site (an existing residential cul-de-sac) and Station Road to the south-west of the site.</li> <li>• A Transport Assessment will be provided as part of any future planning application for the site and will confirm the suitability of the proposed access locations on to Burgh Road, including visibility and tracking assessments, appropriate junction capacity modelling,</li> </ul>	<p>Policy requirements relating to transport, drainage, and archaeology.</p>	<p>Comments noted and integrated into policy wording.</p>	<p>Allocate with alterations to policy wording.</p>
---	----------------	---	--	---	---

		<p>along with a detailed review of accessibility by sustainable modes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A site-wide Travel Plan would also be provided to support the proposed development, and to encourage and demonstrate uptake of travel by sustainable modes.</li><li>• Off-site drainage routes and land ownership will need to be established, including any easement requirements for land in third party ownership. If an off-site route to a watercourse is not feasible, a discharge to the public surface water sewer could be considered.</li><li>• The site is generally at 'very low' risk of flooding from surface water; however, areas of 'high', 'medium' &amp; 'low' risk flooding have been identified that are routed through the site with predicted flood depths in the range "below 300mm" to "over 900mm". Ideally these areas should be left undeveloped with all housing, infrastructure and drainage features located in areas of the site at 'very low' risk of flooding. If, however, housing is required in higher flood risk areas, hydraulic modelling will be required to demonstrate that the development will remain safe and not increase flood risk elsewhere.</li></ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There will be no adverse impact on the nearby Grade II Listed Building of Bure Valley Farmhouse, due to the screening provided by intervening shelter planting and the lack of any associative link between the Listed Building and the site itself.</li><li>• A Drainage Impact Assessment has been prepared by Anglian Water Services, which provides a recommendation for mitigation to ensure that development would not cause detriment to the capacity of the sewer system nor result in increased flood risk downstream. This would comprise installation of 194m<sup>3</sup> of off-line storage at the proposed connection location in Burgh Road.</li><li>• Small numbers of prehistoric, Roman, Medieval and Post-Medieval finds are recorded as being found on the site.</li></ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

### Aylsham (including Blickling, Burgh and Tuttington and Oulton) – Carried Forward Allocations

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy AYL3 Land at Dunkirk Industrial Estate (east), south of Banningham Road, Aylsham (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3 (one of which appear logged in error, referring to matters not applicable to this site)
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Aylsham Town Council	Support	Welcomes new employment to the area subject to the review of vehicular movements to the site and any emissions.		AYL3 remains deliverable and is carried forward.	None Reallocate site.
Anglian Water	Comment	Reference is made to upgrades to the wastewater treatment works potentially being required. Any required upgrades would normally be funded by Anglian Water as part of our business plan which is funded by customer bills. As such we would suggest the text should be removed or rephrased. Please also see comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove or rephrase the text “Upgrades to the wastewater treatment works may be required”.</li> <li>• Consider requirement for Non-housing development to meet the BREEAM "Very</li> </ul>	Energy and water matters dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy.	Reallocate but remove requirement for possible upgrade to wastewater treatment works.

			Good" water efficiency standard, or any equivalent successor.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy AYL4 Land at Dunkirk Industrial Estate (east), south of Banningham Road, Aylsham (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Aylsham Town Council	Support	Welcomes new employment to the area subject to the review of vehicular movements to the site and any emissions.		AYL4 remains deliverable and is carried forward.	None Reallocate site.
Member of public	Support	An important area of Aylsham that needs investment.		Support noted	None
Anglian Water	Comment	Reference is made to upgrades to the wastewater treatment works potentially being required. Any required upgrades would normally be funded by Anglian Water as part of our business plan which is funded by customer bills. As such we would suggest the text should be removed or rephrased. Please also see	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove or rephrase the text "Upgrades to the wastewater treatment works may be required".</li> <li>Consider requirement for Non-</li> </ul>	Energy and water matters dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy.	Reallocate but remove requirement for possible upgrade to wastewater treatment works.

		comments relating to Policy 2 of the Sustainable Communities of the Strategy document.	housing development to meet the BREEAM "Very Good" water efficiency standard, or any equivalent successor.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

### Aylsham (including Blickling, Burgh and Tuttington and Oulton) – Reasonable Alternative Sites

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0336 Next to River Bure, Aylsham (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	6
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 0 Object, 4 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – various	Comment	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The concept of this site to include more for the community in terms of leisure, retail and neighbourhood centre is positive. However, concerns about flood risk, a school being placed on the fringe of town and road access off the A140 or bure meadows development.</li> </ul>		Comments noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.
Environment Agency		Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The River Bure, a chalk stream which is a S41 NERC habitat [Section 41 habitats of principal importance] (NPPF 170 &amp; 174), flows through the land allocated to the North East of Aylsham</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement with the Environment Agency about the country park, ecological mitigations, and</li> </ul>	This is a known constraint and a matter for ongoing dialogue to ensure capacity exists to accommodate new development.	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<p>(GNLP0336), the development must not be on the flood plain as this will inhibit the natural functioning of the river and compromise the ability to reach Good WFD status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aylsham WRC currently only has room to accommodate around 160 dwellings before it reaches capacity. Paragraph 314 [of the Draft Strategy] states that Anglian Water Services has plans to increase capacity at Aylsham WRC. Given the number of dwellings proposed, the Plan should outline the importance of early consultation with Anglian Water about potential options for foul waste in this area.</li> </ul>	<p>achieving overall biodiversity net gain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written confirmation required, and to be agreed, of Water Recycling Centre capacity. Both current capacity and if/when upgrades are made.</li> </ul>		
Westmere Homes/Armstrong Rigg Planning (site promoters)	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The option for a scaled down development centred around approximately 150 dwellings (essentially the first phase of the larger scheme).</li> <li>• Norfolk County Council's strong preference would be the provision of the principle vehicular access to the site from the Bure Meadows development to the south.</li> <li>• The main point of access would be supplemented by an additional</li> </ul>	<p>Policy requirements relating to transport, drainage, community facilities, historic environment, landscape impact, informal open space, and biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>The documents provided for GNLP0336 give assurance for the deliverability of development, but GNLP0336 is not preferred. The alternative Burgh Road proposal has advantages in terms of access and proximity to the town</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<p>emergency access located at either the south east or south west corners of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of the most suitable site in the Town for a new primary school that would both complement and share the facilities currently available at Aylsham High School. (Two forms of entry approximately 2.1ha).</li> <li>• Sufficient land to deliver additional community benefits including a new site for the 1st Aylsham Scout Group.</li> <li>• The enhancement of the historic environment. A minor positive impact can be anticipated through the opening up of the riverside land in the northern part of the site to public access. This will present the opportunity to better reveal the connection of the river and the Aylsham Navigation (a non-designated heritage asset) to the town and conservation area, and particularly to the Grade II listed former watermill and other listed buildings and historic infrastructure that stand to the west on Mill Row.</li> <li>• A linear country park comprising a wildlife and recreation area along the banks of the River Bure on the northern edge of the site including a protected</li> </ul>		<p>centre. The second choice site and now allocated is GNLP0596. In comparison to GNLP0336, GNLP0596R is well-related to the town centre, and benefits from good access from Norwich Road.</p> <p>Importantly, too, the strategic requirement for new homes in Aylsham is being kept to 550, based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>wildlife habitat on the site's northernmost parcel. Planting will be supplemented with more impenetrable planting (e.g. blackthorn) to create some 'low-disturbance' areas parallel to the riverbanks to deter both pedestrian and dog entry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Enhanced connections with the local footpath networks allowing for improved pedestrian access to both the town centre and the Dunkirk Industrial Estate to the north.</li><li>• A scheme of flooding and surface water drainage attenuation along the northern and eastern fringes of the site which would provide the additional benefits of increased landscaping around the site's fringes and an extension of the wildlife zone in the north allowing for a net gain in biodiversity.</li></ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0596 Norwich Road, Aylsham (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	10
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 6 Object, 3 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – various	Support	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few services and facilities in village</li> </ul>		Comments noted	Allocate with alterations to policy wording.
Members of public – various	Object	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most favourable option due to the fact that they have come up with concrete suggestions for two access points, are prepared to look at the feasibility of a long stay car park and only plan to build 250 houses, as well as the support for the primary school as will the other sites. I do think further discussions are needed with the Town Council.</li> </ul>			Allocate with alterations to policy wording, including the idea of a transport hub.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Norwich Road site least preferred for transport, access to services, and wildlife reasons. Other sites can take 300 homes, offer a school site, and in the case of provide a riverside country park.</li> <li>• Concerns about loss of agricultural land, impact on landscape, and impact on local services.</li> <li>• Concerns about the traffic implications of developing this site, particularly given the existing pressures on the A140/Norwich Road roundabout.</li> </ul>			
Members of public – various	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GNPL031/0595/2060, Burgh Road, will create access problems where Burgh Road meets Oakfield Road and again where Burgh Road meets Norwich Road/Red Lion Street. For this reason I would suggest that your second option, GNLP/0596 Norwich Road would be preferable.</li> <li>• Questions the possibility to grow Aylsham more organically it would be best to develop the smaller volume of houses here and therefore a smaller volume of houses on the preferred site?</li> </ul>		<p>The constraints of Burgh Road are recognised but are addressed in representations for GNPL031/0595/2060.</p> <p>The observation about ‘organic’ development is acknowledged, but larger sites can also bring other advantages. To do with efficient use of land, provision of community facilities and infrastructure.</p>	Allocate with alterations to policy wording,

Aylsham Town Council	Object	<p>There is the opportunity for two exits – again the Town Council still have not been advised of why this is a requirement – and Norwich Road is more capable of accepting the additional traffic.</p> <p>The site would provide an ideal location for a transport hub as requested by the Town Council.</p>		<p>The potential for two access points on Norwich Road is recognised.</p> <p>The concept for a ‘transport hub’ for Aylsham is noted, along with the fact that the idea features in the Neighbourhood Plan’s objectives.</p>	<p>Allocate with alterations to policy wording, including the idea of a transport hub.</p>
Environment Agency	Comment	<p>Aylsham WRC currently only has room to accommodate around 160 dwellings before it reaches capacity. Paragraph 314 [of the Draft Strategy] states that Anglian Water Services has plans to increase capacity at Aylsham WRC.</p> <p>Given the number of dwellings proposed, the Plan should outline the importance of early consultation with Anglian Water about potential options for foul waste in this area.</p>	<p>Written confirmation required, and to be agreed, of Water Recycling Centre capacity. Both current capacity and if/when upgrades are made.</p>	<p>This is a known constraint and a matter for ongoing dialogue to ensure capacity exists to accommodate new development.</p>	<p>Add importance of early consultation with Anglian Water about potential options for foul waste in the area either to the policy or supporting text.</p>
Cornerstone Planning/Norfolk Homes (site promoters)	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We reiterate/clarify the proposed allocation of this site for circa 300 dwellings, access, land for community</li> </ul>	<p>Policy requirements relating to access at Norwich Road for two vehicle accesses and</p>	<p>The documents provided for GNL0596 give assurance for the</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<p>use (2-hectare primary school site), public open space and associated infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education/Children's services that there is a requirement for a 2ha site to allow the building of a new 2FE/ 420 place school. We confirm that we are willing and able to make provision for such on the proposed (Norwich Road, 0596) site, as indicated on the attached Indicative Masterplan, and at any stage of the development required by the County Council.</li> <li>• The Town Council would like a transport hub included in the development. The Town Council rejected Burgh Road as the most favourable site and instead would only agree to Norwich Road.</li> <li>• Norfolk Homes has a legal control over all the land in question</li> <li>• Norfolk Homes has undertaken considerable work with a view to being able to make an early planning application and ensure early delivery. Work undertaken includes: Indicative Masterplan; Access Plans (including off-site highway works); Tree Survey; Air Quality Assessment; Noise Assessment; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; Ecology and Habitat Survey.</li> </ul>	<p>non-vehicular access at Buxton Road, a school site, noise, air quality associated to the A140, and landscape setting considerations.</p>	<p>deliverability of development, and GNL0596 is now allocated. Of the sites available in Aylsham, GNL0596R is well-related to the town centre, and benefits from good access from Norwich Road.</p> <p>This site has been uprated from reasonable to allocated in order to part fulfil an increased housing figure for Aylsham of 550. A change that is prompted by a decision that a further 5,000 homes are needed across the Greater Norwich area.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anglian Water can confirm that there is currently capacity at Aylsham Water Recycling Centre to accommodate the 300 dwellings proposed.</li> <li>• A large area open space is proposed for the central part of the development with views to the south-east over the proposed lagoon. This will link in with a landscape buffers along the southern boundary with the A140 and along the eastern boundary with Diggens Farmhouse will help to soften the impact of development on the surrounding locality as well as making provision for a new footpath/cycle link through the site.</li> <li>• Consideration of 'dark skies' policy and mitigations to minimise light spillage.</li> <li>• Landscape and townscape mitigation solutions, including: strong architectural statement or 'gateway' design solution along Norwich Road; and, consideration of countryside views from the south-east viewing what would be the new urban edge of Aylsham.</li> <li>• Off-site highway works on Norwich Road and at junction leading to Buxton Road.</li> <li>• Based on the assessment results, air quality issues are not considered a</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>constraint to planning consent for the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Based on our survey data, noise levels at the site are generally low enough that non-acoustic glazing and trickle vents can be used across the majority of the site. However, there are some areas of the site that may require acoustically rated glazing and trickle ventilators to achieve the indoor ambient noise levels set out in professional practice guidance.</li></ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

**Aylsham (including Blickling, Burgh and Tuttington and Oulton) – Unreasonable Sites**

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0287 North of Marriotts Way, Aylsham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	4
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	3 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public - various	Support	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aylsham has been completely inundated by new housing for the last few years. The town will not survive as a community with any more growth. Please- no more houses.</li> <li>• This site would mean a road crossing the Marriott's Way and loss of an area widely used by walkers and cyclists.</li> <li>• Not a suitable site for expansion. This would put additional pressure on the existing estate roads and is an unwelcome urbanisation of the Marriott's Way. Its distance from the town centre makes this unsustainable.</li> </ul>		<p>Concerns about overall development level in Aylsham are noted. As too the possible effect on the highway and Marriott's Way.</p> <p>GNLP0287 is not considered the preferred alternative over Site GNLP0311, 0595 and 2060; and, GNLP0596.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

				<p>By comparison GNL0287 is more distant and disconnected from the centre of Aylsham.</p> <p>Importantly, too, the strategic requirement for new homes in Aylsham is being kept to 550, based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
<p>Cheffins Planning on behalf of William Young (site promoters)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development is significantly less than stated at circa 125 dwellings as opposed to the 250 dwellings. In addition, the development will provide for a fully serviced site for a health facility.</li> <li>• The site promoter is also committed to providing contributions to fund a new all-weather pitch to complement the sports facilities located to the south west of the site.</li> <li>• A single point of access is to be provided across the Marriott's Way. The proposed access will form a northwards extension of the road which</li> </ul>	<p>Policy requirements relating to access across the Marriott's Way, non-vehicular access points, provision of sports and community facilities, landscaping, and biodiversity net gain through the expansion of the adjacent Marriott's Way County Wildlife Site.</p>	<p>GNLP0287 is not considered the preferred alternative over Site GNL0311, 0595 and 2060; and, GNL0596. By comparison GNL0287 is more distant and disconnected from the centre of Aylsham.</p> <p>Importantly, too, the strategic</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<p>already serves both Aylsham Football Club and the recently completed Woodgate Way development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A further significant benefit arising from this development is the proposition to manage the triangular shaped parcel of land to the west of (circa 2.5 hectares).</li> <li>• A separate pedestrian/ cycle route is also proposed from the centre of the scheme providing access to both the Marriott's Way but also Liz Jones Way in the adjacent housing development.</li> <li>• When comparing the level off growth with other towns the figures appear very low with 745 and 625 dwellings proposed for Diss and Harleston respectively, whilst only 521 dwellings are proposed for Aylsham. However, the above figure needs to be treated with caution as 225 dwellings of the 525 figure represents existing commitments with only 300 dwellings being provided. The 225 dwellings are largely complete. This is an exceptionally low figure for what is the largest town in Broadland District, which can accommodate significant levels of development without an adverse impact upon the environment.</li> <li>• It is also apparent that the figure of 14% of total housing growth being targeted towards main towns is rather low when</li> </ul>		<p>requirement for new homes in Aylsham is being kept to 550, based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

		compared with the higher level of delivery associated with such settlements.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2059 B1145 Henry Page Road/ Norwich Road, Aylsham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	2
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of the public	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aylsham has been completely inundated by new housing for the last few years. The town will not survive as a community with any more growth. Please- no more houses.</li> </ul>		GNLP2059 is not considered the preferred alternative over Site GNLP0311, 0595 and 2060; and, GNLP0596. By comparison 2059 is disconnected from the centre of Aylsham, due to being south of the A140/B1145 roundabout.	None  Site not to be allocated.

				Importantly, too, the strategic requirement for new homes in Aylsham is being kept to 550, based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy.	
Aylsham Town Council	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any entrance would be too close to the roundabout with the A140. The site is also outside the natural boundary for the town.</li> </ul>		Noted	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

## DISS INCLUDING PART OF ROYDON

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	DISS OVERVIEW
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	132
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	28 Support,721 Object, 32 Comment

Diss including part of Roydon has 5 carried forward allocations, 2 preferred sites (0102 and 0250/0342/0119/0291 combined), 2 reasonable alternative sites (0341 and 1045) and 9 sites which are judged to be unreasonable (8 Residential and 1 Non-residential).

