FOREWORD

1) Introduction
a) What is the LDF?
   • Joint Core Strategy (JCS)
   • Community infrastructure Levy (CIL)
   • Development Management Policies DPD
   • Site Specific Allocations DPD
   • Area Action Plans –Long Stratton and Wymondham
   • South Norfolk Place Making Guide Supplementary Planning Document
   • Explain Norwich Policy Area & Rural Area

b) What is the Sites Specific allocations Preferred Options DPD?
   EXPLAIN
   • What South Norfolk wants for its area up to 2026
   • Covers South Norfolk district except for the settlements of Long Stratton and Wymondham, where new development is to be provided for by the production of Area Action Plans in association with this DPD, and the parish of Cringleford, where development is to be provided for by a neighbourhood development plan to be produced by the parish council.
   • Shows development allocations, boundaries and designated land uses on the proposals map

   c) Stage reached in the DPD production process and what happens next
   EXPLAIN
   • This is the third public consultation following two Regulation 25 public consultations in 2010 and 2011
   • This document will be revised in the light of comments received to produce a “Submission” version to be considered by the government Planning Inspector at an Examination in Public
   • Before submission, the revised document will be subject to a further six week publication period to enable further public comment on the soundness its justification, effectiveness and means of preparation.
   • The Site Specific Policies DPD will then be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate with supporting information and a summary of issues raised by the public.

d) How to comment on the Preferred Options DPD
   EXPLAIN and provide links
   • On-line through the SNC web site
   • Using the response form included with this document

2) How the Preferred Options were developed
EXPLAIN
   (a) Principles of the Site Specific allocations DPD derived from the Joint Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal;
SN LDF Site specific policies and allocations: Preferred Options consultation document draft format – DRAFT Feb 12

- To allocate appropriate sites for housing and affordable housing, in the most sustainable settlements.
- To allocate land for employment to promote economic growth and diversity for a wide range of jobs.
- To make best use of previously developed land
- To avoid allocating land in Flood Zones, and in sensitive landscapes such as SSSI and Special Areas Conservation (SAC)
- To ensure that all site allocations identify where possible the infrastructure requirements
- To ensure that all allocated uses positively protect and enhance the individual character of the area and its neighbourhood
- To ensure that site allocations are close to core services so that people have ready access and minimal need to travel by car

EXPLAIN
(b) Sites suggested to us /SHLAA sites
(c) Previous public consultations on suggested sites
(d) Explain Z sites – not previously consulted on
(e) Explanation of 1st sieve process
(f) Explain the site assessment process (briefly)
(g) Explain some of the issues agreed by LPSG e.g. removal of development boundaries that were in flood zones, removal of development boundaries that are over 800m from services, exception sites and sites of less than 5 permitted since base-date

3) Site Allocations and Defined Development Boundaries
- Sustainability Appraisal relationship to site assessments – explanation of SA legal requirements/ reference to SA framework (include framework in SA report appendix)
- Appropriate Assessment relationship – Habitats Regulations requirements/ reference to potential for mitigation measures if required

4) Development land allocations (all types) by settlement hierarchy

SECTION 1 – Major growth locations (Norwich Policy Area)
Costessey/Easton, Hethersett

SECTION 2 - Norwich fringe parishes (Norwich Policy Area)
Colney, Trowse

SECTION 3 - Main towns (Rural Area)
Diss, Harleston,

SECTION 4 – (a) Key Service Centres (Norwich Policy Area)
Poringland/Framingham Earl

(b) Key Service Centres (Rural Area)
Hingham, Loddon/Chedgrave

SECTION 5 – (a) Service Villages (Norwich Policy Area)
Bramerton, Little Melton, Mulbarton & Bracon Ash, Newton Flotman, Saxlingham Nethergate, Spooner Row, Stoke Holy Cross, Surlingham, Swardeston, Tasburgh

(b) **Service Villages** (Rural Area)
Alburgh, Ashwellthorpe, Aslacton and Great Moulton, Barford, Barnham Broom, Bergh Apton, Brooke, Broome, Bunwell, Carleton Rode, Diddleburgh, Ditcheingham, Earsham, Geldeston, Gillingham, Hales (inc. part in Heckingham Parish), Hempnall, Kirby Cane (inc. part in Ellingham Parish), Norton Subcourse, Pulham Market, Pulham St Mary, Rockland St Mary, Roydon, Saxlingham Nethergate, Scole, Seething, Tacolneston and Fornsett End, Thurton, Thurston (inc. part in Ashby St Mary Parish), Wicklewood, Woodton (inc. part in Bedingham Parish), Wreningham, Yelverton (inc. part in Alpington Parish).

SECTION 6 – (a) **Other Villages** (Norwich Policy Area)
Bawburgh, Colton, Flordon, Keswick, Ketteringham, Marlingford, Swainsthorpe.

(b) **Other Villages** (Rural Area)
Aldeby, Bressingham, Brockdish, Burgh St Peter (inc. part within Wheatacre Parish and the adj. Developed area in Aldeby), Burston, Claxton, Denton, Fornsett St Mary, Fornsett St Peter, Haddiscoe, Hardwick, Hedingham, Langley Street, Morley, Needham, Shelfanger, Shotesham, Starston, Tibenham, Tivetshall St Margaret, Tivetshall St Mary, Toft Monks, Topcroft Street, Winfarthing.

SECTION 7 – **Smaller Rural Communities**
Only those where sites were suggested will be mentioned. Explanation of how Great Melton & Caistor St Edmund are now in this category from ‘Other village’ category.

5) Monitoring and Implementation

6) **Sustainability Appraisal Report including Site Assessments** (Will be separate stand alone report which is consulted on alongside the DPD)

7) **Habitats Regulation Assessment**

**Background Information**
- Site Assessment checklist
- Landscape character Assessment
- Draft Place-making guide
- JCS topic papers
- Historic Characterisation and sensitivity assessment 2009
- South Norfolk Council Annual Monitoring reports
- Report of Housing development permitted since 2008 base date
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Service Villages which are defined based on having a good level of services/facilities. The services considered the most important, but in no particular order are a primary school, food shop, journey to work transport service and a village hall. Most Service villages have 3 or 4 or all of these available, along with a range of other services.

In Services Villages land will be allocated for small-scale housing development subject to form and character considerations. It is envisaged that allocations will be within the range of 10-20 dwellings in each Service Village. Small-scale employment or service development appropriate to the scale and needs of the village and its immediate surroundings will be encouraged and existing local shops and services will be protected. This will be achieved through our separate Development Management Policies Development Plan Document rather than this Site Specific Policies DPD.

Service villages are defined based on having a good level of services/facilities. Service villages have been dealt with in two parts. Part A – Service Villages in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA). Some of the Service Villages in the NPA may have to have allocations of more than 10-20 dwellings to accommodate some of the undistributed 1800 houses still to be located within the NPA.

Service Villages in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) are; Bramerton, Little Melton, Mulbarton & Bracon Ash, Newton Flotman, Saxlingham Nethergate, Spooner Row, Stoke Holy Cross, Surlingham, Swardeston, Tasburgh

PART B - Service Villages in the Rural Area are; Alburgh, Ashwellthorpe, Aslacton and Great Moulton, Barford, Barnham Broom, Bergh Apton, Brooke, Broome, Bunwell, Carleton Rode, Dickleburgh, Ditchingham, Earsham, Geldeston, Gillingham, Hales (inc. part in Heckingham Parish), Hempnall, Kirby Cane (inc. part in Ellingham Parish), Norton Subcourse, Pulham Market, Pulham St Mary, Rockland St Mary, Roydon, Saxlingham Nethergate, Scole, Seething, Tacolneston and Fornsett End, Thurlton, Thurton (inc. part in Ashby St Mary Parish), Wicklewood, Woodton (inc. part in Bedingham Parish), Wortwell, Wrenningham, Yelverton (inc. part in Alpington Parish).

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
ALBURGH (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Alburgh as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Alburgh is a linear village of mainly single plot frontage development with a mixture of housing types forming a central core along The Street, with a short spur along part of Church Road. A ribbon of scattered farmsteads and dwellings extends northwards towards Mill road, and an open area containing farmsteads and some isolated dwellings extends southwards towards Piccadilly Corner. The latter forms the focus of an outlier of development centred on the junction of Low Road, Station Road and Tunbeck Road, which contains a mixture of farmsteads, detached dwellings, small fields and outbuildings. The area is characterised by many hedgerows and a number of mature trees, and is generally surrounded by open fields affording distant views.

Services and Community Facilities
The village contains a village hall at the junction of Low Road and Church Road, and a primary school. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage which has some spare capacity.

Communication
The village is linked to Hempnall and the B1527 to the north via The Street; and is linked to the A143 to the south via Tunbeck Road and Station Road, thereby on to Beccles, Bungay, Harleston and Diss.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary encompasses the integrated residential development along The Street and Church Road. The more dispersed development in the village and the cluster of dwellings at Piccadilly Corner are also excluded.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The only alteration proposed to the development boundary as identified in the 2011 consultation is a small extension to the northern end of the boundary along the western side of The Street which could accommodate one additional dwelling.

Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
No sites have been identified that, in terms of the form, character and servicing constraints of the village, are suitable to allocate for residential development.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
There are no reasonable alternatives for site allocations.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

ASHWELLTHORPE (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Ashwellthorpe as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, permission has been granted for 31 dwellings and additional community facilities at Wood Farm, The Street; therefore we are not seeking to allocate further land.

Form and Character
The main concentration of development has taken place along both sides of The Street resulting in a predominantly linear settlement. A further ribbon of development extends at the western end of The Street, southwards on New Road. Some estate development has taken place at Knyvett Green and Greenwood Close on the south of The Street. To the north of The Street is Lower Wood, a large wooded area (and SSSI) forming an attractive backdrop to the village and contributing to the rural character and setting of the village.

The rural village setting is enhanced further by mature hedges and trees, particularly around the church and Church Farm to the east and Wood Farm to the west. Also within the parish are two hamlets at Fundenhall to the south and Smithy Corner to the east of the main village. Individual farmsteads and dwellings are sparsely distributed through the rest of the parish, which lies in predominantly flat countryside.

Services and Community Facilities
There are a few facilities including a village hall and pub (the village shop has closed). The village has mains sewers.

Communication
Good road links exist to Wymondham on the B1135 and Norwich via the B1135 and A11.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The proposed development boundary is fragmented at Wood Farm and Church Farm where the wooded and agricultural hinterland can be seen, and around All Saints’ Church, which has a rural setting. The existing development boundary affords some limited opportunity for infill development.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The development boundary as defined during 2011 public consultation allows for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy. As the village has a recent planning permission outstanding for 31 dwellings, it is not considered appropriate to extend the development boundary. The permission site will included within the development boundary when it is built out.

Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
No sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, due to the outstanding permission for 31 additional dwellings.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
There were no reasonable alternative to consider.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

ASLACTON & GREAT MOULTON (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Aslacton and Great Moulton as a combined Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, permission has been granted for 14 dwellings at Coopers Scrap Yard Church Road, therefore we are seeking to allocate land for 5 dwellings.

Form and Character
The main concentrations of development within the parishes of Aslacton and Great Moulton are in three distinct settlements – the historic village cores of Aslacton and Great Moulton, and an area of largely modern development at Sneath Common.

The historic core of Aslacton is concentrated around The Street and Church Road, separated by a small area of undeveloped land where The Street passes through in a cutting. The Church and school and are in the northern portion around Church Road and Pottergate Street.

Great Moulton is a compact settlement which has developed between a number of traditional farmsteads strung along the south side of High Green and some further farms on the north side of Old Road. The village has seen a considerable amount of modern development, with modern estate development such as Potters Crescent and Heather Way as well as a large amount of infill development.

Sneath Common lies to the south west of Great Moulton and largely consists of frontage development along Station Road and Sneath Road.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlements combined have a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, shop and post office, and village hall.

Communication
The local road network comprises of mainly ‘C’ and unclassified roads, but the B1134 to the south of Sneath Common provides links to the A140 to the east and the B1077 and New Buckenham to the west.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundaries have been drawn up around the existing built-up areas to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding countryside. The Aslacton boundary is drawn in two parts to protect the gap between development around The Street and Church Road.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The development boundary will be extended to include the two allocations (see below) and to allow for limited additional development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy, with an extension along the south side of High Green to match the

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

allocation on the northern side of the road and to allow for possible additional development along Station Road.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 5 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>Land north of High Green</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development will comprise of frontage development on to High Green only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- Site 812 – close to school and bus stops on Muir Lane. Only part of site would be required for frontage development on to Church Road which could provide over 10 homes. This Greenfield site would result in more significant impact and land for 5 dwelling is what is required.
- Site 859a – would not have significant impact in wider landscape due to infill nature within Great Moulton. However, relatively remote from services such as school. Development would likely erode rural character of adjoining parts of Hallowing Lane and Old Road.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

BARFORD (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Barford as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, permission has been granted for 7 dwellings at Barford Van Hire on Watton Road; therefore we are seeking to allocate up to a further 13 dwellings.

Form and Character
Barford is a compact settlement on the north bank of the River Tiffey. Development has extended northwards away from the B1108 along Cock Street and Style Loke, with frontage development to the north of Church Lane and along Chapel Street/Marlingford Road. The historic centre of the village is concentrated on Cock Street and Chapel Street with later estate development situated off Chapel Street at Park Avenue and Clarke Close.

The village is set in the attractive valley of the River Tiffey and is characterised by mature tree planting, with the most sensitive area of the village situated either side of Cock Street where the Hall and its grounds on the west side and the popular plantation on the east side, positively contribute to the form and character of the village. This area also forms part of the Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme.

Services and Community Facilities
The parish has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school and village hall. There are a number of industrial and commercial concerns located within the centre of village, which provide local employment opportunities. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
Barford has a good road link via the B1108 to Norwich 6.8miles to the east and links via mainly unclassified roads to Wymondham 3 miles to the south.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The main part of the development boundary has been drawn around the built-up area of the village to prevent its extension into the surrounding countryside, especially the attractive Tiffey Valley to the south. There is an additional smaller development boundary drawn around the existing properties on Church Lane to the west of the village.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to extend the development boundary on land behind the Lilacs at Church Lane (site R0784), this will allow for limited development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy. The development boundary has been re drawn to the south of Style Loke to exclude land within the flood risk zone.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (ha*)</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Church Lane (part of site – see map)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Approx 10 dwellings</td>
<td>• Footpath would be needed to link site to main part of village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developer would need to demonstrate that safe access could be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainable Drainage Strategy will be required to take account of potential groundwater movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any direct or indirect discharge into the Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme would need prior consent from South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site would need to be well screened as approached from Church Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
• No reasonable alternatives considered due to localised flooding issues in Barford and potential impact of development on the Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
BARNHAM BROOK (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Barnham Broom as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Development has been concentrated in two areas, at Mill Road/Bell Road and at Norwich Road.

The built-up area around Mill Road is set on a west-facing slope of part of the attractive Yare Valley. It is separated from the eastern part of the village by the significant wooded area south of St Michael's Church and open fields south of Norwich Road. The settlement form is based on the junction of Mill Road and Bell Road, and estate-scale development has occurred between the two roads.

However, the built-up area of Norwich Road is linear, with small cul-de-sacs at Chapel Close and Lincoln’s Field. To the east of the built-up area at Norwich Road is the detached farm hamlet of Pockthorpe, which is separated from the main part of the village by a significant open gap, with good views of the surrounding open countryside.

Services and Community Facilities
There is a good range of facilities including a primary school, village hall, garage, shop and pub. Outside the village centre, the parish also contains Barnham Broom Golf & Country Club. The village has mains sewers discharging to the Wymondham sewage treatment works.

Communication
Good road links exist to Norwich and Watton (B1108) and Wymondham and Dereham (B1135).

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The proposed development boundary covers most development in the parish, reflecting the two cohesive built-up areas. There is a significant break in the development boundary where agricultural land and woodland provide a rural setting for the village. The boundary includes an area (adjacent to the telephone exchange) which was allocated under the previous plan but has not been developed.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The development boundary (as defined during 2011 public consultation) should be extended to allow a small extension of Lincoln’s Field by incorporating gardens from dwellings on Norwich Road. This allows for infill development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy. To avoid excessive windfall applications, the undeveloped plot at the eastern edge of the development boundary will be removed. At the far west of the village, the development boundary will also be re-drawn to exclude properties in the flood zone.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
Preferred Development Sites For Allocation

The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate the total requirement of 10-20 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>986</td>
<td>Bell Road</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20 dwellings</td>
<td>• Smaller site than proposed by landowner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Footpath to be extended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Layout to acknowledge role as gateway to village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access either from Millview or Bell Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Screening to ensure no negative impact on setting of Kimbolton Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered

- To keep the existing development boundary. This was rejected as there is no indication that the plot at the eastern edge (north of Norwich Road) will be developed, but an infill plot to the south of the Norwich Road has been actively promoted.
- To add to the existing development boundary without removing the undeveloped portion to the east. This was rejected as it could significantly increase windfall permissions in the village and, in conjunction with the allocated site, put a strain on local services.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

BERGH APTON (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Bergh Apton as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Development within the parish is relatively small scale with a scattered area of individual dwellings and farmsteads along The Street south of Cookes Road, an area of Council housing supplemented by a recently completed affordable housing development on Church Road, and the main concentration of development along Mill Road and Threadneedle Street. The remainder of the parish consists of isolated dwellings and farmsteads.

Development at Mill Road and Threadneedle Street has created a linear settlement form characterised by one plot depth development. The settlement is set in a flat and generally open landscape although there are significant wooded areas to the north of Threadneedle Street. The good tree and hedge planting along the road frontages together with the open setting of the settlement contributes towards its rural form and character.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a post office and shop, and a village hall.

Communication
The local road network comprises ‘C’ class and unclassified roads. The A146 is to the north of the settlement which provides a good link to Norwich and Loddon.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area at the junction of Mill Road and Threadneedle Street to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding countryside.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to adopt the boundary subject to the previous consultation on at the junction of Mill Road and Threadneedle Street and in addition draw a new development boundary around existing development on Cookes Road and The Street, which will also include a proposed allocation (see below), as this area contains both the village hall and shop.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>Land south of Cookes Road</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>10 dwellings</td>
<td>Development will comprise of frontage development on to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.

Cookes Road and The Street
- The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its southern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the south
- Anglian Water advice required for sewerage network capacity

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered

There are no reasonable alternatives that can deliver 10 dwellings or more.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

BROOKE (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Brooke as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The village situated on the B1332 with development being principally located in a linear form running eastwards and westwards from the Norwich Road (B1332) along The Street and High Green. To the south and east the land falls away into a valley although the village itself is situated on a fairly flat plateau. The area immediately to the south of the village is well wooded which creates a visual shield for the village.

The village is characterised by a mixture of dwellings, especially on The Street and High Green where there are many historic buildings. These combine with trees, hedges, water features and undeveloped spaces to create an attractive area which is encompassed by a conservation area.

Infill development has been permitted within the conservation area, whilst estate development has developed off the two ‘arms’ of the village, notably off Brecon Road, Astley Cooper Place and Burgess Way. Elsewhere within the parish development is widely dispersed comprising individual dwellings and farmsteads, although Brooke Industrial Park has been developed in recent years to the north of the village on the B1332.

Services and Community Facilities
The village has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, shops, a public house, a filling station, post office, village hall and related amenities. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
The B1332 provides relatively good access to Norwich some 12km to the north and Bungay to the south. The remainder of the local road network comprises a mixture of ‘C’ class and unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary is currently divided into two parts. The western section around High Green includes the estate development around Brecon Road as well as the existing development along Norwich Road itself which includes most of the services. To the east, the other boundary encompasses much of the development along The Street including the estate development around Burgess Way and Churchill Place. This boundary is designed to specifically exclude the Meres and to protect the character of the Conservation Area around Brooke House and along the western end of The Street.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is not proposed to alter the development boundary, other than to accommodate the proposed residential allocations (see below).

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites for residential development accommodating 20 dwellings in total and 4.8 hectares of employment. Much of the employment allocation has already been developed, however by formally allocating it as employment land, rather than open countryside as is currently the case, will enable the site to be developed more flexibly for employment purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (ha*)</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 351     | Land to the west of Norwich Road (part of suggested site only) | 1.8 | 6 dwellings        | • Development will comprise of frontage development along Norwich Road only  
• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its western boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the west  
• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding foul sewerage network capacity  
• A safe access(es) will need to be provided |
| 352     | Land to the east of Norwich Road (part of suggested site only) | 1.6 | 6 dwellings        | • Development will comprise of frontage development along Norwich Road only  
• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its eastern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the east  
• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding foul sewerage network capacity  
• A safe access(es) will need to be provided |
| 218a    | Land at High Green Farm | 0.92 | 8 dwellings | • A safe access will need to be provided  
• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding foul sewerage network capacity |
| 959     | Brooke Industrial Park | 4.8 | Employment use  | • New development on the site shall be limited to B1, B2 and B8 uses only |

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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- Site 218c (south-western corner) – would be accessed from High Green but would be much further from core services than the preferred option.
- Site 779 – development may be possible as an extension to Mereside. However, would be a very sensitive site given its position within the Conservation Area and prominence in views on the approach into the village from Seething.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
BROOME (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Broome as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Development within the parish has been concentrated along Yarmouth Road and Sun Road with an isolate group of development at Broome Street. Elsewhere the parish displays a dispersed settlement pattern comprising individual dwellings and farmsteads.

Development along Yarmouth Road and Sun Road is linear in form and predominantly of one plot depth. However, a significant amount of development has taken place to the rear of frontage properties along part of Yarmouth Road and a small grouped development has taken place off Sun Road at Sunley Close. The south-western end of the village merges with development at Ditchingham so that there is no clear distinction between the two settlements at this point.

The village is set in attractive open countryside within the Waveney Valley. Broome Heath lies to the north of Yarmouth Road and the undeveloped nature of this side of Yarmouth Road provides an open aspect which contributes significantly towards the rural character of the village.

Part of the parish lies within the Broads Authority area.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has limited social and community facilities including a public house and village hall. However, it is close to a wider range of services in Ditchingham.

Communication
The A143, which by-passes the village, provides a link to Harleston and Diss to the south-west and Beccles and Great Yarmouth to the north-east, as well as Lowestoft via the A146. Local road and pedestrian links provide easy access to Bungay to the south, whilst the nearby B1332 provides a link to Norwich to the north. The remainder of the parish is served by a network of ‘C’ class and Council unclassified roads with Dull’s Road (C395) providing a relatively good link to Loddon.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up to reflect the existing settlement form and to prevent further development extending into the open countryside. The boundary specifically excludes land north of Yarmouth Road to ensure the open nature and integrity of Broome Heath is safeguarded.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to largely retain the existing development boundary other than to incorporate the proposed allocation (see below) and to regularise an area in which development extends to the south of Yarmouth Road around Walpole Close which will

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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allow for limited additional development, subject to suitable accesses being achieved, in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings in total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 822a    | Land south of Yarmouth Road, between Nos 144 and 148 | 0.23 | 5 dwellings | • Development will comprise of frontage development along Yarmouth Road only  
  • The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its southern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the south  
  • Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding Waste Water Treatment Works capacity  
  • A safe access(es) will need to be provided |
| 775     | Land at Yarmouth Road, adj 185 | 0.26 | 5 dwellings | • Development will comprise of frontage development along Yarmouth Road only  
  • The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its north-eastern and north-western boundaries to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the north.  
  • Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding Waste Water Treatment Works capacity  
  • A safe access(es) will need to be provided |

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- Site 685 – partial development of this site along Sun Road or Loddon Road could be achieved, however this would have a significant impact on the rural character of this part of Broome and was therefore not as preferable as the above preferred options.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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BUNWELL (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Bunwell as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, permission has been granted for 5 dwellings adjacent to Bunwell Stores on Bunwell Street; therefore we are seeking to allocate up to a further 15 dwellings.

Form and Character
The village is a series of dispersed groups of dwellings. Development has been concentrated at Bunwell Street with small clusters of development at Bunwell Hill and The Turnpike, Bunwell Bottom, Cordwell and Low Common. Parts of the built-up area of Bunwell Street lie within the parish of Carleton Rode. For the purposes of a development boundary, these are included within Bunwell (Carleton Rode is also a Service Village and will receive an allocation of sites).

Bunwell Street is an extensive linear settlement, characterised in the west by one plot depth development along The Street, interspersed with a number of farms generally set back from the road, and The Barns forming backland development. The settings of the farmhouses are important in themselves and provide an open aspect on the street scene, contributing to the semi-rural character of the village. Further east, there is estate development at Greenways and Haylock Close. The village at Bunwell Street is set in predominantly flat open countryside. This contrasts with the clusters of development at Low Common and Bunwell Hill, which are set in the Tas Valley.

Services and Community Facilities
There is a good range of facilities, most of which are concentrated at Bunwell Street, although the primary school, village hall and playing field are along (or close to) The Turnpike.

Communication
The B1113 runs through the parish, linking it to New Buckenham and Norwich. There are also road links to Attleborough and Wymondham.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The proposed development boundary covers most development in Bunwell Street, but is split at Lilac Farm where farm buildings and newly developed affordable housing are excluded. There are additional development boundaries at Old Turnpike (by the school), The Turnpike (development adjacent to the village hall) and Bunwell Hill.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The development boundary at Bunwell Hill is more than 800m from the nearest core service (the school) and will be removed. For consistency, a new development boundary is proposed around development adjacent to local employment opportunities at Little Green. The combined development boundaries will allow for limited development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could between them accommodate the total requirement of 15 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z1191</td>
<td>The Street</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8 dwellings</td>
<td>• Site design to reflect role of gateway to village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R0825</td>
<td>The Turnpike</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7 dwellings</td>
<td>• Access road/footpath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian access to school (possibly via Church Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site design to reflect role of gateway to village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- To retain existing development boundary. This option was rejected due to the lack of services at Bunwell Hill and the improved local employment opportunities and residential development at Little Green.
- To extend development boundary to the west of Bunwell Street at site 708c to allow infill development at site 708c. This was rejected as potentially damaging to the rural setting and gateway of the village.
- Allocation of site 1029. This was rejected as the site forms an important break in development, emphasizing the rural setting of the village.
- Allocation of site Z1237. This was rejected as it would not balance the development on both sides of Bunwell Street.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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CARLETON RODE (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Carleton Rode as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, permission has been granted for 5 dwellings at Cooks Garage on The Turnpike; therefore we are seeking to allocate up to a further 15 dwellings.

Form and Character
To the north of the parish dwellings are within the development boundary of, and therefore considered with Bunwell (which is also a Service Village and will receive an allocation of sites).

Elsewhere, the main development of Carleton Rode village is along Flaxlands Road/Rode Lane, resulting in a linear settlement form characterised by one plot depth. There are isolated clusters of development at Hargate on the B1113 and at the junction of the B1113 and Rode Lane. Development along Rode Lane has been concentrated along the east side of the road, with the exception of a small group of dwellings on the west side. The relatively undeveloped west side of Hall Road and Rode Lane allows views of the surrounding countryside. Development around Church Farm is separated from the main built-up area by large open fields, contributing to the rural setting of the village. The open area to the east of the church and the wooded setting of the Old Rectory contributes further to the rural setting of the village and church. Development elsewhere in the parish consists of widely dispersed dwellings and farmsteads. The village is surrounded by generally flat countryside, with the Tas Valley in the southern part of the parish.