Main issues:

### Preferred Site GNLP0102

- The retention of employment and appropriateness of residential development on this site
- Issues over the principle and density of residential development in this location, as well as a variety of highways impacts
- Possible implications and mitigations on the adjacent Frenze Back County Wildlife Site

#### Preferred Site 0250/0342/0119/0291 combined

- Matters concerning overall strategic policy for housing in Diss, capacity of infrastructure and services, traffic constraints, landscape intrusion and the need to expand the adjacent cemetery
- Ruling out GNLP0362 and GNLP2014 on landscape grounds is queries given the similarities and proximity to this allocation
- Highway scheme and burial land contribution will need negotiation
- Investigate removal of site GNLP0119
- Requirement for SUDs needed in policy
- Policy wording for protecting or re-routing public rights of way and safeguarding route of high-pressure pipeline

#### Carried Forward Allocation DIS1

- None

#### Carried Forward Allocation DIS2

- Help to relocate Norfolk Feather Company and creation of landscape connection from Diss Park to DIS2
- Investigate provision of open space and riverside walk
- Investigate site for new leisure centre and business hub
- Consideration against the Neighbourhood Plan

#### Carried Forward Allocation DIS3

- Consideration of the landscape gap between Diss and Roydon
- Consideration of policy requirements, particularly number/density of development and landscaping

#### Carried Forward Allocation DIS8

- Follow outcome of planning application 2020/0478

### Carried Forward Allocation DIS9

- Reconsider site boundary adjacent to Frenze Beck County Wildlife Site

### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP0341

- Public opinion against development.
- The site's current status in the South Norfolk Local Plan as 'Important Local Open Space'.
- The site's status in the Norfolk Historic Environment Record as NHER.33463.
- Likely designation in the Neighbourhood Plan as a Local Green Space.
- Status as UK biodiversity priority habitat 'Wood-Pasture and Parkland'.
- The need for further ecological studies.
- Investigate other brownfield sites, mixed-use development options, and improved bus travel, and improved car parking solutions.
- Continued engagement with community planning colleagues and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
- Can Scott Properties negotiate a scheme that is acceptable to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Town Council and provides benefits in terms of public access to Parish Fields and biodiversity net gain.

### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP1045

- Investigate opportunity for higher density, efficient use of land in a sustainable location, with fewer landscape constraints than on the edge of Diss
- Consider the compatibility of uses and the need for employment land
- Consider form and density of development
- Issues include the principle of residential use, vehicular access from Norwich Road, a pedestrian/cycle link between Nelson Road and Prince Regent Way and mitigation of noise from railway

### Unreasonable Site GNLP0185

- The principle of residential development near to employment uses

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP0362

- Site is no worse than other greenfield sites preferred by the GNLP team and would be better than site GNLP0341 (Parish Fields). Better to extend into the countryside where mitigation can be provided
- Issues include inappropriate access immediately adjacent to the site and wider network consideration on the B1077 into Diss, loss of countryside
- Investigate landscape impact and distance to main services
- Site is in administrative boundary of Roydon and thus inappropriate to the 10-20 homes required in Roydon

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP0599

- Consider partial development of the site to meet housing need, the railway provides screening of the site from the landscape valley and with more investigation highway constraints may not be insurmountable.
- Investigate the distinct design character of Walcot Green rather than treating the site as an extension to Diss
- Assessed as unsuitable under the Neighbourhood Plan process
- Visual impact on adjacent nursing home
- Highways constraints – carriageway, width alignment and no footpath provision

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP0606

- Partial development could be suitable compared to other preferred sites/reasonable alternatives
- Considerations of a suitable access arrangement being achievable off Factory Lane
- Investigate extent of flood risk constraining the developable area, as well as landscape and access to school considerations

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP1003

- Investigate the distinct character of Walcot Green, rather than treating the site as an extension to Diss
- Partial development could be suitable
- Assessed as unsuitable under the Neighbourhood Plan process
- Highway constraints – carriageway width, alignment and no footpath provision

#### Unreasonable Site – GNLP1038

- Adjoining lanes unsuitable to allow development
- Loss of landscape gap between Diss and Roydon
- Highways constraints – carriageway width, alignment and no footpath provision

#### Unreasonable Site – GNLP1044

- Investigate whether highways constraints can be overcome with a smaller scheme.
- Development in the countryside may offer more opportunities for mitigation than selecting GNLP0341 (Parish Fields)
- Investigate the design character of Walcot Green, rather than treating sites as add ons for Diss
- Conduct further appraisal of site based on the new lower proposal for 120 homes and the new information submitted. Key issues are highways, landscape and drainage.

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP2104

- Matters to investigate are access to nearby schools, why highway improvements are ruled out and why the site cannot be considered in part
- Considerations of a suitable access arrangement being achievable off Factory Lane

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP2067

- None

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

**Diss including part of Roydon – Preferred Sites**

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0102 Land at Frontier Agriculture Ltd, Sandy Lane, Diss (Preferred Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	6
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 1 Object, 4 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – two comments	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is inappropriate to squeeze housing into the middle of an employment site and adjacent to a railway. The site should remain in employment use. Diss needs more land designated for employment use and a policy to generate new work opportunities.</li> </ul>	The retention of employment and appropriateness of residential development on this site.	<p>Employment use is fully established on the Frontier Agriculture land. The principle of redevelopment for residential use is acceptable due to the highly sustainable location</p> <p>Allocations in Diss will only be necessary if</p>	Allocate with alterations to policy wording.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conversion of this site to residential development would be contrary to the need to retain land for employment purposes. Although effectively a brownfield site, the temptation to introduce further high density housing in this area, where first families will want to extend or sell, should be resisted. Residential development of this 3.6ha (plus 1.01 ha for GLNP0185) in Diss is unjustified.</li> </ul>		<p>progress ceases on the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan. The requirement for new homes in Diss is expected to remain at 400, based on the Part 1 Strategy. Yet GNLP0102 is a unique site due to its brownfield status and proximity to the railway station. Should the site become vacant, as appears likely, its redevelopment would be automatic in order to make effective use of land. On this basis GNLP0102 should be included in the GNLP rather than deferred to the neighbourhood planning process.</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

Diss Town Council	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to retain and indeed expand our employment land otherwise we risk becoming a dormitory town.</li> <li>• Density of over 60 homes/ha, more than double that of any other location in Diss.</li> <li>• highway constraints -- we estimate that at least 50% and up to 70% of road traffic would turn left and</li> <li>• travel under the railway bridge and along Frenze Hall Lane.</li> <li>• Sandy Lane [Walcott Green] is very narrow between the proposed site and the bridge bordered. Constructing a suitably wide carriageway, and 2 metre wide footpath, is not possible. On one side is the railway; on</li> </ul>	<p>Issues over the principle and density of residential development in this location, as well as a variety of highways impacts.</p>	<p>Policy requirements to be reviewed. Such as the extent of highways improvements.</p>	<p>Allocate with alterations to policy wording.</p>
-------------------	--------	---	---	---	---

		<p>the other side is a drainage ditch.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frenze Hall Lane is already busy. With existing and planned development 500 to 700 traffic movements a day is estimated.</li> <li>• There would also be a significant increase in traffic using the Sawmills Road/ A1066 junction which would require road improvements to aid flow on/off Victoria Road.</li> </ul>			
Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.	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	This proposal is adjacent to Frenze Beck CWS. This CWS is a vital part of local green infrastructure with public access granted by	Possible implications and mitigations on the adjacent Frenze Beck County Wildlife site.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 3. An example being the policy on Recreational	No change to policy.

		the Waveney Rivers Trust. Adjacent housing will add to visitor pressure on the CWS and should contribute to the restoration of the CWS and management of local green infrastructure in order to avoid visitor pressure impacts on the CWS.		Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.	
Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Frontier Agriculture Ltd (site promoter)	Support	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to retain and indeed expand our employment land otherwise we risk becoming a dormitory town.</li> <li>• Fully supports the principle of the allocation of the Site for comprehensive redevelopment, but the policy should be amended to include flexibility and support for both residential or employment land uses.</li> <li>• Policy should not impose specific requirements linked to</li> </ul>	Flexibility of policy wording to reflect: redevelopment or continued employment use; remediation costs; uncertainty over affordable housing viability; and, highways improvements being limited to the extent of the site frontage.	<p>Policy requirements to be reviewed. Such as the extent of highways improvements. Clarification needed that the railway car park obligations does not apply to this site.</p> <p>Consideration needed of housing density. Given the town centre location, and proximity to public transport, a higher density development</p>	Allocate with alterations to policy wording.

		<p>the deliverability of affordable housing in percentage or unit terms, particularly given site remediation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy refers to station car park expansion, and is ambiguous about it being on GNLP0102 land or not, The requirement should be removed or it made clear that GNLP0102 should not prejudice car park expansion on adjacent land.</li> <li>• Policy refers to widening of Sandy Lane. This should be clarified to widening to a 5.5 metre minimum along the extent of the site frontage.</li> <li>• The requirement for a 2-metre wide footway from GNLP0102 northwards to Frenze Hall Lane is not considered justified,</li> </ul>		<p>should be a sought. Provided the design and layout is appropriate to the site context and character of Diss.</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

		<p>and should be limited to the site frontage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rewording of Policy DIS 9 is suggested to include the widening of Sandy Lane, that is moving the fifth bullet point of GNLP0102 to the wording of DIS 9.</li></ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0250/0342/0119/0291 Land north of the Cemetery, west of Shelfanger Road and East of Heywood Road, Diss (Preferred Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	24
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	7 Support, 12 Object, 5 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – various	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many houses. Busy road, flood risk, traffic, pollution, wildlife/environmental damage, no support for services like the doctors, dentists, etc, new houses will be squeezed onto narrow roads and will look unsightly.</li> <li>• Strain on services e.g. bin collections are fortnightly and landfill already heaving. No consideration of the</li> </ul>	Matters concerning overall strategic policy for housing in Diss, capacity of infrastructure and services, traffic constraints, landscape intrusion, and the need to expand the adjacent cemetery.	Allocations in Diss will only be necessary if progress ceases on the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan. The requirement for new homes in Diss is expected to remain at 400,	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>once beautiful area – building ‘Lego’ houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify, allocate and gift adequate extra land for Diss cemetery. Provision for the link road, without leaving them contingent upon planning conditions.</li> <li>• Commitments for development have recently already saturated Diss without increasing facilities.</li> <li>• <b>TRAFFIC ISSUES:</b> Commuter times are particularly busy as workers avoid the frequently congested A1066 in order to reach the A140. Also congestion caused by cars dropping off and picking up pupils from Diss High School. A sharp bend on the Heywood Road/Burston Road junction has been an accident spot over the years.</li> </ul> <p><b>WILDLIFE:</b> The Heywood Road cemetery is a haven for wildlife. <b>COMMUNITY AMENITY:</b> The footpaths on this field are extremely well used by local dog</p>		<p>based on the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------	--

		<p>owners and Individuals and local walking groups.</p> <p><b>CEMETERY EXPANSION:</b>  Allow expansion for 50 years, not the short term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would ask that any development in this part of town, is built with a little more empathy to the surroundings than the current development being built on the eastern side of town. We also ask that the services available in the town, especially medical and educational, are reviewed and resourced before commencing with the GNLP proposed house construction, that could give rise to a 20% population growth in the town.</li> <li>• We would ask that any development in this part of town, is built with a little more empathy to the surroundings than the current development being built on the eastern side of town. We also ask that the services available in the town, especially medical</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>and educational, are reviewed and resourced before commencing with the GNLP proposed house construction, that could give rise to a 20% population growth in the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A combination of factors make the suite unsuitable for highways reasons -- bends on Shelfanger Road and very busy junction with Walcot Rd (with High School)/ Shelfanger Rd/Mount St (single track).</li> <li>• Concerns over habitat and higher emissions in the context of climate change. Need to preserve trails for people who enjoy walking.</li> </ul>			
Members of public – various	Support	<p>Building houses on these four sites (GNLP0250/0342/0119/0291) seems to us to be entirely reasonable, although it will mean that the northern boundary of the town is extended into open countryside. Further comments challenge what was ruled out as well as what was put forward. This</p>	<p>Ruling out GNLP0362 and GNLP2104 on landscape grounds is queried given the similarities and proximity to GNLP0250/0342/0119/0291. Whether GNLP0341 should be “unreasonable”.</p>	Noted	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		includes justifications for ruling out GNLP0362 and GNLP2104, as well justifications for considering development on The Fields (GNLP0341).			
Diss Town Council	Support	We agreed with the GNLP especially as this was an area they were already looking at. It was seen as an option that gives a west to east link road connecting Shelfanger Road to Heywood Road and that it would help alleviate traffic pressures in the north of the town especially on roads such as Sunnyside. We were also pleased to see the GNLP recognised our earlier submissions about the need to expand the cemetery. Recommendation: That Diss Town Council support this preferred GNLP option.	Matters to investigate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiation of highway scheme.</li> <li>• Negotiation of burial land contribution.</li> </ul>	Noted	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.
Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

				include it in the allocation policy	
Strutt & Parker LLP on behalf of Scott Properties (site promoters)	Support	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recommends that site reference GNLP0119 is excluded from the policy and is not put forward as an allocation or part of the wider site. The site has recently changed ownership and would not form a viable portion to bring forward with the wider site given its existing residential use and value. In addition to this, it is not possible to achieve sufficient visibility splays to achieve a separate vehicular access, which further impacts its viability to be brought forward.</li> <li>• Scott Properties are actively engaging with the Landowners of GNLP0250 and have already agreed terms with GNLP0291.</li> <li>• Provision of an area of c. 3.4 acres (at 800 burial plots per acre) at nil cost to the Town Council could</li> </ul>	<p>Matters to investigate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove GNLP0119.</li> </ul>	Noted	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>impact on the viability of the site and the ability of the site to deliver at least 200 dwellings as per the allocation wording. My client would question the extent to which projected future burial needs well into the next century and beyond the Local Plan period should be prioritised over the need to deliver housing to meet the identified needs during the Local Plan period. The Masterplan proposes an area of 1.2 acres which would provide an additional c. 20 years supply (as per the Local Plan period), and we would welcome further discussions with the Town Council and GNLP Team on this subject.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details on the site schematic plan on the associated road and pedestrian connections as well as the plans to retain and enhance the existing Public Rights of Way</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree a proportionate contribution to burial land.</li> <li>• Identifying link road route and securing other highways improvements in policy.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>(PROW) to the north and west of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aim of providing a vehicular connection between Shelfanger Road and Heywood Road is supported, as it will improve connectivity to the north of the Diss and provide a degree of relief to Sunnyside from vehicle users who would otherwise need to take this route.</li> <li>• The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and as such, flood risk at the site is considered to be low to negligible. However, it is noted that once the proposed development introduces new paved areas, the surface run off will increase and require management. Flood Risk Assessments and Surface Water Drainage Strategies required at the planning application.</li> <li>• A Landscape Constraints and Opportunities Appraisal Plan has been prepared by Lockhart Garratt and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation and agreement needed from the Highways Authority.</li> <li>• Requirement for SUDs needed in policy</li> <li>• Policy wording for protecting or re-routing public rights of way.</li> </ul>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>provides an indicative landscape plan, outlining the location of retained PROW's, developable areas within the wider allocation and potential access points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of the high pressure pipeline as referred to within the policy, located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site, and applicable the 14.3m Building Proximity Distance (confirmed by Cadent) where no buildings may be constructed.</li> <li>• Initial discussions have taken place with private house builders who have expressed an interest in purchasing the site on either an unconditional (post planning) or subject to planning basis. An updated planning and delivery strategy will be agreed following pre-application advice and public consultation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy wording to safeguard the route of the high-pressure pipeline.</li> <li>• Details for the Statement of Common Ground.</li> </ul>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

### Diss including part of Roydon – Carried Forward Allocations

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy DIS1 Land north of Vince's Road, Diss (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	4
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of the public	Comment	Tastefully distributed housing here has the potential of enhancing the area and access to amenity space for others, provided existing natural space is retained and integrated.		Noted.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.
Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

Bidwells on behalf of Rackham Builders (site promoters)	Support	Confirmed to be deliverable and set to progress at the earliest available opportunity.		Support noted	None
Diss Town Council	Support	Noted that this is an existing allocation with an access via Frenze Hall Lane but is subject to an acceptable design and layout being achieved.		Support noted	None

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy DIS2 Land off Park Road, Diss (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	5
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 1 Object, 3 Comments

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of public	Object	DIS 2 & 7: Retail use should be deleted from the sui generis approved uses for DIS 7 and effort made to help relocate the feather factory and to create a landscape connection between the Diss Town Park and DIS 2.	Investigate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help to relocate Norfolk Feather Company and creation of landscape connection from Diss Park to DIS2.</li> </ul>	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.
Member of public	Comment	Proximity to the Waveney river provides a prime site for enhancing access and improvement of the area for natural amenity but	Investigate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space and provision of a riverside walk.</li> </ul>	Noted	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		residential development should be strictly limited.			
Diss Town Council	Comment	Diss Town Council continue to look at developing this combined site for health, leisure and housing. We are already in discussions with both Norfolk County Council and South Norfolk Council about combining DIS 2 with DIS 7 (combined area 6.81 ha) to use as the site of a new Leisure Centre and a possible business hub, together with delivering more housing, open green space and riverside walks. It would also enable us to improve the walking and cycling connectivity between Diss and Palgrave. This is currently being assessed for feasibility by both Norfolk County Council and South Norfolk Council. They are due to report back on this in March 2020. A small number of homes (approx.10) will be built to enable the rest of the site	Investigate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site for a new leisure centre and business hub.</li> <li>• Consideration against Neighbourhood Plan.</li> </ul>	Noted	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		to deliver open space, natural green space and a riverside walk. It will also allow the Neighbourhood plan group to deliver better walking and cycling connectivity between Diss and Palgrave.			
Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy DIS3 Land off Denmark Lane, Roydon, Diss (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	5
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 2 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public - two	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This critical, if small, site on the edge of the A1066 has high visual impact. It may look convenient on a map to complete zoned residential to a straight line, but this is desk-planning with little regard to the actual look and feel of the land. The site needs to revert back to open space so as to emphasise and not diminish the value of the landscape gap between</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of the landscape gap between Diss and Roydon, as well as the site's continued allocation.</li> </ul>	Noted	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>Diss and Roydon and to avoid allotments butting up against housing. A planted woodland strip along the edge of housing land would be beneficial to the look and character of the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This agricultural land currently provides a rural buffer for the dense housing estate to the north. The proposed 42 property development here would provide 'more of the same', but the whole site should be undeveloped ideally to provide a 'landscape belt' for existing housing and northerly aspect from the A1066.</li> </ul>			
Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.	Energy and water matters dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary	None

				to include it in the allocation policy.	
Bidwells on behalf of Rackham Builders (site promoters)	Support	Confirmed to be deliverable and set to progress at the earliest available opportunity.		Support noted	None
Diss Town Council	Comment	A figure of less than 42 may be more appropriate as there is a requirement for a 10m landscape belt on the western boundary which may limit capacity.	Consideration of policy requirements, particularly number/density of development, and landscaping.	Noted	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy DIS8 Land at Station Road/Nelson Road, Diss (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	2
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.	Energy and water matters dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy.	None
Diss Town Council	Support	The part of the site which was an old coal yard has already been developed as a car park for railway users. Diss Town Council had pre-planning discussions at the end of last year with a developer	Follow outcome of application 2020/0478.	Comment noted  This long-standing employment allocation that has not come forward. This area is in transition, as	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>wishing to build 'Extra Care Retirement Homes' on the remainder of the site. We were supportive of the scheme that was put forward at this meeting. Since our meeting on 11 March 2020 we have received a planning application 2020/0478 from the developer for an Extra Care building containing 77 apartments (68 x 2-bed and 9 x 1- bed). This will meet the employment use criteria and as the apartments allow full independent living accommodation should be included as part of the numbers required in the new local plan.</p>		<p>shown by the approval of 2020/0478 -- demolition of existing bungalow and erection of an extra care building containing 77 apartments and communal facilities, Land North Of Nelson Road Diss Norfolk.</p> <p>Allocation of DIS8 likely to be superseded.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy DIS9 Land at Sandy Lane (north of Diss Business Park), Diss (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 0 Object, 3 Comments

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Anglian Water	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.	Energy and water matters 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	This site partially overlaps the northern end of Frenze Beck CWS. We recommend that the boundary of this allocation is reviewed and that the overlapping area is	Reconsider site boundary adjacent to Frenze Beck CWS.	Noted  Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		secured. Anecdotal records of turtle dove, a rapidly declining migrant species that is at risk of extinction as a UK breeding species, are known from the local area and there is the potential for this area to contribute vital nesting habitat.		Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	
Diss Town Council	Comment	An existing allocation in the local plan from 2015 and will be carried forward into the new plan.		Noted	None

### Diss including part of Roydon – Reasonable Alternative Sites

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0341 Land between Shelfanger Road and Mount Street, Diss (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	47
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 support, 43 Object 4 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – various – all opposed to allocating GNLP0341 for residential development	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Local Green Space - it is unique to Diss.</li> <li>• Cultural heritage, in 1964, John Betjeman (later Poet Laureate) referred to the site as “A bit of country coming right into the town - a little park”.</li> <li>• In 1997, this parcel of land was recorded in the Norfolk Gardens Survey Report, commissioned by English Heritage, and given a Grade** (regional</li> </ul>	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public opinion against development.</li> <li>• Consideration of the site’s current status in the South Norfolk Local Plan as ‘Important Local Open Space’.</li> <li>• The site’s status in the Norfolk Historic Environment Record as NHER.33463.</li> <li>• Likely designation in the Neighbourhood Plan as a Local Green Space.</li> </ul>	Allocations in Diss will only be necessary if progress ceases on the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan. The requirement for new homes in Diss is expected to remain at 400, based on the Part 1 Strategy.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>importance) listing. In 1998, it was designated as Norfolk Historic Environment Record site 33463, '</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group Parish Fields Friends has launched two petitions which have collected more than 2,600 signatures against construction of dwellings on Parish Fields.</li> <li>• In August 2019, Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan consultants AECOM rated Parish Fields “red” for development.</li> <li>• Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitat 'Wood-pasture and Parkland'. It incorporates a number of large oak trees (some evidently over 200 years old).</li> <li>• The present area (approximately 3 ha) was landscaped late in the 18<sup>th</sup> century to form The Lawn, a wooded landscape parkland for The Cedars, a prominent town house across Mount</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status as UK biodiversity priority habitat 'Wood-Pasture and Parkland'.</li> <li>• The need for further ecological studies.</li> <li>• Investigate other brownfield sites, mixed-use development options, and improved bus travel, and improved car parking solutions.</li> </ul>	<p>Site unlikely to be allocated, due to consultation concerns raised..</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>Street which stands today. (Norfolk Historic Environment register as NHER 33463)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian access to the town between Shelfanger Court and St Nicholas Street is rather hazardous and not suitable for wheelchair users. The junction with Roydon Road is also very difficult for wheelchair/mobility scooter users.</li> <li>• A bat survey undertaken in July 2019 identified that no fewer than eight species used the site for feeding.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be developed before considering greenfield development, referencing the CPRE Norfolk campaign.</li> <li>• It has prime potential for acquisition by Diss Council as an open space for encouraging nature to thrive close to the town.</li> <li>• The need for giving GNLP0341 “alternative”</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>status is only necessary because you – the planners – have rejected at least two larger sites for what would seem to be inadequate, if not specious, reasons. GNL0341 is qualitatively different to any other site in Diss. Its astonishing that the GNL0 Team repeat the propaganda of the developers; and, is unethical.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing GNL0341 would be contrary to GNL0 principles: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 'Identify land that should be protected from development.'</li> <li>2. ensure the 'Infrastructure includes a wide range of facilities and services such as: green spaces.'</li> </ol> </li> <li>• 2,600 people object to any development on Parish Fields, respect their wishes. As an alternative vision, reclaim all brownfield sites, promote spaces for</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		business start-ups and community facilities; encourage bus travel, and install car park stacking systems.			
Diss & District Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Steering Group is attempting to afford Parish Fields the greatest level of protection possible from development.</li> <li>• A local historian and heritage expert is giving ongoing support to evidence the considerable heritage credentials of Parish Fields.</li> <li>• 1964 John Betjeman (later Poet Laureate) visited Diss to make a film called 'Something about Diss', and he remarked on The Lawn. "On the other side of Mount Street do you see that bit of country? ... A bit of country coming right into the town - a little park".</li> <li>• 1980s Commander Patrick Taylor died and The Lawn area was sold</li> </ul>	Continued engagement with community planning colleagues, and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group directly.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>to WBA Gaze &amp; Sons. The site is still used for grazing cattle. The Parish Fields area was also sold, one part to Diss Town Council (for the Health Centre) and the other to South Norfolk Council (for the Youth Centre, two car parks and the Citizens Advice Bureau).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1997 The Lawn recorded in the Norfolk Gardens Survey Report, commissioned by English Heritage, and given a Grade** (regional importance) listing.</li> <li>• 1998 'The Cedars and The Lawn' designated as Norfolk Historic Environment Record site 33463, 'The only example of a detached landscape park within a town in Norfolk'.</li> </ul>			
Strutt & Parker LLP on behalf of Scott Properties (site promoters)	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scott Properties has prepared a scheme for the site that would see it developed for a modest</li> </ul>	Whether Scott Properties can negotiate an alternative scheme that is acceptable to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Town	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>development of 24 retirement bungalows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of 24 single storey dwellings would equate to the development of 45% of the site and will fulfil a specific housing need that is not being met by other sites proposed for allocation within Diss.</li> <li>• There has been a lot of local objection to the proposals on environmental grounds, however, this does not acknowledge that the site is currently in private ownership with no public access and as such the owners have a free hand over its future agricultural use and management.</li> <li>• Scott Properties has been working with Natural England on a steering group for developing a Nature Toolkit for small and medium sizes sites, and early indications show that a significant increase in biodiversity</li> </ul>	<p>Council; and, provides benefits in terms of public access to Parish Fields and biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>net gain (20%+) could be achieved through sensitive development of the site alongside targeted new habitat creation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is in a single ownership, it is therefore achievable as there are no complex land ownerships or legal issues to compromise its ability to come forward for development. It is available now and would represent a realistic and deliverable development in the current market conditions.</li> </ul>			
Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listed in the South Norfolk Local Plan as 'Important Local Open Space'</li> <li>• Listed in the Norfolk Historic Environment Record as NHER.33463 as 'The only example of a detached landscape park within a town in Norfolk', and this status is endorsed by a Norfolk</li> </ul>		Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>Gardens Trust survey report, 1997 (funded by English Heritage) and the landscape historian Professor Tom Williamson.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitted as a candidate site for listing by Historic England as a rare example of a detached landscape park in a market town setting (case pending).</li> <li>• A candidate for 'Local Green Space' designation in the forthcoming Diss &amp; District Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• A significant wildlife reservoir and network linked to local gardens, for instance a bat survey undertaken in July 2019 showed that no less than eight species used the site for feeding.</li> <li>• A notable Green Infrastructure asset which is part of the 'green corridor' linking Diss with its rural hinterland.</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An example of the UK biodiversity priority habitat 'Wood-Pasture and Parkland'. Noted by Poet Laureate John Betjeman in his film about Diss (1964) as integral to the character of the market town and its rural links, being 'a little bit of country coming right into town', as he put it.</li> </ul>			
Diss Town Council	Object	<p>We were surprised to see the site recommendation has been changed from unsuitable to a reasonable alternative. This greenfield site is identified as an important open space in the South Norfolk Local Plan. It is also recognised by Norfolk County Council as an Historic Environment Site NHER 33463. The site is a very historic open space within the Conservation Area, with strong historic links to 60 Mount Street (the only detached landscape park in Norfolk) and other listed</p>		<p>Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.</p>	<p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>

		buildings. We agree with the initial GNLP conclusion that development would clearly adversely affect the openness of the area. Diss Town Council would not support development on this site and the loss of any of this historic important open space.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP1045 Land west of Nelson Road and east of Station Road, Diss (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	6
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 2 Object, 2 Comment (one of which was a second additional comment from Diss Town Council)

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of public	Support	GNLP.1045 is suitable for high-density housing development, perhaps over 50 units per hectare, given its low landscape conservation value and proximity to the railway station. Since there are limiting factors to the scale of housing growth possible elsewhere in Diss, this site is a prime candidate for high density development. It is one of the only sites where this kind of development would be	Investigate opportunity for higher density, efficient use of land in a sustainable location, with fewer landscape constraints than on the edge of Diss.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		justified in landscape terms. Also, Diss needs to maximise the number of housing units at sites such as this to mitigate adverse impacts elsewhere on more sensitive sites.			
Members of public – various	Object	It is inappropriate to squeeze housing into the middle of an employment site and adjacent to a railway. The site should remain in employment use. Diss needs more land designated for employment use and a policy to generate new work opportunities.	Consider the compatibility of uses and need for employment land.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.
Members of public - various	Comment	Conversion of this site to residential development is contrary to the need to retain land for employment purposes.	Investigate principle/need of retaining employment use.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

Diss Town Council	Support (as well as a second additional comment)	Diss Town Council would support the change of use to residential providing the density of development is no more than that of the adjacent estate, i.e. 25 to 30 per ha.	Consider the form and density of development.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.
Pigeon Investment Management Ltd (site promoter)	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Site would be served by a pedestrian/cycle link between Nelson Road and Prince Regent Way and is well placed to encourage walking and cycling in-place of care-based trips.</li> <li>• The Site is in close proximity to land north of Nelson Road that has previously been granted planning permission for a 76-bed care home (application ref. 2013/1748) and more</li> </ul>	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principle of residential use.</li> <li>• Vehicular access from Nelson Road.</li> <li>• A pedestrian/cycle link between Nelson Road and Prince Regent Way.</li> <li>• Mitigation of noise from railway.</li> </ul>	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>recently has been proposed for 82 'extra care' apartments, thereby demonstrating the suitability of Nelson Road for residential and/or care uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The use of the Site for new homes has also received support in principle from the Town Council, which has indicated that 'residential development would be supported given its proximity to Diss Railway Station'.</li><li>• Highways: The Site would be served from Nelson Road with suitable provision for off-street parking provided within the Site.</li><li>• Noise and Amenity: The Norwich to London railway line is located to the west of the Site. In order to ensure an appropriate noise environment for future</li></ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>residents, acoustic design measures would be incorporated within the scheme design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities and Services: The Site will make best use of the existing infrastructure located within close proximity to the Site.</li> <li>• Flood Risk: The Site is located in Flood Zone 1</li> <li>• There is a residual need for 1,826 residential institution bedspaces in the period 2018-36, comprising 1,081 in Broadland, 57 in Norwich and 679 in South Norfolk. The GNLP cannot demonstrate and more importantly may not meet the objectively assessed needs of this population contrary to paragraphs 35a and 61 of the NPPF.</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

### Diss including part of Roydon – Unreasonable Sites

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0185 Land to the south of Prince William Way, Diss (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	1
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public	Support	It is inappropriate to squeeze housing into the middle of an employment site and adjacent to a railway. The site should remain in employment use. Diss needs more land designated for employment use and a policy to generate new work opportunities.	The principle of residential development near to employment uses.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	None  Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0362 Land at Sturgeons Farm, off Farm Close, Louies Lane, Shelfanger Road, Diss (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	4
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – two comments	Object	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The argument that building houses on site 0362 would have “consequential landscape impacts” (a clumsy euphemism for spoiling the view) applies with equal force to houses built on the fields between Heywood Road and Shelfanger Road. [If Diss needs more land for housing, sites like GNLP0362 should be preferred</li> </ul>	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GNLP0362 is no worse than other greenfield sites preferred by the GNLP Team, and that it would be better instead to protect GNLP0341 (Parish Fields).</li> <li>If it is inevitable that Diss must provide new housing it is better to extend into the countryside where mitigations can be</li> </ul>	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	None  Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>ahead of GNLP0341 (Parish Fields) that has a much higher value in terms of landscape within the town, heritage importance, and ecological sensitivity.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site should be considered suitable for development, as its landscape impacts are no more adverse than for the nearby site GNLP0342 (Land East of Shelfanger Road). It seems perverse to claim that they are. It is inevitable that Diss will have to be extended 'further into the open countryside' if the high housing allocation for the town (743 houses by 2038) is to be met. It is best to do so upon arable sites such as this one which have low historical and ecological value. Impacts on 'open countryside' and wildlife can be mitigated by good landscape design.</li> </ul>	<p>provided, and to use land of lower ecological and historical importance.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Members of public	Support	This site presents a wholly inappropriate location for a housing invasion. The site is situated in Roydon parish but the adjacent B1077 leads into Diss as a minor road into a busy area of the town. The potential for over 400 properties at a high density far exceeds the projected maximum number of 10-20 for the whole of Roydon. Rural countryside enjoyed by present residents would be destroyed.	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate access immediately adjacent to the site and wider network considerations on the B1077 into Diss.</li> <li>• That GNLP0362 is in the administrative boundary of Roydon and thus inappropriate to the 10-20 homes required in Roydon.</li> <li>• Loss of countryside.</li> </ul>	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	None  Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.
Diss Town Council	Support	We agree with your assessment of unsuitable as any development would extend Diss further into the open countryside and be too far away from the main services.	Investigate landscape impact and distance to main services.	Support noted	None

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0599 Land off Walcott Road, Walcott Green, Diss (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	4
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of public	Object	This site should be considered partly suitable for development. Clearly the character of the hamlet of Walcot Green and the 'green space' between it and the eastern edge of Diss are valuable in landscape conservation terms, however the high housing allocation for Diss (743 houses by 2038) and the shortage of developable land mean that part of this site, at least, should not be ruled	Consider partial development of the site, to meet housing need, that the railway provides screening of the site from the landscape valley, and that with more investigation highways constraints may not be insurmountable.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	None  Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		out. It is said that highways modifications do not 'appear achievable', but that implies they may only be an apparent problem. GNLP.0599 would not impact on the valley landscape because lies beyond the railway embankment.			
Members of public -- two	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GNLP0599, 1044, 1003: None are currently designated for the next plan period, but should they be considered they need to be designed and built as part of a special Walcot Green village design with its own open surrounds, not treated as added Diss girth.</li> <li>• There is too much development in this rural area already which has overloaded the infrastructure of Diss.</li> </ul>	Investigate the distinct design character of Walcot Green, rather than treating the site as an extension to Diss.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	<p>None</p> <p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>
Diss Town Council	Support	We are in full agreement with both the GNLP and	Issues including:	Site not to be allocated under	None

		<p>AECOM that highway constraints make this site is unsuitable. It is very rural and remote from the existing services and would have a visual impact on the adjacent nursing home. There is restricted visibility with 2 bends on the very narrow road and no pavements. It is unlikely that satisfactory road re-alignment, widening and the provision of pavements could be achieved. However, we currently have a speculative outline planning application 2019/1555 for this site for 94 dwellings which we are opposing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessed as unsuitable under the Neighbourhood Plan process.</li> <li>• Visual impact on adjacent nursing home.</li> <li>• Highways constraints – carriageway width, alignment, and no footpath provision.</li> </ul>	<p>GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.</p>	<p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0606 Boundary Farm, Shelfanger Road, Heywood (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	4
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of public	Support	Development here on the outskirts of Roydon parish is incompatible with a sustainable population of Diss.		Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	None  Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.
Member of public	Object	This site is a suitable candidate for partial	Partial development could be suitable because:	Site not to be allocated under	None