Services and Community Facilities
The primary school is located to the south of the village, opposite the church, while the village hall and playing field are to the east of the village on Mill Road.

Communication
The B1113 runs through the south of the parish, linking it to New Buckenham and Norwich. There is also a road link to Old Buckenham.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The proposed development boundary covers most development along Rode Lane/Flaxlands Road, and separates the main village from the Church Farm cluster where open countryside is prominent.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The development boundary should remain, as it allows for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
Norfolk County Council Transport has expressed concerns regarding the road capacity in the village therefore the preference is to allocate land to accommodate to the lower end of the required range of 10 – 20 dwellings. The following sites have been

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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assessed as potential allocated sites, and could between them accommodate an additional 10 dwellings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>999c</td>
<td>Land south of Flaxlands Road</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>• Access road needed (possibly continue existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site design to reflect role as gateway to village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cordon sanitaire limits wider use of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Road bend dictates extent of access to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999a</td>
<td>Land west of Rode Lane</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>• Site should balance development on east of Rode Lane and not extend village further into the countryside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

### Reasonable Alternatives Considered

There are no reasonable alternatives for site allocations.
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DICKLEBURGH (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Dickleburgh as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The main concentration of development within the parish is based along the former A140. There are also smaller rural communities at Rushall and Langmere. Individual dwellings and farmsteads are dispersed throughout the remainder of the parish.

The historical centre of the village has developed along The Street and is characterised by buildings close to the road. More recent development has extended the built-up area both north and south along the former A140 with further developments eastwards along Rectory Road and Harvey Lane. Immediately to the north of the main part of the village is an area of development at Dickleburgh Moor, a small detached ribbon of development along the west side of Norwich Road.

Development north of Rectory Road is predominantly one plot deep and is situated along the top of an attractive north facing valley slope. Development south of Harvey Lane is also predominantly of one plot depth only. A number of estate developments have taken place in between Rectory Road and Harvey Lane.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, village hall and shop. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
The A140 by-passes the village to the west providing links to Norwich to the north and Ipswich to the south, as well as Diss via the A1066. The remainder of the local road network comprises ‘C’ class and unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area of to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding countryside, particularly into the attractive valley north of the village. The boundary has been drawn specifically to exclude the grounds of All Saints Church, the grounds of the Rectory, the allotment gardens on Chapel Road and the recreation ground on Harvey Lane because of their contribution to the form and character of the village.

No development boundary has been drawn around the detached ribbon development at Dickleburgh Moor for residential development as further development would extend this ribbon into the surrounding open countryside to the detriment of the rural character of the area.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to extend the development boundary to encompass the proposed allocation (see below) as well as along Chapel Road from Cantera to and including Normandale and along Rectory Road to the east from Chanticleer to Greenacre as this

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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will allow for limited additional development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy. It is also proposed to delete the development boundary on Norwich Road at its northern end to exclude Dickleburgh Place, Micklegate House and Trecvia as these properties are within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 and therefore would not be suitable for any new development.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate approximately 20 additional dwellings and employment use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 056     | Land north of Langmere Road and east of Limmer Avenue (part of suggested site) | 1.1 | 20 dwellings | • Development will comprise of a small estate development  
  • The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its eastern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the east  
  • Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding Waste Water Treatment Works and foul sewerage network capacity  
  • A safe access will need to be provided |
| 1092    | Land at Beech Farm, Norwich Road | 1.6 | Employment use | • New development on the site shall be limited to B1 and B8 uses only  
  • A safe access will need to be provided  
  • Development will need to fund the restoration of the listed Beech Farm |

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- Site 54 – potential to allocate southern part of the site for housing without intruding into open valley landscape to north, however concerns about access and Cordon Sanitare for Sewage Works to north, rejected in favour of the preferred site.
- Site 357 – close to village core, however rejected in favour of the preferred site because it would need to developed sensitively given Conservation Area and setting of church. Concerns about possible infringement into Cordon Sanitare.
- Site 656 – would extend the village south along Ipswich Road affecting the setting of the historic core, but close to services.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
DITCHINGHAM (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Ditchingham as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Development within the parish has been concentrated along Loddon Road, Norwich Road, Station Road and Thwaite Road to form the established village of Ditchingham. Abutting the village to the east is the village of Broome. To the south of the parish at Ditchingham Dam is a small area of development which is contiguous with the built-up area of Bungay. Development within the remainder of the parish comprises of individual dwellings and farmsteads.

The village has developed a nucleated settlement form largely as a result of substantial post-war development. The majority of this growth has taken the form of estate development between Thwaite Road and Loddon Road. An area of 1950s Tayler and Green housing at Windmill Green and Scudamore Place makes a significant contribution to the character of the village and is now a Conservation Area.

The southern part of the parish lies within the Broads Authority area.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, village hall, public house, post office and shops. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
The A143 runs across the south of the parish linking Beccles and the A146 to the east and Harleston, the A140 and Diss to the west. The B1332 provides a link to Norwich, whilst local road and pedestrian facilities provide easy access to Bungay. A network of ‘C’ class and unclassified roads serve the remainder of the parish.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent further extension of development into the attractive Waveney valley. The development boundary has also been drawn to exclude All Hallows Hospital, the adjacent playing field and Windmill Green as these make an important contribution to the character of the village.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is not proposed to extend the development boundary other than to include the proposed allocation (see below).

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 20 additional dwellings:

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Land north of Rider Haggard Way (part of suggested site)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>20 dwellings</td>
<td>Access to the development will be via Waveney Road and Hamilton Way, with pedestrian access to the footpath running along the western boundary of the site. The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its northern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the north. Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding Waste Water Treatment Works capacity and sewers crossing site. Mineral resource investigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

**Reasonable Alternatives Considered**
- Site 328 – whilst development of this site would infill between the main settlement and existing development along Tunneys Lane, it would extend the village along Loddon Road to the detriment of its rural character and therefore the rejected in favour of the preferred site.
- Site 061 – close to centre of the village but levels differences within the site which would restrict development potential.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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EARSHAM (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Earsham as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Earsham is located within the Waveney Valley approximately 1km south west of Bungay. The main area of development in the parish lies to the south of the modern A143 along The Street. Development elsewhere in the parish is of a scattered and sporadic nature.

The main built-up area of Earsham was originally based along the line of The Street with the core of the village centred on the crossroads of The Street and Station Road. Significant post-war development has resulted in a more nucleated settlement form.

Part of the parish, to the north of the A143 bypass, lies within the Broads Authority area.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school and village hall. Earsham is in close proximity to Bungay which provides a large range of social and community facilities. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage capacity.

Communication
Earsham has good links, via the A143 with Beccles and Lowestoft to the east, and Harleston and Diss to the west, and to Norwich via the B1332. The remainder of the local road network comprises mainly unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding landscape of the Waveney Valley.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to extend the development boundary around the garden of Sunrise on Church Road as this will allow for limited additional development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy. It is also proposed to remove part of the boundary at the north-eastern end of the village along The Street as this area is within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. Otherwise, the only alteration proposed is to accommodate the proposed allocation (see below).

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 20 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 064     | Land on School Road (south of Queensway) | 0.8 | 20 dwellings | • The development will fund a new section of footway on the western side of School Road from the site to the existing footway north of Queenway  
• A pedestrian link should be provided to Church Path  
• A safe vehicular access will need to be provided on to School Road |

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- Site 285 – close to school, but development of this site for 20 homes likely to be intrusive into the open countryside and therefore site 064 is preferable.
- Site 930 – development would be intrusive into countryside and more distant from school than sites 64 or 285.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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GELDESTON (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Geldeston as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The main concentration of development is around Geldeston Hill and The Street, with a small detached cluster at West End and isolated Dockeney and Dunburgh Hill.

The village has developed in a linear form along The Street with a small post-war council housing estate having been developed to the west of Geldeston Hill. Some infill development has occurred along The Street. Much of the parish to the south of the village lies within the Broads Authority area.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has limited social and community facilities including a village hall, public houses and a farm shop.

Communication
The A143 to the north of the parish provides a direct road link to Bungay, the A140 and Diss to the west and Beccles and Great Yarmouth to the east and to Lowestoft and Norwich via the A146. Mains sewerage is also available.

Development Boundary
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding valley landscape.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to remove the development boundary for No6-12 Station Road as this land falls within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. It is not proposed to extend the development boundary other than to accommodate the proposed allocation (see below).

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>Land west of The Kells</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10 dwellings</td>
<td>• Development will be accessed from Kells Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A landscaping belt will be provided along the northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boundary with Yarmouth Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding Waste Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment Works capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mineral resource</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
GILLINGHAM (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Gillingham as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The historic core of the village lies along The Street and Loddon Road, with a further cluster of development at west Kings Dam. Estate development has occurred north of The Street, and the majority of the village (contained within the development boundary) is now in a nucleated form. The older part of the village is characterised by substantial tree planting along Loddon Road, in particular the wooded area to the east and the line of trees along Forge Grove which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

The village is set in the Waveney Valley, and open views out from the village are an important feature of the village, making an important contribution to its rural character. The attractive area around Gillingham Hall and its park was designated as a Conservation Area in 1994.

Services and Community Facilities
The village has a primary school at The Boundaries on Geldeston Road; a village hall on the east, and a motel on the west of Loddon Road. There is a petrol station and fast food restaurant north of the village at the A146/A143 roundabout. The village benefits from mains sewerage.

Communication
The parish is well served by the A146 (providing direct links to Beccles, Lowestoft, Loddon and Norwich) and the A143 (access to Bungay, Gt Yarmouth, and to the A140 and Diss). The former B1140 provides access to Thurlton and Norton Subcourse.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has helped to maintain views to the surrounding countryside. It encompasses the core of the village, but excludes the Swan motel, the cluster around the school and the small cluster at west King’s Dam.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is also proposed to delete the development boundary to remove land from it which falls within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. This affects properties on the southern side of the village along Kings Dam and Loddon Road.

Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
No sites have been identified that, in terms of the form, character and servicing constraints of the village, are suitable to allocate for residential development.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
There are no reasonable alternatives for site allocations.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
HALES (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Hales including the part in Heckingham parish as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Development in Hales and Heckingham has been concentrated around Yarmouth Road east of the A146 Beccles Road. Individual dwellings and farmsteads are sparsely distributed through the remainder of the parish.

The village has developed along the historical road network of Yarmouth Road, School Lane and Briar Lane. There has been significant modern infill development together with some limited estate development which has resulted in a more nucleated settlement form.

The village is set in an attractive valley landscape which contributes to its rural setting. Views of the surrounding countryside from within the built-up area, especially along School Lane and Briar Lane contribute to the semi-rural character of the village.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a village hall and shop at the Hales Service Station on the edge of the village. The village has mains sewerage.

Communication
Hales is adjacent to the A146 which provides a good link to Norwich, Beccles and Loddon whilst the B1136 provides relatively good access to Haddiscoe, and then to Great Yarmouth via the A143. The remainder of the internal road network comprises ‘C’ class and unclassified roads. A cycleway also links the village to Loddon.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding valley landscape. The development boundary also excludes the gap in development between the existing built-up area and the site of Hales Hospital.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
A significant proportion of the current development boundary falls within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. It is proposed to remove land which falls within these Flood Risk Zones from the development boundary which will as a consequence divide the boundary in two. The properties that will fall outside of the boundaries due to being these Flood Risk Zones are all those fronting the southern and western side of Millside and the properties fronting the western side of Briar Lane.

It is proposed to extend the development boundary to include the site of Hales Hospital, including a proposed allocation within the existing gap (see below). This reflects the permission given for residential development permitted at the site of Hales Hospital.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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Hospital and because there no other suitable sites for new residential development that can deliver the development allocated for Hales in the Joint Core Strategy.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 561     | Land on Yarmouth Road west of Hales Hospital (southern part of suggested site only) | 0.9 | 10 dwellings | • Development will comprise of small estate development accessed from a safe access onto Yarmouth Road  
• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its northern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the north  
• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding foul sewerage network capacity |

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
There are no reasonable alternatives, primarily due to the severely restricted nature of School Lane and Briar Lane.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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HEMPNALL (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Hempnall as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The main settlement of Hempnall comprises of development along the lines of Broaden Lane, The Street, Mill Road / Bungay Road and Field Lane. Originally a linear settlement based on the historic road network, the village has developed a more nucleated settlement form mainly as a result of modern estate development to the east of Broaden Lane and east of Field Lane. The village has also experienced significant infill development.

The historic core of the village is based along The Street between the junction with Mill Road and Bungay Road and the junction with Broaden Lane, which forms the main part of the Conservation Area.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a good range of social and community facilities including a primary school, a number of shops, surgery, garages and village hall. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
The B1527 runs through the parish providing good access to the A140 and Long Stratton to the west and to the B1332 and Bungay to the east. The remainder of the local road network comprises ‘C’ class and unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding valley landscape. The grounds of St Margaret’s Church have been excluded from the development boundary because of their importance in terms of the setting of the Church and its contribution to the character of the village by providing a ‘soft’ edge to the village. Similarly the playing field off The Street has been excluded from the boundary as this is an important open area within the village.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to remove the development boundary from areas within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. This specifically affects the area around the junction of The Street with Mill Road and Bungay Road and as a consequence will split the development boundary in half.

In addition to including the allocation proposed below, a minor extension is also proposed to the development boundary to the west of Field Lane as this will allow for limited additional development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 20 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| R0091   | Land west of Roland Drive     | 1.4      | 20 dwellings       | • Development should retain the historic agricultural building on the Bungay Road frontage of the site  
• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its southern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the south  
• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding foul sewerage network capacity  
• Access from Bungay Road should be combined with access to the Village Hall and Playing Field  
• A secondary access point for pedestrians and cyclists should also be provided on to Roland Drive |

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
• Site 097 – site could accommodate between 10 and 20 dwellings. However, accessing the site from Broaden Lane will significantly alter its character by requiring removal of a substantial hedge. Development of the site would also require construction of a footway along Broaden Lane from the site to the junction with The Street and Fairstead Lane.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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KIRBY CANE (Service Village in RPA)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Kirby Cane including the part in Ellingham parish as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The main development of Kirby Cane and Ellingham is concentrated in what has developed into a nucleated settlement around Mill Road, Mill Lane and Yarmouth Road, with significant estate development south of Yarmouth Road and on a more limited scale to the east of Mill Road and Mill Lane. There has also been a significant amount of infill development.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, shop and village hall.