		<p>development. The East Anglian clayland landscape typically has a dispersed rather than a nucleated settlement pattern. The emphasis being place by the GNLP on promoting a nucleated pattern, with big housing concentrations, is detrimental to the landscape character of the area. Small dispersed housing development at sites such as GNLP0606 could make a modest contribution to meeting housing targets while respecting landscape character. Visual landscape impacts can be mitigated by landscape design. Walking routes to schools do not exist for other parts e.g. The Heywood, so are not a necessity here.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dispersed settlement patterns are more in character with the area than a nucleated approach.</li> <li>• Whether footpaths to schools are so important in assessing site, as not all existing locations have them.</li> </ul>	<p>GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.</p>	<p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>
<p>Clarke and Simpson (site promoters)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Issues including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The south of the field does have a good vehicular access. Factory Lane to the east is a two way public</li> </ul>	<p>Considerations of a suitable access arrangement being achievable off Factory Lane; that an alternative is to allocate part of</p>	<p>Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>

		<p>highway with footpaths which continues until the south east corner of the proposed development site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development has sufficient space for a new entrance off Factory Lane.</li> <li>• It is questionable that the timeframe for delivery of GNLP0102 can practically take place as a whole and therefore unlikely that 200 homes would be achievable.</li> <li>• There is a limit on the number of open spaces within the town of Diss and it is understood town greatly values the open space existing currently in GNLP0341 (Parish Fields).</li> <li>• Reconsider the partial allocation of GNLP2104 or GNLP0606. The land to the south can comfortably</li> </ul>	<p>GNLP0606; that other preferred sites are similar in their planning constraints; that other sites may not come forward as quickly as expected; as well as opposition to developing sites like GNLP0341 (Parish Fields).</p>	<p>allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	--

		accommodate 200 units or greater or less if required with 33% affordable and open space in addition to leisure facilities if required.			
Diss Town Council	Support	This site is unsuitable as a large proportion of the site is at risk of flooding. Development of this site would extend the built-up area of Diss into the open countryside. There is no safe walking route to schools in Diss.	Investigate extent of flood risk constraining the developable area, as well as landscape and access to school considerations.	Support noted	None

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP1003 The Grange, Walcot Green, Diss (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	4
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – two comments	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GNLP0599, 1044, 1003: None are currently designated for the next plan period, but should they be considered they need to be designed and built as part of a special Walcot Green village design with its own open surrounds, not treated as added Diss girth</li> <li>There is too much proposed development</li> </ul>	Investigate the distinct design character of Walcot Green, rather than treating the site as an extension to Diss.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	<p>None</p> <p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>

		in this area already which has overloaded the infrastructure of Diss.			
Member of public	Object	While housing development at this site would adversely affect the present layout of the hamlet of Walcot Green, the site is suitable for limited housing development that respects the dispersed nature of settlement here and local ecological sensitivities. 'Safe walking routes' to local schools do not exist in most rural parts of the Norfolk and Suffolk clayland landscape, owing to the essentially dispersed settlement pattern. The same is true of Walcot Green, so it seems perverse to apply considerations of nucleated, urban planning to this locality. It is inevitable that Diss will have to be extended further into open	Partial development could be suitable because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dispersed settlement patterns are more in character with the area than a nucleated approach.</li> <li>• Whether footpaths to schools are so important in assessing site, as not all existing locations have them.</li> </ul>	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	None  Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		countryside if its housing allocation (743 houses by 2038) is to be met without damaging more sensitive sites or building at much higher densities.			
Diss Town Council	support	This site is outside the settlement boundary. It is located in a bend in the road with no safe walking access. We agree with both AECOM and the GNLP that the significant highway constraints make this site unsuitable for development.	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessed as unsuitable under the Neighbourhood Plan process.</li> <li>• Highways constraints – carriageway width, alignment, and no footpath provision.</li> </ul>	Support noted	None

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP1038 Land north of Brewer Green Lane, Roydon (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	3 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – two comments	Support	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This wedge of agricultural land is bounded by two single track lanes and Diss football club. Access from either lanes is suitable only for agricultural traffic, although an extra access gateway was recently added. The site was owned for many years by a Quaker Trust and provides a strategic buffer of green space between Diss town and Roydon</li> </ul>	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjoining lanes are unsuitable to allow development.</li> <li>Possible loss of an important landscape gap and ecological corridor between separating the Brewer's Green part of Roydon and the western edge of the Diss</li> </ul>	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	None  Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		<p>village. Any housing here would be priced well above the 'affordable' category. Its presence, and regular access, would completely destroy a unique rural area, sited near agricultural fields and a wildlife site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site is important in landscape terms for separating Brewer's Green part of Roydon and the western edge of the Diss / Roydon East built-up area. It has visual landscape value as a 'green belt' buffer, and provides elements of ecological connectivity as a wildlife corridor.</li> </ul>			
Diss Town Council	Support	Development on this site would close the settlement gap between Diss and Roydon. Roads around this site are all very narrow and there are no safe walking routes to schools in Roydon and Diss. This site is unsuitable for development.	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of landscape gap between the settlements of Diss and Roydon.</li> <li>• Highways constraints – carriageway width,</li> </ul>	Support noted	None

			alignment, and no footpath provision.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP1044 Land north of Frenze Hall Lane and west of Walcott Green, Diss (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	5
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 2 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of public	Object	This site is partly suitable for development. The access point has not been defined, so it cannot be argued that highways constraints are insuperable obstacles to developing this site. They could be mitigated if the scale and layout of the proposed development were altered. The landscape impacts are likely to be no more adverse than for GNLP.0342 on open farmland. It is inevitable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigate if highways constraints can be overcome with a smaller scheme; and, given the housing requirement of Diss, investigate if development into the countryside on arable sites offers more opportunities for mitigation than selecting GNLP0341 (Parish Fields).</li> </ul>	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	None  Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

		that Diss will have to be extended 'further into the open countryside' if its housing allocation (743 houses by 2038) is to be met. It is best to do so upon arable sites like this which have low historical and ecological value. Impacts on 'open countryside' can be mitigated by landscape design.			
Members of public – two comments	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GNLP0599, 1044, 1003: None are currently designated for the next plan period, but should they be considered they need to be designed and built as part of a special Walcot Green village design with its own open surrounds, not treated as added Diss girth.</li> <li>• There is too much development in this northern area which has</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate the design character of Walcot Green, rather than treating sites as additions for Diss.</li> </ul>	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	<p>None</p> <p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>

		already overloaded the infrastructure of Diss.			
Pegasus Group on behalf of Pigeon Investment Management Ltd (site promoters)	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 120 new homes, including affordable homes and bungalows plus around 10 self-build plots</li> <li>• New strategic landscaping providing a permanent buffer to ensure separation between Diss and Walcot Green hamlet.</li> <li>• Walcot Green Lane is currently a single lane, the road will be widened (including the junction with Frenze Hall Lane) to a full two lane road.</li> <li>• Rights are reserved over the residential development (Orchard Croft) immediately to the south for a link to the loop estate road (Harrier Way), this link will be incorporated into the scheme to provide a pedestrian/ cycle link,</li> </ul>	Conduct further appraisal of the site, based on the new lower proposal of 120 homes and the new information submitted. Key issues are highways, landscape, and drainage.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	<p>None</p> <p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>

		<p>and also as an emergency second point of access to the Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All highway works can be carried out within existing highway land, or land within the control of the Landowners.</li> <li>• The scheme proposes soakaways and permeable paving, and a attenuation basin designed to accommodate the 100 year storm event with allowance for climate change at the site's south-eastern corner. Drainage from the basin will go to the surface water drain in Frenze Hall Lane with this pipe discharging to the ditch network east of the railway and to the River Frenze.</li> <li>• The scheme has been designed with the proposed self-build plots set back from the</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>railway line with an extensive area of open space and new landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New footpath links will be provided, creating links with the existing PROW network and a new circular walk</li> <li>• There are two Grade II listed buildings on Walcot Road, approximately 250m north / northwest of site, located within Walcot Green Hamlet. However, both properties have clearly defined landscape boundaries and do not present a constraint to development.</li> <li>• The Landowners have entered into a partnership with Pigeon to progress the Site through the planning process and the Site can deliver homes within the forthcoming five years.</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Site has been considered in the SA as providing a total of 289 dwellings plus the form of development proposed in the Sites Assessment booklet is different to that now being proposed by Pigeon at the site for 120 homes including bungalows and affordable dwellings plus up to 10 custom/self-build dwellings with considerable public open space and green infrastructure improvements.</li> </ul>			
Diss Town Council	Support	Site is adjacent to railway line with a narrow road Walcot Green which can't be widened due to highway constraints including a gas main. Residential development would also extend the built-up area of Diss further into open countryside. We agree with the GNLP and AECOM		Support noted	None

		assessment that it is unsuitable for allocation.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2104 West of Shelfanger Road (part in Roydon, part in Heywood) (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	5
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 3 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – two comments	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the strongest reasons why site GNLP2104 should be re-considered is that it is a very short walk – even for small children - between the southern boundary of the site to Roydon Primary School.</li> <li>• If new roads can be constructed for the preferred site GNLP0250, 0342, 0119 and 0291 We find it hard to believe that</li> </ul>	Matters to investigate are: Access to nearby schools; why highways improvements are ruled out; and, why the site cannot be considered at least in part.	Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	<p>None</p> <p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>

		<p>comparable road access to site 2104 is not possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the GNLP's purpose of finding land for housing it appears absurd to reject a site for being too big, and not to consider allocating it in part.</li> <li>• This site is very important in landscape terms for separating the Brewer's Green part of Roydon and the housing estates in Diss/Roydon East. The site may be partly suitable for housing development. Existing housing in the Factory Lane area enjoys unproblematic vehicular and pedestrian access. Any development here would have to enhance ecological connectivity and safeguard visual impact when seen from Factory Lane.</li> </ul>			
Members of public - various	Support	This is a completely inappropriate agricultural		Support noted	None

		site for swamping both Roydon and Diss with housing with a population explosion.			
Clarke and Simpson (site promoters)	Object	<p>Issues including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The south of the field does have a good vehicular access. Factory Lane to the east is a two way public highway with footpaths which continues until the south east corner of the proposed development site.</li> <li>• The development has sufficient space for a new entrance off Factory Lane.</li> <li>• It is questionable that the timeframe for delivery of GNLP0102 can practically take place as a whole and therefore unlikely that 200 homes would be achievable.</li> <li>• There is a limit on the number of open spaces within the town of Diss and it is understood</li> </ul>	<p>Considerations of a suitable access arrangement being achievable off Factory Lane; that an alternative is to allocate part of GNLP0606; that other preferred sites are similar in their planning constraints; that other sites may not come forward as quickly as expected; as well as opposition to developing sites like GNLP0341 (Parish Fields).</p>	<p>Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.</p>

		<p>town greatly values the open space existing currently in GNLP0341 (Parish Fields).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconsider the partial allocation of GNLP2104 or GNLP0606. The land to the south can comfortably accommodate 200 units or greater or less if required with 33% affordable and open space in addition to leisure facilities if required.</li> </ul>			
Diss Town Council	Support	<p>This very large site would alter the character of the settlements of Diss and Roydon. It is too large a scale for the development required in Diss. The road network is unsuitable both in terms of junction capacity and also lack of footpaths.</p>		Support noted	None

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2067 Victoria Road, Diss (Unreasonable Non-Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	1
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Diss Town Council	Support	This site is subject to flood risk constraints and there is sufficient employment land at present.		Site not to be allocated under GNLP. Note comment about the Diss and District Neighbourhood allocating sites to meet the future development needs of the Town.	None  Deferred to neighbourhood plan process.

## REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON OVERVIEW
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	27
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	3 Support, 14 Object, 10 Comment

Redenhall with Harleston has 4 carried forward allocations, 2 preferred sites (2108 and 2136), 0 reasonable alternatives and 8 site which are judged to be unreasonable.

Main issues:

### Preferred Site GNLP2108

- Further consideration of infrastructure and employment constraints, particularly regarding flooding and education.

### Preferred Site GNLP2136

- Further consideration needed of cumulative impact of development
- Investigate potential inaccuracies in the site assessment booklet and update as appropriate
- Consider submitted masterplan and increased number of dwellings

Carried Forward Allocation HAR4

- Further consideration of cumulative impact of development

Carried Forward Allocation HAR5

- Further consideration of cumulative impact of development
- Investigate the planning permission for residential on the site

Carried Forward Allocation HAR6

- None

Carried Forward Allocation HAR7

- Further consideration of cumulative impact of development

Unreasonable Sites GNLP2099 and GNLP2115

- None

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0209
- GNLP2088
- GNLP2098
- GNLP2105
- GNLP2116
- GNLP3048

### Redenhall with Harleston – Preferred Sites

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2108 Land South of Spirketts Lane, Harleston (Preferred Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	6
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 4 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of the public	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of GPs, their services and provision of NHS dental care declined in last 6 years.</li> <li>Local school full and large community function facility needed.</li> </ul>		Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment. Including adjustments on policy requirements. These are setting two points of access from Spirketts Lane; and, having regard to nearby listed building.	None  Allocate with alterations to policy wording.

				GNLP2108 remains the preferred site in Harleston to meet housing requirement.	
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"> <li>Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed</li> </ul>	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
Landowner via Durrant's	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood zone 1, low risk of flooding</li> <li>Natural extension of the town</li> <li>Not within a designated area</li> <li>No trees that are subject to TPO</li> <li>Good access with no challenge to surrounding road network</li> <li>Good access to town centre</li> <li>No utilities constraints (barring foul drainage upgrade required for HAR4)</li> <li>No contamination/ground work issues</li> <li>Attractive area for housing</li> <li>No detrimental impact on sensitive landscapes or their setting</li> <li>In-fill site so no loss of open space</li> <li>Suitable, available and achievable,</li> </ul>		Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment. Including adjustments on policy requirements. These are setting two points of access from Spirketts Lane; and, having regarding to nearby listed building.	Allocate with alterations to policy wording.

				GNLP2108 remains a preferred site in Harleston to meet housing requirement.	
Redenhall with Harleston TC	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JCS envisaged 200-300 new homes (Moderate) but number considered by developers for Briar Farm is now 420.</li> <li>• In light of this the site should not be considered until infrastructure and employment constraints are resolved</li> <li>• Objective 6 of JCS should be adopted in GNLP (adequate services must exist/be provided for new homes/jobs to be developed)</li> <li>• Believe there should be review every 5 years to investigate infrastructure support/quality which determines whether further growth can be permitted.</li> <li>• Issues of flooding in Harleston, stormwater being a particular issue.</li> <li>• Proportionately more growth here compared to Diss with less employment and local services.</li> <li>• Hospitals are all over 20 miles away and there is only limited public transport to get there.</li> </ul>	Further consideration of infrastructure and employment constraints, particularly regarding flooding and education.	<p>The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing is a key priority.</p> <p>Matters to do with overall housing numbers, timing development, phasing infrastructure, and distribution of growth across the settlement hierarchy are dealt with under the Part 1 Strategy of the GNLP.</p>	Allocate with alterations to policy wording.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased number of children means either the school would need extending or a new school would need to be provided.</li> <li>• HAR 6&amp;7 need to be realised before new sites allocated.</li> </ul>			
Historic England	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No designated assets within boundary but to west are the grade II listed Dove House and its garden wall. Proposed site is set back from these building.</li> <li>• Suggest third bullet point is amended to reference the listed building</li> </ul>		It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this.	Use standard wording – policy amended to take account of listed building to the west

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2136 Land at Briar Farm, Harleston (Preferred Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	7
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 4 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Action for Harleston	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure has not kept pace with increase in residents.</li> <li>• Transport, drainage, sewerage, school, medical, dental and employment issues.</li> <li>• A Major Cumulative Impact Study is needed</li> </ul>	Further consideration of cumulative impact of development	The revised scheme masterplan includes 2.5 ha for older people's specialist housing that contributes to a sub-regional need. The obligation for employment land is removed; this obligation is unnecessary given the other employment	Allocate with a different description of development that includes specialist older people's housing.

				allocations in Harleston.  GNLP2136 remains the preferred site in Harleston to meet housing requirement.	
Member of the public	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment booklet inaccuracies – p2, 13 and 24 identifies 350 dwelling whereas 28&amp;29 state 300</li> <li>• HELAA identifies site as having amber for 6 of the 14 categories (42.85%)</li> <li>• Booklet not up to date, p1 references Fullers Place development which is almost complete and p8 references Apollo Rooms which were demolished in advance of development of 40+ retirement properties</li> <li>• p1 advises of some take up of existing employment allocations suggesting not all have been taken up, this may cause doubt on the need for further employment allocations?</li> <li>• P1 sewerage and flooding is referenced, who will take</li> </ul>	Investigate inaccuracies in the site assessment booklet and update as appropriate.	The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing (including specialist housing for older people) is a key priority. Where it is possible and reasonable to new development can mitigate impact or even bring improvements. Examples may include highways works, or provision of additional recreational space. Mitigations through the	None

		<p>responsibility should the development or town be subjected to flooding? There are local flooding issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• woodland perimeter has been discussed for Jays Green side, what about residents on other sides (Barley Close, Harvest Way)?</li> <li>• No planned timetable for dwellings to be built. Development will disrupt town which already has infrastructure difficulties.</li> <li>• Conflict between p11 – would impact form and character of Harleston, and p28 – well located in terms of form and character</li> </ul>		<p>development process can also address ‘amber’ rated constraints as well. Finally, the assessment booklet will be reviewed and checked for inaccuracies.</p>	
Member of the public	Object	Support Action for Harleston comments		Comment noted	Allocate with a different description of development that includes specialist older people’s housing.
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed	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

Member of the public	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of GPs, their services and provision of NHS dental care declined in last 6 years.</li> <li>• Local school full and large community function facility needed.</li> </ul>		The GNLP Team is working with NHS commissioners so that healthcare investment can be timed appropriately with new development.	None
Redenhall with Harleston TC	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree in principle</li> <li>• Disagree with HELAA conclusion – nearest bus stop is at least half a mile.</li> <li>• In discussion with the developer they have shown the site to potentially have 420 homes rather than the 300 on the GNLP paperwork.</li> <li>• An additional vehicular access road is also proposed from Jays Green which is not on the original documentation – this will need serious consideration. Suggest Highways Agency survey Jay's Green Road and its junction with School Lane.</li> <li>• Noted that 21 acres would be allocated for open space but planners</li> </ul>		<p>The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing (including specialist housing for older people) is a key priority.</p> <p>Specific requirements for highways we be considered through consultation with Norfolk County Council highways.</p>	Allocate with a different description of development that includes updated highways obligations.