Communication
The A143 provides a good link to Bungay, the A140 and Diss in the west and to Beccles, the A146 and Great Yarmouth to the east. The remainder of the local road network comprises ‘C’ class and unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent further extension of development into the surrounding valley landscape.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to remove part of the development boundary at the western end of Yarmouth Road where it falls within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. This affects properties from Nos 27 and 48 Yarmouth Road westwards. The development boundary will also be expanded to accommodate the proposed allocations (see below).

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate approximately 5 additional dwellings each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1174</td>
<td>Land at Florence Way</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding foul sewerage network capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Works to upgrade the access will need to be provided as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Land west of Mill Lane</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>• Development will comprise of frontage development on to Mill Lane only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding Wastewater Treatment Works capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Land east of Mill Lane</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding Wastewater Treatment Works capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered

- Site 948 (part) – close to school, but would result in development protruding into open countryside and therefore not as favourable as the sites proposed for allocation.
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NORTON SUBCOURSE (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Norton Subcourse as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The main concentration of development within the parish is based along Loddon Road/The Street, and adjoins the main built-up area of Thurlton. There is a small scattering of development based along Low Road with development in the remainder of the parish comprising dispersed individual dwellings and farmsteads.

Development along Loddon Road is one plot deep, with much of the southern side remaining undeveloped, providing good views of the surrounding countryside. Further along, development has taken place on both sides of The Street, also one plot depth. A particularly attractive feature of the village is the group of buildings at the junction of The Street and Loddon Road, built close to the road in the traditional style.

The village is set within a small tributary valley with the marshland of the River Yare immediately to the north. The good open views of the surrounding landscape from within many parts of the built-up area, together with areas of good tree and hedge planting, provide the village with its essentially rural character.

Services and Community Facilities
Limited facilities are available in Norton Subcourse. A wider range of facilities is available in the adjacent village of Thurlton. The village has mains sewerage.

Communication
The former B1140 provides a link to the A143, A146 and Beccles to the south, and to Reedham via the Reedham Ferry to the north. The B1136 links the village to Haddiscoe and Gt Yarmouth to the east and Loddon to the west.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary links the two parishes of Norton Subcourse and Thurlton (the majority of the combined village being in Thurlton parish).

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to remove land subject to Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 from the development boundary. This primarily affects properties on The Street and results in the development boundaries for Norton Subcourse and Thurlton becoming detached.

Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
No suitable sites have been identified, given the form, character and servicing constraints of the village.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
There were no reasonable alternatives to consider.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
PULHAM MARKET (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Pulham Market as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Pulham Market is a nucleated village which has developed around an attractive village green. A large number of attractive buildings front the green which are included within a larger conservation area. The village green affords an open aspect for the village centre. There has been considerable post war development to the north and west of the conservation area at Falcon Road, Julians Way, Mill Close and Springfield Walk. In addition infill development has occurred within the built-up area of the village.

Land around the village is gently rolling and offers distant views across mainly arable land. This gives the village its attractive rural setting.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, shop, post office and village hall. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
The former route of the B1134 (Tattlepot Road) provides a good link to the A140 linking to Norwich and Long Stratton to the north and Diss to the south. To the west, there is a relatively good link to Harleston. The remainder of the local road network comprises ‘C’ class and unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent extensions to the edge of the settlement and to protect frontages which offer views across open countryside and hence retain its rural setting and character.

The village green and church are excluded to retain the character of the conservation area.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary

It is proposed to extend the development boundary to include the two allocations (see below) and also to include existing development to the south of the church which will allow for limited additional development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate approximately 5 and 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 124     | Land on Colegate End Road (part) | 0.4      | 5 dwellings        | • Development will comprise of frontage development along Colegate End Road only  
• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its eastern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the east  
• A safe access(es) will need to be provided |
| 121     | Land at Sycamore Farm, Tattlepot Road | 0.7      | 10 dwellings       | • Development of the site will retain the listed Sycamore Farm and its historic outbuildings close the site frontage  
• The development will take the form of a small estate development accessed from Tattlepot Road the west of Sycamore Farm |

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
• Site 367 – partial development of this site to provide a small estate development adjacent to Jocelyn Close could be acceptable, however this would be extending into the open countryside and is further from services than the preferred sites.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
PULHAM ST MARY (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Pulham St Mary as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The main village is located centrally within the parish. It developed in a linear form east-west with development later being located on a north-south axis along North Green Road, Station Road and Mill Lane, and later still, estate development at Goldsmith Way, Bond Close and Chestnut Road. This has resulted in a village with both linear and nucleated features. The ribbon of local authority housing on Norwich Road reinforces the linear form at the western end of the village.

In the centre of the village the grounds of ‘The Grange’ form a large undeveloped area which adds to the open character of the village, as does the area to the north of The Street around the churchyard. Large parts of the village containing a variety of historic buildings fall within a Conservation Area, which extends to the river meadows south of The Street as far as Dirty Lane.

Services and Community Facilities
The village hall, post office/stores and shop are located along The Street. The village has mains sewerage.

Communication
The village has good road access via Starston to Harleston to the east and via Pulham Market to the A140 to Norwich, Long Stratton and Diss to the west.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary is drawn tightly around the built-up area of the village. The boundary excludes the churchyard and the grounds of The Grange, which give the central village a rural character.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to delete the development boundary to remove land that falls within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. This affects a small number of properties at the southern end of the village on Station Road and at the eastern end of the village.

Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
No sites have been identified that, in terms of the form, character and servicing constraints of the village, are suitable to allocate for residential development.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
There are no reasonable alternatives for site allocations.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
ROCKLAND ST MARY (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Rockland St Mary as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Development is concentrated along The Street with a small detached cluster of development at Rockland Staithe to the east of the village, and an isolated group of houses to the west at The Oaks, Bramerton Lane. A small number of individual dwellings and farmsteads are widely dispersed throughout the remainder of the parish.

The village has developed a linear settlement form based along Rookery Hill and The Street. It has experienced some limited estate development, particularly at the eastern end of the village adjacent to Surlingham Lane together with some infill development.

The village is set on the Yare Valley with a smaller tributary valley to the south, which together with good views from within the built-up area of the surrounding landscape and the good tree and hedge planting throughout, give the village a pleasant rural character.

Most of the parish to the east of the village, including Rockland Staithe, lies within the Broads Authority area.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, post office, shop, doctors surgery and village hall. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
Bramerton Lane / Rockland Road (C202) which meets the A146 at Trowse provides a relatively quick link to Norwich and the A47. Run Lane links to the A146 at Hellington Corner. The remainder of the local road network comprises predominantly unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding countryside.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
In addition to extending the development boundary to incorporate the proposed allocation (see below), it is also proposed to extend the boundary at Old Hall to allow for limited additional development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation

The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 20 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Land off Bee-Orchid Way</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>20 dwellings</td>
<td>• Development will be accessed via Bee-Orchid Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its northern and eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boundaries to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the north and east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A safe access will need to be provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered

- Site 1150 – potential to develop as an extension to the affordable housing scheme, although development would further erode gap between main village and Rockland Staithe and therefore not as preferable as site 129
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ROYDON (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Roydon as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. Since the JCS base date April 2008 up to September 2011, 12 dwellings have been permitted at Holy Trinity Church, Stanley Road, therefore we are seeking to allocate up to a further 8 dwellings.

Form and Character
The main development in the parish is contained within the three development boundaries of the village of Roydon; Snow Street/Banyards Lane/Hall Lane; and parts of Diss west of Shelfanger Road north of Factory Lane, and along Tottington Lane west of Fair Green (both of which are within Diss development boundary and considered with Diss). The parish also contains clusters of development around Brewers Green and part of Bressingham Common along Bressingham Road.

Roydon village is located on the A1066 overlooking the Waveney Valley, and comprises mainly several residential estates to the north of the road and a ribbon of development along its south side. Much of the village comprises bungalow development built during the 1960s and 1970s and contains relatively few notable buildings. The village contains several attractive areas of trees along Bellope Lane, Swamp Lane, and around Roydon Hall and Diss Rugby Club ground, forming a western boundary to the village. To the north and north east of the village, Brewers Green forms an attractive open area of grassland bordered by areas of trees and scrub, large detached dwellings and a group of cottages with a farmstead. Part of this area is also of noted nature conservation value.

To the east, an area of open fields containing an isolated row of dwellings on Factory Lane separates Roydon from the developed area of Diss. Elsewhere, the village is surrounded by open farmland affording attractive views to Snow Street and a shallow valley to the north, and across the larger Waveney Valley to the south.

At Snow Street/Banyards Lane/Hall Lane development is linear, comprising mainly detached dwellings, two farmsteads and a notable number of mature trees and hedgerows. These combine to create an attractive environment, where trees are integral to the setting of the dwellings.

Services and Community Facilities
The village contains a range of facilities including a primary school, service station, village hall and pub.

Communication
The A1066 provides Roydon with a direct east-west link to Diss and other settlements along the Waveney Valley. Old High Road provides a further link to the centre of Diss via Roydon Road. The B1077 Shelfanger Road links northward to Shelfanger and Attleborough.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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**Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)**
The two development boundaries representing the village of Roydon have been drawn to maintain the separation of the two parts of the village, and that of Roydon from Diss. The boundaries retain the notable wooded character parts of the settlements and have protected the high landscape quality of the areas north and south of the village, and the setting and open aspect of Brewers Green.

**Preferred Option – Development Boundary**
It is proposed to retain the development boundary as identified in the 2011 consultation.

**Preferred Development Sites For Allocation**
No sites have been identified that, in terms of the form, character and servicing constraints of the village, are suitable to allocate for residential development.

**Reasonable Alternatives Considered**
There are no reasonable alternatives for site allocations.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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SAXLINGHAM NETHERGATE (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Saxlingham Nethergate as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Development within the parish is concentrated at Saxlingham Nethergate with smaller concentrations at Saxlingham Thorpe and Saxlingham Green, and a small cluster of dwellings at West End. The remainder of the parish comprises scattered individual dwellings and farmsteads.

Saxlingham Nethergate has developed from a linear settlement form with development historically taking place along one side of both The Street and Church Hill. This contrasts with the opposite frontage of The Street and Church Hill which is generally wooded, and which makes an important contribution to the rural character of the village. Estate development has taken place at Kensington Close, Steward Close and Pitts Hill Close. Church Green is a particularly attractive open space which contributes to the attractive setting of The Old Rectory, the church and The Old hall, all of which are listed buildings. The importance of this area is reflected in its inclusion in the Conservation Area, which also includes Church Hill and The Street.

The open water meadows on the east side of The Street opposite the junction with Browns Lane makes a significant contribution to the generally open character of this part of the village. Development has extended northwards along Shotesham Lane and Norwich Road with a further ribbon of development extending westwards along Cargate Lane. The village is set in an attractive valley landscape based on a tributary of the River Tas.

Services and Community Facilities
The village has a primary school and village hall, and a GP surgery.

Communication
The local road network comprises a mixture of C class and unclassified roads, with the exception of the A140 which runs north-south through the western limit of the parish, providing good links from the village to Norwich and Long Stratton.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn fairly tightly around the existing built-up area of the village. The open water meadow opposite the junction of The Street and Browns Lane has been excluded as this makes an important contribution to the open character of this part of the village. Similarly, the wooded grounds south of the water meadow have been excluded as they provide an attractive wooded frontage to The Street, contributing to the rural form and character of the village. The area of Church Green has also been excluded, as new development would detract from the character of the area and the setting of the listed buildings.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to extend the development boundary to include the proposed allocation (see below), to allow limited infill development at Nethergate House and to remove land which falls within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 near the junction of The Street and Cargate Lane.

Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site which, subject to agreement by the landowner to expand the size of site 447d, could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>447d, 447e &amp; additional land</td>
<td>Land on Norwich Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>dwellings</td>
<td>• The development will comprise of frontage development on to Norwich Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
There are no reasonable alternatives.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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SCOLE (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Scole as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. Since the JCS base date April 2008 up to September 2011, five dwellings have been permitted and are now under construction and therefore we are only now seeking to allocate 5-15 dwellings.

Form and Character
The village is located partly on the edge of the Waveney Valley. The village is centred around the junction of the former routes of the A140 and A143. The village contains extensive frontage development to the north and east of this junction backed by several large housing estates. Relatively little development is located on the western side of the former A140, except for some limited frontage development along The Street and a small housing estate to the south of Diss Road. The area around the junction forms the village core and includes a variety of buildings of considerable historical significance.

Approximately half of the village consists of relatively modern dwellings of which many are detached, and the village is characterised by several open spaces near the centre, some of which afford views over the surrounding countryside.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, shop and village hall. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
The A140 and A143, which both bypass the village, provide direct links to Norwich and Ipswich and to towns along the Waveney Valley. The A1066 to the west of the village links Scole to Diss, with Diss railway station around 2.5km from the village. The remainder of the local road network comprises ‘C’ class and unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Development to the south and west are constrained to some extent by the A140, A143 and the River Waveney. The development boundary has therefore been drawn up around the existing built-up area of to prevent the setting of the village being adversely affected by new development, to prevent further extension of development into the surrounding countryside and to protect the character of the conservation area.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to extend to development boundary to include Holmleigh, Osmosderston Lodge and High House on Norwich Road which would allow for limited infill development, and to extend the boundary to accommodate the proposed allocation (see below).