		<p>should be mindful of visual impact from the A143 approach to the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The additional 120 housing negates any requirement for further housing.</li> </ul>			
Scott Properties Ltd via Strutt & Parker LLP	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support client's site being preferred.</li> <li>• Updated masterplan and supporting info as more dwellings can be provided.</li> <li>• Policy wording recommended to be amended to acknowledge low demand for local employment land and increase housing numbers.</li> <li>• Masterplan shows proposed access points and a new footpath.</li> <li>• Consideration given to surrounding developments and large open space buffer provided. Noise survey has confirmed A143 noise not a constraint to development.</li> <li>• Draft drainage strategy prepared to address issues.</li> <li>• Updated planning and delivery strategy will be agreed following pre-application advice and public consultation.</li> <li>• Available, deliverable, suitable, achievable and a logical expansion to the town</li> </ul>	Consider submitted masterplan and increased number of dwellings	<p>The revised scheme masterplan includes 2.5 ha for older people's specialist housing that contributes to a sub-regional need. The obligation for employment land is removed; this obligation is unnecessary given the other employment allocations in Harleston.</p> <p>GNLP2136 remains the preferred site in Harleston to meet housing requirement.</p>	Allocate with a different description of development that includes specialist older people's housing.

### Redenhall with Harleston – Carried Forward Allocations

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy HAR 4 Land at Spirketts Lane, Harleston (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	4
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 3 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Action for Harleston	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure has not kept pace with increase in residents.</li> <li>• Transport, drainage, sewerage, school, medical, dental and employment issues.</li> <li>• A Major Cumulative Impact Study is needed</li> </ul>	Further consideration of cumulative impact of development	The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing needs to be provided through the GNLP and this site is considered to be suitable for residential development,	None  Reallocate with alterations to policy wording to remove access from Willow Walk.
Trustees of Harleston Relief in Need Charity	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are in the final stages of negotiations with the neighbouring</li> </ul>		The requirement for a secondary access from	Reallocate with alterations to policy wording to

		<p>land owners to develop both parcels of land as one development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current draft local plan includes access to our land from Willow Walk. The combined development is not intended to include more than 95 dwellings. Following consultation with members of South Norfolk District Council's planning department we believe that no access is necessary from Willow Walk, vehicular or pedestrian</li> </ul>		<p>Willow Walk is removed following consultation with the South Norfolk Council planning department. The policy requirement is adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>HAR 4 remains deliverable and is carried forward.</p>	<p>remove access from Willow Walk.</p>
Anglian Water	Comment	<p>No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed</li> </ul>	<p>This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy</p>	<p>None</p>
Durrants	Comment	<p>We wish South Norfolk to know that considerable work has been undertaken in relation to the existing allocation for 95 houses and to include a pre-application enquiry, infiltration testing, surface water potential scheme design and investigation of utilities with particular reference to foul drainage. The private land owners and the Seymour Charity</p>		<p>HAR 4 remains deliverable and is carried forward.</p>	<p>Reallocate with alterations to policy wording to remove access from Willow Walk.</p>

		are working in collaboration and wish to reiterate their joint intention to bring this land to market in the near future.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy HAR 5 Land off Station Hill, Harleston (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 2 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Action for Harleston	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure has not kept pace with increase in residents.</li> <li>• Transport, drainage, sewerage, school, medical, dental and employment issues.</li> <li>• A Major Cumulative Impact Study is needed</li> </ul>	Further consideration of cumulative impact of development	The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing needs to be provided through the GNLP and this site is considered to be suitable for residential development,	None  Reallocate with alterations to the supporting text in recognition of the residential permission on the site.
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed</li> </ul>	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary	None

				to include it in the allocation policy	
Bullen Developments Ltd via CODE Development Planners Ltd	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient justification for allocation of site for employment/ retail/ health/ community facilities.</li> <li>• Draft plan refers to carrying forward previous allocation from South Norfolk Local Plan.</li> <li>• In the meantime, the LPA has granted planning permission on site for residential development.</li> </ul>	Investigate the planning permission for residential on the site	<p>Application 2019/2115 is likely to superseded the allocation. This scheme is an outline application for demolition of one building and erection of up to 40 dwellings with public open space and associated infrastructure, Land Off Station Hill.</p> <p>At present, the agreed position is to carry forward existing allocations as per the January 2020 Regulation 18 consultation, and this includes HAR 5.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Reallocate with alterations to the supporting text in recognition of the residential permission on the site.</p>

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy HAR 6 Land north of Spirketts Lane, Harleston (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	2
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Trustees of Harleston Relief in Need Charity	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are in the final stages of negotiations with the neighbouring land owners to develop both parcels of land as one development.</li> <li>The current draft local plan includes access to our land from Willow Walk. The combined development is not intended to include more than 95 dwellings. Following consultation with members of South Norfolk District Council's planning department we believe that no access is necessary from Willow Walk, vehicular or pedestrian</li> </ul>		The approval for a commercial unit on part of the site is recognised (2018/1904), showing that HAR 6 deliverable and the site is carried forward.	Reallocate with alterations to policy wording to remove access from Willow Walk.

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"> <li>• Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed</li> </ul>	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
---------------	---------	---	---	---	------

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Policy HAR 7 Land south of Spirketts Lane, Harleston (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Action for Harleston	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure has not kept pace with increase in residents.</li> <li>• Transport, drainage, sewerage, school, medical, dental and employment issues.</li> <li>• A Major Cumulative Impact Study is needed</li> </ul>	Further consideration of cumulative impact of development	The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing and employment needs to be provided through the GNLP and this site is considered to be suitable for employment development,	None  Reallocate with alterations to policy wording if required.
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"> <li>• Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed</li> </ul>	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites.	None

				It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy.	
Durrants	Comment	We wish South Norfolk to know work has been undertaken in relation to the existing allocation for 11.77ac (4.7ha). Initially services feasibility investigations were made but more recently investigations with a partner of South Norfolk, Blue Sky Developments, have been undertaken as to how the site can be brought forward in access and services terms these being crucial in releasing the land for development. The owners remain committed to a sale of the site and would be happy to answer any questions reference this project.		The policy position is to carry forward existing allocations as per the January 2020 Regulation 18 consultation, and this includes HAR 7.	None Reallocate with alterations to policy wording if required.

### Redenhall with Harleston – Unreasonable Sites

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2099 South of Redenhall Road, Harleston (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	1
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Ben Reay	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well connected, sustainable &amp; suitable</li> <li>Safe vehicular access can be achieved via eastern boundary by reducing ground level, a bank will be formed further into the site behind which would be a footpath with significant tree/hedge planting.</li> <li>Highest part of site to have ground level reduced and single storey dwellings/tree and hedge planting to help views – Surrounding developments had similar issues and do not look overly prominent.</li> </ul>	Policy requirements relating to vehicular access, visibility splay, visual impact in the landscape, and drainage strategy.	GNLP2099 is not considered a preferred alternative over GNLP2108 or GNLP2136. A third site allocation in Harleston would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sufficient open space has been provided which can be utilised to deal with surface water drainage.</li><li>• Local facilities within walking distance.</li><li>• Well related to existing settlement.</li><li>• HELAA comments are favourable</li></ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2115 North of Needham Road, Needham (Technically in Needham Parish but considered with Harleston as well related to the built-up area) (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	1
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Landowners via Durrants	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural continuation of settlement pattern.</li> <li>• Flood zone 1, low risk</li> <li>• not located in designated area</li> <li>• No TPO subjected trees</li> <li>• Satisfactory access can be provided without challenging surrounding road network.</li> <li>• Dispute their being poor connectivity into Harleston, main thoroughfare into town is via Needham Road, eastern boundary has a footpath and another footpath to Swan Lane</li> </ul>		GNLP2115 is not considered a preferred alternative over GNLP2108 or GNLP2136. A third site allocation in Harleston would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre is 950m away.</li> <li>• No utilities constraints or contamination/ ground stability issues</li> <li>• Marketable and desirable area for housing</li> <li>• no detrimental impact on sensitive landscapes and their setting</li> <li>• Whilst it is understood that there are concerns about connecting Needham with Harleston, there is a natural divide caused by the A143 with height differences either side providing a naturally stark break.</li> <li>• Site is grade 2 agricultural land and grade 2 lands are treated the same as grade 3 land forming natural arable rotation of the area. The land forms part of larger field which is grade 3.</li> <li>• Noted that site is in River Valley, but so are all sites in Harleston.</li> <li>• Will have no impact on nearby listed buildings</li> <li>• No loss of open space – essentially an extension development</li> <li>• Available &amp; achievable</li> <li>• Could provide additional capacity in a phased way</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

## HETHEL STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	7
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 2 Object, 5 Comment

Hethel (as a strategic employment location) has 2 carried forward allocations, 1 preferred site (2109), 0 reasonable alternatives and 0 unreasonable sites.

Main issues:

### Preferred Site GNLP2109

- Consider impact on County Wildlife Site and effect on bats in neighbouring ancient woodland
- Consider impact on grade II listed Little Potash south of site
- Consider carrying out a detailed Historic Impact Assessment

### Carried Forward Allocation HETHEL1

- Consider impact on County Wildlife Site and effect on bats in neighbouring ancient woodland

Carried Forward Allocation HETHEL2

- Consider impact on County Wildlife Site and effect on bats in neighbouring ancient woodland
- Consider impact on grade II Little Potash south of site

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Non-Residential Sites

- GNLP2097

## Hethel Strategic Employment – Preferred Site

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	GNLP2109 South of Hethel Industrial Estate, Bracon Ash (Preferred Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of the design unlike other allocation policies. See comments on Policy 2	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed	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	Hethel allocations are adjacent to Hethel Wood CWS, an important ancient woodland site, likely to also be of importance for several bat species. Given the proximity of the existing	Consider impact on CWS and effect on bats in neighbouring ancient woodland	Minor wording changes are made to further account for heritage and ecological impacts. Wording is adjusted to ensure	Allocate with alterations to policy to include ecological impact assessment.

		<p>industrial area to the wood, and the sensitivity of ancient woodland to nearby development, we recommend that any allocations in this area safeguard the CWS from further encroachment and includes appropriate policies to avoid indirect disturbance from features such as external lighting. This area is also a key location for connectivity with other priority habitats in the south Norfolk claylands and net gain contributions could help link Hethel Wood with other County Wildlife Sites and ancient woodland.</p> <p>Additional report submitted</p>		<p>the layout and design of GNLP2109 takes in to account its proximity to the Grade II Little Potash (Brunel House). An ecological impact assessment is specifically required too, reflecting the sensitivity of the site and that this assessment may not automatically accompany an application for development on a relatively small piece of land.</p>	
Historic England	Object	<p>Although there are no designated heritage assets within this site, the grade II listed Little Potash (also known as Brunel House) lies immediately to the south of the site and would be surrounded on two sides by the proposed site. The</p>	<p>Consider impact on grade II listed Little Potash south of site.</p> <p>Consider carrying out a detailed Historic Impact Assessment</p>	<p>Minor wording changes are made to further account for heritage and ecological impacts. Wording is adjusted to ensure the layout and design of</p>	<p>Allocate with alterations to policy to protect the residential amenity of nearby Grade II Little Potash</p>

		<p>cottage dates from the late 16th or early 17th century with a timber frame and brick plinth, with rendered brick infill and a pantile roof. There is no mention of the nearby listed building within the policy or supporting text and no provision for appropriate landscaping/setback of development. We are concerned that development of this site would affect the setting of this listed building. We are therefore concerned about the inclusion of this site.</p> <p>Suggested Change: We suggest a detailed HIA is undertaken for this site to assess the suitability or otherwise of the site and consider any appropriate mitigation.</p>		<p>GNL2109 takes in to account its proximity to the Grade II Little Potash (Brunel House). An ecological impact assessment is specifically required too, reflecting the sensitivity of the site and that this assessment may not automatically accompany an application for development on a relatively small piece of land.</p>	<p>(Brunel House).</p>
--	--	---	--	--	------------------------

## Hethel Strategic Employment – Carried Forward Allocations

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	HETHEL 1 Hethel Settlement Boundary, Redevelopment of existing uses (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	1
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Comment	<p>Comments regarding ecological concerns.</p> <p>Hethel allocations are adjacent to Hethel Wood CWS, an important ancient woodland site, likely to also be of importance for several bat species. Given the proximity of the existing industrial area to the wood, and the sensitivity of ancient woodland to nearby development, we recommend that any</p>	<p>Consider impact on CWS and effect on bats in neighbouring ancient woodland</p> <p>Revisit Policy wording</p>	The points raised relate to the wording of HETHEL 2 – see below.	Reallocate with no changes to policy.

		<p>allocations in this area safeguard the CWS from further encroachment and includes appropriate policies to avoid indirect disturbance from features such as external lighting. This area is also a key location for connectivity with other priority habitats in the south Norfolk claylands and net gain contributions could help link Hethel Wood with other County Wildlife Sites and ancient woodland.</p> <p>Additional report submitted</p> <p>Recommend: specific policy wording is included in the allocation policies.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	HETHEL 2 Land South and South West of Lotus Cars, Hethel (Carried Forward Allocation)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of the design unlike other allocation policies. See comments on Policy 2	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed	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	Comments regarding ecological concerns.  Hethel allocations are adjacent to Hethel Wood CWS, an important ancient woodland site, likely to also	Consider impact on CWS and effect on bats in neighbouring ancient woodland  Revisit Policy wording	Alterations to the policy wording have been considered but are not necessary. The HETHEL2 allocation is 20 ha	Reallocate with no changes to policy.

		<p>be of importance for several bat species. Given the proximity of the existing industrial area to the wood, and the sensitivity of ancient woodland to nearby development, we recommend that any allocations in this area safeguard the CWS from further encroachment and includes appropriate policies to avoid indirect disturbance from features such as external lighting. This area is also a key location for connectivity with other priority habitats in the south Norfolk claylands and net gain contributions could help link Hethel Wood with other County Wildlife Sites and ancient woodland.</p> <p>Additional report submitted</p> <p>Recommend: specific policy wording is included in the allocation policies.</p>		<p>of land and a requirement is set for masterplanning. Both the scale of the site and the masterplanning work will themselves involve detailed consideration and consultation of heritage and ecological considerations at the planning application stage.</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

Historic England	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II listed Little Potash/Brunel House and Corporation Farmhouse lie to the east of the site. There is currently no mention of these heritage assets in the policy or supporting text or of the need to conserve and enhance the significance of the heritage assets (including any contribution made to that significance by setting).</p> <p>Suggested Change: We suggest that the policy be amended to refer to these heritage assets and the need to conserve and enhance them and also to the need for appropriate landscaping along the eastern edge of the site.</p>	<p>Consider impact on grade II listed Little Potash south of site.</p> <p>Consider amending the policy wording</p>		<p>To be consistent with elsewhere consider amending policy in relation to English Heritage comments?</p>
------------------	--------	---	--	--	---

## LONG STRATTON INCLUDING PART OF THARSTON AND HAPTON PARISH

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	LONG STRATTON INCLUDING PART OF THARSTON AND HAPTON OVERVIEW
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	2
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

Long Stratton including part of Tharston and Hapton parish has 0 carried forward allocations, 0 preferred sites, 0 reasonable alternatives and 8 sites which are judged to be unreasonable (7 residential and 1 non-residential).

Main issues:

### Unreasonable Site GNLP0509

- Reconsider site assessment

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

### Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0142
- GNLP0201
- GNLP0458
- GNLP0576
- GNLP1050
- GNLP3033

### Unreasonable Non-Residential Sites

- GNLP0272

**Long Stratton including part of Tharston and Hapton parish – General Comments**

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Long Stratton, No Preferred Sites (General Comments)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	1
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Rosconn Group	Object	<p>Objects to no allocations proposed in Long Stratton. Currently no deliverable planning permissions within AAP. Additional capacity within the existing allocations but unlikely to be delivered until late in the plan period or beyond. Soundness of plan questioned.</p> <p>RSL request that the land south of Flowerpot Lane, Long Stratton should also</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider additional information submitted</li> </ul>	Based on the Part 1 Strategy, no new allocations are being made in addition to the Long Stratton Area Action Plan. The Area Action Plan will be reviewed later, separately to the GNLP.	None

		be considered in these terms. Further details of site have been submitted including contribution to Stratton bypass			
--	--	---	--	--	--

**Long Stratton including part of Tharston and Hapton parish – Unreasonable Site**

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0509 Land South of St Mary's Road, Long Stratton (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	1
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Armstrong Rigg Planning	Object	Orbit Homes object to the identification of Land south of St Mary's Road, Long Stratton as an 'unreasonable site'. This conclusion is not justified by the Council's own evidence contained in the Site Assessment Booklet for Long Stratton which demonstrates that the site is the only option for growth in the town that has been consistently assessed as	Reconsider Site Assessment for GNLP0509	Site not to be allocated. Note comment about existing commitment from the Area Action Plan, and its later, separate review to the GNLP.	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<p>suitable for development. The reasons for discounting the site are dubious and unsubstantiated and the promoted development would bring significant benefits in terms of the delivery of market and affordable housing and open space. The proposed development is shovel ready and could be delivered in the short term to meet Long Stratton's needs now. In the context of the clear need for additional allocations in the town identified in Orbit Homes' representations to Policies 1 and 7.2, it should be therefore be allocated accordingly.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

## WYMONDHAM

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	WYMONDHAM OVERVIEW
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	58
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	8 Support, 33 Object, 17 Comment

Wymondham has 0 carried forward allocations, 2 preferred sites (0354 and 3013), 7 reasonable alternatives and 12 sites which are judged to be unreasonable (10 residential and 2 non-residential).