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>Land to the north of Ransome Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 dwellings</td>
<td>• The development will be accessed through the recently completed affordable housing scheme between the site and Norwich Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered

- Site 135 – development would extend the built-up area of the village eastwards along Bungay Road and is likely to require new footway provision and further from the school than the preferred site.
- Site 334 – could be developed partially, accessed from Reeve Close. Adjacent to village hall and playing field, but further from school than site 891. Also would extend into open countryside.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Seething as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The village of Seething has developed a linear form along Seething Street. It is characterised by predominantly one plot depth development. The abundance of tree and hedge planting especially along road frontages, together with the large open grounds of the church, and the undeveloped frontage of The Street east of the Church affording good views of the surrounding open countryside, all contribute to the rural setting of the village which is recognised by its designation as a conservation area.

A particularly attractive feature of the village is the large pond and adjacent woodland area which are an integral part of the setting of Mere House and White Lodge, both listed buildings.

To the north-east of the main built-up area is a ribbon of development comprising council housing set in open countryside. The north and north-west of the parish comprises attractive valley landscape which contribute towards the attractive rural setting of the village.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, shop and village hall.

Communication
Road links exist via Brooke Road (C203) and the B1332 to the west, and to Loddon and the A146 to the east. The remainder of the local road network comprises predominantly unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding countryside. The development boundary also specifically excludes the church and its grounds and around Mere House and the ponds.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary

To keep the proposed development boundary but to provide an additional development boundary to the south of the ponds from Langhale Cottage to Green’s End, which includes the proposed allocation below, as this will allow for limited additional development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate up to 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>684</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>10 dwellings</td>
<td>Development will comprise of frontage development along Seething Street only • The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its eastern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the east • A safe access(es) will need to be provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered

There are no reasonable alternatives.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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TACOLNESTON and FORNCETT END (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Tacolneston and Fornsett End combined as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The main concentration of development within the parish of Tacolneston is based along Norwich Road and adjoins the built-up area of Forncett End to the south. Development in the remainder of the parish comprises scattered individual dwellings and farmsteads.

The village has developed as a predominantly linear settlement along Norwich Road with the exception of post war estate development, namely at Dovedale Road, Boileau Avenue and off Bentley Road in Forncett End. A significant break in the built-up frontage on both sides of Norwich Road exists to the north of the Manor House buildings whose setting in spacious grounds with good tree growth contributes towards the ‘open’ nature and rural character of this part of the village.

In Forncett End a ribbon of development has extended along Long Stratton Road to the east with development limited to the north side of the road east of Chestnut Tree Farm with the southern side largely undeveloped and fronting open fields. Development has also extended along the south side of West Road and along both sides of Tabernacle Lane as far as Elm Tree Farm.

Services and Community Facilities
The parish has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school and village hall.

Communication
The B1113 provides relatively good access to Norwich and New Buckenham whilst the B1135 runs to the north providing access to Wymondham and Long Stratton. The remainder of the parish is served by ‘C’ class and unclassified roads.

Conservation Area
The area north of the estate development at Dovedale Road is designated as a Conservation Area, which extends as far east as the church. This area has a distinctly rural character with mature trees.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The main part of the development boundary has been drawn around the built-up area of the villages of Tacolneston and Fornsett End to prevent their extension into the surrounding countryside. A separate development boundary is drawn around the estate development at Dovedale Road to the north of the village.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
On request from Norfolk County Council it is proposed to extend the development boundary to include all the school buildings at Tacolneston Primary School but the school playing fields remain outside the development boundary.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
It is also proposed to extend the development boundary around site 442 as this will allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

A further development boundary extension is proposed to include site 689 and the development of barn conversions at White House Farm, again this will allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 20 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Land adj The Fields</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>20 dwellings</td>
<td>• The site will need to be well screened from properties on The Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding WWTW capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local highways improvements will be needed and a safe access will need to be provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- Site 586 – potential for a line of road frontage properties to round off existing development boundary (maximum of 10 dwellings). Site would be more intrusive in the landscape than the preferred site.
- Site 702a – possible site for housing development, although whole site would be too large for 20 dwellings. Site has no obvious constraints but adjacent proposed allocation site 214 would be a more logical extension to the development boundary and would be less intrusive in the landscape.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
THURLTON (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Thurlton as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The main concentration of development has developed in a linear settlement form based upon the historical road network based along Beccles Road, Church Road and Low Road although modern estate development off Beccles Road has resulted in a more nucleated form in this area. In addition to development, the village has experienced a considerable amount of modern infill development which has generally respected the existing character of frontage development. There is a detached group of houses at College Road, whilst the wooded grounds of All Saints Church and The Rectory provide a ‘soft’ edge to the village which makes an important contribution to its rural character.

The village is set in an attractive landscape with Thurlton Marshes to the north and a small tributary valley immediately to the west with views of the surrounding countryside from within parts of the built-up area.

There is a detached area of development at Low Thurlton comprising of a number of farms interspersed with older cottages and more recent development. The area is very rural in nature, set in attractive open landscape with significant open gaps between buildings. Part of the parish lies with the Broads Authority area.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, post office and shop, public house and village hall. Main sewerage is available in the village.

Communication
Beccles Road provides a relatively a good link to Beccles and the A143 to the south, whilst the nearby B1136 links to the A146 and Loddon to the west and Haddiscoe and the A143 to Great Yarmouth to the east. The remainder of the local road network comprises a mixture of ‘C’ class and unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding valley landscape. The wooded grounds of All Saints Church and the Rectory have been excluded because of its contribution to the character of the village, whilst the College Road development was excluded because of the gap between it and the main settlement.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to remove land subject to Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 from the development boundary. This primarily affects properties on The Street and results in the development boundaries for Norton Subcourse and Thurlton becoming detached.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 5 – SERVICE VILLAGES

It is proposed to extend the development boundary to include College Road as this will allow for limited additional development within this area in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy, whilst providing for an allocated site (see below) within the existing gap between the main village and College Road.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>613a &amp; 613b (part)</td>
<td>Land on Beccles Road west of College Road (frontage part of suggested site)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 dwellings</td>
<td>• Development will comprise of estate development accessed from Beccles Road&lt;br&gt;• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its northern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the north&lt;br&gt;• A safe access(es) will need to be provided&lt;br&gt;• Mineral wording required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- Site 1133 – subject to access being provided through the recently completed affordable housing scheme this site is close to the school and could be developed without significant intrusion into the landscape. However, may not be able to provide all of Thurlton’s allocation on its own and therefore sites 613a, 613b are preferred.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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THURTON & ASHBY ST MARY (Service Village in RPA)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Thurton including part of Ashby St Mary parish as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
Development within Thurton parish has been concentrated along Ashby Road north of the A146 and is contiguous with the main built-up area of Ashby St Mary. Development south of the A146 is limited to The Street and Loddon Road. In Thurton, detached clusters of development exist along Cookes Road, White Heath Road and Hall Road; in Ashby St Mary, a detached cluster of development exists at Mill Common, to the east of the built-up area, and scattered development at Low Common and along Folly Lane. The remainder of both parishes is made up of individual dwellings and farmsteads.

The village is based on the historic road network, in particular Mill Road/Ashby Road and The Street, although estate development has occurred on either side of Mill Road/Ashby Road, resulting in a nucleated settlement form.

The village of Thurton is set in an attractive tributary valley of the River Yare. The wooded areas to the north and east of the village are a particularly attractive feature of the valley and are important in the rural setting of the village, and combined with the open character of The Street give the village an attractive semi-rural character.

Services and Community Facilities
There is a range of facilities, including a primary school, church, village hall, and pub. The village is on mains sewerage.

Communication
The A146 provides good road links with Norwich, Loddon and Beccles. A network of ‘C’ roads and unclassified roads links the village with surrounding villages.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary straddles the A146, incorporating the pub and garage to the south, but excluding dwellings at Cookes Road (south of A146) and Mill Common (north of the village).

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
To delete the development boundary to remove land that falls within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. This affects the George & Dragon pub on the southern side of the A146 and properties on The Crescent and The Meadows on the northern side and results in the division of the development boundary into two.

Extensions to the development boundary are also proposed to the north of the village along Mill Road and to extend the boundary along Low Common to accommodate the below allocation.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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Due to the form and character of the settlement, only an allocation of 5 dwellings has been identified. However, coupled with the above extension to the development boundary, it is likely that more than five dwellings can be delivered. The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 5 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Land south of Low Common</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>• Development will comprise of frontage development on to Low Common only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its southern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A safe access(es) will need to be provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered

There are no reasonable alternatives.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
WICKLEWOOD (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Wicklewood as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, permission has been granted for 6 dwellings at High Oak Works; therefore we are seeking to allocate up to a further 14 dwellings.

Form and Character
The main concentration of development has taken place along Wymondham Road, High Street, Hackford Road, Church Lane and Low Street. Further clusters of development have taken place at Milestone Lane and The Green. Individual farmsteads and dwellings are sparsely distributed through the rest of the parish. The core of the village has frontage development formed into a doughnut shape, with local employment sites of the nursery and mushroom farm, along with some agricultural land, in the centre. A couple of small estate-type developments have grown up at All Saints Close and Hillside Crescent.

Church Lane and Low St are located on the north-facing slope of a valley, and the dwellings here and on Hackford Road and Wymondham Road benefit from extensive views of the surrounding countryside. The Grade II listed windmill is a distinctive feature on the eastern side of the High Street, and dominates the skyline of this part of the village.

Services and Community Facilities
There is a good range of facilities including a primary school, village hall and pub. The village has mains sewers discharging to the Wymondham sewage treatment works.

Communication
Good road links exist to Wymondham and Hingham via the B1135 and B1108 respectively.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The proposed development boundary covers most development in the parish, reflecting the cohesive built-up area. There is a small break in the development boundary where the central agricultural land is accessed (behind the mushroom farm on Church Lane).

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The development boundary as shown (as defined during 2010 and 2011 public consultations) does not allow for infill development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy. It is proposed to extend the boundary along Low Street and create a new development boundary on Hackford Road, adjacent to the preferred allocation Site No.575. To delete the development boundary to the north of the village to exclude the land that is in the flood zone. To extend the development boundary at High Street to include site 1168 and the preferred site for allocation, site 695a.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could between them accommodate the total requirement of 14 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>Land at Hackford Road</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6 dwellings</td>
<td>• Screen to minimise visual impact on church from rear of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695a</td>
<td>Land fronting High Street</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8 dwellings</td>
<td>• Create setting for Wicklewood Windmill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prevent surface water running off site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- To allocate up to 12 dwellings at site 428 with an extended boundary to allow only frontage development along Low Street. This option was rejected due to the topography of this site, as land levels would make the site visually intrusive.
- To retain the existing development boundary. This was rejected as there appear to be very few opportunities for windfall within the boundary.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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WOODTON (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Woodton including part in Bedingham parish as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The village has a predominantly nucleated settlement pattern based around Hempnall Road, The Street, Triple Plea Road and Chapel Road. Some limited estate scale development has taken place in the village. The village is set in an attractive valley landscape being situated on a south facing valley slope with a smaller tributary valley to the east.

The attractive setting of the village, the views of the surrounding countryside from various points of the village, and the good tree and hedge planting throughout, combine to give the village its attractive rural character.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school, post office and shop, and village hall.

Communication
The B1527 provides a link to the A140 and Long Stratton to the west, whilst the B1332 to the east of the village provides links to Norwich and Bungay. The remainder of the local road network comprises mainly of unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding countryside. In particular the attractive valley landscape.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to remove parts of the development boundary along The Street where in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. As a consequence the development boundary will be split between the main bulk of the village around Hempnall Road and Triple Plea Road and a boundary further to the north around The Woodyard Square and the proposed allocation (see below).

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>To the rear Georges House, The Street and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 dwellings</td>
<td>Development will comprise of a small estate development accessed from adjacent to Georges House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
WORTWELL (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Wortwell as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
There are two main areas which together form the established village of Wortwell. The main part of the village has developed along the line of High Road whilst the remainder, known as Low Street, has developed along Low Road. Individual dwellings and farmsteads are dispersed throughout the remainder of the parish.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a community centre, public house and garage. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
The A143, which bypasses the village, provides good links to Harleston, the A140 and Diss to the west, and to Bungay and the A146 to the east. The remainder of the local road network comprises mainly unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area to prevent further extension of development into the Waveney Valley. The development boundary was drawn to maintain the separation of the two parts of the village and also to exclude land on Low Road opposite Sandcroft Way which represents an important undeveloped area that contributes to the rural character of the village.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to delete the development boundary to take remove areas that are within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. This includes the removal of all of the development on the eastern side of High Road from No64 northwards and the inclusion of sites to the rear of existing development on the western side of High Road to allow for some limited additional development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy where suitable accesses allow.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 15 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (ha*)</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 543b    | Land on both sides of High Road (excluding land recently permitted for) | 15 | dwellings | • Development will comprise of frontage development along High Road only  
• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its southern and northern |

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>affordable housing scheme</th>
<th>boundaries to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the south and north</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding foul sewerage network capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A safe access(es) will need to be provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

**Reasonable Alternatives Considered**

There are no reasonable alternatives for site allocations.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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WRENINGHAM (Service Village in Rural Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Wreningham as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The village centre is linear, with ribbon development following Church Road, Wymondham Road and Ashwellthorpe Road, with a pocket of further development along Mill Lane. The primary school is located centrally where the four roads meet, and further along Mill Lane at the Norwich Road junction is the hamlet of Toprow. The village is surrounded by large open fields interspersed with hedgerows and a few trees. Toprow lies along a shallow valley. Narrow lanes and mature trees contribute to the village’s rural atmosphere.

Services and Community Facilities
The primary school, playing field and village hall are in the centre of the village, with a pub at the edge of the village on the Norwich Road.

Communication
The B1113 provides a direct link to Norwich. Other roads running through the village are narrow.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The proposed development boundary covers most development along Wymondham Road, Ashwellthorpe Road and Church Road, up to the junction at Hethel Road. The clusters of development to the east of the church and to the north-east of Hethel Road are excluded. The separate development boundary at Mill Lane/Toprow includes most of the cluster of dwellings in that location.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
To extend the proposed development boundary to include site 915 land at Church Lane and to extend the Toprow development boundary to include site 705. These changes will allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Preferred Development Sites For Allocation
Norfolk County Council Transport has expressed concerns regarding the road capacity in the village, therefore the preference is to allocate land which will accommodate to the lower end of the required range of 10 – 20 dwellings. The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate 10 dwellings:

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1175</td>
<td>Land adjacent to builder’s yard, Church Road</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10 dwellings</td>
<td>• Access road may be needed due to bend in road/visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TPO on corner of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Right of Way (footpath) to be preserved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- To allocate 10 dwellings at site Z1226. This was rejected as the distance to village services is slightly further than site 1175.
- To allocate 5 dwellings at site 1175 and 5 dwellings at site Z1226. This was rejected in order to achieve higher levels of affordable housing from 10 dwellings.
- To retain the development boundary unchanged. This was rejected as it would not facilitate infill development in line with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.
YELVERTON (Service Village in RPA)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Yelverton including part in Alpington parish as a Service Village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Form and Character
The main built-up areas of Alpington and Yelverton form a contiguous settlement. Development is concentrated around Church Road and Wheel Road. There is also a significant area of development at Mill Road, Alpington. This latter area abuts development in Bergh Apton and is considered as part of the settlement of Bergh Apton for the purposes of a development boundary (see Bergh Apton). Small detached clusters of development exist to the west of the main built-up area on Burgate Lane and to the south on Church Meadow Lane in Alpington, whilst a small number of individual dwellings and farmsteads are dispersed throughout the remainder of both parishes.

The settlement has developed as a ribbon form along Church Road and Wheel Road, though significant post-war estate scale development has taken place in the parish north of Wheel Road and west of Church Road, resulting in a more nucleated settlement form for this part of the settlement.

The settlement is set in generally flat open countryside, although in the south of Alpington there is a small area of attractive valley landscape. The village is characterised by good areas of tree and hedge planting especially along Church Road which together with its setting and views of the surrounding countryside give it attractive rural character.

The western limit of the village along Wheel Road / Burgate Lane is clearly defined by a significant tree belt on the north side of the road which together with open fields on both sides of the road maintains the separation between the main village and the small cluster of dwellings to the west.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement has a range of social and community facilities including a primary school and village hall. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage.

Communication
The A146 is 1km (0.6 miles) to the north and provides a good link to Norwich and Loddon whilst the B1332 lies immediately to the west of the parish providing good links to services in Poringland and also to Norwich and Bungay. The remainder of the internal road network comprises ‘C’ class and unclassified roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary has been drawn up around the existing built-up area of Alpington and Yelverton to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding countryside.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to extend the development boundary around the southern half of site 496 (the northern half has been developed for affordable housing) as this will allow for limited additional development in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 10 additional dwellings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>Land south of Wheel Road (west of Alpington School)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>10 dwellings</td>
<td>• Development will comprise of frontage development along Wheel Road only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The site will need appropriate boundary treatment on its southern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Anglian Water advice will be needed regarding foul sewerage network capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A safe access(es) will need to be provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.

Reasonable Alternatives Considered
- Site 004 – potential to allocate part of the site for housing but only access is via Church Meadow is to the north of the site which given the size of the site could result in an irregular pattern of development. The site is also further from services than site 803.
- Site 804 – would be developed in a similar way to that envisaged at site 803. However site 804 is further from services and has more potential to adversely affect the entrance to the village on Wheel Road and erode the village’s rural character.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Other Villages as those having a basic level of services/facilities. These villages will have a defined development boundary to accommodate very limited infill development without affecting the form and character of the village.

There are a number of villages in South Norfolk that have few or no local services, and would not provide a sustainable location for significant new development. Such places are very reliant on the services of larger centres for their everyday needs, and new development would not necessarily help to retain or attract services due to the ever increasing population thresholds required to support them. While significant expansion would be unsustainable, and no allocations are proposed, some of those places with basic essential services would be capable for accommodating very limited infill development without affecting the form and character of the villages. A basic level of services is generally a primary school and village hall, though regard will be had to the presence of a range of other services. These will normally be available within the identified settlement, though regard will also be had to their availability in other nearby settlements where there is good access particularly by foot or cycle.

Other villages have been dealt with in two parts.  
Part A - Other Villages in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) are;  
**Bawburgh, Caistor St Edmund, Colton, Flordon, Great Melton, Keswick, Ketteringham, Marlingford, Swainsthorpe**

Part B - Other Villages in the Rural Area are;  
**Aldeby, Bressingham, Brockdish, Burgh St Peter** (including part within Wheatacre parish and the adjacent developed area in Aldeby parish)  
**Burston, Claxton, Denton, Forncett St Mary, Forncett St Peter, Haddiscoe, Hardwick, Hedenham, Langley Street, Morley, Needham, Shelfanger, Shotesham, Starston, Tibenham, Tivetshall St Margaret, Tivetshall St Mary, Toft Monks, Topcroft Street, Winfarthing**

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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ALDEBY
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Development within the parish has been concentrated in two separate conurbations at The Street and around Common Road. Individual dwellings and farmsteads are dispersed throughout the remainder of the parish.

Development at The Street is linear in form and comprises one plot depth along The Street, Beccles Road and Rectory Road. It is set in open countryside with the attractive Waveney Valley to the south.

Development at Common Road comprises a small concentration of dwelling centred on the crossroads of Dun Cow Road, Common Road and Lily Lane. It is characterised by tree and hedge planting along the road frontages although the open nature of the western side of Dun Cow Road, north of the crossroads, affords particularly good views of the surrounding countryside.

Much of the southern part of the parish lies within the Broads Authority area.

Social and Community facilities
There are very limited facilities available in Aldeby although further facilities are accessible at nearby Burgh St Peter for residents of Common Road.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Aldeby does not have a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The development boundaries have been drawn around the two main concentrations of development centred on The Street and Common road. They have been drawn to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding open countryside, in particular the adjacent valley landscape of the Waveney valley.

Preferred Option
To define the development boundaries as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. To extend the boundary to include the road frontage of Site (794), former Tobar Ltd, at Common Lane because it is a brownfield redevelopment opportunity which could provide infill housing development whilst retaining some rural local employment.

Other reasonable options considered
Extend the development boundary to the west side of Common Road, to include site 002. This option was rejected because a brownfield site was preferable and including this site would result in more than the limited infill required to accord with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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BRESSINGHAM
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
The parish contains a number of scattered settlements of which the largest are the part of Bressingham located on High Road, and Bressingham Common located along Common Road. Both settlements are mainly linear in form, and are separated and surrounded by large open fields. Both settlements are distinguished by many trees and hedgerows contributing greatly to their rural character and are afforded views across the Waveney Valley by the downward sloping land to the south.

Social and Community Facilities
The village has a small range of services; Village hall, Bus service to Diss and a primary school. Blooms of Bressingham provide for some employment opportunities locally.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Bressingham has a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The potential for further development is limited by the linear forms of the two main settlements of Bressingham. There is still some scope for limited infill within the defined development boundary.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. To extend the boundary at High Road to include part of site No. 761 (land at High Road) this would be in keeping with the existing form and character of the settlement.

Other reasonable options considered
- To keep the existing development boundary. This was rejected because of the limited scope in this boundary for infill development opportunities, although this is the wish of the Parish Council.
- To extend the development boundary along High Road to incorporate road frontage of sites 471 and 389. This option was rejected as it would cumulatively equate to more than ‘limited infill development’ especially because it would also take in the rest of site 761. Concerns raised by English Heritage about the adverse affect of development of these sites on the Listed building adjacent to them.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
BROCKDISH inc. Thorpe Abbotts
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
The parish contains Brockdish and Thorpe Abbotts. Brockdish is primarily a linear village located along the northern side of the Waveney Valley on the A143. The village core is based on the junction of A143. A separate area of residential development is located a short distance to the west near the church and separation of this from the rest of the settlement should be maintained in order to preserve the conservation area featuring many listed buildings.
Thorpe Abbotts comprises a group of mainly detached houses located on frontage plots around the junction of The Street and Mill Road, approx. 2.5 kilometres west of Brockdish. There has been a designated conservation area around Thorpe Abbotts since 1994.

Social and Community Facilities
The parish contains very limited services comprising a school, village hall and Bus service.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Brockdish has a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. However, the potential for development in the village of Brockdish is limited by the surrounding topography and the river valley area to the south.

Preferred option
To keep the defined development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. The development boundary has been drawn to allow for very limited sensitive infill development.

Other reasonable options considered
To extend the development boundary to include a small part of site 558 north of Crabtree Rise. This option was rejected because the site size and shape does not lend itself to a boundary extension which accords with a limited infill requirement in the existing form of this area.
To extend the development boundary eastwards along Scole Road to join up with the development in the west of the settlement. This option was rejected because it would affect the conservation area as entered from the west and maintaining this space separates the two development forms which are distinctly different in type.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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BURGH ST PETER inc. part within Wheatacre
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Development within the parish has been concentrated around the crossroads formed by Beccles Road, Staithe Road, Pitt Road and Mill Road. The remainder of the parish comprises a small number of widely dispersed individual dwellings and farmsteads with the exception of the small concentration of development at the River Waveney Centre in the east of the parish. Part of the built-up area of Burgh St Peter lies within the adjacent parish of Wheatacre but for the purposes of a village development boundary is included within the boundary of Burgh St Peter.

The village of Burgh St Peter has developed a linear settlement form comprising one plot depth along Beccles Road, Staithe Road, Mill Road and Pitt Road. Good tree and hedge planting exists especially along the eastern side of Pitt Road, whilst elsewhere within the village a more open character prevails allowing for good views of the surrounding countryside, in particular the Waveney Valley which lies to the south and east.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Burgh St Peter does not have a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The proposed development boundary has been drawn around the existing built up area to prevent further extension into the surrounding countryside, in particular the attractive valley landscape of the Waveney Valley.

Social and Community facilities
There is a small range of facilities in Burgh St Peter comprising a village hall, bowling green and a pub at nearby Wheatacre and a limited bus service.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.
To extend the development boundary to the south side of Beccles Road to include site Z1234 in the adjoining parish of Wheatacre for limited infill development. Site Z1233 at Pitt Road Burgh St Peter is also within the proposed boundary. To extend the boundary west along Beccles road to include site 1014.

Other reasonable options considered
Due to the form and character of Burgh St Peter and the limited services there were no other reasonable alternative options considered. The preferred boundary provides sufficient limited infill development opportunity to accord with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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BURSTON
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Burston comprises the village and outlying hamlets of Mill Green and Shimpling. A further group of dwellings is located at Audley End. Burston has developed mainly along Diss Road, Crown Green and Station Road and is centred round two village greens. The western half comprises relatively modern detached dwellings in contrast to the eastern side which is mainly semi-detached ribbon development. Crown green, Church green and the open areas leading into Higdon Close form an attractive centre to Burston. There are several notable old buildings which form part of the designated conservation area extending along Diss Road and Mill Road. The surrounding countryside comprises mainly open fields bordered by low hedges and scattered trees.

Social and Community Facilities
The village has limited facilities comprising a school, pub and outdoor recreation area.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Burston has a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The development boundary provides for the consolidation of much of the developed part of Burston and provides for limited infill development. The development boundary excludes the areas considered to form the attractive features of the village which include Crown Green and Church Green and their setting. The boundary also excludes the outlying settlements, although should the Mill cease to operate this could provide a suitable brownfield redevelopment opportunity.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. Extend the boundary along Crown Green to the corner of Gissing Road to include site 547.

Other reasonable options considered
- To keep the current South Norfolk Local Plan boundary. This option was rejected because of the limited scope remaining within the current defined development boundary for limited infill within it.
- To consider extending the boundary south along Rectory Road to include a small part of site 191. This option was rejected because the site is too large for limited infill and to include a small part of the site i.e. road frontage would not be in keeping with the existing developed form.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 6 - OTHER VILLAGES

- To consider extending the boundary to the west of the settlement to include site 390. This option was rejected because the site is considered too large for limited infill development, would not fit with the existing linear development form and could impact on the entry from the west into the conservation area of the village. It is also further away from services that the preferred option.

- To extend the development boundary along Gissing Road to include site 548. The site is too large for limited infill development and consideration was given to including road frontage only. Cumulatively, this site with site 547 (the preferred site), would create more than the limited infill required, and Anglian water has raised objections due to the proximity of the Cordon Sanitaire of a pumping station. Consequently this option has been rejected.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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CLAXTON
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Development within the parish has been concentrated along The Street with a few isolated dwellings and farmsteads scattered throughout the remainder of the parish. The village, located on the edge of the Broads Area, is set in the attractive Yare Valley with extensive marshlands to the north and a gently sloping valley to the south.
The village has a strong linear settlement form with dwellings generally set back from the road although the older cottages at the east end of The Street are built-up close to the road in a traditional style.

Social and Community Facilities
The parish contains very limited services comprising a village hall, pub and Bus service.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Claxton does not have a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. The development boundary has been drawn around the existing built-up area excluding those parts which are within the flood zone.

Other reasonable options considered
Much of the surrounding area falls within the Broads Authority Plan area and therefore no other options were considered. The preferred development boundary provides for limited infill which accords with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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DENTON
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
The main concentration of development within the village is based along Norwich Road and Trunch Hill. Development has taken place in the form of frontage development resulting in a linear settlement form of one plot depth. The settlement is set in an attractive valley landscape with Trunch Hill forming part of the south facing slope of the valley whilst the east side of Trunch Hill/Norwich Road forms part of a tributary valley slope. The good open views from within parts of the built-up area the attractive valley setting and the good tree and hedge planting combine to give it an attractive rural character.