Main issues:

### Preferred Site GNLP0354

- Investigate site constraints identified including highway access and network implications, views of the Abbey, impact on tourism and the nearby Mid Norfolk Railway, possible impact on Cavick House estate, implications for nearby ecological sites and the feasibility of future development within the remaining field enclosure
- Consider new scheme layout for approx.. 100 homes, particularly in relation to access off Old London Road, landscape implications on the Abbey and if further expansion is feasible beyond 2038 in the remaining field enclosure.
- Consideration of existing AAP and DM Planning policies
- Investigate relevance of achieving development to 'National Trust covenant' to protect the Cavick Estate

### Preferred Site GNLP3013

- Landscape considerations and infrastructure capacity
- Apply Environment Agency advice and relevant policy requirements

### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP0006

- Investigate housing numbers for Wymondham, including the need for a contingency site and landscape impact of development crossing to the north side of Tuttle Lane
- Investigate ability of site to develop and provide a contingency to housing numbers being delivered
- Appropriateness of indicative masterplan and general matters of landscape impact, ecological protection, drainage and highway access
- Apply Environment Agency advice and relevant policy requirements

### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP0515

- Investigate adverse impacts including loss of farmland, heritage impact and environmental damage
- Specific issues are impact on nearby Deer Park, harm to local tourism industry and the pinch point in the network at Silfield Railway bridge
- Investigate the ability of the proposal to provide upfront infrastructure alongside policy compliant levels of affordable housing
- Consider the sites connectivity to infrastructure and services in Wymondham as well as its suitability to be a readily deliverable contingency in the event of other allocations being delayed
- Apply Environment Agency advice and relevant policy requirements
- Investigate against other new settlement proposals at Hethel and Honingham

#### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP0525R

- Investigate impact on the Strategic Gap to Hethersett
- Investigate issues with land at Elm Farm being included in site GNLP0525R and WYM14 allocation
- Investigate further selection of a preferred contingency site for Wymondham and which is most sequentially preferable
- Apply Environment Agency advice and relevant policy requirements

#### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP1055

- Investigate the ability of the proposal to provide upfront infrastructure alongside policy compliant levels of affordable housing
- Investigate against other new settlement proposals at Hethel and Honingham
- Consider overall housing numbers for Wymondham and whether the contingency land for 1,000 homes should be met through other sites due to the lead in time for new settlements
- Apply Environment Agency advice and relevant policy requirements

#### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP2150

- Investigate impact on the strategic gap to Hethersett and the implications of recent refusal 2019/0184
- Consider whether site GNLP2150 is the appropriate size site to deliver the infrastructure required to meet the 1,000 homes contingency

#### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP2155

- Investigate adverse impacts: landscape harm at Downham Grove, traffic congestion and the necessity for the 1,000 homes contingency
- Consider whether site GNLP2155 is the appropriate size site to deliver the infrastructure required to meet the 1,000 homes contingency

#### Reasonable Alternative Site GNLP2168

- Investigate adverse impacts which include loss of agricultural land, landscape and ecological considerations and threat to Ancient Woodland
- Investigate the ability of the proposal to provide upfront infrastructure alongside policy compliant levels of affordable housing
- Consider overall housing numbers for Wymondham and whether the contingency land for 1,000 homes should be met through other sites due to the lead in time for new settlements
- Apply Environment Agency advice and relevant policy requirements
- Investigate against other new settlement proposals at Hethel and Honingham

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP0320

- Investigate adverse impacts which include proximity of Grade II listed Gonville Hall, impact from nearby recent development and the potential harm to an important 'gateway' into Wymondham
- Consider overall housing numbers for Wymondham, the appropriateness of the indicative masterplan and general planning matters e.g. landscape impact, extending the built edge of the town, ecological protection, drainage and highways access

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP0355

- Investigate the outcome of pre-application discussions with development management colleagues.

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP0402

- Investigate issues of agricultural land quality and ecological impact (particularly to Silfield Nature Reserve)
- Investigate against other new settlement proposals at Hethel and Honingham

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP0403

- Investigate issues of agricultural land quality and possible adverse impacts (such as effect on Wymondham as an historic town and tourist attraction)
- Investigate against other new settlement proposals at Hethel and Honingham

#### Unreasonable Site GNLP0116

- Investigate the benefits of the new site boundary and the schemes details as discussed with Development Management colleagues
- Consider how proposals fit with the wider ambitions for the Hethel Strategic Employment area

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

#### Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0032
- GNLP0200
- GNLP0507
- GNLP2073
- GNLP2090
- GNLP2169

#### Unreasonable Non-Residential Sites

- GNLP0285

## Wymondham – Preferred Sites

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0354 Land at Johnson's Farm, Wymondham (Preferred Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	10
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 6 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of public – five comments	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is in the environs of the abbey and the Mid Norfolk Railway line halt / start platform - this area is a major tourist attraction and also an amenity area for Wymondham residents.</li> <li>I welcome your consideration of previous objections to housing development on a larger scale (75ha) in this area in relation to scale, road safety, impact on amenity, and environmental and landscape</li> </ul>	Investigate the site constraints cited. These include: highway access and network implications; views of the Abbey from on and across GNLP0354; impact on tourism and nearby Mid Norfolk Railway; possible impact on Cavick House estate; implications for	The revised scheme masterplan for GNLP0354 shows a relatively self-contained site. Increasing the site from 2.34 ha to 5.39 ha increases the housing supply from 50 to approximately 100 homes. Obligations for	Allocate with alterations to policy wording and uplift site to approximately 100 homes.

		<p>damage. Nevertheless, concern that even smaller scale development, with access from Abbey Road or Preston Drive, will have an impact on Bradman's Lane, Cavick Road and Becketswell Road, and access to the Town from the south west. These highways already carry traffic at a volume, size and speed that is hazardous to all road users, including those who value this part of Wymondham for quiet and recreation in walking, cycling and the enjoyment of the countryside. The indication that more than 50 homes may be accommodated subject to layout and design only strengthens this concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extends town boundary, encroaching on setting of western approach to Abbey and Grade 1 Cavick House estate. Access difficulties via Abbey Road. marginal increase in housing vs plan needs. Increased vehicle movements, emissions and light pollution. Negligible CIL, Section 106</li> </ul>	<p>nearby ecological sites; and, the feasibility of further future development within the remaining field enclosure.</p>	<p>mitigating adverse impact on heritage assets is retained, but other policy requirements are revised. These relate to vehicular access from London Road and pedestrian/cycle access from Preston Avenue.</p> <p>The process for negotiating a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) will be used clarify if a restrictive covenant affects the site.</p> <p>GNL0354 remains a preferred site in Wymondham to meet housing requirements, but on a revised site</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

		<p>contribution so nothing to mitigate infrastructure demands - schools, doctors etc. Does nothing for town centre too remote. No public transport links. Scope for development creep on site up to historic hedge line. Abbey Road was genuine in-fill this is virgin agricultural land spoken environmental considerations. Lazy allocation not thought through.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'At least 50 houses' could become more given the landowners previous proposals for 400 homes and the draft policy appearing to allow the possibility of further development on the remaining field enclose. Views of the Abbey from Bradmans Lane are excellent and could be lost. This site lies on the outskirts of the designated river valley landscape, is in a Conservation Area, there are County Wildlife Sites at nearby Wymondham Abbey Meadows and Tiffey Meadows South and North, the site presents potential impacts upon Preston Avenue</li> </ul>		<p>size allowing for approximately 100 homes</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>and the old London Road and there is a new estate being developed nearby - William's Park for 335 houses. There is a National Trust restrictive covenant in place to protect the Cavick Estate and the valley to the west.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 homes is likely to lead to an unacceptable expansion of up to 400 homes over time given the obvious and past intentions of the landowners. Other concerns are the unsuitability of the Abbey Road junction, the disturbance likely from the construction phase, that there are already 335 new homes on the B1172 Gonville site opposite (ref: 2014/2495).</li> </ul>			
Wymondham Town Council	Support	The proposed sites reference GNLP0354 at Johnson's Farm and GNLP3013 Land North of Tuttle Lane, each with an allocation of 50 dwellings are considered acceptable. The Council is pleased that there is only a minimal additional proposed allocation of 100 homes to be added to the existing allocation		The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing needs to be provided through the GNLP and this site is considered to be	Allocate with alterations to policy wording and uplift site to approximately 100 homes.

		resulting in an overall commitment of 2,563.		suitable for residential development,	
Cheffins on behalf of RJ Baker & Sons (site promoters)	Support	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site area is defined as 2.34 ha and the allocation is for 50 dwellings; 80 dwellings might reasonably be expected on this site.</li> <li>• The western and northern boundaries of the allocated land do not relate to any specific features on the ground; and, would leave some arable land isolated and with no practical use for farming.</li> <li>• The comment that development of GNL0354 would not affect the setting of Wymondham Abbey is supported but it is reiterated that a detailed Heritage Setting Appraisal already shows that a higher level of development is possible without adversely affecting the Abbey.</li> <li>• In light of the Draft Strategy, the landowners submit an alternative</li> </ul>	Consideration to the new scheme layout of approximately 100 homes, particularly in relation to access off Old London Road, landscape implications on the Abbey, and if further expansion is feasible beyond 2038 in the remaining field enclosure.	The revised scheme masterplan for GNL0354 shows a relatively self-contained site. Increasing the site from 2.34 ha to 5.39 ha increases the housing supply from 50 to approximately 100 homes. Obligations for mitigating adverse impact on heritage assets is retained, but other policy requirements are revised. These relate to vehicular access from London Road and pedestrian/cycle	Allocate with alterations to policy wording and uplift site to approximately 100 homes.

		<p>masterplan for GNL0354. The scheme is for approximately 100 dwellings, with vehicular access via the Old London Road. Access to Preston Avenue is limited to pedestrians and cyclists to protect residential amenity. No access via Abbey Road is proposed. The layout, including open space, is located so as to provide views of Wymondham Abbey. The scheme specifically responds to the Plan's recognition that the allocated site should make provision for longer term growth within the 'remaining field enclosure'.</p>		<p>access from Preston Avenue.</p>	
<p>Anglian Water Services Ltd</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Unlike other allocation policies there is no reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.</p>	<p>Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement or as a general strategic requirement of all development.</p>	<p>This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Wymondham Heritage Society</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>This is a sensitive elevated area, and there are excellent views of the Abbey from Bradmans Lane.</p>	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of existing AAP and</li> </ul>	<p>All policies have to be balanced against each</p>	<p>Allocate with alterations to policy wording</p>

		<p>Development would destroy the wide sweeping landscape views from this elevated site. Regard should be given to existing policies such as: the Wymondham Area Action Plan policies, and especially Objective 7.3; and, Development Management Policy 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys. There is a National Trust covenant in existence to protect the Cavick estate and the countryside to the west. We oppose GNLP0354 and we do not agree that this area of Wymondham offers scope to accommodate some of the 1,000 dwellings contingency. Wymondham does not have the capacity for this further development i.e. doctors, dentists, schools, roads and hospitals.</p>	<p>DM planning policies (and evidence base).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate relevance of achieving development to 'National Trust covenant' to protect the Cavick estate.</li> </ul>	<p>other in the promotion of sustainable development, whether they be national or local policies. The policies and objectives of the Area Action Plan and Development Management policies remain relevant. However, these are not incompatible with the allocation of GNLP0354.</p> <p>The process for negotiating a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) will be used clarify if a restrictive covenant affects the site.</p> <p>GNLP0354 remains a</p>	<p>and uplift site to approximately 100 homes.</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--

				preferred site in Wymondham to meet housing requirements, but on a revised site size allowing for approximately 100 homes.	
Historic England	Comment	There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary. The Wymondham Conservation Area lies to the north of the site though at some distance. We therefore welcome the inclusion of bullet point 3 – ‘Mitigation of the impact of development on the Conservation Area and listed buildings to the north of the site.’		Noted	None

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	POLICY GNLP3013 Land North of Tuttlles Lane, Wymondham (Preferred Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	5
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 2 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of public	Object	What does "at least 50 houses" mean? How many more houses may be accommodated? Tuttlles Lane already suffers, congestion, the natural landscape should remain, and infrastructure is lacking.	Appraise considerations of landscape implications and infrastructure capacity (such as healthcare and education).	GNLP3013 remains a preferred site in Wymondham to meet housing requirements, providing approximately 50 homes.  The exact number of homes will be determined via plans submitted at the development management	None  Allocate with alterations to policy wording.

				stage, as is usual planning practice.	
Wymondham Town Council	Support	The proposed sites reference GNLP0354 at Johnson's Farm and GNLP3013 Land North of Tuttle Lane, each with an allocation of 50 dwellings are considered acceptable. The Council is pleased that there is only a minimal additional proposed allocation of 100 homes to be added to the existing allocation resulting in an overall commitment of 2,563.		The points made are acknowledged.	None Allocate with alterations to policy wording.
Wymondham Heritage Society	Object	Is 50 houses the total housing on this site? Development would encroach upon and erode the natural landscape across Tuttle Lane. infrastructure is lacking – hospital, doctors, dentists, schools.		The issues and concerns raised are acknowledged but new housing needs to be provided through the GNLP and this site is considered to be suitable for residential development,	None Allocate with alterations to policy wording.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	Unlike other allocation policies there is no	Consider inclusion as a site specific requirement	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2	None

		reference to water efficiency forming part of the design.	or as a general strategic requirement of all development.	that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	
Environment Agency (Eastern Region)	Comment	Site allocations around Wymondham (GNLP2168, GNLP0525R, GNLP3013, GNLP0006, GNLP0515, GNLP1055) are all in the headwaters of the River Tiffey and its tributaries, the land allocations are adjacent to the streams. The Tiffey is a chalk stream Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act s41 habitat of conservation importance. We are currently working on several projects to improve the River Tiffey to good WFD status e.g. fish passage and habitat restoration. The developments must not compromise this.	To apply Environment Agency advice, and to include where relevant policy requirements, which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A buffer between developed land (including gardens) and the river of 20 metres;</li> <li>• That developments carry out a Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment, which follows Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 18, and ensures no deterioration in WFD status.</li> </ul>	Comment about the WFD noted.  Policy wording has been reconsidered during further site assessment. A criterion is added to determine possible impact on the River Tiffey and its tributaries	Additional policy requirement added.  Allocate with alterations to policy wording

## Wymondham – Reasonable Alternative Sites

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0006 Land to the north of Tuttlles Lane East , Wymondham (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	4
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 3 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of the public	Object	A huge and unacceptable conurbation in the Tuttlles Lane area to include GNLP0525 and GNLP2155 and completely surrounding GNLP3013 and 2014/0799.	Investigate housing numbers for Wymondham, including the need for a contingency site, and landscape impact of development crossing to the north side of Tuttlles Lane.	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0006 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third	None  Site not to be allocated.

				site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.	
Carter Jonas LLP	Object	it is very unlikely that this strategic extension would be delivered quickly enough to address non-delivery of housing at existing commitments and allocations. As such, this site does not meet the requirements for a contingency site and should not be identified as a reasonable alternative in the emerging GNLP.	Investigate which site/s can provide evidence of their ability to develop and provide a contingency to housing numbers being delivered.	Comments about lead-in time and infrastructure noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.
Bidwells on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land (site promoters)	Object	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether development rates can be relied upon in the Norwich urban fringe or village clusters is queried and so a contingency site in Wymondham is argued for. Of the seven</li> </ul>	Considerations include: overall housing numbers for Wymondham; the appropriateness of the indicative masterplan; and, general planning matters of landscape impact, ecological protection, drainage, and highways access.	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0006	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<p>reasonable alternative sites, in Wymondham, GNLP006 is argued as the optimal choice both in size and location. As per the approach adopted in relation to Costessey GNLP0006 should be identified as the contingency site for Wymondham.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The indicative masterplan submitted as part of this representation demonstrates how the site can be developed to provide approximately 800 units. This would, based on an area of 53ha, give a gross density of 35dph, which is reflective of the local context.</li> <li>• The illustrative masterplan demonstrates how the site can incorporate open space in accordance with the Adopted Development Plan, whilst also including</li> </ul>		<p>considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>land for a new primary school, sixth form centre and local centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is proposed that two points of access would be taken from Tuttle Lane East and a meeting with NCC Highways has agreed this in principle. It is proposed to provide a 4m wide shared footway/cycleway along the site frontage on the north side of Tuttle Lane, where this is possible with a Toucan crossing near to Lime Tree Avenue.</li> <li>• The Drainage Strategy for the site is likely to comprise attenuation and discharge to the local watercourse, given the likely underlying geology. Consequently, the Masterplan incorporates suitably sized attenuation basins.</li> <li>• Direct surveys in 2019 did not find any evidence of; great crested newts,</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>roosting bats, water voles, otters, badgers, reptiles and brown hares and they are therefore considered to be absent. Some foraging by five bat species, nesting and foraging bird, hedgehogs and moths were recorded but the assemblage and individual species are considered to be of no more than local importance and minor components of larger populations across the landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on a site of 800 units, the site could be fully developed by 2031.</li> </ul>			
Environment Agency (Eastern Region)	Comment	<p>Site allocations around Wymondham (GNLP2168, GNLP0525R, GNLP3013, GNLP0006, GNLP0515, GNLP1055) are all in the headwaters of the River Tiffey and its tributaries, the land allocations are adjacent to the streams. The Tiffey is a chalk stream</p>	<p>To apply Environment Agency advice, and to include where relevant policy requirements, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A buffer between developed land (including gardens) and the river of 20 metres;</li> </ul>	Comment about the WFD noted.	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated</p>