Social and Community facilities
There are very limited services within the village, only a village hall and limited bus service. The school is located in the next village at Alburgh and a playing field is located south of the village.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Denton does not have a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The boundary has been drawn around the existing built up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding countryside, especially the attractive valley landscape to the south and east of the settlement.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. To include site 536 land at Trunch Hill/Middle Road in the development boundary and part of site 1181 land at Trunch Hill/Middle Road which could accommodate some limited infill development in a linear form in keeping with the existing settlement pattern. This option is supported the Parish Council.

Other reasonable options considered
There were no other reasonable options to consider due to the linear settlement form and lack of services/facilities. The Preferred development boundary provides for limited infill within it and accords with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
FORNCETT ST MARY & FORNCETT ST PETER
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Forncett St Mary and Forncett St Peter are both linear in form and have developed along Aslacton Road/ Low Road which follows the line of the Tas valley. The buildings comprise mainly farms and cottages interspersed with open fields and more recent development. The majority of new development has taken place at Forncett St Peter. A conservation area is drawn around most of the settlements and numerous listed and historic buildings feature within it. The undeveloped flood plain of the River Tas valley is located to the east.

Social and Community facilities
Forncett St Peter has limited facilities; a school and bus and Forncett St Mary has the village hall. These settlements share these dispersed facilities and others that are located at Forncett End/Tacolneston, although these are much further afield.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Forncett St Mary does not have a defined development boundary but Forncett St Peter does. This development boundary has been drawn around the existing built-up area of Forncett St Peter in order to prevent the linear spread of the settlement into the surrounding valley landscape and the flood zones to the south.

Preferred option
To define a small development boundary around the cluster of linear development form at Forncett St Mary leaving its more dispersed outlying areas outside and maintaining the space between the two villages.
To define the development boundary in both parishes as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. Site 707 (land at Street Farm) is included within the Forncett St Mary boundary.
To remove the South Norfolk Local Plan defined boundary at Forncett St Peter in the south due to its being in the flood zones.

In addition it should be noted that a brownfield site at Old Station Yard (oil depot) has been given permission for 17 dwellings.

Other reasonable options considered
Due to the flood zone in the south at Forncett St Peter and the proximity to services at Forncett St Mary and the rural character of the settlements, there were no other options considered reasonable. The preferred development boundary provides for limited infill within it and the brownfield site at Old Station Yard will provide additional homes in the village.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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HADDISCOE
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Development along The Street and Thorpe Road has resulted in a linear form of settlement characterised by one plot development the main exception being the Tayler and Green housing at Mock Mile Terrace. The mainly undeveloped nature of the north side of Thorpe Road provides attractive views towards the River Waveney, which contribute to the rural character of the area. The detached area of development at Rectory Road also displays a strong linear form.

The settlement is an attractive valley landscape with the Waveney Valley to the north and a small tributary valley to the west.

Social and Community facilities
There is a limited range of facilities including a village hall, public house and limited bus service.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Haddiscoe has a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. This development boundary has been drawn around the existing development at Rectory Road to prevent the further extension of this detached ribbon of development and to protect its attractive rural setting, in particular the valley to the west and around the main built-up area along The Street and Thorpe Road.

Preferred option
To remove parts of the boundary along The Street and Thorpe Road which are in the flood zones.
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy in keeping with the form and character of the settlement.

Other options considered
To keep the development boundary as defined in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. This option was rejected because of the flood zones as outlined above.
To extend the development boundary along The Loke to incorporate a small part of sites 313/474. This option was rejected due to the openness and rural nature of the area, opposite a working farm and the prominence in the landscape.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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HARDWICK including Shelton
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Development within the parish has been concentrated at Hardwick with a small isolated cluster at Shelton and individual dwellings and farmsteads dispersed throughout the remainder of the parish. Hardwick has developed a linear settlement form based along Mill Road, Hall Lane and The Street characterised by one plot depth development. The village comprises three distinct areas. The first is based along Mill Road and comprises generally modern development. To the north-west of this area and separated by a large open field is a limited ribbon of development along Hall Lane. The third main area is the main core of the village along The Street. The three parts of the village give it an attractive rural character set in a flat and open landscape but with an attractive river valley immediately to the north.

Social and Community facilities
There are very few facilities available in the Parish; the village hall is located within Hardwick and the first school at Shelton.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Shelton with Hardwick does not have a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The new development boundary has been drawn around two of the more built up areas of ribbon development at Shelton to allow for limited infill development within the boundary. Corner Farm has not been included within the development boundary in order to maintain the important open spaces around it and therefore the separation of the two parts which characterise the village.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. Site 429 (land at Mill Road) has been included within the proposed development boundary for limited infill development. To exclude part of the proposed boundary to the south due to its closeness to sewerage treatment works.

Other reasonable options considered
Due to the very limited services in Hardwick there were no other reasonable alternatives to consider.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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HEDEHAM
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Hedenham is a sparsely populated parish. It mainly comprises individual dwellings and farms with a small concentration of development on Church Road. The settlement is set in attractive open countryside interspersed with small wooded areas, and is partly situated on the south slope of a small valley bounded to the east by Hedenham Park giving a rural character. The settlement is characterised by traditional cottages with some Tayler and Green housing at Smiths Knoll and both Hedenham Hall and Ditchingham Hall with their associated parklands form an attractive area of historic parkland. Hedenham has had a designated Conservation Area since 1994.

Social and Community facilities
These are very limited and comprise a village hall and a bus service.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Hedenham does not have a development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. A proposed development boundary has been drawn around the area of Smiths Knoll to allow for limited sensitive infill. Any proposal for new development within the development boundary of Hedenham must take account of the character of the Conservation Area and positively enhance it.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Other reasonable options considered
- To not have a development boundary. This option was rejected because it would not accord with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.
- Due to the dispersed nature of the settlement and no land being suggested in Hedenham, no other options were considered.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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LANGLEY with Hardley
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Development within the parish has been concentrated into three small groups at Langley Green, Langley Street and Hardley Street with individual dwellings and farmsteads widely dispersed throughout the remainder of the parish. The three groups of development are set on the edge of Langley and Hardley Marshes within the Yare Valley. In the west of the parish is the historic parkland of Langley Park.
The character of the developed areas is of a dispersed nature comprising small scattered ribbons of development together with the attractive valley setting combine to give the area an attractive rural character.

Social and Community facilities
There is a village hall and outdoor recreation facilities at Langley Street and a limited bus service. Employment opportunities are available at Langley Abbey.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Langley with Hardley does not have a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. Much of the parish lies within the Broads Authority area with the boundary defined by Langley Street and including the whole of Hardley Street.
The proposed development boundary has been drawn around the isolated linear development forms along Langley Street, Langley Green, and Hardley Street.

Preferred option
Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy identifies Langley Street as being a place with basic essential services which would be capable of accommodating very limited infill development without affecting the form and character of the village. However, much of the proposed development boundaries lie close to or within the flood plain. As a consequence in-fill development in this location should be resisted.
The preferred option is to remove the proposed development boundary in Langley Street that is within the flood zone. Remove the boundary at Hardley Street because it is partly in the flood zone and over 1500m from core services and to reduce the boundary at Langley Green to remove the part that is in the flood zone.

Other reasonable options considered
Due to the dispersed and isolated development pattern and with much of the parish being within the Broads Authority area, there were no other reasonable options to consider. The preferred boundary option accords with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy to provide for limited infill development within it.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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MORLEY
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Morley (formerly the parishes of Morley St Peter and Morley St Botolph) has a widely dispersed settlement pattern. Historically the settlement has developed around two isolated parish churches and a number of farmsteads.

The main area of development in the parish is located at Morley St Botolph and extends along Chapel Road, The Street and Deopham Road. There is also a significant linear development in the south of the parish at Hill Road, astride the former A11, which adjoins development at Besthorpe within Breckland District and is part of the area covered by the Attleborough and Snetterton Heath Area Action Plan. The other significant development within the parish is Wymondham College, a large secondary boarding and day school. The College is located in the south of the parish in an area otherwise characterised by isolated and dispersed dwellings and farms.

Social and Community Facilities
There is a limited range of facilities dispersed through the village including a primary school, a village hall and public house. Wymondham College, a state maintained secondary boarding and day school provides local employment opportunities.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Morley has a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The development boundaries have been drawn to retain the existing wooded character of the settlements while allowing for further limited infill development in the Morley St Botolph area.

Preferred Option
To keep the existing development boundary as shown which has been drawn around the built-up area of Deopham Road and Chapel Lane/Hall Lane and that part of the existing built up area of Hill Road which lies within the Plan Area. Hill Road is remote from services in Morley village but has access to some services at nearby Besthorpe in Breckland Council plan area. To straighten the north-eastern boundary at Chapel Lane to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Other reasonable options considered
- To keep the existing development boundary which still has scope for some limited infill development. As these infill plots had not yet come forward, it could be assumed that they still may not and therefore scope for some additional infill should be preferred. Therefore this option was rejected.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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- To extend the boundary westward along Deopham Road to include part of site 464. This option was rejected because of the affects upon the Listed Buildings and the distance from the dispersed services in the village. The Preferred boundary already provides for limited infill development opportunity in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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NEEDHAM
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Needham is a linear village of mainly detached dwellings on single plot frontage along the former A143. The village is located along the foot of the northern valley slope of the River Waveney. Most development has been concentrated between the village hall and Whitehouse Farm in a linear form. The northern end of the village has a more open aspect and includes a semi-derelict sunken area of ex-gravel pits. The surrounding area comprises valley slopes rising above the village to the north characterised by large fields and few hedgerows or trees. To the south, the valley floor comprises a mixture of arable fields and many mature trees providing an attractive rural setting.

Social and Community facilities
There is a limited range of facilities including a village hall, public house and bus service.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Needham has a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The development boundary provides for infill development within the existing village core while precluding the extension of the existing developed area. The area of development adjacent to the Harleston bypass roundabout is excluded as it is not considered to be an appropriate area for further consolidation, and is separated from the village core by a distinct gap.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. To extend the existing boundary to include part of site 114 (High Road) and straighten the boundary to rear of The Rising site Z1244. The preferred boundary includes Site 706d (land at High Road) within it.

Other options considered
• Not to extend the development boundary. There is still some scope for limited infill development in the current plan development boundary but because this has not come forward, it could be assumed that it still may not, therefore this option was rejected.

• To extend the boundary to the west to include site 706b. This option was rejected due to the steepness of the landscape and the proximity to the bypass and the preferred option has adequate scope for limited infill to accord with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

• To extend the boundary northwards along High Road on the east side to include part of site 401. This option was rejected because of the
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affect upon the church opposite and the contribution it makes to the rural character of this area. The site is also too large for limited infill development. There is adequate scope for limited infill within the preferred development boundary option.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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SHELFANGER
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
The settlement has developed along the B1077 and contains a mixture of old and new development centred on the junction of The Street, Church Road and Rectory Road, with newer extensions to the east and west. The built up areas are surrounded by large open field with few trees or hedgerows affording distant views especially to the north and to the west.

Social and Community facilities
There are very limited facilities available, only a village hall and garage.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Shelfanger has a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. Much of the current development boundary is aligned within the flood zone and extending this further could create flood issues. The form and character of the settlement limits the potential for further development if further intrusion into the countryside is to be avoided.

Preferred option
The preferred option is to redraw the existing development boundary around the existing developed area that is outside the flood zone to provide very limited infill development while precluding further expansion of the ribbon development extensions to the east and west of the village. This would accord with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Other reasonable options considered
- To keep the existing defined development boundary. This option was rejected because it would create infill development within a flood zone which should be resisted. Localised flooding has occurred in this area.
- No other alternative options were considered reasonable because of the flood issues in the village and there are adequate limited infill opportunities provided within the preferred boundary as defined.
- To extend the development boundary eastwards along Heywood Road to include part of site 550. Due to the narrowness of the highway and the distance from services /facilities this option was rejected.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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SHOTESHAM
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Development within the parish has been concentrated along the Street to form the established village of Shotesham. The village has developed a linear settlement form with one plot depth only. The whole is set within an attractive valley landscape with a particular feature being the abundance of trees and hedges which fill the significant gaps that separate many of the buildings and therefore are important in maintaining the rural character of the village.

The main built-up area together with part of Shotesham Common is a Conservation Area designated since 1973. This was extended in 1994 to include the attractive landscape to the west associated with Shotesham Hall.

Social and Community facilities
There is a limited range of facilities including a village hall, public house and bus service.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Shotesham does not have a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The new development boundary has been drawn around the existing built up area to prevent further ribbons of development extending into the surrounding countryside.

The area from The walled frontage of Shotesham House between the converted stables of Shotesham House and the Old Barn southwards along the Street has been excluded from the development boundary because of the importance this area has in contributing towards the form of the village and the important frontage identified on the south side of The Street between The Rectory and High Bohuns any development in this area would impair the form and character of this important frontage.

Any proposal for new development within the development boundary of Shotesham must take account of the character of the Conservation Area and positively enhance it.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Other reasonable options considered
Due to the limited services available and the attractive valley landscape there were no alternatives considered reasonable. The Preferred option boundary provides for limited infill development.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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STARSTON
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
The parish contains a dispersed form of development which includes a ribbon of development fronting onto The Street. The row extends along the northern slopes of a shallow valley toward the junction with Church Hill, Redenhall Road, Railway Hill and Harleston Road, which combined with the setting of the church and the bridge forms an attractive focal point. The whole area is defined as a Conservation Area which is distinguished by the presence of some notable buildings. The surrounding area is open and affords distant views.

Social and Community facilities
There are very limited facilities available comprising a village hall and bus service.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Starston does not have a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The new development boundary has been drawn to reflect the existing settlement form and to prevent further development extending into the surrounding open countryside. The development boundary allows for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. Any proposal for new development within the development boundary of Starston must take account of the character of the Conservation Area and positively enhance it.

Preferred option
To define a development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. To remove part of the boundary that was proposed in the south along railway Hill because of its location within the flood zone.

Other reasonable options considered

- To not have a development boundary. This option would not accord with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Due to its dispersed character and attractive valley landscape there were no other reasonable alternatives to be considered. The preferred boundary provides for adequate infill development.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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TIBENHAM
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
The parish of Tibenham has a dispersed rural settlement pattern consisting of individual dwellings and farms scattered throughout the parish. The established village of Tibenham is concentrated along The Street and around the site of the old school. Further detached clusters of development exist at Pristow Green and Long Row. The main concentration of development has developed in a linear form characterised by one plot depth. Its setting in a small valley with abundant tree hedge planting along the road frontages and attractive open countryside give it a rural character.

Social and Community facilities
The parish has very limited facilities; a pub and newly built village hall and recreation area.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Tibenham does not have a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The new development boundary has been drawn to maintain the separation between the two parts of the village and to provide some limited infill development opportunities in locations close to facilities.

Preferred option
To define a new development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development at The Street (site 723) and Pristow Green Lane (sites 764 and 1051) in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Other reasonable options considered
There were no other reasonable options to consider. The preferred option boundary provides for limited infill development in the most sustainable locations within the village.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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TIVETSHALL ST MARY & ST MARGARET
These settlements are identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Tivetshall St Mary
Development in the parish is concentrated along The Street/Rectory Road in a linear form comprising mainly single plot development. Development is also concentrated around School Road which is the dividing line between the parishes of Tivetshall St Mary and Tivetshall St Margaret. Isolated clusters of development are located at Rectory Road but these are away from the limited facilities that the Tivetshall share. Development in the remainder of the parish comprises individual dwellings and farmsteads. The village has an open rural character derived from the tree and hedge planting and views of the surrounding open countryside.

Tivetshall St Margaret
Development is concentrated along Green Lane, School Road and The Street in a linear form characterised by single plot development. This area is contiguous with development lying within the parish of Tivetshall St Mary and forms a single area of settlement joining both parishes.

Social and Community facilities
There is a very limited range of facilities shared by the Tivetshall; a primary school and village hall which are located along the parish boundary between the two settlements. A public house is located away from the built up areas on the A140 Norwich-Ipswich road.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The Tivetshall do not have a development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The new development boundary has been drawn around the existing built-up area where the two parishes meet. It has been drawn in order to maintain the physical separation between the two built up areas to the south of The Street to prevent further extension of development into the surrounding countryside.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. It is proposed to redraw the proposed boundary to extend southwards at The Street on the east side to level development with opposite side of the highway which includes a small part of site147 road frontage only. A proposed boundary along Rectory Road Tivetshall St Mary has been removed as facilities are more than 800m making development here unsustainable.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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Other reasonable options considered

- To extend the boundary south to include site 673b. This would be further from services than the preferred boundary extension and sufficient limited infill is available within the boundary that has been defined.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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TOFT MONKS
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Development within the parish has been concentrated around the junction of Yarmouth Road/Beccles Road, Post Office Road/Mardle Road and along Bulls Green Lane. Development within the remainder of the parish comprises individual dwellings and farmsteads. The main village comprises two distinct areas which are separated by the open field to the south of Mardle Road and which is important in contributing towards the generally open appearance from which much of the attractive rural character of the village is derived. Development along Yarmouth Road, both sides and along the west side of Bulls Green Lane has taken the form of ribbon development. Along Beccles Road development is limited to the east of the road whilst to the west is the open field separating the two parts of the village. To the north of Mardle Road is Grade 2 agricultural land.

Social and Community facilities
There are limited facilities in the village with only a pub and garage close to the village centre. The primary school is located on the Yarmouth Road some 1500m north of the village.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Toft Monks does not have a development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The new development boundary has been drawn to reflect the existing settlement form and to prevent further development extending into the surrounding open countryside. The development boundary allows for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Other reasonable options considered
There were no other reasonable alternative to consider.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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TOPCROFT
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
The main concentration within the parish has taken place along The Street with a cluster of houses located at Church Road away from the main part of the village. Individual dwellings and farmsteads are dispersed throughout the remainder of the parish. Development along The Street has resulted in a linear settlement form characterised by one plot depth development mainly to the east side of the road, with the west side characterised by more open frontages interspersed with a number of farms set back from the road. The large open areas, views of the surrounding countryside and good tree and hedge planting along much of The Street, are all important in maintaining the rural character and setting of the village.

Social and Community facilities
These are limited and comprise a social club and playing field and a bus service.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Topcroft does not have a development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The new development boundary has been drawn around the existing built-up area to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding countryside and flood zones.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. The open areas to the front of Street Farm and Trees Farm are recognised for their importance in terms of the street scene and general rural character. Development would not be appropriate in these areas and they have therefore been excluded from the development boundary. There is scope for limited infill development within the boundary as drawn.

Other options considered
Due to the proximity of the flood zone, the rural character of the village and limited services/facilities available, there were no other reasonable alternatives to be considered.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
WINFARTHING
This settlement is identified as an ‘Other Village’ in Policy 16 of the Joint Core. As such it will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village.

Form and Character
Winfarthing has developed a linear settlement character along The Street, along part of Hall Road and along Mill Road southwards with outliers of development at Short Green and Goose Green. Winfarthing comprises mainly single plot frontage development including a mixture of housing types and some notable old buildings. The Street is characterised by several areas of open frontage formed mainly by the playing field and several farms which contribute towards the dispersed nature of much of the development, especially in the southern half of the village which has a very open aspect.

The village contains a conservation area in the centre containing a variety of development interspersed with open spaces and an attractive tree-lined area adjacent to St. Mary’s Church. The visual interest along The Street is enhanced by a number of notable old buildings and complemented by the bends in the road.

Social and Community facilities
The parish contains a limited range of facilities including a school, playing field, pub and village hall located a short distance away.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Winfarthing has a defined development boundary in the current South Norfolk Local Plan. The potential for development is limited by the linear nature of Winfarthing. The existing development boundary has been drawn to allow for limited infill within it. The development boundary includes the areas within the main village which are developed but excludes the area considered to form an attractive setting to the church. The boundary therefore maintains the separation of the existing settlements while providing for limited infill development which should enhance the form and character of the village.

Preferred option
To define the development boundary as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy. To redraw the existing boundary to include site 912 land at The Street and to straighten the boundary in a linear form along site 763a land at Church Farm to provide some additional infill development within it.

Other reasonable options considered
- To extend the existing boundary in a linear form southwards, to include part of site 763b land at The Street. This was discounted due to the openness of the surrounding countryside and the distance from existing service/facilities in comparison with the preferred boundary amendment.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
SECTION 6 - OTHER VILLAGES

- To extend the boundary north-west to include site 643 land Stocks Hill/Short Green, this was discounted due to the open countryside to the west and its prominent location at the gateway into the village and conservation area from the west. Additionally, if included this site along with site 335 would provide more than limited infill development. This would therefore not accord with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

- To keep the boundary as in the current South Norfolk Plan. There is little scope for limited infill development in the current Plan development boundary and therefore this would not accord with Policy 16 Joint Core Strategy.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
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SMALLER RURAL COMMUNITIES AND THE COUNTRYSIDE

Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) covers a number of smaller rural communities and hamlets in the countryside. These smaller rural communities will not have a defined development boundary. Affordable housing for which a specific local need can be shown will be permitted in locations adjacent to villages as an exception to general policy. Farm diversification, home working, small-scale and medium-scale commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified, including limited leisure and tourism facilities to maintain and enhance the rural economy will also be acceptable. Other development, including the appropriate replacement of existing buildings, will be permitted in the countryside where it can clearly be demonstrated to further the objectives of the Joint Core Strategy.

Sites that were suggested in the smaller rural communities have not been taken forward for assessment because they do not accord with Policy 17.

The table below shows clearly the 45 sites in the RURAL AREA that have not been taken forward. There were 2 sites which have been taken forward for assessment because of their closeness to a nearby larger settlement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site address</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Size of Site (ha)</th>
<th>suggested landuse</th>
<th>JCS hierarchy</th>
<th>Site conforms with JCS settlement hierarchy for consideration of housing allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Carleton St Peter</td>
<td>Land at Ferry Road</td>
<td>634346/303184</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087</td>
<td>Carleton St Peter</td>
<td>Black Cat Stables, Ferry Road</td>
<td>634348/303054</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0050</td>
<td>Deopham</td>
<td>Land at Pye Lane (opp Red Gables)</td>
<td>604512/299565</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0051</td>
<td>Deopham</td>
<td>Land at The Green next to Old Forge</td>
<td>604511/299413</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0052</td>
<td>Deopham</td>
<td>Land at The Green next to Five Oaks</td>
<td>604603/299003</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference 1</td>
<td>Reference 2</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0057</td>
<td>Deopham</td>
<td>Land at Low Common - off Victoria Lane Deopham</td>
<td>605159/300356</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0358</td>
<td>Deopham</td>
<td>Land at The Green next to Five Oaks (x ref 52)</td>
<td>604620/298977</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0363a</td>
<td>Deopham</td>
<td>Land at Deopham Green adj. Three Ways</td>
<td>604529/298864</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0363b</td>
<td>Deopham</td>
<td>Land at Deopham Green adj. Three Ways</td>
<td>604540/298808</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0488</td>
<td>Deopham</td>
<td>West of Cobham Green</td>
<td>604562/300302</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0713</td>
<td>Deopham</td>
<td>Land at Mill Farm, Morley Road, Deopham Green</td>
<td>604662/298820</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0186</td>
<td>Fundenhall</td>
<td>The Turnpike</td>
<td>615808/296875</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0625</td>
<td>Fundenhall</td>
<td>Land adj. Oak Cottage Common Road</td>
<td>613421/296287</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0809</td>
<td>Fundenhall</td>
<td>Land at Brad View The Turnpike</td>
<td>615808/296789</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0810</td>
<td>Fundenhall</td>
<td>Land at The Croft Tracie Road</td>
<td>613159/296262</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0077a</td>
<td>Gissing</td>
<td>Leaffield, Hall Green</td>
<td>615141/285776</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0077b</td>
<td>Gissing</td>
<td>Leaffield, Hall Green</td>
<td>615156/285659</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0480a Gissing</td>
<td>land at Common Rd &amp; Lower Street</td>
<td>614595/285481</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0480b Gissing</td>
<td>land at Common Rd &amp; Lower Street</td>
<td>614126/285845</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0480c Gissing</td>
<td>land at Common Rd &amp; Lower Street</td>
<td>614160/286131</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0933 Hellington</td>
<td>land adj South Acres, Low Common</td>
<td>631671/303504</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0330 Heywood</td>
<td>Heywoods Grange, Burston Road</td>
<td>612004/281083</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0097 Kimberley</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>606829/303669</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0235 Kimberley</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>606858/303750</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0236 Kimberley</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>606877/303810</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0344 Kirstead</td>
<td>Rear of Green Man Lane, Kirstead NR15 1EP</td>
<td>629720/297230</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0714a Kirstead</td>
<td>Land between Kirstead Green and Norwich Road</td>
<td>629438/296772</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0714b Kirstead</td>
<td>Land east of Kirstead Green</td>
<td>629507/296665</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Area (Hectares)</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirstead</td>
<td>land at Kirstead Green</td>
<td>629528/296866</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Housing SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirstead</td>
<td>land at Norwich Road</td>
<td>629267/297411</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Mixed Use SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runhall</td>
<td>land at Mattishall Road</td>
<td>607311/308117</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Housing SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runhall</td>
<td>land at Church Road</td>
<td>607431/308175</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Housing SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runhall</td>
<td>Land at Maycot, Church Road, Brandon Parva</td>
<td>607400/307806</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Housing SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runhall</td>
<td>Adj. 'Brookfields', Welbourne</td>
<td>606801/309610</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Housing SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runhall</td>
<td>Land on Church Lane, Welbourne</td>
<td>606752/311028</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Housing SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxlingham Thorpe</td>
<td>West End Field</td>
<td>621375/297345</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>Mixed Use SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxlingham Thorpe</td>
<td>Land between Ipswich Road and West End</td>
<td>621267/297407</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Housing SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxlingham Thorpe</td>
<td>land off A140 adj Flordon Road</td>
<td>621127/297733</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Housing SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxlingham Thorpe</td>
<td>land at Tasburgh Road</td>
<td>621089/297648</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Housing SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxlingham Thorpe</td>
<td>Land at Windy Lane</td>
<td>622262/297260</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>Mixed use SRC</td>
<td>Assessed as part of Saxlingham Nethergate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxlingham Thorpe</td>
<td>Land at Windy Lane</td>
<td>622201/297243</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>Mixed Use SRC</td>
<td>Assessed as part of Saxlingham Nethergate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>OS Grid Ref</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1183</td>
<td>Saxlingham Thorpe</td>
<td>Land south of Windy Ridge, Foxhole</td>
<td>621605/297119</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17 - NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1030</td>
<td>Thwaite St Mary</td>
<td>Land at The Old Rectory</td>
<td>633518/295005</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0516</td>
<td>Wacton</td>
<td>Land at Church Road</td>
<td>617797/291845</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17 - NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0609</td>
<td>Wacton</td>
<td>Land at Church Road</td>
<td>617800/291672</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17 - NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701</td>
<td>Wacton</td>
<td>Land at Hall Lane</td>
<td>617725/291149</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17 - NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0907</td>
<td>Wacton</td>
<td>Land at Stratton Road</td>
<td>618174/291649</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17 - NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>