		<p>Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act s41 habitat of conservation importance. We are currently working on several projects to improve the River Tiffey to good WFD status e.g. fish passage and habitat restoration. The developments must not compromise this.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That developments carry out a Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment, which follows Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 18, and ensures no deterioration in WFD status.</li> </ul>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0515 Land at south Wymondham – north and south of the A11 and west of Park Lane (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	6
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 4 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of the public – two comments	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of prime agricultural land for food production. Destruction of the natural environment surrounding the medieval town of Wymondham and therefore its unique character as a tourist destination.</li> <li>• There are landscape and townscape issues and highway concerns which need to be addressed. There is a County Wildlife</li> </ul>	Investigate adverse impacts, of which include: loss of farmland, heritage impact, and environmental damage. Specific matters are the impact on nearby Deer Park, harm to the local tourism industry, and the pinch-point in the road network at Silfield Railway Bridge.	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0515 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		Site adjacent to the site (ancient Deer Park). The traffic constraints at Silfield Railway Bridge have not yet been resolved.		Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.	
Carter Jonas LLP	Object	it is very unlikely that this strategic extension would be delivered quickly enough to address non-delivery of housing at existing commitments and allocations. The site promoter should be asked to confirm whether the proposed development could provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing, when taking into account the costs of providing primary infrastructure in advance of development. (It is noted that strategic development at South Wymondham currently under construction was required to provide between 15% and 20% affordable housing because of the	Investigate the ability of the proposal to provide upfront infrastructure alongside policy compliant levels of affordable housing.	Comments about lead-in time and infrastructure noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.

		infrastructure improvements required to connect the site to the town centre.			
Bidwells on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land	Object	This is 132.22 ha in size and could accommodate in the region of 1,500 dwellings. It is therefore 50% larger than required for the contingency and is also part of the proposal for the Silfield garden village. The draft GNLP states that this site, along with adjacent sites, could be considered as a new settlement in a future review of the Plan. In addition, the site is relatively remote from the town centre and other services and less accessible being cut off by the railway line and adding pressure on the main road connection pinch point under the railway bridge.	Considerations are the site's connectivity to infrastructure and services in Wymondham, as well as its suitability to be a readily deliverable contingency in the event of other allocations being delayed.	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0515 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.	None Site not to be allocated.

Environment Agency (Eastern Region)	Comment	Site allocations around Wymondham (GNLP2168, GNLP0525R, GNLP3013, GNLP0006, GNLP0515, GNLP1055) are all in the headwaters of the River Tiffey and its tributaries, the land allocations are adjacent to the streams. The Tiffey is a chalk stream Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act s41 habitat of conservation importance. We are currently working on several projects to improve the River Tiffey to good WFD status e.g. fish passage and habitat restoration. The developments must not compromise this.	To apply Environment Agency advice, and to include where relevant policy requirements, which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A buffer between developed land (including gardens) and the river of 20 metres;</li> <li>• That developments carry out a Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment, which follows Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 18, and ensures no deterioration in WFD status.</li> </ul>	Comment about the WFD noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.
David Lock Associates on behalf of Orbit Homes (site promoters)	Comment	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites including GNLP0402, 0403, 0515 and 2168 have potential to provide up to 6,500 new dwellings, a secondary school, three primary schools, 15 ha of</li> </ul>	To be investigated against other new settlement proposals: Hethel (GNLP1055); and Honingham (GNLP0415). The strategic need for this scale of growth, delivery timescales, and infrastructure	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<p>employment land and three local centres. Access to the site is proposed from a new grade separated junction on the A11 and secondary access points from Silfield Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A utilities assessment shows there is existing electricity, gas, water and telecom infrastructure within the vicinity of the site. There is circa 5.3MVA of electricity available capacity within the existing network that could serve initial phases of the development. To supply the overall site demand UKPN has advised of the requirement to reinforce the network with the installation of a new Primary substation. There are existing HP gas pipelines crossing the site that would be costly and could take up to 1-2</li> </ul>	<p>requirements are amongst the main issues to investigate.</p>	<p>GNLP0515 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

		<p>years to divert if required. The pipelines have a circa 15m building proximity zone to restrict building within that zone. There is currently sufficient capacity within the HP network to serve the whole development, with a proposed point of connection to the main in Silfield Road to the east of the Site. Anglian Water has advised that reinforcement works will be required comprising 4.2km on new off-site 400mm main and a new 120lps pumping station at High Oak WTW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the standard methodology of 2,027 dwellings per annum across the GNLP area would prompt a 16% reduction in the annual rate of housing delivery belatedly achieved over the past three years, therefore contradicting</li></ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>the Government's house-building ambitions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it would be justified for the Draft Plan to target 40,000 additional jobs as a minimum over its full plan period, given recent success in jobs creation, the ambitious economic strategy, and infrastructure investment. The economic argument means the house-building figure should increase to circa 2,400 per annum, as has been achieved in recent years.</li> <li>• All three new settlement proposals should be revisited through the sustainability appraisal. Amongst the reasons is that The Towards a Strategy document on which choices have been based has not been through any SA process itself.</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0525R North Wymondham (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	8
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 4 Object, 4 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of public	Object	Erosion strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett. Traffic congestion.	Investigate impact on the Strategic Gap to Hethersett; and, highways considerations (both in terms of site access and the wider highway network).	Concern about reducing the Hethersett to Wymondham strategic gap is noted. As too concerns over access.	None  Site not to be allocated.
Carter Jonas LLP	Object	it is very unlikely that this strategic extension would be delivered quickly enough to address non-delivery of housing at existing commitments and allocations. The site is	Investigate the impact of GNLP0525R on the Strategic Gap to Hethersett, as well as understand which site/s can provide evidence of their ability to develop.	Concern about reducing the Hethersett to Wymondham strategic gap is noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.

		located within the strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett, and development in this location would reduce that gap and lead to coalescence of the settlements. The landscape impact of development at this site in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment should be scored 'red', and in the Sustainability Appraisal should be identified as 'major adverse'.			
Michael Haslam Associates Ltd on behalf of Elm Farm Properties – two comments	Object (plus an additional comment)	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elm Farm Properties objects to the inclusion of land in its ownership within the proposed allocation. The company has not been approached about or agreed to the inclusion of any of their land within the allocation. That said, the company supports the remainder of the site being considered as a reasonable alternative. A Plan showing the extent of the</li> </ul>	<p>Issues to investigate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exclusion of Elm Farm Properties land from GNL0525.</li> </ul>	Issue of boundary and accurate mapping noted.	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<p>land owned by Elm farm Properties is provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that the Wymondham Rugby Club has now relocated the need for Wymondham Area Action Plan Policy WYM 14 (to provide land) no longer applies. The removal of land belonging to Elm Farm Properties from WYM 14 is requested.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal of Elm Farm Properties land from the existing WYM14 allocation, although it is noted that review of the Area Action Plan (AAP) is separate and the AAP will not be superseded by the GNLP</li> </ul>		
<p>Bidwells on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>GNLP0525R is located to the east of site GNLP0006. As a result it is, when compared with GNLP0006, more detached from the Settlement Boundary, as well as being more remote from all of Wymondham's services. Therefore, sequentially it would not logically be the next site to be allocated and in any case it could not be allocated before GNLP0006 as it relies on that site's delivery first. Accordingly, GNLP0525R should only be considered suitable for development</p>	<p>Investigate further selection of a preferred contingency site for Wymondham, and if GNLP0006 is the sequentially preferable choice.</p>	<p>Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0525R considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<p>once GNLP0006 has been developed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the illustrative masterplan for site GNLP0006 has been prepared to ensure that it would not prejudice the ability of site GNLP0525R to come forward at a later date.</p>		<p>requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Region)</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Site allocations around Wymondham (GNLP2168, GNLP0525R, GNLP3013, GNLP0006, GNLP0515, GNLP1055) are all in the headwaters of the River Tiffey and its tributaries, the land allocations are adjacent to the streams. The Tiffey is a chalk stream Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act s41 habitat of conservation importance. We are currently working on several projects to improve the River Tiffey to good WFD status e.g. fish passage and habitat restoration. The developments must not compromise this.</p>	<p>To apply Environment Agency advice, and to include where relevant policy requirements, which include:</p> <p>A buffer between developed land (including gardens) and the river of 20 metres;</p> <p>That developments carry out a Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment, which follows Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 18, and ensures no deterioration in WFD status.</p>	<p>Comment about the WFD noted.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

<p>Barton Willmore on behalf of Landstock Estates Ltd and Landowners Group Ltd (site promoters)</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site comprises circa 60 hectares of mainly agricultural land. The site is located outside the designated Hethersett – Wymondham Strategic Gap, with the exception of an area east of the site (identified for open space). Note: the proposal includes the portion of GNLP0525R on the north side of Norwich Common (B1172), east and west of Wymondham Rugby Club, and extending to the Melton Road at its western extent.</li> <li>• The development seeks to deliver: 650 new homes, including 33% affordable housing; a local centre (accommodating up to 1,950sqm floorspace with potential for A1 – A5 and D1 uses); land for a 2-form entry primary school; land for the relocation of Wymondham High's Sixth</li> </ul>	<p>Amongst the considerations are selecting the preferred contingency site in Wymondham, landscape impact, and protection of the strategic gap to the Hethersett.</p>	<p>Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0525R considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	<p>None Site not to be allocated.</p>
---	----------------	---	---	--	---

		<p>Form; and, significant areas of open space including the creation of a new 16 ha Kett's Oak Common' Country Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The indicative masterplan (appendix 5) shows main access points are via existing and proposed developments, known as Becket's Grove and Elm Farm, and connect to Norwich Common (B1172).</li> </ul>			
Gladman Developments (site promoters)	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development scheme on land south of Norwich Common (B1172) consists of 630 dwellings, land for a two-form entry primary school, C2 apartments responding to the housing needs of the elderly, a new local centre, open space, pedestrian and cycle improvements. Note that the proposal from Gladman Development is the part of GNLP0525R south of Norwich Common and does not</li> </ul>	Amongst the considerations are selecting the preferred contingency site in Wymondham, landscape impact, and protection of the strategic gap to the Hethersett.	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0525R considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<p>include land to the north of the B1172 east of Elm Farm Properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape analysis says proposed development that does not extend beyond the minimum width of the Strategic Gap (approx. 1.48km) would still ensure that the separate identity of the settlements is retained.</li> <li>• Guidelines recommended for any future development at Wymondham's eastern settlement edge in order to minimise the impact on the Strategic Gap are summarised as: ensure development does not extend east beyond Elm Farm Business Park to ensure a clear sense of leaving Wymondham when travelling in the direction of Hethersett; and provide vegetated edges along exposed eastern boundaries of development to mitigate</li> </ul>		<p>of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

		against potential impact on openness.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP1055 West of Hethel, Stanfield Hall Estate, Stanfield Road (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	5
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 2 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Carter Jonas LLP on behalf of Mrs Janet Skidmore	Object	GNLP1055 is identified for a garden village. These types of development typically take much longer to proceed through the planning processes and deliver housing than originally predicted, largely because they are complex and require significant levels of primary infrastructure to be provided e.g. roads and drainage in advance of housing. It should be noted that the new settlement	Investigate the ability of the proposal to provide upfront infrastructure alongside policy compliant levels of affordable housing.	Comments about lead-in time and infrastructure noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<p>examples in Cambridgeshire which are under construction (Cambourne, Northstowe and Alconbury Weald), referred to in Paragraph 23 of the New Settlements Topic Paper, are not able to meet local affordable housing policy requirements; there is an additional new settlement example at Waterbeach (in South Cambridgeshire) which is providing no affordable housing in the first phase.</p>			
<p>Glavenhill Ltd on behalf of Lanpro Services Ltd (site promoters)</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That a first phase of a new Garden Village at Hethel should be allocated now. Identification of a first phase of development on this site within the plan period would provide a clear commitment to delivering the plan's stated Vision and a clear means to meeting that</li> </ul>	<p>To be investigated against other new settlement proposals: Hethel (GNLP1055); and Honingham (GNLP0415). The strategic need for this scale of growth, delivery timescales, and infrastructure requirements are amongst the main issues to investigate.</p>	<p>Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP1055 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or</p>	<p>None Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<p>Vision in a sustainable manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Features of the development are: 6,000 homes, 28 ha of employment, three primary schools and a secondary school, a new 59 ha country park, and renewable energy generation park.</li> <li>• The technical assessments have demonstrated that there are no over-riding constraints to development.</li> <li>• The site is under the ownership of one willing landowner and the promotor has a promotion agreement with the landowner covering the site</li> <li>• The site has excellent access from an existing underused junction onto the A11, it is physically linked to the existing hi-tech employment area at Hethel, and there is an excellent pedestrian cycle</li> </ul>		<p>GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p> <p>GNLP1055 is also subject to separate assessment as a Garden Village proposal. There are currently no proposals to allocate a new settlement in the local plan, however GNLP1055 is being considered within the context of options for a new settlement in the future</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

		link directly into Wymondham Town Centre using an existing footbridge over the A11.			
Human Nature (Places) and Glavenhill Ltd (site promoters)	Support	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A delivery statement brought together by a collaboration of Human+ Nature, Glavenhill, Periscope, Richard Utting Associates, Urban Movement, amongst others.</li> <li>• An indicative programme timeline consisting of a planning application in 2021, the first 1,500 homes sold by 2025, and 6,000 homes complete by 2032.</li> <li>• That Human + Nature is developing its own housing product – Raw + Craft working with world-class engineers AKTII.</li> </ul>	To be investigated against other new settlement proposals: Hethel (GNLP1055); and Honingham (GNLP0415). The strategic need for this scale of growth, delivery timescales, and infrastructure requirements are amongst the main issues to investigate.	<p>Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP1055 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p> <p>GNLP1055 is also subject to separate assessment as a Garden Village</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

				proposal. There are currently no proposals to allocate a new settlement in the local plan, however GNLP1055 is being considered within the context of options for a new settlement in the future	
Bidwells on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land	Object	GNLP1055 is far in excess of the size required for 1,000 dwellings; being promoted as a garden village. The commentary in the draft GNLP acknowledges this and states that as no new settlement is currently being proposed in this Plan then these two sites are reasonable alternatives for consideration through a future review of the Plan. Given that additional housing will be required in the future this is a sensible strategic approach for the period beyond 2038. GNLP1055 should not	Considerations include: overall housing numbers for Wymondham; and, whether due to the lead-in time for new settlements whether the contingency land for 1,000 homes should be met through other sites.	Comments about lead-in time and infrastructure noted.	None Site not to be allocated.

		meet the contingency need and should not be considered as Reasonable Alternatives.			
Environment Agency (Eastern Region)	Comment	<p>Site allocations around Wymondham (GNLP2168, GNLP0525R, GNLP3013, GNLP0006, GNLP0515, GNLP1055) are all in the headwaters of the River Tiffey and its tributaries, the land allocations are adjacent to the streams. The Tiffey is a chalk stream NERC s41 habitat of conservation importance. We are currently working on several projects to improve the River Tiffey to good WFD status e.g. fish passage and habitat restoration. The developments must not compromise this. There must be a buffer between developed land (including gardens) and the river of 20 metres. A WFD compliance assessment must be undertaken to assess the impacts on the water environment,</p>	<p>To apply Environment Agency advice, and to include where relevant policy requirements, which include:  A buffer between developed land (including gardens) and the river of 20 metres;  That developments carry out a Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment, which follows Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 18, and ensures no deterioration in WFD status.  Design of site GNLP1055, if allocated, should avoid areas at flood if possible, undertake as necessary accurate flood risk modelling, and ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</p>	Comment about the WFD noted.	<p>None  Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<p>including but not limited to water quality of run off. We would welcome partnership working opportunities from any development to improve riparian habitats via Broadland Catchment Partnership (NPPF 174).</p> <p>There are a couple of ordinary watercourses running through GNLP1055 with small flood zones associated with them. The flood zones are JFlow so are not accurately modelled. The development must be sequentially sited to avoid developing within these small strips of flood zones adjacent to the watercourses, and the flood zones must be left open for flood storage. If any development was to be located within these flood zones then the river will need to be accurately modelled to determine the precise flood outlines and flood levels. The</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		development will then need to be designed to be safe and not increase flood risk elsewhere, as detailed previously. This should also be mentioned within the site allocation.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2150 North east of Carpenter Barn, Wymondham (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 3 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Wymondham Heritage Society and a member of the public -- two comments	Object	Far too much development already in this area. 2019/0184 - land north of Carpenters Barn has recently been refused. This would exacerbate the urban sprawl and contribute to landscape harm in Norwich Common. Does not accord with the WAAP, to maintain the open land between Wymondham and Hethersett, loss of habitat for wildlife and loss of open spaces.	Investigate the impact of GNLP2150 on the Strategic Gap to Hethersett, and the implications of the recent refusal decision 2019/0184.	Concern about reducing the Hethersett to Wymondham strategic gap is noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.

<p>Bidwells on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The site can only accommodate 150 dwellings which falls far short of the 1,000 dwellings required. In addition, because of their size they would not deliver the infrastructure improvements necessary to support the additional and existing housing required and they would both represent incremental growth rather than a well-planned strategic contingency for Wymondham.</p>	<p>Whether GNLP2150 is the appropriate size site to deliver the infrastructure required to meet the 1,000 homes contingency.</p>	<p>Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP2150 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	<p>None Site not to be allocated.</p>
---	---------------	--	--	---	---

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2155 West of Carpenter Close, Wymondham (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	2
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of the public	Object	Urban sprawl and landscape harm at Downham Grove. Would contribute to traffic congestion. I am concerned that there is a contingency of 1,000 houses which is excessive.	Investigate adverse impacts: landscape harm at Downham Grove; traffic congestion; and, the necessity for the 1,000 homes contingency.	Comment about 'urban sprawl' noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.
Bidwells on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land	Object	The site can only accommodate 80 dwellings which falls far short of the 1,000 dwellings required. In addition, because of their size they would not deliver the infrastructure	Whether GNLP2155 is the appropriate size site to deliver the infrastructure required to meet the 1,000 homes contingency.	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<p>improvements necessary to support the additional and existing housing required and they would both represent incremental growth rather than a well-planned strategic contingency for Wymondham.</p>		<p>being sought. Neither is GNLP2155 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP2168 Park Farm, Wymondham (Reasonable Alternative Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	6
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 4 Object, 2 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Members of the public – two comments	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Massive loss of prime agricultural land adding to ever-growing food security issues.</li> </ul> <p>Destruction of the natural environment surrounding the medieval town of Wymondham, a tourist destination in the heart of Norfolk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to this reasonable alternative although it is not proposed to include a new settlement at the</li> </ul>	Investigate adverse impacts, of which include: loss of agricultural land; landscape and ecological considerations; and, as identified by Norfolk Wildlife Trust threat to Ancient Woodland.	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP2168 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<p>present time. Park Farm is an ancient deer park, Lower Park Farm is moated and was an ancient hunting lodge. It is a historical site and Norfolk Wildlife Trust object to this site for inclusion in the Plan due to irreplaceable loss of ancient woodland and agricultural land and strongly recommend that the site is removed from the Plan.</p>		<p>Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p> <p>GNLP2168 (and also recorded as GNLP4057) is also subject to separate assessment as a Garden Village proposal. There are currently no proposals to allocate a new settlement in the local plan, however GNLP2168 (GNLP4057) is being considered within the context of options for a new settlement in the future</p>	
Carter Jonas LLP on behalf of Mrs Janet Skidmore	Object	This site is identified for a garden village to the south of Wymondham for 6,500	Investigate the ability of the proposal to provide upfront infrastructure	Comments about lead-in time and	None

		<p> dwellings. Issues are the uncertain delivery timetable and the site is unlikely to deliver policy compliant levels of affordable housing.</p>	<p> alongside policy compliant levels of affordable housing.</p>	<p> infrastructure noted.</p>	<p> Site not to be allocated.</p>
<p> Bidwells on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land</p>	<p> Object</p>	<p> GNLP2168 is far in excess of the size required for 1,000 dwellings; being promoted as a garden village. The commentary in the draft GNLP acknowledges this and states that as no new settlement is currently being proposed in this Plan then these two sites are reasonable alternatives for consideration through a future review of the Plan. Given that additional housing will be required in the future this is a sensible strategic approach for the period beyond 2038. GNLP2168 should not meet the contingency need and should not be considered as Reasonable Alternatives.</p>	<p> Considerations include: overall housing numbers for Wymondham; and, whether due to the lead-in time for new settlements whether the contingency land for 1,000 homes should be met through other sites.</p>	<p> Comments about lead-in time and infrastructure noted.</p>	<p> None   Site not to be allocated.</p>

<p>Environment Agency (Eastern Region)</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Site allocations around Wymondham (GNLP2168, GNLP0525R, GNLP3013, GNLP0006, GNLP0515, GNLP1055) are all in the headwaters of the River Tiffey and its tributaries, the land allocations are adjacent to the streams. The Tiffey is a chalk stream Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act s41 habitat of conservation importance. We are currently working on several projects to improve the River Tiffey to good WFD status e.g. fish passage and habitat restoration. The developments must not compromise this.</p> <p>GNLP2168 lies mainly in Flood Zone 1, with a corridor of Flood Zones 2 and 3 towards the south-western boundary of the site, along the Bays River. The flood zone in this location is JFlow so is not</p>	<p>To apply Environment Agency advice, and to include where relevant policy requirements, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A buffer between developed land (including gardens) and the river of 20 metres;</li> <li>• That developments carry out a Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment, which follows Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 18, and ensures no deterioration in WFD status.</li> <li>• Design of site GNLP2168, if allocated, should avoid areas at flood if possible, undertake as necessary accurate flood risk modelling, and ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment about the WFD noted.</p>	<p>None Site not to be allocated.</p>
--	----------------	--	--	-------------------------------------	---

		accurately modelled. The development must be sequentially sited to avoid developing within this small strip of flood zone, and the flood zone left open as flood storage. If any development is to be located within this flood zone then the river will need to be accurately modelled to determine the precise flood outlines and flood levels. The development will then need to be designed to be safe and not increase flood risk elsewhere, as detailed above. This should also be mentioned within the site allocation.			
David Lock Associates on behalf of Orbit Homes (site promoters)	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites including GNLP0402, 0403, 0515 and 2168 have potential to provide up to 6,500 new dwellings, a secondary school, three primary schools, 15 ha of employment land and three local centres.</li> </ul>	To be investigated against other new settlement proposals: Hethel (GNLP1055); and Honingham (GNLP0415). The strategic need for this scale of growth, delivery timescales, and infrastructure requirements are	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP2168 considered a	None  Site not to be allocated.

		<p>Access to the site is proposed from a new grade separated junction on the A11 and secondary access points from Silfield Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A utilities assessment shows there is existing electricity, gas, water and telecom infrastructure within the vicinity of the site. There is circa 5.3MVA of electricity available capacity within the existing network that could serve initial phases of the development. To supply the overall site demand UKPN has advised of the requirement to reinforce the network with the installation of a new Primary substation. There are existing HP gas pipelines crossing the site that would be costly and could take up to 1-2 years to divert if required. The pipelines have a</li> </ul>	<p>amongst the main issues to investigate.</p>	<p>preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p> <p>GNLP2168 (and also recorded as GNLP4057) is also subject to separate assessment as a Garden Village proposal. There are currently no proposals to allocate a new settlement in the local plan, however GNLP2168 (GNLP4057) is being considered within the context of options for a new settlement in the future</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>circa 15m building proximity zone to restrict building within that zone. There is currently sufficient capacity within the HP network to serve the whole development, with a proposed point of connection to the main in Silfield Road to the east of the Site. Anglian Water has advised that reinforcement works will be required comprising 4.2km on new off-site 400mm main and a new 120lps pumping station at High Oak WTW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the standard methodology of 2,027 dwellings per annum across the GNLP area would prompt a 16% reduction in the annual rate of housing delivery belatedly achieved over the past three years, therefore contradicting the Government's house-building ambitions.</li></ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it would be justified for the Draft Plan to target 40,000 additional jobs as a minimum over its full plan period, given recent success in jobs creation, the ambitious economic strategy, and infrastructure investment. The economic argument means the house-building figure should increase to circa 2,400 per annum, as has been achieved in recent years.</li> <li>• All three new settlement proposals should be revisited through the sustainability appraisal. Amongst the reasons is that The Towards a Strategy document on which choices have been based has not been through any SA process itself.</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

## Wymondham – Unreasonable Sites

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0320 Land south of Gonville Hall Farm, West of Sutton Lane, east of London Road and north of Sawyers Lane, Wymondham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	3
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	2 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of the public	Support	I support your views that this is an unacceptable site. It is detrimental to the proximity of Grade II listed Gonville Hall. Permission for 335 houses nearby. I agree that this site should not be considered for further development which would be totally unacceptable.		Heritage conservation issues are noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.
Wymondham Heritage Society	Support	Detrimental to the proximity of Grade II listed Gonville Hall, increase in traffic, pollution and light pollution. Permission for 335 houses nearby. The entry	Investigate adverse impacts, of which include: proximity of Grade II listed Gonville Hall, the	Heritage conservation issues are noted.	None  Site not to be allocated.

		into Wymondham from the south east has already been irrevocably comprised. We agree that this site should not be considered for further development which would be totally unacceptable.	impact from nearby recent development, and the potential harm to an important 'gateway' into Wymondham.		
Carter Jonas LLP on behalf of Mrs Janet Skidmore (site promoter)	Object	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The promoted development is smaller than the proposed strategic extension and garden village sites, and as such it could meet the requirements for a contingency site to meet non-delivery at the commitments and allocations elsewhere.</li> <li>• The site is owned by a willing landowner and is available for development. It is considered that a number of smaller sites, which could be delivered at the same time by different housebuilders/developers, would be a more appropriate approach to address non-delivery of housing and a housing land supply shortfall in the future.</li> </ul>	<p>Considerations include: overall housing numbers for Wymondham; the appropriateness of the indicative masterplan; and, general planning matters of landscape impact, extending the built edge of the Town, ecological protection, drainage, and highways access.</p>	<p>Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0320 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development to the north of Gonville Hall Farm is currently under construction, and therefore the promoted development at land south of Gonville Hall Farm will in due course be adjacent to the built-up area of the town. It is requested that the commentary in the site assessment is corrected to reflect the status of the adjacent development</li> <li>• There are no constraints to development at this site. A number of site specific technical reports have been prepared for the promoted development: Concept Masterplan; Heritage Desk Based Assessment; Preliminary Ecological Appraisal; Landscape &amp; Visual Overview; Flood Risk &amp; Drainage Appraisal; and Access and Movement Strategy.</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0355 Land at Rightup Lane, Silfield (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	1
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Pegasus Group on behalf of Pigeon Investment Management Ltd (site promoters)	Object	The Land at Rightup Lane provides the opportunity for two small allocations providing a total of up to 27 homes including affordable housing on a site which Development Management officers have identified as being suitable for allocation. A landscape buffer along the eastern boundary of the site is to enhance the Green Infrastructure Corridor identified in the Wymondham Area Action Plan.	Investigate the outcome of pre-application discussions with development management colleagues.	Discussions with development management have confirmed that GNLP0355 is a sub-optimal choice for allocation, due to highways access and its proximity to the A11.  Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in	None  Site not to be allocated.

				<p>Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNL0355 considered a preferred alternative over GNL0354 or GNL03013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0402 Land to the north east of Silfield Road and south of the A11, Wymondham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	2
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of the public	Support	Issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prime agricultural land needed for essential food security would be lost.</li> <li>• This cultivated land also provides a vital buffer area around the SILFIELD NATURE RESERVE allowing green corridors for movement of many species including the Great Crested Newt, a highly endangered species protected by law. This reserve, managed</li> </ul>	Investigate issues of: agricultural land quality, and ecological impact (particularly to Silfield Nature Reserve).	Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0402 considered a preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in	None  Site not to be allocated.

		by Norfolk county Council countryside Team on behalf of the Highways Agency, is an excellent example of supporting nature in its wild state but also needs to retain plenty of open space around it.		Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.	
David Lock Associates on behalf of Orbit Homes (site promoter)	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites including GNLP0402, 0403, 0515 and 2168 have potential to provide up to 6,500 new dwellings, a secondary school, three primary schools, 15 ha of employment land and three local centres. Access to the site is proposed from a new grade separated junction on the A11 and secondary access points from Silfield Road.</li> <li>• A utilities assessment shows there is existing electricity, gas, water and telecom infrastructure within the vicinity of the site. There is circa 5.3MVA of electricity</li> </ul>	To be investigated against other new settlement proposals: Hethel (GNLP1055); and Honingham (GNLP0415). The strategic need for this scale of growth, delivery timescales, and infrastructure requirements are amongst the main issues to investigate.	<p>Potential for a new garden village noted.</p> <p>Based on the Part 1 Strategy a garden village is not being allocated by the GNLP.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<p>available capacity within the existing network that could serve initial phases of the development. To supply the overall site demand UKPN has advised of the requirement to reinforce the network with the installation of a new Primary substation. There are existing HP gas pipelines crossing the site that would be costly and could take up to 1-2 years to divert if required. The pipelines have a circa 15m building proximity zone to restrict building within that zone. There is currently sufficient capacity within the HP network to serve the whole development, with a proposed point of connection to the main in Silfield Road to the east of the Site. Anglian Water has advised that reinforcement works will be required comprising 4.2km on new off-site</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>400mm main and a new 120lps pumping station at High Oak WTW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the standard methodology of 2,027 dwellings per annum across the GNL area would prompt a 16% reduction in the annual rate of housing delivery belatedly achieved over the past three years, therefore contradicting the Government's house-building ambitions.</li> <li>• it would be justified for the Draft Plan to target 40,000 additional jobs as a minimum over its full plan period, given recent success in jobs creation, the ambitious economic strategy, and infrastructure investment. The economic argument means the house-building figure should increase to circa 2,400 per annum, as has been achieved in recent years.</li> <li>• All three new settlement proposals should be</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		revisited through the sustainability appraisal. Amongst the reasons is that The Towards a Strategy document on which choices have been based has not been through any SA process itself.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0403 Land to the south west of Silfield Road and south of the A11, Wymondham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	2
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	1 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
Member of the public	Support	Loss of prime agricultural land when food security is going to become more vital, especially as Norfolk is the bread basket of the UK. Development of land to the south of the A11 will open the door to unlimited expansion of the medieval town of Wymondham and therefore loss of its tourism attraction.	Investigate issues of: agricultural land quality, and possible adverse impacts (such as effect on Wymondham as an historic town and tourist attraction).	Comments about development constraints noted.  Based on revisions to the Part 1 Strategy, a contingency site or sites for 1,000 homes in Wymondham is not being sought. Neither is GNLP0403 considered a	None  Site not to be allocated.

				preferred alternative over GNLP0354 or GNLP3013. A third site allocation in Wymondham would be in excess of the strategic requirement for new homes as set out in the Part 1 Strategy.	
David Lock Associates on behalf of Orbit Homes (site promoter)	Comment	<p>Issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites including GNLP0402, 0403, 0515 and 2168 have potential to provide up to 6,500 new dwellings, a secondary school, three primary schools, 15 ha of employment land and three local centres. Access to the site is proposed from a new grade separated junction on the A11 and secondary access points from Silfield Road.</li> </ul>	To be investigated against other new settlement proposals: Hethel (GNLP1055); and Honingham (GNLP0415). The strategic need for this scale of growth, delivery timescales, and infrastructure requirements are amongst the main issues to investigate.	<p>Potential for a new garden village noted.</p> <p>Based on the Part 1 Strategy a garden village is not being allocated by the GNLP.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Site not to be allocated.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A utilities assessment shows there is existing electricity, gas, water and telecom infrastructure within the vicinity of the site. There is circa 5.3MVA of electricity available capacity within the existing network that could serve initial phases of the development. To supply the overall site demand UKPN has advised of the requirement to reinforce the network with the installation of a new Primary substation. There are existing HP gas pipelines crossing the site that would be costly and could take up to 1-2 years to divert if required. The pipelines have a circa 15m building proximity zone to restrict building within that zone. There is currently sufficient capacity within the HP network to serve</li></ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>the whole development, with a proposed point of connection to the main in Silfield Road to the east of the Site. Anglian Water has advised that reinforcement works will be required comprising 4.2km on new off-site 400mm main and a new 120lps pumping station at High Oak WTW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the standard methodology of 2,027 dwellings per annum across the GNLP area would prompt a 16% reduction in the annual rate of housing delivery belatedly achieved over the past three years, therefore contradicting the Government's house-building ambitions.</li> <li>• it would be justified for the Draft Plan to target 40,000 additional jobs as a minimum over its full plan period, given recent success in jobs creation,</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>the ambitious economic strategy, and infrastructure investment. The economic argument means the house-building figure should increase to circa 2,400 per annum, as has been achieved in recent years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All three new settlement proposals should be revisited through the sustainability appraisal. Amongst the reasons is that The Towards a Strategy document on which choices have been based has not been through any SA process itself.</li></ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:</b>	Site GNLP0116 Stanfield Road, Wymondham (Unreasonable Non-Residential Site)
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:</b>	1
<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:</b>	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

<b>RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)</b>	<b>SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT</b>	<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</b>	<b>MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION</b>	<b>DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN</b>
George J Goff Ltd (site promoter)	Object	The site is now being promoted as a suitable site for development of a new energy research centre focussed upon low carbon innovation and the move away from peak oil production. Goff Petroleum would build out and manage the new centre which would provide high quality space for businesses and researchers to form a hi-tech cluster to drive forward innovation in this expanding	Investigate the benefits of the new site boundary, the scheme's details as discussed with development management colleagues, and how the proposals fit with wider ambitions for the Hethel Strategic Employment area.	This site is owned by Goff Petroleum who are seeking to diversify their existing operations on the adjacent land. Development of this site has good prospects to come forward given that the end-user is already known. There are clear commercial advantages to expanding on the	None  Site not to be allocated.

		sector. Positive pre-application discussions have already taken place with South Norfolk Development Management officers with a view to submitting a planning application for the site in due course.		current site rather than relocating. Uses involved on the site require consultation with the Health & Safety Executive, and it is unlikely that an alternative suitable site is readily available. Positive discussions have been held with the Development Management team and continued progression of a planning application is encouraged, and so the site not to be allocated.	
--	--	---	--	---	--